CHAPTER II. KURUS AND VIDEHAS

SECTION I. THE AGE OF THE PARIKSHITAS

Janaḥ sa bhadrāmedhati
rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitah
—Atharva Veda.

We have taken as our starting point the reign of Parikshit whose accession, according to tradition, took place shortly after the Bhārata War.

Was there really a king named Parikshit? True, he is mentioned in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. But the mere mention of a king in this kind of literature is no sure proof of his historical existence unless we have corroborative evidence from external sources.

Parikshit appears in a famous laud of the Twentieth Book of the Atharva Veda Sūnīhitā as a king of the Kurus (Kauravya) whose kingdom (rāṣṭra) flowed with milk and honey. The passage runs as follows:—

"Rājño viśvajanīnasya yo devo martyām ati
vaiśvānarasya susūṭtim ā sunotā Parikshitah
parichchhinnaḥ kshemamakarot tama āsanamācharan
kulāyan kriṇvan Kauravyaḥ pātirvadati jāyaya
katarat ta ā harāṇi dadhi manthāni pari śrutam
jāyāḥ patim vi prichchhati rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitah
abhivasaḥ pra jihīte yavaḥ pakvaḥ patho bilam
janaḥ sa bhadrāmedhati rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitah."

"Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples, the god who is above mortals, who is thought of by all men," of Parikshit! Parikshit has

1 A.V., XX. 127, 7. 10.
2 For the meaning of Vaiśvānara, see Brahaddevatā, II. 66.
produced for us a secure dwelling when he, the most excellent one, went to his seat. (Thus) the husband in Kuru land, when he founds his household, converses with his wife.

“What may I bring to thee, curds, stirred drink or liquor? (Thus) the wife asks her husband in the kingdom of king Parikshit.

“Like light the ripe barley runs over beyond the mouth (of the vessels). The people thrive merrily in the kingdom of king Parikshit.”

Roth and Bloomfield regard Parikshit in the Atharva Veda as a divine being. But Zimmer and Oldenberg recognize him as a human king, a view supported by the fact that in the Aitareya and Sutapatha Brāhmaṇas the famous king Janamejaya bears the patronymic Pārikshata (son of Parikshit). The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, for example, informs us that the priest Tura Kāvasheya “anointed Janamejaya Pārikshita with the great anointing of Indra”:

“Etena ha vā Aindrēṇa mahābhīshekena Turah Kāvasheyo Janamejayam Pārikshitam abhishishecha.”

Referring to king Parikshit, Macdonell and Keith observe: “The epic makes him grandfather of Pratiśravas and great-grandfather of Pratīpa.” Now, the epic, and the Purāṇas have really two Parikshits. Regarding the parentage of one there is no unanimity. He is variously represented as the son of Avikshit, Anaśvā, or Kuru, and is further mentioned as an ancestor of Pratiśravas and Pratīpa. The other Parikshit was a descendant of Pratīpa and, according to a unanimous tradition, a son of Abhimanyu. We shall call the former Parikshit I, and the latter Parikshit II. Was Parikshit I of the Epic and the Purāṇas identical with the Vedic Parikshit

1 Bloomfield, Atharva Veda, pp. 197-98, with slight emendations.
2 VIII. 21.
4 Mahābhārata, Ādiśāstra, 54, 52 and 95, 41. Regarding Parikshit I, the Matsya Purāṇa says, 50, 23:

Kurustu dayitāḥ putrāḥ Sudhanvā Jahnureva cha
Parikshichcha mahātejāḥ pravaraś cārimardanaḥ.
as suggested by the authors of the *Vedic Index*. In support of this view it may be urged that Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka, priest of Janamejaya, son of the Vedic Parikshit, according to the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, is represented in several *Purāṇas* as chaplain of the son of Parikshit I who came before the Bhārata heroes. Indrota's son Dṛiti was a contemporary of Abhipratārin Kākhaseni, "son of Kakhasena," and the name of Kakhasena actually appears among the sons of Parikshit I in a genealogical list of the *Mahābhārata*. Further, like the Vedic Parikshit, Parikshit I had, according to a *Purānic* passage, four sons, viz., Janamejaya, Śrutasena, Ugrasena, and Bhīmasena, and the eldest son had a quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas.

There are, however, other facts which point to an opposite conclusion. The Vedic Parikshit receives in the *Atharvāṇa* the epithet rājā viśvajanina (universal king) and is called "a deva (god) who is above mortals." In his days the designation Kauravya had ceased to be a mere royal patronymic and was applied to ordinary citizens in Kuru land. Kuru had become the eponymous ancestor of the entire race. And lastly, the people thro'v merrily (janah sa bhadramedhuti) in his realm. These particulars hardly apply to the shadowy Parikshit I of Epic and *Purānic* lists who is said to have been very near in time to Kuru himself. On the other hand the Vedic laud corresponds wonderfully, both in content and phraseology with the famous ākhyāna (story) of Parikshit II, son of Abhimanyu, narrated in Chapters 16 to 18 of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. We are told that this Parikshit undertook a digvijaya, conquest of all the quarters, in the

---

1 *Vedic Index*, i. 78.
2 Vartta, AIHT., 114.
3 *Vedic Index*, i. p. 778.
4 *Abh.,* I. 94. 54.
5 *Vīṣṇu Purāṇa*, iv. 20. 1
6 In the *Vīṣṇu Purāṇa*, 93, 21 and the *Harivamsa*, XXX. 9, Parikshit I seems to be identified with Kuru himself as his son (*Pārikshita*) is called *Kuruḥ putrah*, son of Kuru.
course of which he subjugated all the sub-continents (varshāni). He is called the supreme deva who is not to be regarded as the equal of ordinary men (na vai nṛbhīr-
naradevaṁ parākhyaṁ saṁmātum arhasi). He is further styled samrāt (emperor) and under his protection people thrive and have nothing to fear (vindanti bhadrāṇyakutob-
hayāḥ prajāḥ).

Proof of the identity of this Parikshit (son of Abhimanyu) with his Vedic namesake is also furnished by a later passage of the same Purāṇa which mentions Tura Kāvasheya as the priest of his son Janamejaya:

Kāvasheyam purodhāya Turam turagamedharat
Samantat prithivin sarvān jitvā yakshyati chādhvaraiḥ

It will be remembered that the same sage appears as the priest of Janamejaya Pārīkshita in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa is no doubt a late work. But its evidence does not stand alone. This will be made clear by an examination of the names of the sons of Parikshit given in the Vedic texts and the Epic respectively. The Vedic Parikshit, we are told, had four sons namely, Janamejaya, Ugrasena, Bhīmasena and Śrutasena. The Epic Parikshita I, on the other hand, had only one son (Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 95, verse 42 of the Ādiśāstra of the Mahābhārata, and seven sons (Janamejaya, Kakhasena, Ugrasena, Chitrāsenā, Indrasena, Susheṇa and Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 94, verses 54-55, and among these the name of Śrutasena does not occur. Even Janamejaya is omitted in Chapter 95 and in the Java text. There is no king of that name immediately after Parikshita I, also in the Kuru-Pāṇḍu genealogy given in the Chellur or Cocanāda grant of Viśrachāda. The Epic poet and the writer of the Choḍa inscription, which is much older than many

1 Book IX. Ch. 22, Verses 25-37.
2 Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 520
extent manuscripts of the *Mahābhārata*, therefore, were not quite sure as to whether this Parikshit (I) was the father of Janamejaya and Śrutasena. On the other hand, according to the unanimous testimony of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, Parikshit II had undoubtedly a son named Janamejaya who succeeded him on the throne. Thus the *Mahābhārata*, referring to Parikshit II, the son of Abhimanyu, says.\(^1\)

*Parikshit khalu Mādravatīṁ nāmopayeme, tvanmāta-ram. Tasyāṁ bhavān Janamejayah. “Parikshit married Mādravatī, your mother, and she gave birth to you, Janamejaya.”*

The *Matsya Purāṇa\(^2\)* informs us that

“Abhimanyoḥ Parikshitū puṭraḥ pārapuraṇījayaḥ
Janamejayah Parikshitāḥ puṭraḥ paramadhārmikah.”

“Abhimanyu’s son was Parikshit, the conqueror of his enemy's city. Parikshit's son was Janamejaya who was very righteous.”

This Janamejaya had three brothers, namely, Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena: —“Janamejayaḥ Pārikshitah saha bhrātybhīḥ Kurukshetre dirgha-satram uḍāste; tasya bhrātarastrayah Śrutasena Ugraseno Bhīmaseno iti.”\(^3\)

“Janamejaya, son of Parikshit, with his brothers, was attending a long sacrifice of Kurukshetra. His brothers were three, namely—Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena.”

Particulars regarding the son and successor of the Vedic Parikshit agree well with what we know of the son and successor of the Epic and the Purānic Parikshit II. Janamejaya, the son of the Vedic Parikshit, is mentioned

\(^1\) I. 95. 85.

\(^2\) 50. 57.

\(^3\) *Mbh.*, 1. 3. 1. In translating Epic passages use has been made of the renderings of Ray and Dutt. See also Purānic texts cited by Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 40. The view that Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena were sons of Janamejaya (Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 119 f.) is clearly opposed to the evidence of the Epic and several Purāṇas, as well as that of Harivṃśāṁ. Speaking about Parikshit, son of Abhimanyu, the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, for example, says (iv. 21. 1): “Yo'yaṁ sāmpratam avanipatiḥ tasyāpi Janamejaya Śrutasena-Ugrasena-Bhīmasenaḥ puṭrāḥ chatvāro bhavishyanti.”
in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as a performer of the Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice. The priest who performed the famous rite for him was Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka. On the other hand, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which also mentions his Aśvamedha, names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. The statements of the Śatapatha, and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas are apparently conflicting, and can be reconciled if we surmise that either we are dealing with two different kings of the same name and parentage or the same Janamejaya performed two horse-sacrifices. Which Janamejaya actually did so? Curiously enough the Purāṇas give the information which is needed. The Matsya Purāṇa speaking of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu, and the son of Parikshit II, says:

Dvīr aśvamedham āḥṛtya mahāvājasaneyaṃ
apravartayitvā tavi sarvāni yashinī Vājasaneyaṃ
vivāde Brāhmaṇaṁ sārdham abhiśapta vanunī yawau.

The quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas, alluded to in the last line, is also mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. According to that text Janamejaya’s priestly opponents were the Kaśvapas. That designation hardly applies to the Gārgyas who quarrelled with the son of Parikshit I because the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra includes them in the Aṅgiras group. On the other hand Vaiśampāyana, who led the opponents of the son of Parikshit II, was undoubtedly a Kaśyapa.

Parikshit II has thus a better claim than Parikshit I to be regarded as identical with the Vedic Parikshit. It is, however, possible that Parikshit I and Parikshit II represent a bardic duplication of the same original individual regarding whose exact place in the Kuru genealogy no unanimous tradition had survived. The fact that not only the name Parikshit, but names of

1 50, 63-64. Cf. N. K. Siddhanta, The Heroic Age of India, p. 12.
2 VII. 27.
3 Pargiter, Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, 114; Vāyu, 93. 22-25.
most of the sons (in the *Vishṇu* and *Brahma Purāṇas* the names of all the sons) are common to both, points to the same conclusion. In the case of the son and successor of each of the two Parikshits we have a strikingly similar story of quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas. It will further be remembered that while Tura Kāvasheya is mentioned in the Purānic literature as a *Purohita* of the son of Parikshit II, Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka is represented as the priest of the son of Parikshit I. But it is clear from the Vedic texts that both the royal chaplains served the same king who was separated by five or six generations from Janaka, the contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi, Yājñavalkya and Somaśūshma. Doubts may thus be legitimately entertained about the existence of two Parikshits each of whom had sons and successors with identical names, the heroes of tales of a similar character. The probability is that there was really only one Parikshit in the Kuru royal family, father of the patron of both Tura and Indrota.

Did he flourish before or after the Bhārata War? The necessity felt for offering an explanation of the name Parikshit given to Abhimanyu’s son at the end of the Bhārata War, and the explanation itself, probably suggest that the tradition of an earlier Kuru king with the name of Parikshit had not yet come into existence when the tenth book of the *Mahābhārata* was written. Parikshit I was possibly invented by genealogists to account for such anachronisms as the mention of *Indrota-Pārikshita-saṁvāda* as an old story by Bhīshma in the twelfth book (Chapter 151). The wide divergence of opinion in regard to the name of the father of the so-called Parikshit I, and his position in the list, is also to be noted.

---

1 *Vishṇu* IV. 20. 1; 21. 1; *Brahma*, XIII. 109.
2 *Vāyu*, 93. 22-25; *Matsya*, 50. 65-64, etc.
3 *Mbh.* X. 16. 3.

"While the Kuru line will become extinct (*parikṣhīneshu Kurushu*) a son will be born to you (=Uttarā, wife of Abhimanyu). The child will, for that reason, be named Parikshit."
in this connection. It shows the absence of a clear tradition. On the other hand there is absolute unanimity in regard to the parentage and dynastic position of the so-called Parikshit II.¹

¹ The identification of the Vedic Parikshit with the son of Abhimanyu who flourished after the Bharata War does not seem probable to Dr. N. Dutt, the author of The Aryanisation of India, pp. 50 ff., because, in the first place, it goes against the findings of Macdonell, Keith and Pargiter who prefer to identify the Vedic Parikshit with an ancestor of the Pândus. As to this it may be pointed out that the existence of a Parikshit (father of Janamejaya) before the Pândus, rests mainly on the testimony of those very genealogies which are regarded by Keith as worthless and unreliable (cf. RPVU., 21. 618). That the name of Janamejaya in this connection is an intrusion into the genealogical texts is evident from its omission from Chapter 95 of the Mahabharata, the Java text, the Chellur grant, etc.

Dr. Dutt next argues that the Vishnu Purâna makes the four brothers Janamejaya, Sutasena, etc., sons of Parikshit I. If he had only perused a subsequent passage (IV. 21. 1) he would have seen that the Purâna makes the four brothers sons of "Parikshit II" as well and while this later statement finds corroboration in the Mahabharata, (I. 3. 1) the earlier does not.

Dr. Dutt next says that it is always risky to attempt identification of kings or the fixing of their dates from an examination of their teacher-priests' names. But why should it be risky if the names and order of succession be genuine? The real risk lies in the rejection of such evidence without sufficient examination. It should be remembered in this connection that the identification of the Vedic Parikshita Janamejaya with his Epic namesake (descendant of Abhimanyu) does not depend mainly on the teacher-priests' names, but on the following facts, viz., (1) absence of any cogent proof of the existence of an earlier Janamejaya Parikshita in view of the omission of his name in the Java text, Choḍa inscriptions etc., and (2) agreement of particulars about the Vedic Parikshit and Janamejaya (e.g., words describing the prosperity of the Kuru realm, the performance of two Aśvamedhas, quarrel with the Kaśyapaś), with what we know of Parikshit and Janamejaya who were descendants of Abhimanyu. The question of the chronological relation between the Vedic Parikshit and the Vedic Janaka is entirely independent of this identification. This relation has been determined on the strength of two different lines of evidence. Materials for one have indeed been taken from the Vārha list of the Brāhmaṇa. But the succession from Indrota to Somaśūṣma has been reconstructed from incidental notices in the Brāhmaṇa texts themselves which no critic has represented as late.

Dr. Dutt adds that identity of names does not necessarily imply identity of persons. This is a truism which is not remembered only by those who identify Dhṛitarāṣṭra Vaichitravīrya with Dhṛitarāṣṭra of Kaśi. It has never been suggested in the Political History that the Vedic and Epic Parikshits and Janamejayas are identical merely because their names are identical.

As to Dr. Dutt's contention that there could not be want of motives in later times on the part of the authors belonging to rival families and schools to associate a certain teacher-priest with a famous king of old, etc., it is not clear which particular case he has in mind in making the statement. The association of Indrota and Tura with Janamejaya, and that of Uddālaka and
THE KINGDOM OF KURU

The Vedic hymns throw little light on the domestic life or reign-period of Parikshit. From the epic we learn that he married a Madra princess (Mādravatī) and ruled for 24 years dying at the age of sixty.\(^1\) Little credit, however, can be given to the bardic tales that cluster round his name. The only facts that can be accepted as historical are that he was a king of the Kurus, that the people lived prosperously under his rule, that he had many sons, and that the eldest, Janamejaya, succeeded him.

It will not be quite out of place here to say a few words about the **realm of the Kurus** over which Parikshit

Yājñavalkya with Janaka is found in the Satapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas and in the Upanishads. \(^1\) Is it suggested that such association is a deliberate concoction or fabrication? But no shred of evidence has been brought forward to prove such a charge. No doubt misrepresentations are met with in the Epics and the Purāṇas (as pointed out by Pargiter and others). But it would not be reasonable to argue that the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads are guilty of deliberate falsification because sooth there is confusion in the Purāṇas which are undoubtedly of a later date.

Lastly the credibility of the Vānsa lists in the Vedic texts has been assailed on the following grounds, viz.—

(1) Silence of Commentators.

(2) Discrepancy between the lists appended to the 10th and 14th books respectively of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa in regard to the authorship of the work and ascription of the work to different teachers.

(3) Scant courtesy shown to an alleged teacher by his pupil.

As to (1), the Āchārya-parampara, succession of teachers, is distinctly alluded to by the commentators. If they did not enter into a detailed explanation, it is because they considered it to be sugamam, spashṭam, easily intelligible, plain.

(2) There is no Vānsa list at the close of the 14th book of the Brāhmaṇa proper excluding the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad. There are no doubt lists of teachers at the end of the Upanishad. It is too much to expect that, in the various lists, the entire Brāhmaṇa as well as the Upanishad should be ascribed to the same traditional authority. The Brāhmaṇa and Upanishad texts are not works of single individuals. The question of discrepancy, therefore, does not arise. Reference to different traditions regarding the authorship of a particular work, or of particular portions of a work, does not necessarily vitiate any Āchārya-parampara regarding which we have substantial agreement in the texts.

(3) It is too much to expect that in ancient, as in modern times, all pupils should be equally respectful to teachers. Was not Dhrishtadyumna a pupil of Droṇāchārya whom he killed?

\(^1\) Mbh., I. 49. 17-26 with commentary. We learn from the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (III. 3. 1) that the Pārikśita family was intimately known in the Madra country.
ruled. The kingdom, according to epic tradition, stretching from the Sarasvatī to the Ganges. In the Digvijaya-parva it is taken to extend from the border of the land of the Kulindas (near the sources of the Sutlej, the Jumna and the Ganges) to that of the Sūrasenas and the Matsyas (in the Mathurā and Bairāṭ regions respectively), and from the frontier of Rohitaka (Rohtak in the Eastern Punjab) to that of the Pāñchālas (of Rohilkhand). It was divided into three parts, Kurujāṅgala, the Kuru's proper and Kurukshetra.¹ Kurujāṅgala, as its name implies, was probably the wild region of the Kuru realm that stretched from the Kāmyaka forest on the banks of the Sarasvatī to Khāṇḍava near (samīpataḥ) the Jumna.² But in certain passages it is used in a wider sense to designate the whole country (deśa, rāśtra³). The Kuru proper were probably located in the district around Hāstinapura (on the Ganges), identified with a place near Meerut.⁴ The boundaries of Kurukshetra are given in a passage of the Taittirīya Aryanaka⁵ as being Khāṇḍava on the south, the Tūrghna on the north, and the Parīṇah⁶ on the west (lit. hinder section, jaghanārdha). The Mahābhārata⁷ gives the following description of Kurukshetra: “South of the Sarasvatī, and north of the Dṛishadvatī, he who lives in Kurukshetra really dwells in heaven. The region that lies between Taruntuka and Marantuka or Arantuka, the lakes of Rāma and Macha-

¹ Mbh., I. 109. 1; 149. 5-15; II. 26-32; III. 83. 204; Hitcmy. VII. 1. 12
² ³ Mbh., I. 109. 1; 149. 5-15; II. 26-32; III. 83. 204; Hitcmy. VII. 1. 12
⁴ Taittirīya Aryanaka
⁵ Kāmyakaṁ rāma dadṛśu vanam muniṇaprapyaṁ

"Then they saw before them the forest of Kāmyaka on the banks of the Sarasvatī on a level and wild plain, a favoured resort to anchorites." Mbh., III. 5. 5. For the location of the Khāṇḍava forest see I. 222. 14; 223. 1
⁷ Smith, Oxford History (1919), p. 31. Cf. Rām., II. 68. 13; Mbh., I. 128. 29 ff; 133. 11; Pargiter DKA. 5; Patañjali. II. 1. 2 anu Gangaṁ Hāstinapuruḥ.
⁹ Cf. the Pareno of Arrian (Indika, iv), a tributary of the Indus.
¹¹ 89. 4: 9; 15: 25; 40: 52: 200: 204-08.
kruka—this is Kurukshetra which is also called Sāmanta-
pañchaka and the northern sacrificial altar (uttara vedī)
of the grandsire (i.e., Brahmā)." Roughly speaking, the
Kuru kingdom corresponded to modern Thanesar, Delhi
and the greater part of the Upper Gangetic Doāb. Within
the kingdom flowed the rivers Arunā (which joins the
Sarasvati near Pehoa), Aṃśumati, Hiraṇvatī, Āpayā (Āpagā
or Oghavatī, a branch of the Chitang), Kauśikī (a branch
of the Rakshī), as well as the Sarasvati and the Driṣhadvatī
or the Rakshī. Here, too, was situated Saryanāvat, which
the authors of the Vedic Index consider to have
been a lake, like that known to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
by the name of Anyataḥplakṣā.

The royal residence according to the Vedic texts
was apparently Āsandivat. This city may have been
identical with Nāgasāhvaya or Hāstinapura, the capital
mentioned in the Ēpic and the Purāṇas. But it is more
probably represented by the modern Asandh near the
Chitang.

According to epic tradition the kings of Kurukshetra
belonged to the Puru-Bharata family. The Paurava
connection of the Kurus is suggested by the Rigvedic
hymn, which refers to "Kuru-śravaṇa" (lit. glory of the
Kurus) as a descendant of Trasadasyu, a famous king
of the Pūrus. The connection of the Bharatas with
the Kuruland is also attested by Vedic evidence. A
Rigvedic ode speaks of the two Bhāratas, Devaśravas

---

1 Machakruka, Taruntuka and Marantuka are Yaksha dvārapālas guarding
the boundaries of Kurukshetra.
2 For the identification and location of some of the streams see Mbh.,
III. 83. 95, 151; V. 151. 78; Cunningham's Arch-Rep., for 1878-79 quoted in
JRAS., 1889, 563n; Smith, Oxford History, 29; Science and Culture, 1943,
pp. 468 ff.
4 See the map, Smith, Oxford History, p. 29, An Āsand district is men-
tioned by Fleet in his Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts (Bombay Gazetteer,
1. 2, p. 498). But there is no reason for connecting it with the Kuru country.
5 X. 33. 4.
6 Rigveda, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3.
7 Rig. iii 23; Oldenberg, Buddha, pp. 409-10.
and Devavāta, as sacrificing in the land on the Drisadvatī, the Āpayā and the Sarasvatī. Some famous gāthās of the Brāhmaṇas and the epic tell us that Bharata Daunshanti made offerings on the Jumna, the Ganges (Yamunā anu Gaṅgāyām) and the Sarasvatī. The territory indicated in these laudatory verses is exactly the region which is later on so highly celebrated as Kurukshetra.

In the opinion of Oldenberg "the countless small stocks of the Śāhīhitā age were fused together to form the greater peoples of the Brāhmaṇa period. The Bharatas found their place, probably together with their old enemies, the Pūrūs, within the great complex of peoples now in process of formation, the Kuru; their sacred land now became Kurukshetra."²

Among those kings who are mentioned in the genealogical lists of the Mahābhārata as ancestors and

¹ Sat. Br. xiii. 5, 4, 11; Ait. Br., viii. 23; Mbh., vii. 66. 8.
² The absorption of the Bharatas by the Kuru is suggested by such passages as Kuravo nāma Bhārataḥ (Mbh., XII. 349. 44). In the Rām., IV. 33. 11 Bharatas are still distinguished from the Kuru. It has been suggested by some scholars, e.g., C. V. Vaidya (History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Vol. II, pp. 268 ff.) that the Bharata of Rigvedic tradition is not to be identified with Daunshanti Bharata, the traditional progenitor of the Kuru royal family, but rather with Bharata, the son of Rishabha, a descendant of the first Manu called Suśyambhuva. It should, however, be remembered that the story of Bharata, son of Rishabha, is distinctly late. The Bharata princes and people of Rigvedic tradition are clearly associated with the Kuru country watered by the Sarasvatī and the Drisadvatī and the names of their rulers, e.g., Divodāsa and Sudās occur in Purānic lists of kings descended from the son or daughter of Manu Vaivasvata and not of Manu Sūyambhuva. The Bharata priests Vaiśhītha and Viśvāmitra Kaūśika are connected in early literature with the royal progeny of Manu Vaivasvata and his daughter, and not of Manu Sūyambhuva. For the association of Vaiśhītha with the descendants of Bharata Daunshanti see the story of Saṁvarana and Tapati in the Mahābhārata, I. 94 and 17 f. Viśvāmitra Kaūśika’s association with the Pūru-Bharata family is, of course, well-known (Mbh. I. 94. 33). It may be argued that Bharata, ancestor of Viśvāmitra, who is called Bharata-rishabha in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, must be distinguished from the later Bharata, the son of Śakuntāla, daughter of Viśvāmitra. But there is no real ground for believing that the story of Viśvāmitra’s connection with the nymphs is based on sober history. The Rigvedic Viśvāmitra belonged to the family of Kuśika. In the Mahābhārata (I. 94. 33) the Kuśikas are expressly mentioned as descendants of Bharata Daunshanti.

² Adiparva, Chapters 94 and 95.
predecessors of Parikshit, the names of the following occur in the Vedic literature:—

Pūru-ravas Aila,1 Āyu,2 Yayāti Nahushya,3 Pūru,4 Bharata Dauḥshanti Saudyumni,5 Ajamīḍha,6 Rīksha,7 Saṃvaraṇa,8 Kuru,9 Uchchāiṣṭravas,10 Prātīpa Prātisatvana or Prāti sutvana,11 Balhika Prātipīya,12 Saṃtanu,13 and Dhrītarāṣṭrapā Pracitravīrya.14

The occurrence of these names in Vedic texts probably proves their historicity,15 but it is difficult to say how far the epic account of their relationship with one another or with Parikshit, and the traditional order of succession, are reliable. Some of the kings may not have been connected with the Kuru at all. Others, e.g., Uchchāiṣṭravas Kaupayeya, Balhika Prātipīya and Saṃtanu, were undoubtedly of the same race (Kauravya) as Parikshit.16

Pūru-ravas Aila, the first king in the above list, is represented in epic tales as the son of a ruler who migrated from Bāhli in Central Asia to Mid-India.17 It may be

---

1 Rg Veda, X. 95; Sat. Br., XI. 5. 1. 1.
2 Rg Veda, I. 53. 10; II. 14. 7. etc.
3 R. V., I. 31. 17; X. 63. 1.
4 R. V., VII. 8. 4. 18. 13.
5 Sat. Br., XII. 5. 4. 11-12; Ait. Br., viii, 23.
6 R. V., IV. 44. 6.
7 R. V., VIII. 68. 15.
8 R. V., VIII. 51. 1. (Vedic Index II. 44a).
10 Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa, III. 29. 1-3.
11 Atharva Veda, XX. 129. 2.
12 Sat. Br., XII. 9. 3. 3.
13 R. V., X. 98.
14 Kāṭhaka Samhitā, X. 6.
15 It should, however, be noted that no individual king named Kuru is mentioned in Vedic literature. Kuru is the name of a people in the Vedic texts.
17 Rām., VII. 103. 21-22. This Bāhli lay outside the Madhyadesa and is associated with Kārdma kings. The reference is doubtless to Balkh or Bactria in the Oxus Valley. For a discussion about its identity see IHQ. 1933. 37-99. The Mātṛṣva Purāṇa, 12. 14 ff. distinctly mentions Iīvrīta-Varsha (in Central Asia) as the realm of the parent of Pūru-ravas. Mbh., III. 90. 22-25) however seems to locate the birth place of Pūru-ravas on a hill near the source of the Ganges.
noted in this connection that the \textit{Papañcha-sūdani} refers to the Kurus—the most important branch of the Ailas according to the \textit{Mahābhārata} and the \textit{Purāṇas}—as colonists from the trans-Himalayan region known as Uttarā Kuru. Bharata, another king mentioned in the epic list, is described as a lineal descendant of Purū-ravas and of Purū. But this is doubtful. He is, as we have seen, definitely associated in Brāhmanic and epic gāthās with the land on the Sarasvatī, the Ganges and the Jumna, and is credited with victory over the Satvats. The epic tradition that he was the progenitor of the Kuru royal family is in agreement with the Vedic evidence which connects him and his clansmen, Devaśravas and Deva-vāta, with the same territory which afterwards became famous as the land of the Kurus. Uchchāravas Kaupayeya had matrimonial relations with the royal family of the Pañcālas. But Balhika Prātipīya could ill conceal his jealousy of the ruler of the Śrinjayas, a people closely associated with the Pañcālas in epic tales. The word Balhika in the name Balhika Prātipīya seems to be a personal designation and there is no clear evidence that it is in any way connected with the Balhika tribe mentioned in the \textit{Atharvā Veda} and later texts. It may, however, point to the northern origin of the Kurus\footnote{Law, \textit{Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes}, p. 16. Note the association of the Kurus with the Mahāvṛīsha, \textit{Vedic Index}, II. 279n, and with the Bālhikas, \textit{Mbh.} II. 63. 2-7. In \textit{Mbh.} III. 145. 18-19 the Uttara Kurus are apparently placed near Mount Kailāsa and Badari. In other texts they are located much farther to the north. The Kurus of the \textit{Madhya-deśa} are called \textit{Dakṣiṇa-Kurus} in \textit{Mbh.}, I. 109. 10.} of the “Middle country,” a theory rendered probable by the association of the Kurus with the Mahāvṛīshas\footnote{Note the association of the Prātipēyas of the Kuru assembly with the Bālhikas in \textit{Mbh.}, ii. 63. 2-7; \textit{Pratipēyāḥ Sāntanavā Bhimasenaḥ sa Bālhikāḥō, triṇudvam Ādviyām vāchaṁ saṁsadi Kauravāṇāṁ}.} and the fact that a section of the Kuru people dwelt beyond the Himālayas in the days of the \textit{Aitareya Brāhmaṇa} and the \textit{Mahābhā-
rata. The history of the Kuru royal line becomes more
definite from the time of Saṁtanu who was fifth in the
ascending line from Parikshit. Regarding the events
of Parikshit’s reign we have little reliable information.
We only know that the drought that threatened the Kuru
realm in the time of Saṁtanu had passed away and the
people “throve merrily in the kingdom of Parikshit.”

The date of Parikshit is a matter regarding which the
Vedic texts give no direct information. In the Aihole
Inscription of Raviśrīti, panegyrist of Pulakeśin II, dated
Śaka 556 (expired) = A.D. 634-35, it is stated that at that
time 3735 years had passed since the Bhārata War:

\[\text{Triaṁśatsu tri-sahasreshu Bhāratād āhavād itaḥ}
\text{saptābda-sata-yuktēshu gatah�abdeshu paṁchasu.}^{1}\]

The date of the Bhārata war which almost synchronised
with the birth of Parikshit, is, according to this calculation,
and the testimony of Āryabhaṭa (A.D. 499), 3102 B.C.
This is the starting point of the so-called Kali-yuga era.
But, as pointed out by Fleet\(^2\), the reckoning was not
founded in Vedic times. It is an invented one, devised
by Hindu astronomers and chronologists for the purposes
of their calculations some thirty-five centuries after the
initial point which they assigned to it. As a matter of
fact another school of Hindu astronomers and historians,
represented by Vṛiddha-Garga, Varāhamihira and
Kalhaṇa, placed the heroes of the Bhārata war 653 years
after the beginning of the Kali-yuga and 2526 years before
the Śaka era, \textit{i.e.}, in B.C. 2449.\(^3\) This last date
is as much open to doubt as the one adopted by Āryabhaṭa
and Raviśrīti. The literature that embodies the Vṛiddha-
Garga tradition cannot claim any higher antiquity or
reliability than the composition of the great astronomer
of Kusumapura. The chronology to which it gives

---

\(^{1}\) Ep. Ind., VI, pp 11, 12.
\(^{2}\) JRAS., 1911, pp. 479 ff., 675 ff.
\(^{3}\) Asan Mapāḥsū munayaḥ sāsati prithivām Yudhishṭhire nyajata
Rajataraṅgini, I. 48-56.
preference is not accepted by the Aihole inscription of Ravikīrti. A noted writer,\(^1\) who accepts the dating of Vṛiddha-Garga and Varāha, cites only two late cases (*op. cit.* p. 401) to prove its currency in India, *viz.*, the commentary on the Bhāgavatāmṛīta and certain modern Almanacs. His attempts to support this tradition by astronomical calculation based on certain Mahābhārata passages are beset with difficulties. For one thing there is a good deal of uncertainty regarding the starting point of what he calls the “Purānic” or “epic” Kaliyuga. He says (p. 309) “most likely the Mahābhārata Kaliyuga truly began from the year 2454 B.C. The year of the Bhārata battle according to his finding is however 2449 B.C. In other words the battle was fought five years after the epic Kaliyuga had already begun. But he himself points out (p. 393) that the battle was fought, according to the Mahābhārata, when it was the junction of (antara, really interval between) Kali and Dwāpara, and 36 years before the year of Krishna's expiry (p. 309) which was the true beginning of the Kaliyuga. Thus the dates assigned to the beginning of Kali do not agree. These discrepancies demonstrate the unstable character of the ground on which the chronological edifice is sought to be 'built. It may be remembered in this connection that Kalhaṇa, who places Gonarda I of Kashmir and the Bhārata War in 2449-8 B.C. fixes a date for Asoka much earlier than Gonarda III (1182 B.C.). This result is opposed to all genuine historical evidence and proves the unreliable character of the scheme of chronology which has for its basis a belief in 2449 B.C. as the date of the Bhārata War. Some writers\(^2\) try to reconcile the conflicting view presented by the schools of Āryabhaṭa and Vṛiddha-Garga by suggesting that the Saka-kāla, of Varāhamihira is really Sākya-kāla, *i.e.*, the era of the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa. This


conjecture is not only opposed to the evidence of Kalhana, but is flatly contradicted by Bhattotpala who explains Śaka-kāla of the Brihat Sārīhiti passage as Śaka-nripa-kāla, era of the Śaka king. Varāhamihira himself knew of no Śaka-kāla apart from the Sakendraśa or Śaka-bhūpa-kāla, i.e., the era of the Śaka king.

A third tradition is recorded by the compilers of the Purāṇas. There is a remarkable verse, found with variants in the historical Purāṇas, which places the birth of Parīkṣhit 1050 (or 1015, 1115, 1500 etc. according to some manuscripts), years before Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king of Magadha:

Mahāpadm-ābhishekāt tu
yāvajjanma Parīkṣhitah
evaṁ varshasahasraṁ tu
jñeyam pañchāśaduttaram.

If the reading Pañchāśaduttaram be correct, the verse would seem to point to a date in the fourteenth or fifteenth century B.C. for the birth of Parīkṣhit. It is, however, doubtful if even this tradition can be regarded as of great value. In the first place the divergent readings in the different Mss. take away from the value of the chronological datum. Secondly, the Purāṇas themselves in giving details about the dynasties that are supposed to have intervened between the Bhārata war and the coronation of Mahāpadma mention totals of reigns which when added together neither present a unanimous tradi-

---

1 The Brihat-Sarīhiti by Varāhamihira with the commentary of Bhattotpala, edited by Sudhākara Dwivedi, p. 281.
3 Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 58. From the account of Pargiter it appears that the reading Pañcha-śatottaram, finds no support in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa texts. The variant Śatam pañchadaśottaram occurs only in some Bhāgavata Mss. ‘Pañchadasi-uttaram’ is however unknown to the Mālasya. One Mālasya Ms. has ‘śato trayam.’ The reading generally accepted by the scribes seems to have been Pañchiśad-uttaram. The biggest figure (1500) is probably obtained by the wrong inclusion within the Magadhan list of the Pradyotās of Avanti and taking the period of Bāhrdrathra rule to cover 1000 instead of 725 years. 1000 (for the Bāhradrathas) + 152 (for the Pradyotās) + 360 (for the Śaśiṇāgas) = 1512 years.
tion nor correspond to the figure 1050, which alone finds general acceptance in the Matsya, the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇda manuscripts. The discrepancies may no doubt be partially explained by the well-known fact that the Purānic chroniclers often represent contemporaneous lines e.g. the Pradyotases and the Bimbisārīdes, as following one another in regular succession. But there is another point which deserves notice in this connection. The same passage which says that “from Mahāpadma’s inauguration to the birth of Parikshit, this interval is indeed 1050 years,” adds that “the interval which elapsed from the last Andhra king Pulomāvi to Mahāpadma was 836 years.” As most of the Purāṇas agree in assigning a period of 100 years to Mahāpadma and his sons who were followed immediately by Chandragupta Maurya, the interval between Chandragupta and Pulomāvi, according to the Purānic chronology, will be 836—100—736 years. Now as Chandragupta could not have ascended the throne before 326 B.C., Pulomāvi, according to the calculation of the Purāṇas, cannot be placed earlier than 410 A.D. But this date can hardly be reconciled with what we know about the history of the Deccan in the first half of the fifth century A.D. Contemporary records show that the territory that had acknowledged the sway of Pulomāvi and his ancestors was at that time under the Vākāṭakas and other dynasties that rose on the ruins of the so-called “Andhra,” or Śatavāhana empire. This emphasizes the need of caution in utilizing the chronological data of the Purāṇas.¹

An attempt has been made in recent times to support the Purānic date for Parikshit and the Bāharata War which is taken to correspond to c. 1400 B.C.,² by calculations based on the Vaṁśa lists of teachers and pupils

¹ See also Raychaudhuri. The Early History of the Vaishñava Sect, second edition, pp. 60ff.
² Dr. Altekar, Presidential Address to the Archaic Section of the Indian History Congress, Proceedings of the Third Session, 1939, pp. 68-77.
preserved in the Vedic literature. The importance of these lists was emphasized in these very pages as early as 1923. But the data they yield have been made to square with the chronological scheme adumbrated in some of the Purānic Mss with the help of a number of assumptions for which no cogent proofs have been adduced. It has, for instance, been taken for granted that the Vaṁśa list given at the end of the Brīhadāraṇyaka Upanishad is virtually contemporaneous with those found in the Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa and the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa, and that all the lists “must be” dated “not later than c. 550 B.C.” (op. cit. p. 70). A few pages further on (p. 77) the date of the Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa is stated to be “c. 550 B.C.” (the words “not later than” being omitted). The mere fact that the Brīhadāraṇyaka Upanishad and other works of the Śruti literature are generally regarded as Pre-Buddhist cannot be taken to prove that the entire lists of teachers and pupils appended to or inserted in all of them can claim equal antiquity. Scholars in assigning the period before 500 B.C. to the Vedic literature expressly exclude “its latest excrescences.”¹ Pāṇini² draws a distinction between Vedic works which, to him, are Purāṇaprokta and those that he does not obviously regard as equally old. The date “c. 550 B.C.” has even less justification than the vague words “not later than c. 550 B.C.”

It has been stated further that the period separating the priests of Janamejaya from c. 550 B.C. is 800 years. This figure is obtained by accepting the round number 40 for the intervening generations and assigning to each generation in the guruśishya parampurā a period of 20 years. The probative value of this mode of calculation is impaired by the fact that the actual number of teachers of the period given in the Brīhadāraṇyaka Upanishad is 45 and not 40 (p. 70), and the true average length of a spiritual generation is, according to Jaina and Buddhist

¹ Winternitz, A History of Indian Literature, p. 27
² IV. 3. 105.
evidence, about 30 and not 20 years. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that if the lists which form the basis of calculation are really to be dated ‘not later than c. 550 B.C.,’ c. 1350 B.C. (550 + 800) can only be regarded as a terminus ad quem. The terminus a quo still remains to be determined. The uncertainty regarding the date of the particular Vāmaśa lists, on which the whole chronological theory rests, lays even the lower limit open to objection.

Tradition recorded in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara points to a date for the Pārīkshitas which is much later than that assigned to them by Purāṇic chroniclers and astronomers of the Gupta Age. It refers to Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī (c. 500 B.C.), as fifth in lineal succession from Pārīkshit. The evidence is late but the text professes to embody tradition that goes back to Guṇāḍhya who is known to Bāna (c. 600 A.D.) and is assigned to the Śātavāhana period.

A comparatively late date, albeit not the date suggested by the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, can also be inferred from certain passages in the later Vedic texts. We shall show in the next section that Pārīkshit’s son and successor Janamejaya was separated by five or six generations of teachers from the time of Janaka of the Upanishads and his contemporary Uddālaka Āruṇi. At the end of the Kaushitaki or Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka we find a vamśa or list of the teachers by whom the knowledge contained in that Āraṇyaka is supposed to have been handed down. The opening words of this list run thus:—

“Om! Now follows the vamśa. Adoration to the Brahman! Adoration to the teachers! We have learnt this text from Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana from Kahola Kaushitaki, Kahola Kaushitaki from Uddālaka Āruṇi”

1 Jacobs, Pārīshtrapurvan, 2nd ed. xviii; Rhys Davids, Buddhist. Sutta
Introduction, xlvii.
2 Kathā-sarit-sāgara, IX. 6-7 ff, Penzer, I. 95.
3 Ādīhāya 15.
The passage quoted above makes it clear that Guṇākhyā Śāṇkhāyana was separated by two generations from the time of Uddālaka who was separated by five or six generations from the time of Janamejaya. Guṇākhyā, therefore, lived seven or eight generations after Parikshit. He could not have flourished much later than Āśvalāyana because the latter, or preferably his pupil, honours his guru Kahola.¹ It is to be noted that we have no personal name prefixed to Āśvalāyana as we have in the case of Śāṇkhāyana. This probably suggests that Vedic tradition knew only of one great teacher named Āśvalāyana. It is significant that both in Vedic and Buddhist literature this famous scholar is associated with one and the same locality, viz., Kosala, modern Oudh. The Praśna Upaniṣad tells us that Āśvalāyana was a Kausalya, i.e., an inhabitant of Kosala, and a contemporary of Kabandhi Kātyāyana. These facts enable us to identify him with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi (a city in Kosala) mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya² as a famous Vedic scholar, and a contemporary of Gotama Buddha and, hence, of Kakuda³ or Pakudha Kachchāyana. The reference to Gotama’s contemporary as a master of ketubha, i.e., kalpa or ritual, makes it exceedingly probable that he is to be identified with the famous Āśvalāyana of the Gṛihya Sūtras. Consequently the latter must have lived in the sixth century B.C. Guṇākhyā Śāṇkhāyana, whose teacher Kahola is honoured by the famous Gṛihyasūtra-kāra, cannot be placed later than that century. That the upper limit of Guṇākhyā’s date is not far removed from the lower one is suggested in the first place by the reference in his Āraṇyaka to Paushkarsādi, Lauhitya and a teacher who is styled Magadhavāsī. The first two figure, in the

¹ Āśvalāyana Gṛihya Sūtra, III. 4. 4.
² II. 147, et seq.
³ ‘‘Ṭīṇinām’’
⁴ As to the equation kabandhi = kakuda, see IHQ, 1932, 603 ff. Kabandha in the Atharva Veda, X. 5.3 means śroṣī and āru (hips and thighs). According to Amara kakudmati has substantially the same meaning.
Ambattha and Lohaccha suttas, among the contemporaries of the Buddha. The attitude of respect towards a Magadhan teacher in the Aranyaka points to an age later than that reflected in the Srauta Sutras which mention Brähmanas hailing from the locality in question in a depreciatory tone as Brahmobandhu Māgadha-deśiya.1

Goldstücker points out2 that Pāṇini used the word Aranyak only in the sense of 'a man living in the forest'. It is Kātyāyana (c. fourth century B.C.) who vouchsafes in a Vārttika the information that the same expression is also used in the sense of treatises 'read in the forest'. The silence of Pāṇini in regard to this additional meaning of the term, when contrasted with the clear statement of the later grammarian, leaves little room for doubt that Aranyak in the sense of a forest-treatise was well-known to writers traditionally assigned to the fourth century B.C., but not to Pāṇini. It may be recalled in this connection that, unlike Kātyāyana again, Pāṇini does not include the works of Yājñavalkya, a contemporary of Kahola, the teacher of Guṇākhyā, among the older (Purāṇa-prokta) Brähmanas.3 Śvetaketu, another contemporary of Kahola, teacher of Guṇākhyā, is mentioned in the Dharmaśūtra of Āpastamba4 as an avara or modern authority. The reference to Yavanāni in the sūtras5 of Pāṇini and the tradition recorded in the Kāvyā-Mīmāṃsā6 that he made his mark in the city of Pātaliputra (founded, as we know, after the death of the Buddha, c. 486 B.C., in the reign of Udāyin), clearly suggest that he could not have flourished before the sage of the Śākyas. Pro-

1 Vedic Index, II. 116. Isolated references to Paśkaśaśā and others may not be of much value. What we have to consider is the cumulative effect of the references in the Sāṅkhāyana Āryaka combined with the testimony of Pāṇini and Āpastamba.
2 Pāṇini, His Place in Sanskrit Literature, 1914, 99.
3 IV. 3. 105 with commentary quoted on page 106n of Goldstücker's Pāṇini, Yājñavalkyaśāstra hi na chirakālā styākhyāneshu vārtā.
4 Dharmaśūtra, 1. 2, 5, 4-6.
5 IV. I. 49.
6 P. 55.
found as his knowledge is in regard to Vedic literature, Pāñini is unaware of the existence of Āranyakas as a class of forest-treatises. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to conclude that he could not have been considerably posterior to the great masters of the Āranyakas among whom Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana holds an honoured place. In other words, the upper limit of the date of this teacher almost coincides with the lower. With a date for him in the sixth century B.C. all the evidence accommodates itself.

We are now left with the task of attempting to measure the distance between Guṇākhya and Parikshit. Professor Rhys Davids in his Buddhist Suttas assigns 150 years to the five Theras from Upāli to Mahinda. Jacobi, too, informs us that the average length of a patriarchate may be estimated at about 30 years. We may, therefore, assign 240 or 270 years to the eight or nine generations from Parikshit to Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, and place the former in the ninth century B.C.

Parikshit was succeeded on the Kuru throne by his eldest son Janamejaya. The Mahābhārata refers to a great snake-sacrifice performed by this king. In this connection it is stated that the king conquered Taxila.1 It is clear from the Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa2 and the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra3 that the epic account of the Kuru king’s Sarpa-satra cannot be regarded as having any historical basis. There is hardly any doubt that the Satra mentioned in the Vedic texts is the prototype of the famous sacrifice described in the epic. The story seems to have undergone three stages of development. The original tale is concerned with a mythical rite performed by the serpents one of whom was named Janamejaya, who served as an Adhvaryu (priest). “Through this rite the serpents van-

---

2 XXV. 15; *Vedic Index*, I. p. 274.
3 *Vol. II*, p. 298; XVII. 18.
quished death." The next stage is reached in the *Baudhāyana Śrāuta Sūtra*. Janamejaya appears among the kings and princes of the serpents assembled for sacrifice in human shape at Khāṇḍavapraṣṭha (in the Kuru country) with the object of obtaining poison. In the epic the performer of the sacrifice is identified with the Kuru king; and the object of the sacrifice is not the acquisition of immortality for the serpents, or of poison, but the extinction of these reptiles. It is impossible to find in the doings of these venomous creatures a reference to an historic strife.\(^1\)

The conquest of Taxila by the Kuru king may, however, be an historical fact, because King Janamejaya is represented as a great conqueror in the *Brāhmaṇas*. Thus the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa says: \(^2\)  "Janamejayaḥ Pārikṣhitah Samantarāṁ sarvataḥ pṛithivinī jayan pariṣyāṣvena cha medhyene, tadesaḥ yajña-gathā gīyate:  
Āsandīvatī dhānyādaṁ rukmiṇiṁ karitasrajam  
aśvam babandha sāraṅgāṁ devabhya Janamejaya iti"  
"Janamejaya Pārikṣhita went round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice." Regarding this a sacrificial verse is sung:

"In Āsandīvat Janamejaya bound for the gods a black-spotted grain-eating horse, adorned with a golden ornament and with yellow garlands."\(^3\)

In another passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^4\) it is stated that Janamejaya aspired to be a "Sarvabhūmi", i.e., a universal sovereign:

"Evānvidam āsti vai māmevānvido yādayantī tasmād  
aham jayāmyabhītvarīṁ senaṁ jayāmyabhītvarīya senayaṁ  

\(^1\) *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, translated by Dr. W. Caland, p. 641; cf. Winternitz, *JBBrRAS*, 1926, 74. ff. Pargiter, *AIHT*, p. 285, observes that "the Nāgas killed Parikshit II, but his son Janamejaya III defeated them and peace was made!"

\(^2\) VIII. 21.

\(^3\) Variant—abadhnādaṁśaṁ sāraṅgāṁ—*Sat. Br.* xiii. 5. 4. 1-2.


\(^5\) VIII. 11.
na mā divyā na mānushya ishava richhantyeshyāmi sarvamāyuḥ sarvabhūmir bhavishyāmīti.”

(Janamejaya Pārīkṣhita used to say) “Those who know thus sacrifice for me who know thus; therefore I conquer the assailing host, I conquer with an assailing host. Me neither the arrows of heaven nor of men reach. I shall live all my life, I shall become lord of all the earth.”

The possession of Taxila in the extreme north-west implies control over Madra or the central Paṇjāb, the homeland of Janamejaya’s mother Mādravatī. In this connection it may be remembered that the western frontier of the Kuru country once extended as far as the Pariṇāḥ or Parenos, a tributary of the Indus. Princes of the Paurava race ruled in the territory lying between the Jhelam and the Rāvi down to the time of Alexander, while Ptolemy, the geographer, expressly mentions the Paṇḍus as the rulers of Śākala (Śālkot) in the heart of this extensive region.

It was presumably after his victorious campaigns that Janamejaya was consecrated with the Punar-abhisheka and the Aindra mahābhishheka, performed two horse-sacrifices and had a dispute with Vaiśampāyana and the Brāhmaṇas. The Matsya version, which is considered by Pargiter to be the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest; but the Vāyu version says he perished and the Brāhmaṇas made his son king. The broad facts of the Purānic narrative are confirmed by the evidence of the Brāhmaṇas. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa refers to one of the horse-sacrifices, and says that the priest who performed the rite for him was Indrota Daivāpi Saunaka. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa mentions the other sacrifice and names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. It also contains a tale stating that at one sacrifice of his he did not employ the Kaśyapas, but the Bhūtavīras. There-upon a family of the Kaśyapas called Asita-mṛiga forcibly

---

1 The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (I. xvi. 2) mentions Irāvatī, daughter of Uttara as the mother of Janamejaya and his brothers.
took away the conduct of the offering from the Bhūtavīras. We have here probably the germ of the Purānic stories about Janamejaya's dispute with the Brāhmaṇas. Vaiśampāyana, who headed the opponents of Janamejaya, undoubtedly belonged to the Kaśyapa clan. An allusion to the famous quarrel occurs also in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra (kopāj-Janamejaya Brāhmaṇeshu vikrāntaḥ).

The Gopatha Brāhmaṇa narrates an anecdote of Janamejaya and two ganders, pointing out the importance of Brahmacarya, and the time which should be devoted to it. The story is obviously mythical but it shows that Janamejaya was already looked upon as a legendary hero in the time of the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa.¹

Janamejaya's capital, according to a sacrificial song (yajña-gāthā) quoted above, was Āsandīvat to which reference has already been made. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa affords an interesting glimpse of life in the royal palace or sacrificial hall:

Samānāntsadam ukshanti hayān kāśṭhabhrīto yathā pārṇān parisrutah kumbhān Janamejayasādana' iti

"Even as they constantly sprinkle the equal prize-winning steeds so (they pour out) the cups full of fiery liquor in the palace (or sacrificial hall) of Janamejaya."²

"Curds, stirred drink or liquor" were favourite beverages of the Kurus already in the days of Parikshit.

If the Mahābhārata is to be believed, Janamejaya sometimes held his court at Taxila, and it was at Taxila that Vaiśampāyana is said to have related to him the story of the great conflict between the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus³ who had for their allies several peoples including the Śṛṅjayas. No direct independent proof of this war is forthcoming.

¹ Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by R. L. Mitra and Harachandra Vidyābhūṣhana, pp. 25 ff (I. 2. 5). In connection with the legend referred to above we hear of a sage named Daṇṭāhala Dharma, who is identified by some writers with Daṇṭāla Dharmaṇya of the Jaṭāmśīya Brāhmaṇa. The conjecture lacks proof. In the Baudhāyana Śrāuta Sūtra, Vol. III, p. 449. "Dhumra, Dhumrāṇyas and Dharmaṇyas" find separate mention as distinct members of the Kaśyapa group.


³ Mbh., XVIII. 5. 94.
but allusions to the hostility of Kuru and Śrīnjayaa, which forms an important feature of the epic ballads, are met with in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. Moreover Hopkins invites attention to a gāthā in the Chhāndogya Upanishad which alludes to the mare which saves the Kuru:

\[ \text{Yato yata āvartate tat tad gachchhati mānavaḥ} \]

…………………………………Kurūn aśvābhirakshati.

The verse cannot fail to recall the disaster (Kurūṇāṃ vaiśasam) referred to in the Mahābhārata.

It may be asserted that the Pāṇḍus are a body of strangers unknown to the Vedic texts, and that, therefore, the story of their feuds with the Kuru must be post-Vedic. But such a conclusion would be wrong because, firstly, an argumentum ex silentio is seldom conclusive, and, secondly, the Pāṇḍus are, according to Indian tradition, not a body of strangers but in fact scions of the Kuru. Hopkins indeed says that they were an unknown folk connected with the wild tribes located north of the Ganges. But Patañjali calls Bhima, Nakula and Sahadeva Kuru. Hindu tradition is unanimous in representing the Pāṇḍavas as an offshoot of the Kuru race just as the Kuru themselves were an offshoot of the Bharatas. The very name of the Great Epic betrays the Bhārata (Kuru) connection of the principal heroes and combatants. The testimony of Buddhist literature points to the same conclusion. In the Dasa-Brāhmaṇa Jātaka a king “of the stock of Yuddhiṭṭhila” reigning “in the kingdom of Kuru and the city called Indapatta” is distinctly called “Koravya,” i.e., Kauravya—belonging to the Kuru race. The polyandrous

---

1 The battle of Kurukshtetra is very often described a fight between the Kuru and the Śrīnjayas (Mbh., VI. 45. 2; 60. 29; 72. 15; 73. 41; VII. 20. 41; 149. 40, VIII. 47. 23; 57. 12; 59. 1; 93. 1). The unfriendly feeling between these two peoples is distinctly alluded to in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa XII. 9. 3.

1 R., Vedic Index, II. p. 63.
2 IV. 17. 9-10. The Great Epic of India, p. 385.
3 Mbh., IX. 35. 20.
4 The Religions of India, p. 388.
5 IV. 1. 4.
7 Jātaka No. 495.
marriage of the Pāṇḍavas does not necessarily indicate that they are of non-Kuru origin. The system of Niyoga prevalent among the Kurus of the Madhya-deśa was not far removed from fraternal polyandry,¹ while the law (Dharma) of marriage honoured by the Northern Kurus was admittedly lax.²

Already in the time of Āśvalāyana’s Grihya Sūtra³ Vaiśampāyana was known as Mahābhāratāchārya. He is also mentioned in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka⁴ and the Ashtādhyāyi of Pāṇini.⁵ Whether the traditional reciter of the original Mahābhārata was actually a contemporary of Janamejaya or not, cannot be ascertained at the present moment. But I have found nothing in the Vedic literature itself which goes against the epic tradition. The early Vedic texts no doubt make no reference to the Mahābhārata, but they mention Itiḥāsa.⁶ It is well-known that the story supposed to have been recited by Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya was at first called an Itiḥāsa and was named Jaya⁷ or song of victory, i.e., victory of the Pāṇḍu, the ancestors of the king:

_Muchyate sarvapāpebhyyo Rāhuṇā Chandramā yathā_  
_Jayo nāmetihāso’ yanī śrotavyo vijīgishunā._⁸

"By listening to this story one escapes from all kinds of sin, like the Moon from Rāhu. This Itiḥāsa (story,
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legend) is named Jaya (Victory); it should be listened to by those that desire victory."

Janamejaya’s brothers. Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena, appear in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa¹ and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra² as performers of the horse-sacrifice.³ At the time of the Bṛihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad their life and end excited popular curiosity and were discussed with avidity in learned circles. It is clear that the sun of the Pārīkshitas had set before the time of the Upanishad,⁴ and it is also clear that they had been guilty of some sinful deeds which they had atoned for by their horse-sacrifice. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa quotes a gāthā which says:—

Pārīkshita yajamānā aśvamedhāiḥ parovaram
ajāhuḥ karmāpaṇakāṁ puṇyāḥ puṇyena karmaṇā.⁵

The righteous Pārīkshitas, performing horse-sacrifices, by their righteous work did away with sinful work one after another.”

It may be presumed that the breach with the ‘lords spiritual’ of those days was healed in this way and for the time being priests and princes in the Kuru country lived in harmony. The Purāṇas state that Janamejaya was succeeded by Satānika Satānika’s son and successor was Aśvamedha-datta. From Aśvamedha-datta was born dhīsima-krāishaṇa famed in the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas. Adhīsima-krishna’s son was Nichakshu. During Nichakshu’s reign the city of Hāstinapura is said to have been

¹ XIII. 5. 4. 3.
² XVI. 9. 7.
³ Did these three brothers take part in the sacrifices of Janamejaya? Such a participation is clearly suggested by Mbh. I. 3. 1.
⁴ The question “Whither have the Pārīkshitas gone?” does not imply their extinction; Parāśara himself points out that the answer “Thither where Aśvamedha sacrificers go” suggests the opposite because such sacrifices procured great blessings. AIHT., 114. The Rāmāyaṇa, too, includes Janamejaya (II. 64. 42) in a list of kings who attained to a glorious destiny.
⁵ Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 3. Cf. Mbh. XII. 152, 58. The sinful deeds of which the eldest of the Pārīkshitas was guilty according to the epic, were Brahma-hatyā and bhrūṇahatyā (ibid., 150 Verses 3 and 9). Cf. also Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 1.
carried away by the Ganges, and the king is said to have transferred his residence to Kauśāmbī, or Kosam near Allahabad.¹

The Vedic texts do not refer in clear terms to any of these successors of Janamejaya or to the city of Hāstina-pura which figures as the principal metropolis of the Kurus in the epic and the Purāṇas. The antiquity of the city is, however, clearly proved by the evidence of Pāṇini.² As to the princes the Rig-Veda no doubt mentions a (Bhārata) king named Āśvamedha,³ but there is nothing to show that he is identical with Āśvamedha-datta. A Śatānīka Sāstrājīta is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as a powerful king who defeated Dhṛitarāṣṭra a prince of Kāsi, and took away his sacrificial horse. He, too, was probably a Bharata,⁴ but the patronymic Sāstrājīta probably indicates that he was different from Śatānīka, the son of Janamejaya. The Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa, the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa and the Chhāndogya Upanishad mention a Kuru king named Abhipratārin Kākhaseni, who was a contemporary of Girikshita Auccha-manvaya, Śaunaka Kāpeya and Dṛiti Aindrōta. As Dṛiti was the son and pupil of Indrota Daivāpa (Daivāpi) Śaunaka, the priest of Janamejaya,⁵ Abhipratārin, son of Kākhasena, appears to have been one of the immediate successors of the great king. We have already seen that Kākhasena appears in the Mahābhārata⁶ as the name of a brother of Janamejaya. Abhipratārin was thus Janame-

¹ Gaṅgāyāpahṛite tasmin nagare Nāgasāhvaye
   tyaktvā Nichakhṣur nagaram Kauśāmbyāṁ sa nivatsyati.

   When the city of Nāgasāhvaya (Hāstina-pura) is carried away by the Ganges,
   Nichakhṣu will abandon it and will dwell in Kauśāmbī.

Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 5.

That Hāstina-pura stood on the Ganges is clear from the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 68. 13), the Mahābhārata (I. 188), and the Mahābhāṣya (anugaṅgara Hāstina-
   puram).

² VI. 2. 101.
³ V. 27. 4-6.
⁴ Śat. Br. XIII, 5. 4. 19-23.
⁵ Vanśa Brāhmaṇa; Vedic Index, Vol. I, pp. 27, 373.
⁶ I. 94. 54.
jaya's nephew. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra refer to a prince named Vṛiddhadyumna Ābhipratārīṇa, apparently the son of Abhipratārīn. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa possibly mentions his son Rathagrītsa and priest Suchivṛiksha Gaupālāyaṇa. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra informs us that Vṛiddhadyumna erred in a sacrifice, when a Brāhmaṇa uttered a curse that the result would be the expulsion of the Kurus from Kuru-kṣetra, an event which actually came to pass.

Sacrifices threatened to have serious repercussions on the fortunes of the royal family even in the days of Janamejaya. The performance of ritual in the approved form by proper persons seems to have excited as much interest in the Kuru country as philosophical discussions did at the court of Videha. Even in the fourth century B.C. the great Chandragupta Maurya had to attend to sacrifices in the midst of his pressing duties relating to war and judicial administration. A sacrificial error was not a trivial matter, especially in the ancient realm of the Kurus, which was the citadel of Brāhmaṇic ritualism. To religious indiscretions were soon added natural calamities and the effect on the people was disastrous. Mention has already been made of the Purānic tradition about the destruction of Hāstinapura by the erosive action of the Ganges. The Chhāndogya Upanishad refers to the devastation of the crops in the Kuru country by Maṭachi (hailstones or locusts) and the enforced migration of the family of Uṣhastī Chākrāyaṇa, who repaired to the village of an unnamed noble or wealthy man, next to a neighbourly prince and ultimately to the court of Janaka of Videha.

---

2 Trivedi's translation, pp. 322-23.
3 Gaupālāyaṇa also held the important post of the Sthapati of the Kurus (Baudh. Sr. Śūtra, XX. 25; Vedic Index, I. 128). His relationship with Suchivṛiksha is however, not known.
4 XV. 16 10-13.
5 Chhāndogya, I. 10. 1; Brīhad. Upanishad, III, 4. For earlier vicissitudes, see Rigveda, X. 98 (drought in the time of Śāṃtanu); Mbh. I. 94 (story of Saṃvarana). The Chhāndogya Upanishad says: mājachihateshura Kurushu ātikya
The Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa¹ affords a clue to the royal seat of the ‘Ābhipratārīṇa’ branch of the Kuru family whose reign witnessed the beginning of those incidents that spelled disaster to the Kurus. We are told that Dṛiti, apparently the priest of king Abhiprātāra, son of Kakshasena, completed a sacrifice in Khāṇḍava.² The same Brāhmaṇa³ refers to the Abhipratārinās as the “mightiest of all their relations.” The passage is significant. It suggests that the great Janamejaya was no more in the land of the living in the days of Vbhipratarin and his descendants, and that the line represented by the latter far outshone the other branches of the Kuru royal family. The existence of distinct offshoots of the line is clearly implied by tradition. One of them held sway in Hāstinapura and later on moved to Kauśāmbī. This is the branch mentioned in the Purāṇas. Another line reigned in Ishukāra.⁴ The third and the ‘mightiest’ branch is, as we have seen, connected with Khāṇḍava, the far-famed region where the great epic locates the stately city of Indraprastha. The famous capital which stood close to the site of modern Delhi finds prominent mention in the Jātakas as the seat of a line of kings claiming to belong to the “Yuddhiṭhila gotra” (Yudhisṭhir’s gotra or clan).

The prosperity of the Ābhipratārīnas was short-lived. Great calamities befell the Kurus and the disintegration of the kingdom went on apace.⁵ Large sections of the

---

¹ saha jayāyā Uṣhas śa Chākṛāyaṇa vihīya-greme pradrāṇaka uvāsa. “When Kuruland was devastated by hailstones or locusts, Uṣash Chākṛāyaṇa repaired with his virgin wife to a magnate’s village and there lived in great distress. The plight of the Brāhmaṇa and his wife offers a sad contrast to the condition of the Kauravya and his lady who “throve merrily in the realm of Parikshit.” Commentators took maṣaṣṭha to mean ‘thunderbolt’, ‘hailstone’ or ‘a kind of small red bird’ or ‘locust.’ The last meaning accords with the evidence of the Devābhāgavata, X, 13, 110. maṣaṣṭha-yāthavaḥ teshāṁ samudayastu nirgatāḥ. The Kanarese word maṭiche has the same sense (Kittel’s Dictionary; Jacob, Scraps from Shaddarsana, JRAS, 1911, 510; Vedic Index, II, 119; Bhand. Carin. Lec., 1918, 26-27; Bagchi, IHQ, 1933, 253).
² XIV. 1. 12.
³ II. 9. 4. Caland’s ed., p. 27.
⁴ SBE, xlv. 62.
⁵ Cf. Janmiṇīya Brāhmaṇa, III. 156; JAOS, 26. 61. “When Abhipratāraṇa was lying used up with old age his sons divided the inheritance and made a great noise about it.
people, including Brāhmaṇas and princes, were apparently forced to leave the country, and to migrate to the eastern part of India. The transference of the royal seat of one branch of the Kuru or Bharata dynasty to Kauśāmbi is confirmed by the evidence of some of the plays attributed to Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kauśāmbi, is described in the Svapnāvāsava-datta as a scion of the Bharata or Bhārata family:

\[ \text{Bhāratānāṁ kule jāto vinīto jñānāvāñchhuchiḥ} \\
\text{tan nārhasi balāddhartum rājadharmasya deśikaḥ} \]

"Thou art born in the family of the Bharatas. Thou art self-controlled, enlightened and pure. To stop her by force is unworthy of thee, who shouldst be the model of kingly duty."

### GENEALOGY OF THE PĀRIKSHITA FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parikshit</th>
<th>Janamejaya</th>
<th>Kakshasena</th>
<th>Ugrasena</th>
<th>S'rutasena</th>
<th>Bhīmasena</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'atanika</td>
<td>Abhipratārin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As 'vamedhadatta</td>
<td>Vṛiddhadyumna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhisima-kṛishna</td>
<td>Rathagritsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nichakshu

Kings of Kauśāmbi

Kings of Khāndava (Indapatta)?

(Puranic tradition)

---


\[ \text{Bhāratānāṁ kule jāto} \\
\text{Vatsānāmārjitaḥ pātiḥ, Act IV.} \]
Section II. The Age of the Great Janaka.

Sarve rājño Maithilasya Mainākasyeva parvatāh
nikṛishṭabhūtā rājāno………………

—Mahābhārata.¹

We have seen that a series of calamities sadly crippled the Kurus. The kingdom fell to pieces and one of the princes had to leave the country. During the age which followed the Kuru people played a minor part in politics.

The most notable figure of the succeeding age was Janaka, the great philosopher-king of Videha, mentioned in the Vedic texts as the contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya. The waning power of the Kurus and the waxing strength of the Vaidehas are shown by the fact that while Kuru princes are styled rājan (king) in certain Brāhmaṇas,² Janaka of Videha is called samrāt (supreme king). In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa³ the samrāj is asserted to be of higher dignity than a rājan.

That the great Janaka was later than the Pārīkhitas admits of no doubt. We shall show later on that he was a contemporary probably of Nichakshu (if Purānic tradition is to be accepted), and certainly of Ushasta or Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa during whose time disaster befell the Kurus. In Janaka’s time we find the notable achievements, as well as the mysterious fate, of the Pārīkhitas, still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of general curiosity in the royal court of Mithilā. In the Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhujyu Lāhyāyani tests Yājñavalkya, the ornament of the court of Janaka, with a question, the solution of which the former is said to have previously

¹ III. 134. 5. As all other mountains are inferior to Maināka so are kings inferior to the lord of Mithilā.
² Ait., VIII. 14. Pañchavāṁśa, XIV. 1. 12. etc.
³ V, I, 1, 12-13.
obtained from a being of superhuman power through the medium of a Madra girl:

"Kva Pārikshitā abhavan—who have the Pārikshitas gone?"

Yājñavalkya answers: "Thither where the performers of the horse sacrifice abide." From this it is clear that the Pārikshitas (sons of Parikshit) must at that time have passed away. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of absorbing interest to men and women in different parts of the country.¹

It is not possible to determine with precision the exact chronological relation between Janamejaya and Janaka. Epic and Purānic tradition seems to regard them as contemporaries. Thus the Mahābhārata says that Uddālaka, a prominent figure of Janaka's court, and his son Śvetaketu, attended the sarpa-satra (snake-sacrifice) of Janamejaya:

\[\text{Sadasya śchābhavad } Vyāsaḥ \text{ putra-śishya-sahāyavān} \]
\[\text{Uddālakaḥ Pramatakaḥ Śvetaketuśča Piṅgalaḥ}²\]

"Vyāsa, assisted by his son and disciple, Uddālaka, Pramataka, Śvetaketu, Piṅgala... officiated as sadasya (priest)."

The Vishnu Purāṇa says that Satānīka, the son and successor of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya.³

The unreliability of the Epic and the Purānic tradition in this respect is proved by the evidence of the Vedic

² Weber, Ind. Lit. 126 ff. In the Journal of Indian History, April, 1936, p. 20, edited by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar and others, appears the amazing insinuation that "Mr. Roy Choudhury has... attempted to give Weber's thought and language (as rendered) out as his own, without any reference to Weber." A perusal of the Bibliographical Index (pp. 319, 328) appended to the first ed. of the Political History and p. 27 of the text; the foreword to the subsequent editions, etc., will throw interesting light on the veracity of the writer of the article in question in the Journal of Indian History.
³ Mbh., Adi., 53. 7.
⁴ Vishnu P., IV. 21. 2.
texts. We learn from the Satapatha Brahmana\textsuperscript{1} that Indrota Daivāpa or Daivāpi Śaunaka was a contemporary of Janamejaya. His pupil was Dṛiti Aindrota or Aindroti according to the Jaiminīya Upanishad and Vamśa Brāhmaṇas. Dṛiti’s pupil was Pulusha Prāchīnayoga.\textsuperscript{4} The latter taught Paulusha Satyayajña. We learn from the Chhandogya Upanishad\textsuperscript{3} that Paulusha Satyayajña was a contemporary of Buḍila Āsvatārāsvi and of Uddālaka Āruṇi, two prominent figures of Janaka’s court.\textsuperscript{4} Satyayajña was, therefore, certainly a contemporary of Janaka of Videha. He was an elder contemporary because his pupil Somaśushma Śātyayajñī Prāchīnayogya is mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\textsuperscript{5} as having met Janaka. As Śātyayajñī certainly flourished long after Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka, his contemporary Janaka must be considerably later than Janamejaya, the contemporary of Indrota.

We should also note that in the lists of teachers given at the end of the tenth book of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, and the sixth chapter of the Brhad-āraṇyaka Upanishad Tura Kāvashaya, the priest of Janamejaya, appears as a very ancient sage who was tenth in the ascending line from Śānjīvīputra, whereas Yājñavalkya and Uddālaka Āruṇi, the contemporaries of Janaka, were only fourth and fifth in the ascending line from the same teacher. The lists are given below:—

Janamejaya. Tura Kāvashaya

Yājñavachas Rājastambāyana

Kuśri

Kuśri Vājastravasa\textsuperscript{6}

Śaṅḍilya

Upaveśi

Vātsyya

Āruṇa

Vāmakashāyaṇa

Uddālaka Āruṇi \{ Janaka

Māhitthi

Yājñavalkya \{ the Great

\textsuperscript{1} XIII. 5. 4. 1.
\textsuperscript{2} Vedic Index, II. p. 9.
\textsuperscript{3} V. 11. 1. 2.
\textsuperscript{5} XI. 6. 2. 1-3.
\textsuperscript{6} IC, III. 747.
It is clear from what has been stated above that Janaka was separated by five or six generations from Janamejaya’s time.\(^1\) Jacobi and Rhys Davids\(^2\) agree in estimating the average length of a patriarchate or generation (in lists relating to spiritual succession) at 30 years. To the five or six teachers from Indrota to Somaśushma, and from Tura to Uddālaka Āruṇi and Janaka, we may, therefore, assign a period of 150 or 180 years.\(^3\) It is, therefore, reason-

1 It has been stated by certain writers that Janamejaya should be placed “only a step above Janaka.” They point to the use of laṅ in the verb bhā in the interrogation Keśa Pārīkhitiā abhāvan quoted above. They further identify Dantābala Dhaumya, a contemporary of Janamejaya according to a legend narrated in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, with Dantāla Dhaumya of the Jaminiya Brāhmaṇa, who may be assigned to the period of Janaka. It is also suggested that Bhālavaya of a certain Brāhmaṇa passage is no other than Indradyumna, JIH., April, 1936, 15 ff, etc. Apart from the fact that in the Vedic texts laṅ and lit are at times used alternatively to convey the same meaning (Cf. 37 ante.) it should be noted that the question “Kesa Pārīkhitiā abhāvan” with its answer was not framed for the first time at the court of Janaka.\(^4\) It is a mūrdhābhishikta (traditional)—udāharaṇa attributed to superhuman agency—and, therefore, it cannot be regarded as establishing the synchronism of Janamejaya Pārīkhita and Janaka Vaideha. As to Dantābala it has already been pointed out (p. 39 above), that the Bauḍhāyana Śrauta Sūtra mentions Dhumras and Dhaumyas as distinct members of the Kāśyapa group. Janamejaya must have passed away in the days of Driśi and the Āhīpṛatārīṇas. See ante p. 46. See also IHQ. Vol. VIII, 1932, 600 ff. As to Bhālavaya, serious students should remember that it is a patronymic like Atreyā, Bhāradvāja etc. In the absence of the personal name, it is uncritical to identify every Bhālavaya with Indradyumna himself as it is unreasonable to equate every Atreyā with Udāma or every Bhāradvāja with Droṇa or Piṇḍola.

2 Parīśṣṭha-parvan, 2nd ed. xviii and Buddhist Suttas. Introduction, p. xlvii.

3 It has been urged by some critics that pupils are not necessarily younger in age than their preceptors. It may freely be admitted that in particular cases pupils may be of the same age with, or even older than, the guru. But it is idle to suggest that in a long list of successive āchāryas and sīśyas the presence of elderly pupils must be assumed except where the guru is known to be the father of the pupil. Individual cases of succession of elderly sīśyas do not invalidate the conclusion that the average duration of a generation is as is suggested by Jacobi and Rhys Davids.
able to think that Janaka flourished about 150 or 180 years after Janamejaya, and two centuries after Parikshit. If, following a Purānic tradition, we place Parikshit in the fourteenth century B.C., we must place Janaka in the twelfth century B.C. If, on the other hand, we accept a date for Guṇākhyā Sāṅkhāyana, the pupil’s pupil of Uddālaka according to the Sāṅkhāyana, Aranyaka, in the sixth century B.C., we must place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C., and Janaka in the seventh century B.C.

The kingdom of Videha, over which Janaka ruled seems to be mentioned for the first time in the Saṁhitās of the Yajur Veda. It corresponds roughly to the modern Tirhut in North Bihār. It was separated from Kosala by the river Sadānīrā, usually identified with the modern Gaṅdak which rising in Nepāl, flows into the Ganges opposite Patna. Oldenberg, however, points out that the Mahābhārata distinguishes the Gaṅdakī from the Sadānīrā: “Gaṅdakīṇcha Mahāśonaṁ Sadānīrāṁ tathaiva cha.” Pargiter, therefore, identifies the Sadānīrā with the Rāptī. We learn from the Suruchi Jātaka that the measure of the whole kingdom of Videha was three hundred leagues. It consisted of 16,000 villages.

Mithila, the capital of Videha, is not referred to in the Vedic texts, but is constantly mentioned in the Jātakas and the Epics. It has been identified with the small town of Janakpur just within the Nepāl border north of the place where the Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga districts meet. It is stated in the Suruchi and Gandhāra Jātakas

---

1 Vedic Index, II. 298.
2 According to Pargiter, JASB, 1897, 89—“Videha comprised the country from Gorakhpur on the Rāptī to Darbhanga, with Kosala on the west and Aṅga on the east. On the north it approached the hills, and to the south it was bounded by the small kingdom of Vaiśālī.”
3 Vedic Index II. 299.
5 If the epic enumeration of the rivers quoted above follows a geographical order as is suggested by the use of the expression kramaṇa in the Mbh. II 20. 27, Sadānīrā may be the Burhi Gaṅdak which is distinguished from the Gaṅdak proper. Cf. map in JASB, 1895.
6 J. 489.
7 J. 406. These are apparently conventional figures.
8 J. 489 and 406.
that the city covered seven leagues. At its four gates were four market towns.¹ We have the following description of the city in the Mahājanaka Jātaka²:

By architects with rule and line laid out in order fair to see, With walls and gates and battlements, traversed by streets on every side, With horses, cows and chariots thronged with tanks and gardens beautified, Videha’s far-famed capital, gay with its knights and warrior swarms, Clad in their robes of tiger-skins with banners spread and flashing arms.

Its Brahmins dressed in Kāśi cloth, perfumed with sandal, decked with gems, Its palaces and all their queens with robes of state and diadems.²

According to the Rāmāyana³ the royal family of Mithila was founded by a king named Nimi. His son was Mithi, and Mithi’s son was Janaka I. The epic then continues the genealogy to Janaka II (father of Sītā) and his brother Kuśadhvaja, king of Sānkāśya. The Vāyu⁴ and the Vishnu⁵ Purāṇas represent Nimi or Nemi as a son of Ikshvāku, and give him the epithet Videha.⁷ His son was Mithi whom both the Purāṇas identify with Janaka I. The genealogy is then continued to Siradhvaja who is called the father of Sītā, and is, therefore, identical with Janaka II of the Rāmāyaṇa. Then starting from Siradhvaja the Purāṇas carry on the dynasty to its close. The last king is named Kṛiti, and the family is called Jana-k-a-vānāśa.

¹ J. 546.
³ For another description of Mithila, see Mbh. III. 206. 6-9.
⁴ I. 71. 3.
⁵ 88. 7-8; 89. 3-4
⁶ IV. 5. 1.
⁷ Sa mārena Vaśishṭhasya Videhaḥ samapādyata—Vāyu P. The story of Vaśishtha’s curse on a Videhan king is known to the Brihaddevatā (vii. 99).
Dhāritestu Bahulāśvo bhūḍ Bahulāśva-sutāḥ Kṛitiḥ
tasmin santishṭhate vamśo Janakānāṁ mahātmānāṁ

The Vedic texts know a king of Videha named Namī Sāpya. But he is nowhere represented as the founder of the dynasty of Mithilā. On the contrary, a story of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa seems to indicate that the Videhaṅ kingdom owes its origin to Videga Mathava who came from banks of the Sarasvatī. We are told that the fire-god went burning along this earth from the Sarasvati towards the east, followed by Māthava and his priest, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa till he came to the river Sadānīrā which flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain, and which he did not burn over. No Brāhmaṇas went across the stream in former times, thinking “it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara (the fire that burns for all men).” At that time the land to the eastward was very uncultivated, and marshy, but after Māthava’s arrival many Brāhmaṇas went there, and it was cultivated, for the Brāhmaṇas had caused Agni, the Fire-god, to taste it through sacrifices. Māthava the Videga then said to Agni, “where am I to abide?” “To the east of this river be thy abode,” he replied. Even now, the writer of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa adds, this stream forms the boundary between the Kosalas and the Videhas. The name of Mithi Vaideha, the second king in the Epic and the Purāṇic lists, is reminiscent of Māthava Videga.

If Māthava Videga was the founder of the royal line of Mithilā, Namī Sāpya cannot claim that distinction. The Majjhima Nikāya and the Nimi Jātaka mention Makhā-

---

1 Vāyu 1 urāṇa 89, 32. For Janaka as a dynastic designation see also Mbh tIII. 133, 17; Rām. I. 67, 8. The use of the expressions Janakānāṁ Janakath etc., does not necessarily indicate that every member of the line bore the personal name Janaka. Cf. Ikṣuśākūnāṁ (Rām. I. 5, 8), which refers to those who were Ikṣuśāka-vamsa-prabhavah (I. 1, 8); Raghūnāṁ anvayam, etc.

2 Vedic Index, I, 436.


4 This is the territory which the Mahābhārata refers to as “Jalodbhava,” i.e., reclaimed from swamp (Mbh., II. 90, 4. Pargiter, Ibid, 88n).

5 II. 74-83.
deva as the progenitor of the kings of Mithilā, and a Nimi is said to have been born to "round off the royal house, the family of hermits." The evidence of Buddhist texts thus shows that the name Nimi was borne not by the first, but probably by some later king or kings.¹

As the entire dynasty of Maithila monarchs was called Janaka-vaṁśa, Varṇo Janakānāṁ mahātmāṇām, the family of the high-souled Janakas, in post-Vedic literature, and there were several kings bearing the name of Janaka, it is very difficult to identify any of these with the great Janaka of the Vedic texts, the contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya. But there is one fact which seems to favour his identification with Śrīdradvaja of the Purānic list, i.e., the father of Śītā. The father of the heroine of the Rāmāyaṇa is a younger contemporary of Aśvapati, king of the Kekayas (maternal grandfather of Bharata²), Janaka of the Vedic texts is also a contemporary of Aśvapati, prince of the Kekayas, as Uddālaka Āruṇi and Bhūda Aśvatarāśvi frequented the courts of both these princes.³ But as the name Aśvapati is also apparently given to Bharata's maternal uncle,⁴ it seems that it was possibly not a personal name but a secondary epithet or a family designation like 'Janaka.' In that case it is impossible to say how far the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Śītā is correct. The identification seems, however, to have been accepted by Bhavabhūti. Referring to the father of the heroine, the poet says in the Mahāvīra-charita⁵:

Teshāmidānini dāyādo
vriddhāḥ Śrīrdhvajaḥ uṣpah

¹ The evidence of the Brīhad-devatā (vii. 59) suggests that connection was maintained by Videhan monarchs with their old home on the banks of the Sarasvatī, cf. Pañchevadhitā Brāhmaṇa, XXV 10. 16-18 (story of Nimi Sāpya).
² Rāmdyaṇa, II. 9. 22.
⁴ Rāmdyaṇa, VII. 115. 4.
⁵ Against the view that Aśvapati was a family designation common to all members of the line it may, however, be urged that in the Mbh. vii. 104. 7; 123. 5 Brīhatkshatra, chief of the Kekayas, does not bear that epithet.
⁶ Act I, Verse 14.
Yājñavalkyo munir yasmay
Brahmapārāyaṇam jagau.¹

It is equally difficult to identify our Janaka with any
of the kings of that name mentioned in the Buddhist
Jātakas. Professor Rhys Davids² seems to identify him
with Mahā-Janaka of the Jātaka No. 539. The utterance
of Mahā-Janaka II of that Jātaka.

‘Mithilā’s palaces may burn
But naught of mine is burned thereby
indeed reminds us of the great philosopher-king.

In the Mahābhārata¹ we find the saying attributed to
Janaka ‘Janadeva’ of Mithilā. In the Jaina Uttar-ādhyā-
yana, however, the saying is attributed to Nāmi.³ This
fact coupled with the mention of Nemi in juxtaposition
with Arishta in the Vishnu-Purāṇa⁴ may point to the
identification of Nāmi or Nemi with Mahā-Janaka II
whom the Jātaka represents as the son of Ariśṭha. If
Mahā-Janaka II be identical with Nāmi, he cannot be
identified with Janaka who is clearly distinguished from
Nāmi in the Vedic texts. One may be tempted to identify
the Vedic Janaka with Mahā-Janaka I of the Jātaka.
But proof is lacking.

In the Sātāpatha Brāhmaṇa, the Brīhad-āraṇyaka

153.4 the contemporary of Uddālaka and Kahoḍa seems to be called Aindradyumna. (Cf. AIHT. 96.) In Mbh. XII. 310. 4: 3. 8. 95, the contemporary of
Yājñavalkya is styled Daivarāti. The Sātāpatha Brāhmaṇa is attributed to
this Yājñavalkya (ibid. XII. 318. 115). Both Aindradyumna and Daivarāti are
patronymics and hardly afford a clue to the personal name of the king in
question.

² XII. 17. 18-19; 219. 50.
³ "Mithilāyāṁ prātipādāṁ
na me dahyatī kīṣchana”

⁴ "Api cha bhavati Mahāthilaṁ gītāṁ
nagaram upāhitām nigrodhakshyāṁ
na khalu mama hi dahyate' tra kīṣchit
svayam idam āha kīla sma bhūmipālaḥ”

"Seeing his city burning in a fire, the king of Mithilā himself sang of
old, 'in this (conflagration) nothing of mine is burning.'”

⁵ S. B. E., XLV. 57.
⁶ IV. 5. 15.
Upanishad and the Mahābhārata Janaka is called Samrāṭ. This shows that he was a greater personage than a mere Rājan. Although there is no clear evidence in the Vedic literature of the use of the word Samrāj as emperor in the sense of a king of kings, still the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa distinctly says that the Samrāj was a higher authority than a Rājan; "by offering the Rājasūya he becomes king, and by the Vājapeya he becomes Samrāj; and the office of king is the lower, and that of Samrāj the higher." In the Āśvalāyana Srauta Sūtra Janaka is mentioned as a great sacrificer.

But Janaka's fame rests not so much on his achievements as a king and a sacrificer, as on his patronage of culture and philosophy. The court of this monarch was thronged with Brāhmaṇas from Kosala, the Kuru-Pañchāla countries and perhaps Madra, e.g., Āśvala, Jāratkārava Āratabhāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Ushasta(-i) Chākrāyana, Kahoḍa Kaushitakeya, Gārgī Vāchaknavi, Uddālaka Āruṇi and Vidagdha Śākalya. The tournaments of argument which were here held form a prominent feature in the third book of the Br̤ihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad. The hero of these was Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyya, who was a pupil of Uddālaka Āruṇi. Referring to Janaka's relations with the Kuru-Pañchāla Brāhmaṇas, Oldenberg observes: "The king of the east, who has a leaning to the culture of the west, collects the celebrities of the west at his court—much as the intellects of Athens gathered at the court of Macedonian princes."

The Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads throw some light on the political condition of Northern India during the age of the great Janaka. From those works we learn that besides Videha, there were nine states of considerable importance, viz.:

1 III. 153. 17.
2 Sat. Br., V. 1. 12-15: XII, 5. 3; XIV, 1. 5. 8.
4 Br̤ih. Up. VI. 5. 5.
5 Buddha, P. 398.

The Vedic texts seldom furnish any definite clue as to the exact geographical position of these states. For the location of most of these territories we must, therefore, turn to the evidence of later literature.

The inhabitants of Gandhāra are included by epic poets among the peoples of Uttarāpatha or the northernmost region of India:

Uttarāpatha-jamnānāḥ kīrītyishyāmi tān api
Yauvanā-Kāṁboja-Gāndhārāḥ Kīrītā Barbaraiḥ saha.¹

The country lay on both sides of the Indus,² and contained two great cities, viz., Takshaśilā and Pushkaravati, alleged to have been founded by two heroes of epic fame:

Gandhāra-vishaye siddhe, tayoḥ puryau mahātmanoh
Takshaśya dīkṣitau vikhyātā ramyā Takshaśilā puṛī
Pushkarasyāpi virasya vikhyātā Pushkaravati.³

The vishaya (territory) described in these lines must have embraced the Rāvalpindī district of the Western Pañjāb and the Peshāwar district of the North-West Frontier Province. A few miles to the north-west of Rāvalpindī and 2,000 leagues away from Banaras,⁴ stood the famous city of Takshaśilā or Taxila. The remains of the great city “are situated immediately to the east and north-east of

¹ Mbh., XII. 207. 43.
² Rāmāyaṇa, VII. 113. 11; 114. 11; Sindhor-ubhayatabh pārśve. According to Jātaka No. 406 the kingdom of Gandhāra included Kaśmīra. Hekataios of Miletus (B. C. 549-486) refers to a Gandaric city called Kasparyos. Stein (JASB, 1899, extra No. 2, 11) equates Kasparyos with Kasparyos of Herodotus and says that it must have been situated in that territory where the Indus first becomes navigable, i.e., in the ancient Gandhāra. Kasparyos was the place at which the expedition under Skylax, sent by Darius to explore the course of the Indus, embarked. Stein (pp. 12-13) rejects the view according to which Kasparyos represents the Sanskrit Kaśyapapura from which the name Kaśmir is said to have been derived. Kaśyapapura as a place-name is known to Alberuni (1 298), but he mentions it as an original designation of Multan. Kaśyapa’s traditional connection with Kaśmīra is, however, clear from Rājatarangini, 1, 27.
³ Vyās Purāṇa, 89. 189-90; cf. Rāmāyaṇa, VII. 114. 11.
⁴ Telapatta and Suddha Jātakas, Nos. 96, 169.
Sarai-kala, a junction on the railway, twenty miles north-west of Rāwalpindi. The valley in which they lie is watered by the Haro river. Within this valley and within three and a half miles of each other are the remains of three distinct cities. The southernmost (and oldest) of these occupies an elevated plateau, known locally as Bhirmound.  

Pushkarāvatī or Pushkalāvatī, the Lotus City, (Prākrit Pukkalāoti, whence the 'Peukelaotis' of Arrian) is represented by the modern Prang and Chārsadda, 17 miles north-east of Peshāwar, on the Swāt river.  

Gandhāra is a later form of the name of the people called Gandhāri in the Rig-Veda and Atharva-Veda. In the Rig-Veda the good wool of the sheep of these tribesmen is referred to. In the Atharva-Veda the Gandhāris are mentioned with the Mūjavats, apparently as a despised people. The Brāhmaṇa texts refer to Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, and his son Svarjīt. The former receives Brāhmaṇic consecration, but observations of the family on ritual are treated with contempt. In later times the 'angle of vision' of the men of the Madhya-deśa (Mid-India) changed, and Gandhāra became a resort of scholars of all classes who flocked to its capital for instruction in the three Vedas and the eighteen branches of knowledge.

In a significant passage of the Gāhāndogya Upanishad' Uddālaka Aruṇī, the contemporary of the Vedic Janaka, mentions Gandhāra to illustrate the desirability of having a duly qualified teacher from whom a pupil "learns (his way)

2 Schoff. The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, pp. 183-84; Foucher. Notes on the Ancient Geography of Gandhāra, p. 11; cf. V. A. Smith, JASB, 1889, 111; Cunningham, AGI, 1924, 57 f. Strabo (XV. x6) extends Gandaritis westwards to the Choaspes (Kunar ?).
3 I. 126. 7.
4 V. xx, 14. cf. Mbh. VIII, 44, 46; 45, 8 etc.
5 Aitareya, vii. 34. Satapatha, viii. 1. 4. 10. Vedic Index, i. 432.
7 VI. 14.
and thus remains liberated (from all worldly ties) till he
attains (the Truth or Beatitude, Moksha)." A man who
attains Moksha is compared to a blindfold person who
reaches at last the country of Gandhāra. The passage runs
as follows:

"Yathā somya purusham Gandharebhyo ‘bhinaddha-
āksham āniya tam tato ‘tijane visṛjjet, sa yathātatra prāñ
vā udan vādharān vā pratyañ vā pradhmāyīta—abhinad-
dhāksha ānīto ‘bhinaddhāksho visṛṣṭah. Tasya yathā-
bhinahanam pramuchya prabrūyād etāṁ diśāṁ Gandhārā
etāṁ diśāṁ vrajeti. Sa grāmād grāmāṁ prichchhan
paṇḍito medhāvī Gandhārān evopasampadyeta, evam evēh-
ācāryavān purusho veda."

"O my child, in the world when a man with blindfold
eyes is carried away from Gandhāra and left in a lonely
place, he makes the east and the north and the south and the
west resound by crying 'I have been brought here blind-
fold, I am here left blindfold.' Thereupon (some kind-
hearted man) unties the fold on his eyes and says 'This
is the way to Gandhāra; proceed thou by this way.' The
sensible man proceeds from village to village enquiring
the way and reaches at last the (province) of Gandhāra.
Even thus a man who has a duly qualified teacher learns
(his way)."

The full import of the illustration becomes apparent
when we remember that the Uddālaka Jātaka⁴ represents
Uddālaka as having journeyed to Takshaśilā (Takkaśilā)
and learnt there of a world-renowned teacher. The
Setaketu Jātaka⁵ says that Śvetaketu, son of Uddālaka,
went to Takshaśilā and learned all the arts. The Sata-
patha Brāhmaṇa mentions the fact that Uddālaka Ārūni
used to drive about amongst the people of the northern
country. It is stated in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa⁶ that

---

¹ Cf. Dr. R. L. Mitra's translation of the Chhāndogya Upanishad, v. 114.
² No. 487.
³ No. 377.
⁵ VII. 6. Vedic Index, II 279.
Brāhmaṇas used to go to the north for purposes of study. The Jātaka tales are full of references to the fame of Takshaśilā as a university town. Pāṇini, himself a native of Gandhāra, refers to the city in one of his Sūtras.\(^1\) An early celebrity of Takshaśilā was perhaps Kauṭilya.\(^2\)

The Kekayas were settled in the Western Paṇjab between Gandhāra and the Beas. From the Rāmāyana\(^3\) we learn that the Kekaya territory lay beyond the Vipāśā or Beas and abutted on the Gandharva or Gandhāra Vīshaya. The Mahābhārata\(^4\) associates them with the Madras (Madrasca saha Kekayaiḥ). Arrian\(^5\) places the "Kekians" on the river Saranges, apparently a tributary of the Hydraotes or the Rāvi.

The Vedic texts do not mention the name of its capital city, but the Rāmāyana informs us that the metropolis was Rājavāra or Girivraja:

"Ubhau Bharata-Satrughna Kekayeshu parantapau,  
pure Rājavrâhe ramye mātāmaha-nivesane."\(^6\)

"Both Bharata and Satrughna, repressers of enemies, are staying in Kekaya in the charming city of Rājavraha, the abode of (the) maternal grandfather (of the former)."

"Girivrajam puravaram ūghram sēdur anjāsā."\(^7\)

"(The messengers bound for Kekaya) quickly arrived at Girivraja, the best of cities."

The journey from Ayodhyā to the Kekaya capital, a distance of about 650 miles, took seven days. Videha could be reached from Ayodhyā on the fourth day. The distance is about 200 miles. The slower rate is explained by Pargiter by absence of good roads. Cunningham identifies the capital of the Kekayas with Girjak or Jalalpur on the river Jhelam.\(^8\)

---

\(^1\) Sūtra iv. 3, 93; AGI (1924), 67.
\(^3\) II. 68. 19-22; VII. 113-14.
\(^4\) VI. 61. 13; VII. 19. 7. Madra-Kekayāḥ.
\(^5\) Indika, iv; Ind. Ant. V. 332; Mc Grindle Megasthenes and Arrian, 1916, pp. 168, 196.
\(^6\) Rām., II. 67. 7.
\(^7\) Rām., II. 68. 28.
\(^8\) Rām., I. 69. 7; II. 71. 18. AGI, 1924, 188; JASB, 1895, 250 ff.
There was another Rājagriha-Girivraja in Magadha, while Hiuen Tsang mentions a third Rājagriha in Po-ho or Balkh. In order to distinguish between the Kekaya city and the Magadhan capital, the latter city was called “Girivraja of the Magadhas.”

The Purāṇas tell us that the Kekayas along with the Madrakas and the Usānaras, were branches of the family of Anu, son of Yayāti. The Anu tribe is frequently mentioned in the Rig-Veda. It appears from a hymn of the eighth Mandala that they dwelt in the Central Pāñjab, not far from the Parushṇī, the same territory which we find afterwards in possession of the Kekayas and the Madrakas.

The king of Kekaya in the time of the Vedic Janaka was Āsvapati, a name borne also by the maternal grandfather and maternal uncle of Bharata. The Sutapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Chhāndogya Upanishad suggest that the Kekaya monarch was a man of learning and that he instructed a number of Brāhmaṇas, viz. Aruṇa Aupavesī Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushti, Mahāśāla Jābāla, Buḍila, Āsvataraśvi, Indradhyumna Bhāllaveya, Jana Śārkarākṣhya, Prāchīnasāla Aupamanyava, and Uddālaka Āruṇi. The reference to Aruṇa Aupavesī who belongs to an older generation than Uddālaka, shows that Āsvapati was an elder contemporary of the great philosopher-king of Videha.

The Jaina writers tell us that one-half of the kingdom of Kekaya was Aryan, and refer to the Kekaya city called “Seyaviyā.” A branch of Kekayas seems to have migrated to Southern India in later times and established its authority in the Mysore country.

The Madra people were divided into several sections viz., the northern Madras, the eastern Madras, the southern

---

1 Beal, Śī-yu ki, Vol. 1, p. 44.
2 S. B. E., XIII, p. 150.
3 Matya, 48. 10-10; Vayu, 99. 12-25.
4 I. 108. 8; VII. 18. 14; VIII. 10. 5.
5 74.
6 Rām. II. 9, 22; VII. 115. 4.
7 X. 6. 1. 2.
8 V. 11. 4. et seq.
9 Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375.
Madras or Madras proper etc. The northern Madras known as Uttara-Madras, are referred to in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, as living beyond the Himavat range in the neighbourhood of the Uttara-Kurus, possibly, as Zimmer and Macdonell conjecture, in the land of Kaśmīr. The eastern Madras probably occupied some district to the east of Siālkot, not far from Trigartta or Kangra.¹

The southern Madras were settled in the Central Pañjab in the territory lying to the west of the river Irāvatī or Rāvi.² In later times the eastern limits extended to the Amritsar district which was included within the Madraseśa in the days of Guru Govind Singh.³ The ancient capital (properly *puṭa-bhedana*) was Šākala or Sāgala-nagara (modern Siālkot). This city is mentioned in the *Mahā-bhārata*⁴ and several *Jātakas*⁵ and is probably hinted at in the name ‘Śākalya,’ given to a Vedic teacher who graced the court of Janaka. It stood on the banks of the Āpaga in a tongue of land between two rivers styled the Śākala-dvīpa,⁶ apparently corresponding to a part of the Rechna Doāb.

The Madras proper are represented in early post-Vedic works as living under a monarchical constitution. The name of the ruler of the territory in the time of Janaka is not known. It was politically not of much importance. But, like the northern realms described above, it was the home of many famous scholars and teachers of the *Brāhmaṇa* period such as Madragāra Šauṅgāyani and Kāpya Pataṅchala,⁷ one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddālaka Āruni.⁸ The early epic knows

---

¹ Pāṇini, IV. 2. 107-8; Cf. Association of Madras and Trigarttas, *Mbh.* VI. 61. 12. In I. 121. 36 the number of 'Madras' is given as *four*.
² Cf., *Mbh.*, VIII. 44. 17.
⁵ E. g. *Kāläṅga-śdhi Jātaka*, No. 479; and *Kusa Jātaka*, No. 531.
⁶ Bhṛ. VIII. 44. 10; Cunn. *AGI*, 1924, 211 f. Cunningham identifies this Āpaga with the Ayak rivulet which rises in the Jammu hills and joins the Chenāb.
⁷ *Mbh.* II. 26. 5.
⁹ *Bṛhad, Up.*, III. 7. 1.
the Madra royal house as a virtuous family. But in later times Madra earned notoriety as the seat of outlandish peoples with wicked customs.

The country of the Usinaras was situated in the Madhya-des or Mid-India. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa says “asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratisṭhāyāṁ diśi,” “in this firmly established middle region,” lie the realms of the Kuru-Pañchālās together with Vaśas and Uśinaras. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad also the Uśinaras are associated with the Matsyas, the Kuru-Pañchālās and the Vaśas. They probably lived in the northernmost part of the Madhya-desa, for in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa the Uśinaras and the Vaśas are mentioned just before the Udvichyas or northerners:1 Kuru-Pañchāleshu Aṅga-Magadheshu Kāsi-Kausalyeshu Śālva-Matsyeshu sa Vaśa-Uśinaresh-udvichyeshu.

The Mahābhārata speaks of ‘Uśinara’ as sacrificing on two small streams near the Jumna.2 In the Kathā-sarit-sagara Usinara giri is placed near Kanakhala, the “sanctifying place of pilgrimage at the point where the Ganges issues from the hills.”3 It is, doubtless, identical with Usira-giri of the Divyāvadāna and Usira-dhvaja of the Vinaya Texts.4 Pāṇini refers to the Uśinara country in several sūtras.5 Its capital was Bhoja-nagara.6

---

1 Cf. Aśvapati and his daughter Sāvitrī.
2 For detailed accounts of the Madras see Dr. H. C. Ray in JASB, 1922, 257; and Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India, p. 214. Mr. S. N. Mitra points out that the Paramattha-dipani on the Therigāthā (p. 127) (wrongly) places Sāgala-nagara in Magadhā-rātha. But the Aparadana quotations on p. 131 leave no room for doubt that Madra is the correct name of the kingdom of which Sāgala (Śākala) was the capital.
3 VIII. 14.
4 Gop. Br. II. 9.
5 Mbh. III. 130. 21.
7 P. 22.
9 II. 4. 20; /V. 2. 118.
10 Mbh., V. 118. 2. For Ahavara, a fortress of the Usinaras, see Ind. Ant. 1885, 328.
The *Rig-Veda* mentions a queen named Uśīnarāṇī. The *Mahābhārata*, the *Anukramani* and several *Jātakas* mention a king named Uśīnara and his son Śibi.\(^1\) We do not know the name of Janaka’s Uśīnara contemporary. The *Kaushitaki Upanishad* tells us that Gārgya Bālāki, a contemporary of Ajātasatru of Kāsi, and of Janaka of Videha, lived for some time in the Uśīnara country.

*Matsya* is usually taken to “include parts of Alwar, Jaipur and Bharatpur,” being “the kingdom of the king Virāṭa of the *Mahābhārata*, in whose court the five Pāṇḍava brothers resided *incognito* during the last year of their banishment.”\(^2\) But Alwar seems to have been the territory of a neighbouring people—the Sālvās.\(^3\) The Matsya country lay to the south of the Kurus of the Delhi region and to the west of the Śūrasenas of Mathurā. Southward it may have approached the river Chambal, westward it reached the Sarasvatī. The *Mahābhārata* mentions a people called the Apara-Matsyas whom Pargiter places on the hill tracts on the north bank of the Chambal. The Rāmāyaṇa has a reference to the Vīra Matsyas in connection with the Sarasvatī and the Ganges.\(^4\) The Matsya capital has been identified by Cunningham\(^5\) with Bairat in the Jaipur State. Pargiter thinks\(^6\) that the capital was

---

\(^1\) X. 59. 10.
\(^3\) Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, p. 53.
\(^5\) Mbh. 11. 31. 2-7; III. 24-25; IV. 5 4; Rām. II. 71-5. Pargiter points out (JASB, 1895, 250 ff.) that the Matsya Country lay southward from Khaṇḍava-paśṭha (Delhi region). Its position to the west of Śūrasena (Mathurā district) is brought out clearly by the description of the journey of the Pāṇḍu prince to the court of Virāṭa. *Crossing the Jumna the heroes passed through the territories, north of the Daśārhas and south of the Panchhālas, and then proceeded through the countries of the Yaśtrillomas and the Śūrasenas to the Matsya realm. From Upaplavya, a suburb of the Matsya capital, to Hālinapura, the metropolis of the Kuras in the epic age, was less than two days’ journey by chariot. Vṛikosthala on the way could be reached by a traveller in the evening on the first day.*
\(^6\) AGI. 1924, 287; I. A. V. 179. For a Vīra-nagara in South India, see *Bomb. Gaz.* I. ii. 558.
\(^7\) JASB, 1895, 252.
Upaplavya. But according to Nišākṣa, the commentator, Upaplavya was "Virāṭa-nagara-samīpastha-nagarāntaram," a city close to the metropolis, but not identical with it.¹

The Matsyas first appear in a passage of the Ṛig-Veda² where they are ranged with the other antagonists of Sudās, the great Ṛigvedic conqueror. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa³ mentions a Matsya king named Dhvasan Dvaitavana who celebrated a horse-sacrifice near the Sarasvatī. The Brāhmaṇa quotes the following gāthā (song):

Chaturdasa Dvaitavano rājā samgrāmajjād-hayān
Indrāya Vṛitragnē' badhnāttasmād Dvaitavanam sara(iti).

"Fourteen steeds did king Dvaitavana, victorious in battle, bind for Indra Vṛitrahan, whence the lake Dväitavana (took its name)". The Mahābhārata mentions the lake as well as a forest called Dvaitavana which spread over the banks of the river Sarasvatī.⁴

In the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa⁵ the Matsyas appear in connexion with the Sālvas, in the Kaushitaki Upanishad⁶ in connexion with the Kuru-Pañchālas, and in the Mahābhārata in connexion with the Trigarttas⁷ of the Jālandar Doāb, and the Chedis of Central India.⁸ In the Manu-Samhita⁹ the Matsyas together with Kuru-kshetra, the Pañchālas, and the Śūrasenakas comprise the holy enclave of the Brāhmaṇa sages (Brahmarshi-deśa).

The name of Janaka's contemporary ruler is not known. That the country was important in the time of the great philosopher-king of Videha, is known from the Kaushitaki Upanishad.

² VII. 18.6
³ X. 5-4-9.
⁴ Mbh. III. 24-25.
⁵ 1. 2. 9.
⁶ IV. 1.
⁷ Mbh., Bk. IV. 90-1-2; 92-1-2
⁸ V. 74. 16.
⁹ II. 19.
The Kuru country tried to maintain its reputation as a home of Brâhmanical culture in the age of Janaka. But scholars hailing from that region appear now in the role of students thirsting for philosophical knowledge rather than authorities on sacrificial ritual. This probably points to a new development in the social life of the people, a development that synchronises with the end of the period of prosperity under Parikshit and his immediate successors and the beginning of economic distress hinted at in the Chhândogya Upanishad. The time was soon to come when they would listen even to the heterodox teaching of new faiths that grew up in Eastern India. For the present Kuru Brâhmaṇas (e.g., Ushasti Châkrawâna) took an active part in discussions about Brahman and âtman at the court of Videha. The intellectual life of the eastern kingdom must have been greatly stirred by the exodus of Kurus and perhaps also of the Pañchâlas that took place about this time. An exodus from Constantinople in a like manner enriched the life of the people of western Europe in the fifteenth century A.D.

If the Purânic list of Janamejaya's successors be accepted as historical, then it would appear that Nichakshu was probably the Kuru king of Hâstinapura in the time of Janaka.

1. Janamejaya ... 1. Indrota Daivâpa Saunaka.
2. Satânîka ... 2. Drito Aindrota (son and pupil)
3. Aśva medha-datta 3. Pulusha Prâchînayogya (pupil)
4. Adhisîma-krîshna 4. Pulushi Sâtyayajña (pupil)
5. Nichakshu ... 5. Somaśûshma Sâtyayajñi (pupil); Janaka's contemporary.

Curiously enough, it is Nichakshu who is represented in the Purânas as the remover of the seat of government from Hâstinapura to Kauśambî. We have some indication that the city of Kauśambî really existed about this time. The Satapatha Brâhmaṇa makes Proti Kauśambeya
a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇī who figured in the court of Janaka. It is thus clear that Kauśāmbeya was a contemporary of Janaka. Now, Harisvāmin in his commentary on the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa understood Kauśāmbeya to mean a 'native of the town of Kauśāmbi.' It is, therefore, permissible to think that Kauśāmbī existed in the time of Janaka, and hence of Nichakshu. There is thus no difficulty in the way of accepting the Purānic statement. According to the Purāṇas the change of capital was due to the inroad of the river Ganges. Another, and a more potent, cause was perhaps the devastation of the Kuru country by Maṭaṭā. It is also possible that the attitude of the Ābhīpratārīṇa branch of the royal family towards sacrificial ritual had something to do with the exodus. From this time the Kurus in the homeland appear to have gradually lost their political importance. They sank to the level of a second-rate power. But the memory of the majesty and power of the Bharata dynasty survived till the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.²

Pańchāla comprised the Bareilly, Budauvi, Furrukhabad and the adjoining districts of Rohilkhand and the Central Doab in the modern Uttar Pradesh. It appears to have been bounded on the east by the Gumti and on the south by the Chambal. On the west lay the Yakṛillomas and the Śūrasenas of Mathurā. Belts of dense forests separated it from the Ganges and the realm of the Kurus on the north-west. Northward it approached the jungles that cover the region near the source of the Ganges.³ There is no clear trace in the Vedic literature of the Epic and Jātaka division of the Pańchalas into northern (Uttara) and southern (Dakshina). But it knew an eastern division because the Sanhit-ópanishad Brāhmaṇa makes

¹ Kauśāmbeya may no doubt also mean 'a descendant of Kusāmba'. Even then the city can hardly be dissociated from the eponymous hero of the family. Cf. Kramābhara, p. 794—Kusāmbena nirvṛttā Kauśāmbi-nagari.
² XIII. 5. 4. 11-14; 21-29.
³ Mahādadya Bharatānāṁ na pūrve nāpore janāṁ
  dīyam martyā iha pakṣābhyyāṁ nodāpuḥ saaptamānau (īti).
⁴ Rig-Veda, V. 61. 17-19; Mbh. 1. 138. 74: 150f; 168; IV. 5. 4; IX. 41
mention of the Prāchya (eastern) Pañchālas. The existence of the other two may, however, be hinted at in the expression tryanīka, “threefold”, occurring in the Vedic texts. One of the ancient capitals of Pañchāla was Kampilāya which has been identified with Kampil on the old Ganges between Budaun and Farrukhabad. Another Pañchāla town Parivakrā or Parichakrā is mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. It is identified by Weber with Ekachakrā of the Mahābhārata.

The Pañchālas, as their name indicates, probably consisted of five clans—the Krivis, the Turvaśas, the Keśins, the Śṛiṇjayas and the Somakas. Each of these clans is known to be associated with one or more princes mentioned in the Vedic texts—the Krivis with Kravya Pañchāla, the Turvaśas or Taurvaśas with Sona Sārāsaha, the Keśins with Keśin Dālbhya, the Śṛiṇjayas with Daivavāta, Prastoka, Vītahavya, Suplan or Sahadeva Sārīnjaya and Dush-tarītu, and the Somakas with Somaka Sāhadevya. Of the kings only the first three are definitely associated with Pañchāla.

The Krivis appear in a Rigvedic hymn which also mentions the Sindhu (Indus) and the Asiknī (Chenāb). But their actual habitation is nowhere clearly indicated. They are identified with the Pañchālas in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and connected with Parivakrā.

A gāthā of the same work says, “When Sātrāsāha (King

1 Ved. Ind., I. 469. Cf. also Patañjali (Kielhorn’s ed., Vol I, p. 12) and Ptolemy’s Prasāke (vii. 1. 53) which included the towns of Adisdrā (Ath chhatra) and Kanagara (? Kanauj).
2 Vedic Index, I. 187.
3 Vedic Index, I. 149; Cumm. in JASB, 1865, 178, AGI, 1921, 413.
4 XIII. 5. 4. 7.
5 Vedic Ind., I. 494.
7 XIII. 5. 4. 7: Krivya iti hā vai purā Pañchālān ēchakṣhate. Vedic Index, I. 198, According to Kasten Ronnow, Acta Orientalia, XVI, iii, 1937, p. 165 Krivis were named after a dragon-demon who was their tribal divinity.
8 Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 404; Sat. Br. XIII. 5. 4. 16. H. K. Deb (Vedic India and Mediterranean men, Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig) suggests
of the Pañchālas) makes the Aśvamedha offering, the Taurvaśas arise, six thousand and six (sic) and thirty clad in mail."

Sātrāsaha yajamāne Aśvamedhena Taurvaśaḥ
udirate trayāstrimāḥ saṭsahasrāṇī varmaṇām.

This points to a very close connexion between the Pañchālas and the Taurvaśas. The fusion of the two folks does not seem to be improbable in view of the Purānic statement that, after Marutra, the line of Turvaśu (Turvaśa, Taurvaśa) was merged into the Paurava line¹ of which the Pañchālas are represented as an offshoot. The line of rulers to which Sona belonged seems to be connected in later times with Ahichchhatra (in the Bareilly District).²

The Keśina³ who are connected with the Pañchālas in Vedic literature probably dwelt on the Gunthi. The Srinjayas⁴ are associated with the Pañchālas in post-Vedic tradition. In the Mahābhārata,⁵ Uttamaujas is called a Pañchālya as well as a Sṛiṇjaya. The clan probably lived on the Jumna in epic times.⁶ As to the Somakas, their connection with the Pañchālas is known throughout the great epic.⁷ They occupied Kāmpilya and its neighbourhood.

The royal family of the Pañchālas is represented in

the identification of the Turvaśas with the Teresh, or Tursha, one of the allied peoples who fought against Merneptah, or Meneptah, Pharaoh of Egypt (c. 1254-25 B.C.). Breasted, however, identifies the Teresh with the Tyreans or Etruscans (A History of Egypt, p. 467).

¹ A. I. H. T., p. 108. Turvaśaḥ Pauravah varahāḥ pravīveṣa purā kila (Pāyu. 99, 4).
² Comb. Hist., Ind. I. p. 525.
³ Ved. Ind., I. 186-187. The name Keśin Dālbhya suggests a close connexion between the Keśins and the Dālbhyas whom the Rig-Veda (V. 61. 17 19) places on the Gomati. From Mbh. IX. 41. 1-3 it is clear that this Gomati connected with the Dālbhya family or clan, could not have been far away from Naimisha and the country of the Pañchālas. It must, therefore, be identified with the Gunthi which flows past Nimsār near Sitāpur.
⁴ Parigier, Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, p. 353; Mbh., I. 193. 37; V. 48. 41.
⁵ Brāhmaṇa-Purāṇa, XIII. 94 f.
⁶ Mbh. VIII. 11. 31; 75. 9.
⁷ Mbh. iii. 90. 7, with commentary.
⁸ Cf. Mbh., I. 185. 91; 193. 1; II. 77. 10: Dhrīṣṭa-dyumāṇaḥ Somakāṇāḥ pravārhaḥ; Saumakir Yajñasena iii.
bardic tradition as an offshoot of the Bharata dynasty. Divodāsa, Sudās (a) and Drupada are included among the kings of this line. Divodāsa and Sudās also figure in the *Rig-Veda* where they are closely connected with the Bharatas. But they are not mentioned as Pañchāla kings. In the *Mahābhārata* Drupada is also called Yajasena and one of his sons is named Śikhaṇḍin. A Śikhaṇḍin Yajasena is mentioned in the *Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa*, but it is not clear whether we are to regard him as a prince, or as a priest of Keśin Dālbhya, King of the Pañchālas.

The external history of the Pañchālas is mainly that of wars and alliances with the Kurus. The *Mahābhārata* preserves traditions of conflict between these two great peoples. We are told by the epic that Uttara-Pañchāla was wrested from the Pañchālas by the Kurus and given away to their preceptor. Curiously enough, the *Somānassa Jātaka* places Uttara-Pañchāla-nagara in Kuru raṭṭha. The relations between the two peoples (Kurus and Pañchālas) were sometimes friendly and they were connected by matrimonial alliances. Keśin Dālbhya or Dārbhya, king of the Pañchālas, was sister’s son to Uchchhaiśravas, king of the Kurus. In the epic a Pañchāla princess is married to the Pāṇḍavas who are represented as scions of the Kuru royal family.

Of the famous kings of the Pañchālas mentioned in the Vedic literature Pravahaṇa Jaivali is known definitely to have been Janaka’s contemporary. This prince appears in the *Upanishads* as engaged in philosophical discussions with Āruṇi, Śvetaketu, Śilaka Śālavatya, and Chaikitāyana

---

3 Mbh., *Adi.*, 166, 24; *Bhīṣma*, 190, et seq.
4 VII. 4.
5 Mbh. i. 166.
7 *Ved. Ind.*, 1, 84, 187, 468. Uchchhaiśravas occurs as the name of a Kuru prince in the dynastic list of the *Mahābhārata*, I. 94. 53.
Dālbhya.¹ The first two teachers are known to have met the Vedic Janaka.

The kingdom of Kāsi was 300 leagues in extent.² It had its capital at Vārāṇasī (Benares) also called Ketumati, Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahma-vaddhana, Pupphavati, Ramma, and Molini.³ The walls of the city were twelve leagues round by themselves.⁴

The Kāsis, i.e., the people of Kāsi or Kāsi, first appear in the Paippalāda recension of the Atharva-Veda.⁵ They were closely connected with the Kosalas and the Videhas. Jala Jātūkarnya is mentioned in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra⁶ as having obtained the position of Purohit or priest of the three peoples of Kāsi, Videha and Kosala in the lifetime of Śvetaketu, a contemporary of Janaka. Curiously enough, a king named Janaka is mentioned in the Sattubhasta Jātaka⁷ as reigning in Benāres. This prince cannot be the Janaka of the Upanishads, for we learn from those works that, in the time of the famous Janaka, Ajātaśatru was on the throne of Kāsi.

Very little is known regarding the ancestors of Ajātaśatru. His name does not occur in the Purānic lists of Kāsi sovereigns,⁸ nor does the name of Dhṛitarāṣṭra, king of Kāsi, who was defeated by Śatānīka Sātrājīta with the result that the Kāsis down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa gave up the kindling of the sacred fire. A clue to the lineage of Dhṛitarāṣṭra is afforded by the Mahāgovinda-Suttanta⁹ which represents "Dhataratthā," King of Kāsi, as a Bharata prince. The Purāṇas repre-

---

¹ Brhad. Up., VI. 2; Chh. Up., 1. 8. 1; V. 3. 1.
² A stock phrase, Dhajavhetha Jātaka, No. 391.
³ Dialogues, Part III, p. 73. Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 50-51. The name Vārāṇasī is derived from two little rivers between which the city was situated—Vārāṇāsīstathā ca: Asya madhye Vārāṇasī purī (Pādma, Svarga khaṇḍa, xvii. 50).
⁴ Tantulanāli Jātaka, No. 5.
⁵ Ved Ind., II, 116 n.
⁶ XVI. 29. 5.
⁷ No. 402.
⁸ Vāyu, 99. 21-74; Vīṣṇu, IV, 8. 2-9.
⁹ Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, p. 270.
sent the Kāsi family as a branch of the house of Purūravas, the traditional ancestor of the Bharatas. Of the kings mentioned in the chronicles the names of two only (Divodāsa and his son or descendant Daivadāsi Pratardana) can be traced in the Vedic literature. But the later Vedic texts connect them with the Naimishīyas and not with Kāsi.

The Jātakas often refer to the failure of heirs at Benares (aputtakāri rājakulam), or the deposition of princes in favour of more competent rulers taken from other families. It is clear that tradition does not regard the Kāsi monarchs as belonging to one and the same dynasty. Some of the kings hailed from Magadha. Several others were probably of Videhan origin. Many of the princes belonging to these groups had the cognomen, ‘Brahmadatta.’ That Brahmadatta was not the name of one individual ruler, has been suggested by Mr. Hāritkṛishṇa Dev. The Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas refer to a group of one hundred (i.e. many) Brahmadattas:

Satāṁ vai Brahmadattānāṁ
vṛṛāṇāṁ Kuravah satam.

The “hundred” Brahmadattas are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata. In the Dummedha Jātaka the name is borne both by the reigning king and his son (Kumāra). In the Gaṅgamāla Jātaka king Udaya of Benares is addressed by a Pachcheka Buddha as “Brahmadatta” which is distinctly stated to be a kulanāma or family designation.

The Brahmadattas were not, however, all of the same extraction. The king-elect of the Darimuka Jātaka was originally a Magadhan prince. Some of the other Brahma-

---

1 Kaush. Br., xxvi. 5.
2 Cf. Jātakas, 378. 401, 520.
3 The suggestion has been accepted by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 56.
4 Matsya, Ch. 273. 71; Vāyu, Ch. 99. 451.
5 II. 8. 23.
6 No. 59; Vol. I. p. 126.
7 Cf. also the Suśuma Jātaka (111), the Kumma Sapinda Jātaka (417), the Atthāna Jātaka (425), the Lomasa Kassapa Jātaka (433), etc., 421.
dattas were of Videhan lineage. The Mātiposaka Jātaka,\(^1\) for instance, referring to a Brahmadatta of Kāsi, has the following line:

\[\text{mutto'mhi Kāsirājena Vedehena yasassinā ti.}\]

In the Sambula Jātaka\(^2\) prince Sotthisena, son of Brahmadatta, king of Kāsi, is called Vedehaputta:

\[\text{Yo putta Kāsirājassa Sotthiseno ti tam vidūtassāham Sambulā bhariyā, evam ānāhi dānava, Vedehaputto bhaddan te vane vasati āturo.}\]

Ajātaśatru, Janaka's contemporary on the throne of Kāsi, may have been a Brahmadatta though his exact lineage is not known. The Upanishadic evidence shows that he was a contemporary of Uddālaka. The Uddālaka Jātaka tells us that the reigning king of Benares in the time of Uddālaka was Brahmadatta.

Ajātaśatru appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Gārgya Bālāki. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad he is represented as being jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^3\) mentions a person named Bhadrasena Ajātaśatrava who is said to have been bewitched by Uddālaka Āruṇi. Macdonell and Keith call him a king of Kāsi. He may have been the son and successor of Ajātaśatru.\(^4\)

The kingdom of Kosala\(^5\) corresponds roughly to the modern Oudh. It seems to have extended northward to the foot of the Nepāl hills. In the east it was separated from Videha by the river Sadānirā, which was for a time the limit of the Aryan world in that direction. Beyond it was an extensive marshy region, not frequented by Brāhmaṇas which, after Māthava Videgha's occupation, developed into the flourishing kingdom of Videha. The story of Māthava makes it clear that the Kosalas fell later than the peoples dwelling on the banks of the Sarasvatī.

---

\(^1\) No. 455.
\(^2\) No. 519.
\(^3\) V. 5. 5. 14.
\(^4\) S. B. E., XLI. p. 141.
\(^5\) The form Kosala is met with in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (Vedic Index I. 195) and later literature.
but earlier than the Videhas under the influence of Brāhmanical civilization. In the south Kosala was bounded by the river Sarpikā or Syandikā and on the west probably by the Gumti which flowed past the famous Naimisha forest and apparently formed the boundary between the Kosalas and sundry peoples including the Pañchālas. In the epic Kosalas proper are distinguished from the Uttara-Kosalas, the Kosalas near the Venvā (Waingangā) and the Prāk-Kosalas. The last two peoples were clearly in South India. The Pürva-Kosalas, apparently not identical with the Prāk-Kosalas of the Deccan, dwelt between the river Sarayū and Mithilā.

The Vedic texts do not mention any city in Kosala. But if the Rāmāyaṇa is to be believed the capital of Kosala (Kosalapura) in the time of the Janakas was Ayodhyā. It stood on the banks of the Sarayū and covered twelve yojanas. The Rig-Veda mentions the river Sarayū and refers to an Aryan settlement on its banks. One of the Ārya settlers bears the name of Chitraratha which occurs also in the Rāmāyaṇa, as the appellation of a contemporary of Daśaratha. A prince styled Daśaratha is eulogised in a Rgvedic hymn, but there is nothing to identify him with the Ikshvāku king of that name who appears in the Rāmāyaṇa as the Kosalan contemporary of Stradhvaja Janaka. Daśaratha's eldest son, according to the epic, was Rāma who married Sītā, daughter of Janaka. The Rig-Veda mentions an Asura

---

1 Rām. II. 49 11-12; 50, 1. Cf. Sundarśabā, Kindred Sayings I. 209
2 Rām. II. 68. 13. 71. 16-18; VII. 104. 15. (Kosalan king sacrificing in the Naimisha forest on the Gumti); cf. Mbh. XII. 355. 2; IX. 41. 3 (Pañchālas apparently not far from Naimisha). In Rig V. 61. 17-19, the Dālbhyas, a Pañchāla people, are placed on the Gumti.
3 Mbh. II. 50. 2-3; 31. 12-13.
4 Mbh. II. 20. 28.
5 Rām. I. 55. 7. If is in the Fyzabad District of Oudh. For the name Kosalapura see Rām. II. 18. 38.
6 IV. 90. 18.
7 II. 92. 17.
8 I. 126. 4.
9 X. 95. 14.
(powerful being) named Rāma but does not connect him with Kosala. The Daśaratha Jātaka makes Daśaratha and Rāma kings of Vārānasī and disavows Sītā’s connection with Janaka.

Kosala was probably the fatherland of Janaka’s hotṛ priest, Aśvala, who was very probably an ancestor of Aśvalāyana Kausalya⁴ mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a disciple of Pippalāda and a contemporary of Sukeśā Bhāradvāja and of Hiranyanābha, a Kosalan prince. The details of Kosalan history will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Section III. The Later Vaidehas of Mithila:

NIMI AND KARĀLA

The Purāṇas give long lists of the successors of Śīradhvaja Janaka⁵ whom Bhavabhūti seems to identify with the contemporary of Yājñavalkya.⁶ With one or two exceptions none of the kings in these lists can be satisfactorily identified with the Videhan monarchs mentioned in the Vedic, Buddhist and Jaina literature. It is, therefore, difficult to say how far the lists are reliable. The identification of any of the kings named in the bardic chronicles with the Vedic Janaka is the most knotty of all problems. We have already noted the arguments that can be urged in support of the view of Bhavabhūti. The mere fact that Śīradhvaja is placed high in the Purānic lists does not necessarily prove that he actually flourished long before the extinction of the dynasty. It should be remembered in this connection that Pradyota who was in reality a contemporary of Bimbisāra, king of Magadha, is placed by the Purānic chroniclers or scribes some nine

---

⁴ Aśvalasyāpatyam Aśvalāyanaḥ (Saṁkara’s commentary on Praśna Upanishad, 1. 1).
⁵ Vāyu, 89. 18-25; Vīshnū, IV. 5. 12-19; 4th edition of this work. pp. 67 ff.
⁶ Mahāvīra-charita, I, verse 14; II, verse 43; Uttara-Rāma-Charita, IV, verse 9.
generations before that ruler, and Siddhārtha of the Ikshvāku list, a contemporary of Prasenajit of Kosala, is represented as the grandfather of the latter. The evidence of the Vishnuc Purāṇ suggests that there were at times several collateral lines of Janakas who ruled contemporaneously. The problem of Śiradhvaja must, therefore, be regarded as sub judice. In view of the uncertainty about the identification of this king and his proper place in the dynastic list, it is not easy to determine which of the Videhan kings mentioned in the Purānic chronicles actually came after the contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya. The evidence of the Jātakas, however, suggests that a king named Nimi, at any rate, ruled after the great Janaka, as he is called the penultimate sovereign of the dynasty. Pargiter places all the kings of the Purānic lists down to Bahulāśva before the Bhārata war, and apparently identifies his son Kṛiti with Kṛitakṣaṇa of the Mahābhārata a contemporary of Yudhisṭhirā. But as there were “Janakas,” even after Yudhisṭhirā, and as two Purāṇas conclude with the remark that with Kṛiti ends the race of the Janakas,” the identification of Kṛiti, the last of the race, with Kṛitakṣaṇa does not seem to be plausible. It is more reasonable to identify Kṛiti of the Purāṇas with Karāla Janaka who, as we shall see below, brought the line of Vaideha kings to an end. The only objection to this view is that Karāla is represented as the son of Nimi, whereas Kṛiti was the son of Bahulāśva. But the cognomen Nimi may have been borne by several kings and Bahulāśva may have been one of them. An alternative theory would be to represent Kṛiti and Karāla as the last members of two collateral lines of Janakas.

The Vedic texts mention besides Māthava and Janaka two other Vaideha kings, namely, Namī Sāpya and Para

---

2 अन्त, p. 149.
3 II. 4. 27.
4 अन्त, pp. 96, 330.
Āhlāra. Macdonell and Keith identify the latter with Para Āṭṭāra, king of Kosala, about whom we shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Nāmi Sāpya is mentioned in the Pañchavimśa or Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa as a famous sacrificer. His identification with king Nāmi of the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra, Nemi of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and Nemi of the Makhādeva Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, and the Kumbhakāra and Nimi Jātakas is more or less problematical. In the last-mentioned work it is stated that a Nāmi was the penultimate sovereign of the Maithila family. According to the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra he was a contemporary of Dummukha (Dvimukha), king of Pañcāla, Naggaji (Naggati) of Gandhāra and of Kāraṇḍu (Karakanḍu) of Kaliṅga. This synchronism accords with Vedic evidence. Dummukha, the Pañcāla king, had a priest named Brīhaduktha who was the son of Vāmadeva. Vāmadeva was a contemporary of Somaka, the son of Sahadeva. Somaka had close spiritual relationship with Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, and Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. From this it seems very probable that Dummukha was a contemporary of Nagnajit. This is exactly what we find in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra.

The Nimi Jātaka says that Nāmi was "born to round off" the royal family "like the hoop of a chariot wheel." Addressing his predecessor the soothsayers said, "Great king, this prince is born to round off your family. This your family of hermits will go no further."

Nāmi's son Kalāra Jāṇaka is said to have actually brought his line to an end. This king is apparently iden-
tical with Karāla Janaka of the Mahābhārata. In the Arthaśāstra attributed to Kauṭilya it is stated that "Bhoja, known by the name of Dāndakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relations; so also Karāla, the Vaideha." Karāla, the Vaideha, who perished along with his kingdom and relations, must be identified with Kalāra (Karāla) who, according to the Nimi Jātaka, brought the line of Videhan kings to an end. The downfall of the Vaidehas reminds us of the fate of the Tarquins who were expelled from Rome for a similar crime. As in Rome, so in Videha, the overthrow of the monarchy was followed by the rise of a republic—the Vajjian Confederacy.

There is reason to believe that the Kāsi people had a share in the overthrow of the Videhan monarchy. Already in the time of the great Janaka, Ajātaśatru, king of Kāsi, could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan king's fame. The passage "yathā Kāśyo vā Vaideho vā Ugraputra ujjyam dhanur adhijyam kṛīvā dvau vānavantau sapatnātivyādhinau haste kṛīv-ōpatiṣṭhed" probably refers to frequent struggles between the heroes of Kāsi and Videha. The Mahābhārata refers to the old story (itihāsām purātanam) of a great battle between Pratardana, king of Kāsi according to the Rāmāyaṇa, and Janaka, King of Mithilā. It is stated in the Pāli commentary Param-attha jotiṅka that the Lichchhavis who succeeded Janaka's dynasty as the strongest political power in North Bihar, and formed the most important element of the

1 XII. 502. 7.
2 The evidence of the Arthaśāstra is confirmed by that of the Buddha-charita of Aśvaghosa (IV. 80). "And so Karāla Janaka, when he carried off the Brāhmaṇa's daughter, incurred loss of caste thereby, but he would not give up his love."
3 Bṛhad Upānishad, III. 8. 2 "As the Ugra's son from Kāsi or from Videha strings the slackened bow and arises with two foe-piercing arrows in his hand" (Winternitz, Ind. Lit. translation I. 219 with slight emendations).
4 XII. 99. 1-2
5 VII. 48. 15.
Vajjian Confederacy, were the offsprings of a queen of Kāsi. This indicates a belief in later ages that cadets from the royal family of Kāsi established themselves in Videha.

**Section IV. The Deccan in the Age of the Later Vaidehas**

The expression "Dakṣiṇāpadā" occurs in the Rig-Veda and refers to the region where the exile goes on being turned out. In the opinion of several scholars this simply means "the south" beyond the limits of the recognised Aryan world. Dākṣiṇātya is found in Pāṇini, Dakṣiṇāpatha is mentioned by Baudhāyana coupled with Surāśṭra. It is difficult to say what Pāṇini or Baudhāyana exactly meant by Dākṣiṇātya or Dakṣiṇāpatha. In early Pāli literature the name Dakṣiṇāpatha is sometimes coupled with Avanti (Malwa), and in one text it is placed on the banks of the upper Godāvarī. In the Nalopākhyāna of the Mahābhārata, Dakṣiṇāpatha is placed beyond Avanti and the Vindhya, and to the south of the Vidarbha and the (Southern) Kosala. The last mentioned peoples lived on the banks of the Wardhā and the Mahānadi. In the Digvijaya-parva, Dakṣiṇāpatha is distinguished from the Pāṇḍya realm in the southernmost part of the Madras Presidency. In the Gupta Age it certainly stretched from the land of the Kosala to the kingdom of Kāñchi. In later times it embraced the whole of Trans-Vindhyan India from the Setu (Adam's Bridge) to the Narmada.

Whatever may have been the exact denotation of the terms discussed above in the earliest times it is certain that

---

1 X. 61. 8. *Vedic Index*, I. 337.
2 IV. 2. 98.
3 Baudh. Śāstra, I. 1. 29.
4 DPPN, 1, 1050; Mbh. II. 31, 16-17; III. 61, 21-23. Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta; Fleet, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, 341 n. The *Periplus* distinguishes Dachinabades (Dakṣiṇāpatha) from Damirica (Tamil land).
already in the age of the later Vaidehas, Nimi and Karāla, the Aryans had crossed the Vindhya and established several kingdoms in the territory that stretched from the Revā or the Narmadā to the Godāvari. One of these realms was Vidarbha. It comprised modern Berar, the Varadāta of the Āin-i-Ākbarī, and a considerable portion of the Central Provinces lying between the Wardhā (Varadā) and the Waingaṅgā. In the north it reached the Payoshṇī, a tributary of the Tāptī. Vidarbha was certainly a famous kingdom in the time of Nimi. We have already seen that the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttar-ādhyāyana make him a contemporary of Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, who is known from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa to have flourished about the same time as Bhīma, king of Vidarbha:

"Etamu haiva prochatuh Parvata-Nāradau Somakāya Sāhadevyāya Sahadevāya Sārṇjayaṇa Babhrave Daivāvridhāya Bhīmāya Vaidarbhāya Nagnajite Gāndhārāya."

"This Parvata and Nārada proclaimed to Somaka Sāhadevya, Sahadeva Sārṇjaya, Babhrū Daivāvridha, Bhīma Vaidarbha (i.e. of Vidarbha) and Nagnajit of Gandhāra."

Vidarbha, therefore, existed as an independent kingdom in the time of Nimi. From the Purānic account of the Yadu family it appears that the eponymous hero of the Vidarbhas, was of Yadu lineage. The country is mentioned in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa. It was famous for its Māchalas, perhaps a species of dog, which killed tigers—"Vidarbheṣu mācalās sārameyā apīha śārdūlān mārayanti."

The Praśna Upanishad mentions a sage of Vidarbha named Bhārgava as a contemporary of Āśvalāyana. Another sage called Vidarbhi Kauṇḍinya is mentioned in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. The name Kauṇḍinya is appar-

---

1 Mbh. III. 61. 22-23; 120. 31.
2 VII. 34.
3 Matsya Purāṇa, 44 36; Vāyu Purāṇa, 95. 35-36.
4 II, 440: Ved. Ind., II. 297.
5 JAOŚ, 19, 100.
6 I, 1; II. 1.
7 Pādeśa Index, II. 297.
ently derived from the city of Kuṇḍina, the capital of Vidarbha,¹ represented by the modern Kaunḍinya-pura on the banks of Wardhā in the Chāndur tāluk of Amraoti.² The association of Vidarbha with Kuṇḍina clearly suggests that Vidarbha of the Vedic texts lay in the Deccan, and not in some hitherto unknown region outside its boundaries as contended by a well-known writer.³

If the evidence of the Kumbhakāra Jātaka has any value, then Nimi, king of Videha, mentioned in the work, Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, and Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, must be considered to have been contemporaries of Karnaṇḍu of Kaliṅga. It follows from this that the kingdom of Kaliṅga too, was in existence in the time of Nimi and his contemporaries of the Brāhmaṇa period. The evidence of the Jātaka is confirmed by that of the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta,⁴ makes Sattabhu, king of Kaliṅga, a contemporary of Reṇu, king of Mithilā and of Dhatarāṣṭha, or Dhṛtarāṣṭra, king of Kāsi, mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.⁵ There can thus be no doubt that Kaliṅga existed as an independent kingdom in the time of which the Brāhmaṇas speak. It is mentioned both by Pāṇini⁶ and Baudhāyana.⁷ The latter regards it as an impure country but evidently not unfrequented by Aryans.⁸ According to epic tradition it comprised the whole coast from the river Vaitarani⁹

¹ Mbh., III. 73. 1-2; V. 157. 14; Harivamha, Vishṇuparva, 59-60.
³ Indian Culture, July, 1936, p. 12. Curiously enough, the same writer, who characterises the provisional acceptance of the contradicted testimony of the Purāṇas and lexicons in locating tribes mentioned in Vedic literature as unhistorical, has no hesitation in identifying the Satvats of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa with the Yādavas and in placing them in the Mathurā region and adjoining districts (ibid., 15). He has not referred to any Vedic text which supports his conjecture regarding the identity of the Satvats and their association with the particular city named by him.
⁴ Dialogues of the Buddha, II. 270.
⁵ XIII. 5. 4. 22.
⁶ IV. I. 170.
⁷ I. I. 90-91.
⁸ There was a considerable Brāhmaṇa population in Kaliṅga in the days of Asoka (cf. Edict XIII).
⁹ Mbh., III. 114. 4.
in Orissa to the borders of the Andhra territory. The southern boundary of the Janapada was not well-defined. It reached Yellamanchili and Chipurupalle in the Vizagapatam district and at times even Pishtapura or Pithapuram, north-east of the Godāvari, but not the river itself which flowed through the Andhra country. Pargiter says that Kaliṅga as a settled kingdom appears to have consisted properly of the plain between the Eastern Ghats (Mahendra range) and the sea. But its kings seem to have exercised suzerainty over the Jungle tribes which inhabited the hills far inland, for the Amarakaṇṭaka range, in which the Narmadā rises, is said to be in the western part of Kaliṅga. That large tracts of the country were covered with forests appears from references to Kaliṅgāraṇya in Pālī texts. The windows of the capital city in the days of Kalidāsa looked out on the sea, and the deep roar of the waves drowned the sound of trumpets. In the days of Yuan Chwang Kaliṅga occupied a much smaller area. It is distinguished from Wu-t'u (Orissa) and Kung-yū-t'o (Koṅgoda in the Ganjam district) in the north, and An-to-lo (Andhra or Veṅgi) in the south, and seems to have embraced parts of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts. We learn from the Jātakas that an ancient capital of Kaliṅga was Dantapura-nagara. The Mahābhārata mentions Rājapura as the metropolis. The Mahāvastu refers to another city named Simhapura.

1 Ind. Ant., 1923, 67; Ep. Ind. XII. 2; JASB, 1897, 98 ff; Kürma, p. II. 99. 9; Pādma, Svarga-Khaṇḍa, VI. 22; Vāyu, 77, 4-13; Malalasekera, DPPN. 584: Raghunātha, vi. 58.


3 XII. 4. 3.

4 Senart': edition, p. 452.
The Jaina writers mention a fourth town called Kam-chaṇapura.¹

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta refers to another southern realm, namely, Assaka or Aśmaka on the God(h)āvarī,² which existed in the time of the monarchs Reṇu and Dhata-raṭṭha (Dhṛita-rāṣṭra). It was ruled by king Brahmadatta who held his Court at Potana.

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa alludes³ to princes of the South who are called Bhojas and whose subjects are called Satvats: “dakṣiṇasyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ rājāno Bhaujyāyaiva teḥbhishichyante Bhoj-ete-nān-abhishiktān-āchakshata—” “in the southern region whatever kings there are of the Satvats, they are anointed for Bhauja; ‘O Bhoja’ they style them when consecrated (in accordance with the action of the deities).” In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa⁴ the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats, and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an Āśvamedha or horse-sacrifice are referred to. These Satvats must have been living near Bharata’s realm, i.e., near the Ganges and the Yamunā.⁵ But in the time of

---

¹ Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375. The Bhūmikhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa (47. 5) mentions Śripura as a city in Kalinga.

² Sutta Niṭāta, 977. SBE, X, pt. ii, 184 Cf. Asmagi (Bomb. Gaz. I. 1, p. 532; Megasthenes and Arran, 1926, 145) of classical writers. Aśmaka is also mentioned by Pāṇini, IV. I. 173. As the name signifies “the stony region”, it can hardly refer to Aśvaka, the land of the Assākenoi in the north-west, which the Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, connects with the Sanskrit āsva, and Iranian aspa, horse. The Commentator Bhaṭṭasvāmin identifies Aśmaka with Mahārāṣṭra. The capital was Potali or Potana (Chullakāvīga Jātaka No. 301; Assaka J. (207); D. 2. 235; Parisīṣṭa parvan, I. 92. nagare Potanā-bhidhe. Bomb. Gaz. I. 1, 535; Law, Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective, 74; Mbh. 1. 177. 47; cf. Pāḍana of Lüders’ List, 616, and N. G. Majumder’s List, 658 (Monuments, p. 365—Visākha Pāḍārthiyas). Dr. Sukthankar points out that the Paudanya of the printed editions of the Mahābhārata is a late corruption. The older Mss. give the name as Potana or Podana. This name reminds one of Bodhan in the Nivām’s dominions which lies to the south of the confluence of the Manjirā and the Godāvari. The city of Podana is said to have been founded by a prince of the Ikshvāku family, who is the eponymous hero of the land of Aśmaka. The neighbouring people of Mūlaka also claimed Ikshvāku descent (Vāyu, 88. 177-178).

³ VIII. 14.

⁴ XII. 5. 4. 21.

⁵ Ibid., XIII. 5. 4. 11.
the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* they probably moved farther to the south. They are placed in the southern region (*dakṣiṇā dis* beyond the "fixed middle region"—the land of the Kurus, Pañchālas and some neighbouring tribes. The Pañchāla realm, according to epic testimony, extended as far south as the Chambal. The Satvat people of the "southern region" mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, therefore, in all probability, lived beyond that river. Their kings were called Bhojas. This account of the Satvats and the Bhojas, deduced from the Brāhmaṇic statements, accords with Purāṇic evidence. It is stated in the *Purāṇas* that the Sātvat(a)s and the Bhojas were offshoots of the Yadu family which dwelt at Mathurā on the banks of the Yamunā. We are further told by the same authorities that they were the kindreds of the southern realm of Vidarbha. We have evidence of a closer connection between the Bhojas and the last-mentioned territory. A place called Bhojakaṭa, is included within Vidarbha both by the *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivamśa*. The Chammak grant of the Vākṣaka king Pravarasena II makes it clear that the Bhojakaṭa territory included the Ichhapur district in Berar, a part of ancient Vidarbha. As pointed out by Dr. Smith, the name of Bhojakaṭa, ‘castle of the Bhojas,’ implies that the province was named after a stronghold formerly held by the Bhojas, an ancient ruling race mentioned in the edicts of Aśoka. Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvarṇaśa* calls the king of Vidarbha a Bhoja.

But Vidarbha was not the only Bhoja state. The

1 Mbh., I. 193. 74; *Dakshināḥschāpi Pañchālān yāvach Charmanvati nadi*.
2 *Matsya* 43. 48: 44. 46-48; *Vāyu*, 94. 54; 95. 18; 96. 1-2 *Vishṇu*, IV. 13. 1 6.
3 *Mat.*, 44. 36; *Vāyu*, 95. 33-36.
4 *V* 157. 15-16. 6 *Vishṇu parva*, 60. 32.
5 *JRAS.*, 1914. p. 329.
6 In *Ind. Ant.*, 1923. 262-63. Bhojakaṭa is identified with Bhat-kuli in the Amraoti district.
7 *V* 99-40.
8 Cf. also Mbh., V. 48. 74: 157. 17; *Harivamśa, Vishṇu parva*, 47. 5.
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa refers to several Bhoja kings of the south. A line of Bhojas must have ruled Daṇḍaka. A passage in the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra runs thus:—

"Daṇḍakayo nāma Bhojaḥ kāmāt Brāhmaṇa-kanyām abhimanyamānas sabandhu-rāśtro vinanāsa"—a Bhoja known as Daṇḍakya, or king of Daṇḍaka, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa girl, perished along with his relations and kingdom. We learn from the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka that the kingdom of Daṇḍaki (Daṇḍaka) had its capital at Kumbhavatī. According to the Rāmāyaṇa, the name of the metropolis was Madhumanta, while the Mahāvastu places it at Govardhana (Nāsik).

It is clear, from what has been stated above, that there were in the age of the later Vaidehas, and the treatises called Brāhmaṇas, many kingdoms in the south, both Aryan and non-Aryan, namely, the Bhoja kingdoms, one of which was Vidarbha, and another, probably, Daṇḍaka, as well as Aśmaka and Kaliṅga. With the exception of these organised states the whole of Trans-Vindhyān India was occupied by non-Aryan (dasyu) tribes such as the Andhras, Šavaras, Pulindas and probably also the Mūtibas.

In the opinion of Dr. Smith the Andhras were a Dravidian people, now represented by the large population speaking the Telugu language, who occupied the deltas of the Godāvari and the Kṛishṇā. Mr. P. T. Śrīnivās Iyengar argues that the Andhras were originally a Vindhyān tribe and that the extension of Andhra power was from the west to the east down the Godāvari and Kṛishṇā valleys. Dr. Bhandarkar points out that the Serivānij Jātaka places Andhapura, i.e., the pura or capital of the Andhras, on the river Telavāha which he

1 Ed. 1919, p. 11.
2 No. 522.
3 VII. 92. 18.
5 Ait. Br., VII. 18.
6 Ind. Ant., 1913, pp. 276-78.
identifies with the modern Tel or Telengiri. But if 'Seri' or Śrī rājya refers to the Gaṅga kingdom of Mysore, Telavāha may have been another name of the Tuṅga-bhadrā-Krishṇā, and Andhapura identical with Bevāda or some neighbouring city. The Mayidavolu plates of the early Pallava ruler Śivaskanda-varman prove that the Andhra country (Andhrapratha) embraced the lower valley of the Kṛishṇā and had its centre at Dhaṅnakaḍa, i.e., Bevāda, or some neighbouring city on the south bank of the Kṛishṇā. Yuan Chwàng applies the name An-to-lo (Andhra) to the district round Ping-ki-lo (Veṅgīpura) near Ellore. In later times the Andhra-Khaṇḍa extended from the Godāvarī to the borders of Kaliṅga (ārabhyā Gautojamanaditālam ākaliṅgam) and included Piṭhāpurī (Pithapuram).

The Śavaras and the Pulindas are described in the Matsya and the Vāyu Purāṇas as Dakshīṇa-patha-vāsināḥ, inhabitants of the Deccan, together with the Vaidarbhas and the Daṇḍakas:

*Teshāṁ pare janapadā Dakshīṇa-patha-vāsināḥ*

Kārūshāścha saha-Iṣṭikā Ātavyāḥ Śavarāś tathā
Pulindā Vindhyā-Pushikā (?) Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaiḥ saha.

Ābhūrāḥ saha chu-Iṣṭikāḥ Ātavyāḥ Śavarāścha ye Pulindā Vindhyā-Mūlikā Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaiḥ saha.

---

1 Ind. Ant., 1918, p. 71. There is also a river called 'Ter' in South India, Ep. Ind., XXII. 29.

2 *Mysores and Coorg from Inscriptions*, 38. 'Seri' may also refer to Śrī Vijaya or Śrī Vīshaya (Sumatra?).

3 The name Telavāha, oil-carrier, reminds one of the passages "Vikhyāta-Krishṇa-varṇa (=Krisnā)-tala-snehopalabdhasa-rimalatva" (IA, VIII. 17, cf. Ep. XII. 155)—"with a smoothness caused by sesame oil of the famous (river) Krishṇā."

4 Hultsch (Ep. Ind. VI. 85) identified the city with Amārāvatī. Burgess suggested Dharanikota which lies about 18 miles to the westward from Bevāda, on the right bank of the Kṛishṇā. Ferguson, Sewell and Watters prefer Bevāda itself (Yuan Chwàng, II. 216). In the days of the great Chinese pilgrim An-to-lo (Andhra) had its capital at Ping-ki-lo or Veṅgīpura in the Kṛishṇā district.

5 Watters: II. 209f IA. xx, 93; Ep. Ind., IV. 957.


7 Vāyu, 45. 126
The *Mahābhārata* also places the Andhras, Pulindas and Śavaras in the Deccan:

Dakṣiṇa-patha-janmāṇaḥ sarve naravara-Andhrakāh
Guhāḥ Pulindāḥ Śavarāś Chuchukāḥ Madrakāḥ (? ) saha.¹

The precise position and extent of the Śavaras in the Brāhmaṇa period cannot be shown. They are usually identified with the Sui of Pliny and the Sabarae of Ptolemy, and are probably represented by the Savaralu, or Sauras of the Vizagapatam Hills, and the Savaris of the Gwalior territory.²

The capital of the Pulindas (Pulinda-nagara) probably lay to the south-east of the Daśāṇas³ who dwelt on the river Dasān (Dhasan) in Bundelkhand.⁴

The location of the territory of the Mūtibas, another Dasyu tribe mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* along with the Andhras, Pulindas, and Śavaras, is not so certain. Pliny refers to a tribe called “Modubae,” and places them along with other peoples between the “Modogalingae,” who inhabited a very large island in the Ganges and the Andarac (Andhras).⁵ The Modubae are associated with the Molindac and the Uberae, perhaps corresponding to the Pulindas and the Śavaras of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. In the Śāṅkhaśyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra⁶ the Mūtibas are called Mūvīpa or Mūchīpa. It is not altogether improbable that the last name is connected with that of the river Musi in the Deccan on which Hyderabad now stands.⁷

---

¹ *Mbh.*, XII. 207. 42.
² *Ind. Ant.*, 1879, p. 282; Cunn. *AGI*, new ed., pp. 583, 586; The *Imp. Gaz.*, *The Indian Empire*, I, 384. Śavaras are also found in the south-east portion of the district of Raipur (JASB, 1890, 289), in Sambalpur and Ganjam (ibid., 1891, 33), the western part of the Cuttack district as well as the north-western portion of Vizagapatam (ibid., 1897, 321).
³ *Mbh.*, II. 5-10.
⁴ JASB, 1893, 253; Kālidāsa places them in the Vidiśa or Bhilsa region (*Meghadūta*, 24-25).
⁵ M’Grindle, *Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1926, p. 139-140.
⁶ XV. 26. 6.