CHAPTER III. MAHĀJANAPADAS AND KINGSHIP

SECTION I. THE SIXTEEN MAHĀJANAPADAS

The Vedic texts do not throw much light on the political condition of the period which elapsed from the fall of the Videhan monarchy, probably early in the sixth century B.C., to the rise of Kosala under Mahākosala, the father-in-law of Bimbisāra, about the middle of that century. But we learn from the Buddhist Anguttara Nikāya that during this period there were sixteen states of considerable extent and power known as the “Solasa Mahājanapada.” These states were:

1. Kāsi (Kāsi) 9. Kuru
2. Kosala (Kośala) 10. Pañchāla
3. Aṅga 11. Machchha (Matsya)
4. Magadha 12. Śūrasena
5. Vajji (Vṛijī) 13. Assaka (Aśmaka)
7. Chetiya (Chedi) 15. Gandhāra
8. Vaṁśa (Vatsa) 16. Camboja

These Mahājanapadas flourished together during a period posterior to Karāla-Janaka but anterior to Mahākosala, because one of them, Vajji, apparently rose to power after the fall of the Videhan monarchy, while another, namely, Kāsi, lost its independence before the time of Mahākosala and formed an integral part of the Kosalan empire in the latter half of the sixth century B.C.

The Jaina Bhagavatī Sūtra gives a slightly different list of the sixteen Mahājanapadas:

1. Aṅga 6. Achchha
2. Baṅga (Vaṅga) 7. Vachchha (Vatsa)
3. Magaha (Magadha) 8. Kochchha (Kachchha ?)
4. Malaya 10. Lādha (Lāṭa or Rādha)
5. Mālava (ka) 9. Pāḍha (Pāṇḍya or Paunḍra)

1 PTSI., 215: IV, 252, 256, 260. The Mahāvastu (I. 34) gives a similar list, but omits Gandhāra and Camboja, substituting in their place Śibi and Daśārṇa in the Punjab (or Rājputānā) and Central India respectively. A less complete list is found in the Jana-vasabha-sutta.

2 Soja xv Uddessa I (Hoernle, the Uośagadāsā, II Appendix); W. Kierfel, Die Kosmographie Der Inder, 215.
12. Moli (Malla) 15. Avaha
13. Kasi (Kasi) 16. Sambhattara (Sum-hottara ?)

It will be seen that Aanga, Magadha, Vatsa, Vajji, Kasi, and Kosala are common to both the lists. Malava of the Bhagavati is probably identical with Avanti of the Anguttara. Moli is probably a corruption of Malla. The other states mentioned in the Bhagavati are new, and indicate a knowledge of the far east and the far south of India. The more extended horizon of the Bhagavati clearly proves that its list is later than the one given in the Buddhist Anguttara.¹ We shall, therefore, accept the Buddhist list as a correct representation of the political condition of India after the fall of the House of Janaka.

Of the sixteen Mahajanapadas Kasi was probably at first the most powerful. We have already seen that Kasi probably played a prominent part in the subversion of the Videhan monarchy. Several Jatakas bear witness to the superiority of its capital Benares over the other cities, and the imperial ambition of its rulers. The Guttika Jataka² says that the city of Benares is the chief city in all India. It extended over twelve leagues³ whereas Mithik and Indapatta were each only seven leagues in extent.⁴ Several Kasi monarchs are described as aspirants for the dignity of the chief king of all kings (sabbarajunam aggarajā), and lord of the whole of India (sakala-Jambudīpa).⁵ The Mahavagga also mentions the fact that Kasi was in former

¹ Mr. E. J. Thomas suggests (History of Buddhist Thought, p. 6) that the Jaina author who makes no mention of the northern Kambojas and Gandhāras but includes several south Indian peoples in his list, “wrote in South India and compiled his list from countries that he knew.” If the writer was really ignorant of the northern peoples his Mālavas could not have been in the Pujjāb and must be located in Central India. In that case his account can hardly be assigned to a very early date.

² No. 243.

³ Dvādasayojanikam sakala-Bārāṇasī-nagaram—Sambhava Jataka, No. 515; Sarabha-miga J., 483; Bhūridatta J., 543.

⁴ Suryuchi, J., 489; Vidhurapaṇḍita J., 545.

⁵ Bhaddasala Jātaka, 469; Dhomasēkha Jātaka, 558.
times a great and prosperous realm, possessed of immense resources:

"Bhātāpūbham bhikkhave Bārāṇasiyam Brahmadatto
nāma Kāśivājā ahosi adāho mahaddhano mahābhogo
mahadbalo mahāvāhano mahāvijito pariṇṇakosa-kotṛhā-gāro."n

The Jainas also afford testimony to the greatness of Kāsi, and represent Aśvasena, king of Benares, as the father of their Tīrthaṅkara Pārśva who is said to have died
250 years before Mahāvīra, i.e., in or about 777 B.C.

Already in the Brāhmaṇa period a king of Kāsi, named
Dhṛitarāśṭra, attempted to offer a horse-sacrifice, but was vanquished by Śatānīka Sātrājita with the result that the Kāsīs down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, gave up the kindling of the sacred fire. Some of the other Kāsi monarchs were more fortunate. Thus in the Brahā-
chattā Jātaka a king of Benares is said to have gone against
the king of Kosala with a large army. He entered the
city of Sāvatthi and took the king prisoner. The Kosāmbī
Jātaka, the Kunāla Jātaka, and the Mahāvagga refer to
the annexation of the kingdom of Kosala by the Brahmadattas of Kāsi. The Assaka Jātaka refers to the city of Potali, the capital of Assaka on the Godāvarī, as a city of
the kingdom of Kāsi. Evidently the reigning prince of
Potali was a vassal of the sovereign of Kāsi. In the Sona-
Nanda Jātaka Manoja, king of Benares, is said to have
subdued the kings of Kosala, Aṅga and Magadha. In the

---

1 Mahāvagga, X. 2. 3; Vinaya Piṭaka, I. 342.
2 Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 19.
3 No. 336.
4 No. 428.
5 No. 536.
7 The reference in the Mahābhārata (I. 105. 47 ff; 106. 2. 13; 113. 43;
114. 3f; 126. 16; 127. 24) to Kāsi princesses, the mothers of Dhṛitarāśṭra and
Pāṇḍu, as Kausalyā, possibly points to the traditional union of the two realms
of Kāsi and Kosala in the period when part of the epic was compiled. The
expression Kāsi-Kausalya already occurs in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (Vedic
Index. I. 195).
8 No. 297.
9 No. 582.
Mahābhārata Pratardana, king of Kāsi, is said to have crushed the power of the Viṭahavyas or Haihayas. In the absence of corroborative evidence it is difficult to say how far the account of the achievements of individual kings, mentioned in the Jātakas and the epic, is authentic. But the combined testimony of many Jātakas and the Mahāvagga clearly proves that Kāsi was at one time a great, almost an imperial power, stronger than many of its neighbours including Kosala.

We learn from the Bhojājaniya Jātaka that 'all the kings round coveted the kingdom of Benares.' We are told that on one occasion seven kings encompassed Benares. Benares in this respect resembled ancient Babylon and mediæval Rome, being the coveted prize of its more warlike but less civilized neighbours.

The Kingdom of Kosala as we have seen, was bounded on the west by the Gumti, on the south by the Sarpikā or Syandikā (Sai) river, on the east by the Sadānīrā which separated it from Videha, and on the north by the Nepāl hills. It included the territory of the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, possibly on the Gumti, and that of the Śākya of Kapilavastu in the Nepalese Tarai. In the Sutta Nipāta the Buddha says, "Just beside Himavanta there lives a people endowed with the power of wealth, the inhabitants of Kosala." They are Adichchas.

1 XIII. 90.
2 Dr. Bhandarkar points out that several Kāsi monarchs, who figure in the Jātakas, are also mentioned in the Purāṇas, e.g., Vissasena of Jātaka No. 268. Udaya of Jātaka No. 458, and Bhallatiya of Jātaka No. 504 are mentioned in the Purāṇas as Viśvakṛṣṇa, Udakasena and Bhallatiya. Māṣyaka, 49, 57 et seq. Vāyu, 99, 180 et seq.; Vishnu, IV. 19, 19.
3 No. 23.
4 Jātaka, 181.
5 Rām. II. 49, 11-12; 50, 1; VII. 104, 15.
6 Aṅguttara Nīkāya, I. 188 (PTS); IC. II. 808. In the Rg-veda, V, 61, the Dīlībhīyas, a family or clan closely connected with the Kesins (who possibly gave their name to Kesaputta), are placed on the Gumti.
7 SBE., X, Part II, 68-69.
8 Kvakasus niketino. As pointed out by Rhys Davids and Stede, Niketin means 'having an abode,' 'being housed,' 'living in,' cf. J. III, 432—dumasaṁkā-niketinī.
9 Belonging to the Āditya (Solar) race (cf. Lüders, Ins., 949 l)
by family, Śākiyas by birth; from that family I have wandered out, not longing for sensual pleasures." The Majjhima Nikāya, too, mentions the Buddha as a Kosalan:

"Bhagavā pi Kosalako aham pi Kosalako"

The political subjection of the Śākyas to the king of Kosala in the latter half of the sixth century B.C. is clear from the evidence of the Aggañña Suttanta and the introductory portion of the Bhuddasāla Jātaka.

Kosala proper contained three great cities, namely Ayodhyā, Sāketa and Sāvatthī or Āravastī, besides a number of minor towns like Setavyā and Ukkaṭṭha. Ayodhyā (Oudh) was a town on the river Sarayū now included in the Fyzabad district. Sāketa is often supposed to be the same as Ayodhyā, but Professor Rhys Davids points out that both cities are mentioned as existing in the Buddha’s time. They were possibly adjoining like London and Westminster. Sāvatthī is the great ruined city on the south bank of the Achiravati or Rāptī called Sāhēt-Māhēt, which is situated on the borders of the Goṇḍa and Bahraich districts of the present Uttar-Pradesh.

In the Rāmāyana and in the Purāṇas the royal family of Kosala is represented as being descended from a king named Ikshvāku. Branches of this family are represented as ruling at Kusinārā, at Mithilā and at Vīśālī or Vaiśālī. A prince named Ikshvāku is mentioned in a passage of the

---

1 II. 124.
2 Dīgha Nikāya, III (PTS), 83; Dialogues, III. 80.
3 No. 465; Fausboll, IV. 145.
4 Pāyāsi Suttanta.
5 Ambattha Sutta.
6 Buddhist India, p. 39.
7 Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, 1924, 6. 469; Smith, E. H. I., 3rd ed., p. 159. The royal palace at Āravasti overlooked the Achiravatī (DPPN, II, 170n).
8 The Kuśa Jātaka, No. 581. The Mahāvastu (III. 1) places an Ikshvāku king in Benares—Abhūshi Rājā Ikshvāku Vārāṇasayāṁ mahābalo.
9 Vāyu P., 89, 3.
10 Rāmāyana, 1. 4. 11-12.
Rig-Veda. In the Atharvaveda either this king, or one of his descendants, is referred to as an ancient hero. The Puranas give lists of kings of the Aikshvaka dynasty from Ikshvaku himself to Prasenajit, the contemporary of Bimbisara. The names of many of these kings are probably found in the Vedic literature. For example:

Mandhatrī Yuvanāśva is mentioned in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. Purukutsa is referred to in the Rig-Veda. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa he is styled an Aikshvaka. Trasadasya, too, finds mention in the Rig-Veda. Tryaruna is also mentioned in the same Veda. In the Pañcharitra Brāhmaṇa he is called an Aikshvaka Triśāṅku is referred to in the Taittirīya Upanishad.

Hariśchandra figures in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and is styled Aikshvaka. Rohita, the son of Hariśchandra, is also alluded to in the same Brāhmaṇa. Bhagiratha figures prominently in the Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa under the slightly different name of Bhageratha and is called Aikshvaka and ‘Ekarā’ (sole ruler). Under the name of Bhageratha he is probably referred to in the Rig-Veda itself. Ambarīsha is mentioned in the same Veda. The name Rituparna finds mention in a Brāhmaṇa-like passage of the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra. Daśaratha and Rāma bear names that are known to the Rig-Veda. But these personages and a few others men-

---

1 X. 60. 4.
2 XIV. 39. 9.
3 Vāyu 88. 67.
4 I. 2. 10 et seq.
5 Vāyu, 88. 72.
6 I. 63. 7; 112. 7. 14; 174. 2, VI. 20. 10.
7 XIII. 5. 4. 5.
8 Cf. reference to the Rig-Veda, IV. 42. 8 in this connection.
9 Vāyu, 88. 74.
10 IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3, etc.
11 Vāyu, 88. 77.
12 V. 27.
13 XIII. 3. 12.
14 Vāyu, 88. 109.
15 I. 10. 1.
16 Vāyu, 88. 117.
17 VII. 13. 16.
18 Vāyu, 88. 119.
19 VII. 14.
20 Vāyu, 88. 167.
21 IV. 6. 1 ff.
22 X. 60. 2.
23 Vāyu, 88. 171.
24 I. 100. 17.
25 Vāyu, 88. 173.
26 XVIII. 12 (Vol. II. p. 357).
27 Vāyu, 88. 183-184.
28 I. 126. 4; X. 95. 14.
tioned above are not connected in the Vedic texts with the Ikshvāku family or with Kosala.

Hiraṇyānābha Kausalya,¹ is mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a rāja-puṭra or prince.² He is undoubtedly connected with Para Āṭṭhāra (Āhlāra), the Kosala-Videhan king, mentioned in a gāthā (song) occurring in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa³ and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Śūtra,⁴ as well as a passage of Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa.⁵ The gāthā as quoted in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa gives to Para the patronymic ‘Hairaṇyānābha’, while the Śrauta Śūtra identifies Para with Hiraṇyānābha himself. It is difficult to say whether the original gāthā extolling the deeds of Para Āṭṭhāra (Āhlāra) gave to that conqueror the name ‘Hiraṇyānābha’ or the patronymic ‘Hairaṇyānābha.’ The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is the older of the two works mentioning the prince’s exploits and is, therefore, more likely to preserve the original text than the śūtra. According to the Praśna Upanishad, Hiraṇyānābha, the father, was a contemporary of Sukeśa Bhāradvāja,⁶ who was himself a contemporary of Kausalya Āśvalāyana.⁷ If it be true, as seems probable, that Āśvalāyana of Kosala is identical with Assalāyana of Sāvatthī mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya⁸ as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha, he must be placed in sixth century B.C. Consequently Hiraṇyānābha and his son, Hairaṇyānābha too, must have flourished in that century.

¹ Vāyu, 88. 207.
² VI. 1. In the Jaim. Up. Br. II. 6. he (cf. Śāṅkh. Śr. Sutra, XVI. 9. 13) or his son (Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 4) is styled a māhārāja. Too much significance should not be attached to the designation rāja-puṭra (as distinguished from rājā). In the Mahā. V. 165. 18, Brhavālas is a rājā of Kosala (Kausalya). In a later passage of the epic (XI. 25. 10) the same ruler is referred to as Kosalānāmadhī-patiṁ rāja-puṭraṁ Brhaddabalam.
³ XIII. 5. 4. 4. Ājñārasya Paraḥ puṭro’svaṁ medhīyamabandhayat
Hairaṇyānābhaṁ Kausalyo diśaṁ śūrāḥ amaṇḍhala (iti).
⁴ XVI. 9. 13.
⁵ II. 6.
⁶ VI. 1.
⁷ Praśna, I. 1.
⁸ II. 147 et seq.
Some of the later princes of the Purānic list, e.g., Śākya, Suddhodana, Siddhārtha, Rāhula and Prasenajit, are mentioned in Buddhist texts. The exact relations of Hiraṇyānabha (and Hairaṇyānabha) with Prasenajit, who also flourished in the sixth century B.C. are not known. The Purānic chroniclers make Hiraṇyānabha an ancestor of Prasenajit, but are not sure about his position in the dynastic list.\(^1\) Further they refer to Prasenajit as the son and successor of Rāhula, and grandson of Siddhārtha (Buddha). This is absurd, because Prasenajit was of the same age as the Buddha and belonged to a different branch of the Ikshvāku line. The Tibetans represent him as the son of Brahmadatta.\(^2\) It is clear that no unanimous tradition about the parentage of Prasenajit and the position of Hiraṇyānabha in the family tree has been preserved. Hiraṇyānabha, or preferably his son, performed an Āstamedha sacrifice and was apparently a great conqueror. Is this ruler identical with the “Great Kosalan” (Mahākosala) of Buddhist tradition? If he really flourished in the sixth century B.C., he may have been identical with ‘Mahākosala’ of Buddhist texts.

Pargiter admits that several Purānic passages make Hiraṇyānabha (and therefore also his son) one of the “future” kings after the Bhārata battle.\(^3\) He was the only prince of antiquity who is styled in the Vedic literature both a Kausalya and a Vaideha. That description admirably fits Mahākosala whose daughter, the mother of Ajātaśatru according to Buddhist tradition, is called Kosalādevī as well as Vedēhī (Vaidehī).

A word may be added here regarding the value of the Purānic lists. No doubt they contain names of some real kings and princes. But they have many glaring defects, defects which are apt to be forgotten by writers who make these the basis of early Indian chronology.

\(^1\) AIHT, 173.  
\(^2\) Essay on Gunāḍhya, p. 173.  
\(^3\) AIHT, 173.
(1) Ikshvākuids of different branches and perhaps princes of other tribes, e.g., Trasadasyu, king of the Pūrus, 1 Rituparṇa, king of Śaphāla, 2 Śuddhodana of Kapilavastu and Prasenajit, king of Śrāvastī, have been mixed up in such a way as to leave the impression that they formed a continuous line of monarchs who ruled in regular succession.

(2) Contemporaries have been represented as successors and collaterals have been represented as lineal descendants, e.g., Prasenajit, king of Śrāvastī, is represented as the lineal successor of Siddhārtha and Rāhula, though he was actually a contemporary of Siddhārtha, i.e., the Buddha, and belonged to a separate line of the Ikshvākuids.

(3) Certain individuals have been omitted, e.g., Vedhas (father, or ancestor of Hariśchandra), Para Āṭṭāra (unless he is identical with Hiranyanābha), and Mahākosala.

(4) Names in the list include Śākya, the designation of a clan, and Siddhārtha (Buddha) who never ruled.

It is not easy to find out all the kings of the Purānic chronicles who actually ruled over Kosala. Some of the earlier princes, e.g., Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Hariśchandra, Rohita, Rituparṇa and a few others, are omitted from the list of the kings of Ayodhyā given in the Rāmāyana. 3 We gather from the Vedic literature that many, if not all, of these monarchs ruled over territories lying outside Kosala. The only kings or princes in the Purānic list who are known from the Vedic and early Buddhist texts to have reigned in Kosala, or over some outlying part of it, are Hiranyanābha, 4 Prasenajit and Śuddhodana.

1 Rig-Veda, IV, 58, 1; VII, 19, 3.
2 Band. Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 12 (Vol. II, p. 357); Īpas. Sr. Sūtra, XXI, 20, 3. Rituparṇa is, however, not distinctly called an Aikṣvākī. But from the rarity of the name it is possible to surmise that the epic and Purānic king of that designation is meant.
3 I, 70.
4 In the Sat. Br. XIII, 5, 4–5, Hiranyanābha is described as Kausalyarāja, but not as an Aikṣvākī. On the other hand Purukutsa Daugaha is styled Aikṣvākā-rāja but not as Kausalya, as if a distinction between Kausalyas...
The Buddhist works mention a few other sovereigns of Kosala, but their names do not occur in the epic and Purānic accounts. Some of these kings had their capital at Ayodhyā, others at Sāketa, and the rest at Śrāvastī. Of the princes of Ayodhyā, the Ghaṭa Jātaka1 mentions Kālasena. A Kosalarāja reigning in Sāketa is mentioned2 in the Nandiyaṃga Jātaka.3 Vaṅka, Mahākosala and many others had their capital at Śāvatthī or Śrāvastī. Ayodhyā seems to have been the earliest capital, and Sāketa the next. The last capital was Śrāvastī. Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in the Buddha’s time,4 but Sāketa and Śrāvastī were included among the six great cities of India.5

The chronology of ancient Kosala is in a state of utmost confusion. If the Purāṇas are to be believed, a prince named Divākara occupied the throne of Ayodhyā in the time of Adhisima-Krīṣṇa, great-great-grandson of Parikshit. But, as has already been pointed out above, the princes who are mentioned as his successors did not form a continuous line of rulers who reigned over the same territory in regular succession. It is, therefore, a hopeless task to measure the distance separating him from the Buddha and his contemporary with the help of the traditional dynastic lists alone. It is also not known when the older capitals were abandoned in favour of Śrāvastī. But it must have been some time before the accession of Prasenajit, the contemporary of the Buddha, of Bimbisāra, and of Udayana of Kauśāmbī, supposed to be a descendant of Adhisima-Krīṣṇa.

and Aiśkhyākas is meant. The two terms need not refer to kings of the same dynasty ruling over exactly the same territory. As a matter of fact Trasadasyu is known to be a king of the Pūrūs. An Ikṣyākuṭa styled Vārṣṇa, connected with the Vṛṣṇis (?), is mentioned in Jaim. Up. Br. 1. 5. 4.

1 No. 454.
2 No. 385.
3 E.g., the Kosalarāja of J. 75; Chatta (386); Sabhamitta (512); and Prasenajit.
4 Buddhist India, p. 94.
We learn from the *Mahāvagga* that during the period of the earlier Brahmadattas of Kāsi, Kosala was a poor and tiny state with slender resources: *Dīghiti nāma Kosalarājā ahosi daliddo appadhano appadhogo appabalo appavāhano appavijito aparipūnṇa-kosa-kotṭhāgāro.*

In the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., however, Kosala was a mighty kingdom which contended first with Kāsi, and afterwards with Magadha for the mastery of the upper Ganges valley. The history of these struggles is reserved for treatment in later sections. The rivalry with Magadha ended in the absorption of the kingdom into the Magadhan Empire.

**Aṅga** was the country to the east of Magadha and west of the chieftains who dwelt in the Rajmahal Hills (*Parvatabāṣunah*). It was separated from Magadha (including Modāgiri or Monghyr) by the river Champā, probably the modern Chândan. The Aṅga dominions, however, at one time included Magadha and probably extended to the shores of the sea. The *Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka* describes Rājagriha as a city of Aṅga. The *Śānti-parva* of the *Mahābhārata* refers to an Aṅga king who sacrificed on Mount Vishṇupada (probably at Gayā). The *Sabhā-parva* mentions Aṅga and Vaṅga as forming one *Vishaya* or kingdom. The *Katha-sarit-saṅgara* says that Viṭaṅkapur, a city of the Aṅgas, was situated on the shore of the sea. The imperial glory of Aṅga is doubtless reflected in the

---

1 S.B.E., XVII, p. 294.
2 According to Pargiter (*JASB*, 1897, 95) Aṅga comprised the modern districts of Bhāgarpur and Monghyr, and also extended northwards up the river Kauśikī or Kośi and included the western portion of the district of Purnea. For it was on that river that Kāśyapa Vihāṇḍaka had his hermitage. His son Rishyasrīṅga was betrothed by courtesans of Aṅga into a boat and brought down the river to the capital. In *Mbh. ii. 30. 20-22*, however, Modāgiri (Monghyr) and Kauśikī-Kachchha had rulers who are distinguished from Karnā whose realm (Aṅga) clearly lay between the Māgadhas and the Rājās styled *Parvatabāṣin*.
3 No. 545.
4 35. *JASB*, 1897, 94.
5 44. 9; cf. VI. 18. 28. Aṅgas and Prāchyas.
6 25. 35; 26. 115; 82. 3-16.
songs of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa1 which describe the ‘world-conquest’ (Samantaṁ sarvatah prithiviṁ jayan) of one of its ancient kings in the course of which girls of aristocratic families (ādhyā-duhitri) were brought as prizes from different climes.

Champā, the famous capital of Aṅga, stood at the confluence of the river of the same name2 and the Ganges.3 Cunningham points out that there still exist near Bhāgalpur two villages, Champānagara and Champāpura, which most probably represent the actual site of the ancient capital. It is stated in the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Harivamśa that the ancient name of Champā was Mālinī:4

Champasya tu purī Champā
gā Malinī-abhavaḥ purā.

In the Jātaka stories the city is also called Kāla-Champā. The Mahā-Janaka Jātaka5 informs us that Champā was sixty leagues from Mithilā. The same Jātaka refers to its gate, watch tower, and walls. Down to the time of Gautama Buddha’s death it was considered as one of the six great cities of India, the other five being Rājagriha, Śravasti, Sāketa, Kausāmbī, and Benares.6 Champā was noted for its wealth and commerce, and traders sailed from it to Suvarṇa-bhūmi in the Trans-Gangetic region for trading purposes.7 Hindu emigrants to southern Annam and Cochin China are supposed to have named their settlement after this famous Indian city.8

---

1 Ait. Br. VIII. 22
2 Jātaka, 596.
3 Mbh., iii. 84. 163; 307. 26 (Gangāyāḥ Sūtavishayam Champāmanu yoyau purāṅm); Watters, Yuan Chuang. II. 181; Daśakumāra Charita. II. 2.
4 Mālaviya. 48. 97; Iāyū. 99. 105-106; Hariv., 31. 49; Mbh., XII. 5. 6-7.
5 XIII. 42. 16.
6 No. 559.
7 Jātaka. 559. Fausboll’s Ed., VI, p. 34.
8 Mahā-parirūpāna Sutta.
9 Nundatal Dey, Notes on Ancient Aṅga. JASB, 1914. For the Hindu colonisation of Champā, see Elliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. III, pp. 137 ff. and R. C. Majumdar. Champā. The oldest Sanskrit inscription (that of Vo-can) dates, according to some scholars, from about the third century A.D. The inscription mentions a king of the family of Śri Māra-rāja. ~
Other important cities in Aṅga were Assapura (Aśvapura) and Bhaddiya (Bhadrika).\(^1\)

The earliest appearance of Aṅga is in the *Atharva Veda* in connection with the Gandhāris, Mūjavats, and Magadhas. The *Rāmāyaṇa* tells an absurd story about the origin of this *Janapada*. It is related in that epic that Madana or Anāṅga, the god of love, having incurred the displeasure of the God Śiva fled from the hermitage of the latter to escape his consuming anger, and the region where “he cast off his body (aṅga)" has since been known by the name of Aṅga.\(^2\) The *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* attribute the foundation of the kingdom to a prince named Aṅga.\(^3\) The tradition may claim some antiquity as Aṅga Vairochana is included in the list of anointed kings in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*.\(^4\) The consecration of this ruler with the Aryan ritual styled the *Aindra mahābhishhekaka* causes some surprise as the *Bodhāyana Dharma Sūtra* groups the Aṅgas with peoples of mixed origin, and the *Mahābhārata* brands an Aṅga prince who, by the way, is distinguished from Karna, and is described as skilful in handling elephants, as a *Mlechchha* or outlandish barbarian. In the *Matsya Purāṇa*, the father of the eponymous hero of the Aṅgas is styled *Dānavarshābhah* (chief among demons).\(^5\)

\(^1\) Malalasekera, *DPPN*, 16; *Dharmapada Commentary*, *Harvard Oriental Series*, 29, 59. Cf. Bhaddiya (Bhadrika or Bhadrika of Jaina writers). It is possibly represented by Bhadariyā, 8 miles south of Bāgālpur (JASB, 1914, 337).

\(^2\) *Mbh*. 1. 104. 53-54; *Matsya P.*. 48. 19.

\(^3\) VIII. 22: cf. Pāṇgīśa, JASB, 1897, 97. In connection with the gifts of the Aṅga King mention is made of a place called Ayavatamukha:

**Dānavarshābhah* dattvaśevo vachatmukhe
śrīndha pāriktiṇa prap-ud dānetāḥūṇamā Brāhmaṇah.

The epithet ‘Vairochana’ given to the Aṅga King reminds one of ‘Vairochana’ of the *Matsya P.*, 48. 58.

\(^4\) *Bodh. Dh. S.*. 1. 1. 29; *Mbh*. VIII. 22. 18-19; *Mat. P.*, 48. 60. Note also the connection of Aṅgas with Nīshādas in *Pāṇi*, 62, 107-23. The Purāṇa describes the royal family as *Atrīśvarasamitapanna*. In the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, however, an Aśvina appears as the *priest* of the Aṅga King. For a discussion of the origin of the Aṅgas and other kindred tribes, see S. 1 Ėvi, *pré-Aryen et Pré-Dravidien dans l’Inde*, J. A. Juillet-septembre, 1923.
About the dynastic history of An̄ga our information is meagre. The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* refers to king Dhataraṭṭha of An̄ga. The Buddhist texts mention a queen named Gaggarā who gave her name to a famous lake in Champā. The *Purāṇas* give lists of the early kings of this country. One of these rulers, Dadhivāhana, is known to Jaina tradition. The *Purāṇas* and the *Harivamśa* represent him as the son and immediate successor of An̄ga. Jaina tradition places him in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. His daughter Chandanā or Chandrabālā was the first female who embraced Jainism shortly after Mahāvīra had attained the *Kevaliṣhip*. Satānīka, king of the Vatsas of Kauśāmbī, near Allahabad, is said to have attacked Champā, the capital of Dadhivāhana, and in the confusion which ensued, Chandanā fell into the hands of a robber, but all along she maintained the vows of the order.

Between the Vatsas and the realm of An̄ga lived the Magadhas, then a comparatively weak people. A great struggle was going on between this kingdom and its great eastern neighbour. The *Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka* describes Rājagriha, the Magadhan capital, as a city of An̄ga while the *Mahābhārata* refers to a sacrifice which an An̄ga king probably performed at Gayā. These details may indicate that An̄ga succeeded in annexing Magadha. Its frontier thus approached the Vatsa Kingdom whose monarch’s alarm may have been responsible for an attack on Champā. The An̄ga king preferred to have friendly relations with Kauśāmbī, possibly because he was threatened by the reviving power of Magadha. Śrī Harsha speaks of a ruler of An̄ga named Dṛḍhavarman who gave

---

1 *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II. 270.
3 32. 45.
5 *Champēya Jātaka*.
6 Cowell, VI. 193.
his daughter in marriage to Udayana, son and successor of Satānīka\(^1\) and secured his help in regaining his throne.

The success of Aṅga did not last long. About the middle of the sixth century B. C. Bimbisāra Śreniika, the Crown Prince of Magadha, is said to have killed Brahmādatta, the last independent ruler of Ancient Aṅga. He took Champa, the capital, and resided there as his father’s Viceroy.\(^2\) Henceforth Aṅga becomes an integral part of the growing empire of Magadha.

**Magadha** corresponds roughly to the present Patna and Gayā districts of South Bihār. It seems to have been bounded on the north and the west by the rivers the Ganges and the Šon, on the south by spurs of the Vindhyan range, and on the east by the river Champā which emptied itself into the Ganges near the Aṅga capital.\(^3\) Its earliest capital was Girivraja, the mountain-girt city,\(^4\) or old Rājagriha, near Rājgir among the hills in the neighbourhood of Gayā. The *Mahāvagga*\(^5\) calls it “Giribbaja of the Magadhas” to distinguish it from other cities of the same name, *e.g.*, Girivraja in Kekaya. The *Mahābhārata* refers to it not only as Girivraja, but as Rājagriha,\(^6\) Bāhadratha-pura,\(^7\) and Māgadha-pura,\(^8\) and says that it was an almost impregnable city, *puraṁ durādharshaṁ samantataḥ*, being protected by five hills, *viz.*, Vaihāra, the grand rock (*Vipulaḥ śālō*), Varāha,

---

\(^1\) Priyadrīśkā, Act IV


\(^3\) *Mbh.* II. 26. 29; *Mahā-paññabhāna Sutta* (*Dialogues* ii. 94) and DPPN. I. 331 which show that the Vṛjad frontier commenced from the northern bank of the Ganges as Ukkāvelā or Ukkachelā, was included within the limits of that state; Champeya Jātaka (596); *Fleet*, *CII*, 227, *DPPN*, 103. In the epic period the eastern boundary of Magadha proper may not have extended as far as the Champā river as Modāgiri (*Monghyr*) finds mention as a separate state.

\(^4\) Broadley in *JASB*, 1872, 299. Girivraja was at one time identified with Girk on the Pañchana rise: about 36 miles north-east of Gayā, 6 miles east of Rājgir (Pargiter in *JASB*, 1897, 86).

\(^5\) S. B. E., XIII. 150.

\(^6\) *Mbh.* I. 113. 27; 204. 17; II. 21. 34; III. 84. 104.

\(^7\) II. 24. 44.

\(^8\) *Gorathah girināsādyya dadṛṣur Māgadhahṃ purum*, II. 20. 30; 21. 13.
Vṛshabha, Rishigiri and Chaityaka with their compact bodies (rakshanitvābhisanāhatya samhataṅgā Girivrajam). From the Rāmāyaṇa we learn that the city had another name, Vasumati. The Life of Huin Tsang mentions still another name, Kuśāgra-pura. Indian Buddhist writers give a seventh name, Bimbasāra-purī.

In a passage of the Rig-Veda mention is made of a territory called Kīkata ruled by a chieftain named Pramaganda. Yāska declares that Kīkata is the name of a non-Aryan country. In later works Kīkata is given as a synonym of Magadha.

Like Yāska the author of the Brihad-dharma Purāṇa apparently regarded Kīkata as an impure country which however, included a few holy spots:

Kīkata nāma dese' sti Kāka-karṇākhyaṅko nṛyāh praṇāin hitakṛṇinyāṁ Brahma-dveshakarastathā tatra dese Gayā nāma pūṇyadeśo' sti viśrutah nadī cha Karṇadā nāma pītṛṇāṁ svargadāyinī Kīkate cha myito' tyesha pāpabhūmau na saṁśayah

It is clear from these verses that Kīkata included the Gayā district, but the greater part of it was looked upon

---

1 The names given in the Pāli texts (DPN, II, 721) are Pāṇḍava, Gijjukāta, Vebhāra, Isigili and Vepulla (or Vaṅkaka). The Pāli evidence may suggest that Vipula in the Mbh. verse is a name, and not an epithet. In that case Dr. J. Wenger suggests Chaityakapañchakāh (five goodly Chaityakas) for Chaityakapañchamāśa (with Chaityaka as the fifth). For a note by Keiith see IHQ, 1939, 163-61.
2 I. 32. 8.
3 P. 113. Apparently named after an early Magadhan prince (Vāyu, 39, 224; AIHT, 149).
4 Law, Buddhaghosha, 87 n.
5 III. 53. 14.
6 Nirukta, VI, 32.
7 Kākasthu Gayā pūṇyā pūṇyāṃ Rājagrihim vanam Chāyvanasyāramāṇā pūṇyāṃ nadī pūṇyā Prunkāṇa.
9 For an epigraphic reference to Kīkata see Ep. Ind. II. 222, where a prince of that name is connected with the Maurya family. See also 'Kekaṭeyaka' (Monuments of Sānci, I. 502).
10 Madhya-Khaṇḍam, XXVI. 20, 22.
11 XXVI. 47; cf. Vāyu, P. 78. 22, Pādma Pāṭalakhaṇḍa, XI. 45.
as an unholy region (pāpabhūmi, doubtless corresponding to the anārya-nivāsa of Yāska). Kāka-karna, of line 1, may be the same as Kāka-varṇa of the Śaśūṇāga family.

The name Magadha first appears in the Atharva-Veda where fever is wished away to the Gaudhāris, Mūjavats, Aṅgas and Magadhās. The bards of Magadhā are, however, mentioned as early as the Yajur-Veda. They are usually spoken of in the early Vedic literature in terms of contempt. In the Vṛāṭya book of the Atharva Sāṁhitā, the Vṛāṭya, i.e., the Indian living outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism, is brought into very special relation to the puṁśchali (harlot) and the Māgadhā. “In the eastern region (Prāchyaṇi diśi)” faith is his harlot, Mitra his Māgadhā (bard or panegyrist). In the Śrūta Sūtras the equipment characteristic of the Vṛāṭya is said to be given, when the latter is admitted into the Aryan Brāhmaṇical community, to the so-called Brāhmaṇas living in Magadhā, Brahma bandhu Māgadhadeśīya. The Brāhmaṇas of Magadha, are here spoken of in a disparaging tone as Brahmabandhu. In the Sāṅkhāyana Āryāyaka, however, the views of a Māgadhavāśi Brāhmaṇa are quoted with respect. The Vedic dislike of the Magadhās in early times was due, according to Oldenberg, to the fact that the Magadhās were not wholly Brāhmaṇised. Pargiter suggests that in Magadha the Aryans met and mingled with a body of invaders from the east by sea.

With the exception of Pramaganda no king of Magadha appears to be mentioned in the Vedic literature. The earliest dynasty of Magadha according to the

---

1 V. 22. 14.
2 Vāj. Sāṁ. XXX. 5; Vedic Index, II. 116. For the connection of the Māgadhās with Magadhā, see Vīyu P. 65. 147.
3 XV. ii. 5—śraddhā Puṁśchali Mitra Māgadhā etc.; Griffith, II. 186.
5 Vedic Index, II, 116.
6 Note also the expression rājānāh kṣatra-bandhavaḥ applied to Magadhan kings in the Purāṇas (Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 22).
7 Buddha, 400 n.
8 JASB, 1897. 111; JRAS, 1908, pp. 851-53. Bodh. Dh. Sātra, I. i. 29 refers to Aṅgas and Magaghās as saṅkhr̥a-yonayaḥ, “of mixed origin”.

---
Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas is that founded by Bṛihadratha, the son of Vasu Chaidya-Uparichara, and the father of Jarāsandha. Rāmāyaṇa makes Vasu himself the founder of Girivraja or Vasumatī. A Bṛihadratha is mentioned twice in the Rig-Veda, but there is nothing to show that he is identical with the father of Jarāsandha. The Purāṇas give lists of the “Bṛihadratha kings” from Jarāsandha’s son Sahadeva to Ripuṇjaya, and apparently make Senajit, seventh in descent from Sahadeva, the contemporary of Adhisīma-Krishna of the Pārikshita family and Divākara of the Ikshvāku line. But in the absence of independent external corroboration it is not safe to accept the Purānic chronology and order of succession of the princes as authentic. Bṛihadrathas and certain princes of Central India are said to have passed away when Pulika (Pupika) placed his son Pradyota on the throne of Avanti, i.e., the Ujjain territory. As Pradyota was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha, and as the Purānic passage, “Bṛihadratheshvatiteshu Vitihotreshu-Avantishu, ‘when the Bṛihadrathas, Vitihotras and Avantis (or the Vitihotras in Avanti) passed away’,” suggests that the events alluded to here were synchronous, it is reasonable to conclude that

1 I. 63, 20.
2 I. 32, 7.
3 I. 36, 18, X. 49, 6.
4 Cf. supra, pp. 80 ff, 104, discussion about later Vaudecha and Kosalan kings. The number of ‘the future Bṛihadrathas’ is given as 16. 22 or 32, and the period of their rule, 723 or 1000 years (DKA, 17, 68). The last King Ripuṇjaya or Ariṇjaya (tīrth 17, 96) reminds one of Arindama of the Pāli texts (DPPN, ii. 402).
5 Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 18; cf., IHQ, 1900, p. 683. There is no reason to believe with the late authors of the Kathā-sarit-sāgara and certain corrupt passages of the Purāṇas, (IHQ, 1930, pp. 679, 691), that there was a Pradyota of Magadha distinct from Mahāsena of Avanti who is called Pradyota by several earlier writers, Buddhist as well as Brāhmaṇical. The use of the expression ‘Avantishu’ (DKA, 18) in the Purānic passage which refers to the dynastic revolution brought about by Pulika, the identity of the names of the Purānic family of Pradyota with those of the Avanti line of Mahāsena, and the mention in reference to Pradyota of the Purāṇas, of epithets like ‘Preṇata-sāmanṭa’ and ‘nayanavaṭa’ which remind one irresistibly of Čāndā Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti as described in Buddhist literature, leave little room for doubt that the Pradyota of the Purāṇas and Pradyota of Avanti cannot be regarded as distinct entities.
the Brihadratha dynasty came to an end in the sixth century B.C.

Jaina writers mention two early kings of Rājagriha named Samudra-vijaya and his son Gaya. Gaya is said to have reached perfection which had been taught by the Jinas. But little reliance can be placed on uncorroborated assertions of this character.

The second Magadhan dynasty, according to the less corrupt texts of the Purāṇas, was the Śaśunāga line which is said to have been founded by a king named Śiśunāga. Bimbisāra, the contemporary of the Buddha, is assigned to this family. Aśvaghosha, an earlier authority, refers however, in his Buddha-charita to Śrenya, i.e., Bimbisāra, as a scion, not of the Śaśunāga dynasty, but of the Haryaṇka-kula, and the Mahāvaṁśa makes 'Susunāga', i.e., Śiśunāga, the founder of a distinct line of rulers which succeeded that of Bimbisāra. The Purāṇas themselves relate that Śiśunāga "will take away the glory of the Pradyotas" whom we know from other sources to be contemporaries of the Bimbisārīds:

\[
\text{Ashṭa-trimśačhetaḥḥataṁ bhāvyāḥ} \\
\text{Pradyotāḥ pañcha te sutaḥ} \\
\text{hatvā teshāṁ yaśaḥ kṛtsnam} \\
\text{Śiśunāgo bhavishyati.}
\]

If this statement be true, then Śiśunāga must be later than the first Pradyota, namely Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena, who was, judged by the evidence of the Pāli texts, which is confirmed in important details by the ancient Sanskrit poets and dramatists, a contemporary of Bimbisāra and his son. It follows that Śiśunāga according to the last-mentioned authorities, must be later than those kings.

1 S.B.E. XLV. 86. A king named Gaya is mentioned in Mbh., vii. 64. But he is described there as a son of Amūrtasayas.
2 Aśvaghosha was a contemporary of Kanishka (c. 100 A.D.) (Winternitz, Ind. Lit., II. 257). On the other hand the Purānic chronicles presuppose Gupta rule in the Ganges Valley (DKA, 53), c. 320 A.D.
3 XI. 2; Raychaudhuri, IHQ, I. (1925), p. 87.
4 Vāyu Purāṇa, 99; 314.
5 Indian Culture, VI. 411.
But we have seen above that the Purāṇas make Śiśunāga an ancestor of Bimbisāra and the progenitor of his family. This part of the Purānic account is not corroborated by independent external evidence. The inclusion of Vārāṇasī and Vaiśāli within Śiśunāga’s dominions proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan rule in those regions. The Malālaṅkāravatthu, a Pali work of modern date, but following very closely the more ancient books, tells us that Śiśunāga had a royal residence at Vaiśāli which ultimately became his capital. That monarch (Śiśunāga) not unmindful of his mother’s origin re-established the city of Veśāli (Vaiśāli), and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagriha lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered. The last statement indicates that Śiśunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagriha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. It may be argued that the Purāṇas make Girivraja, and not Vaiśāli, the abode of Śiśunāga (Vārāṇasyāṁ sulaṁ sthāpya śrayishyati Girivrajam); and as Udāyin, son of Ajātaśatru was the first to transfer the capital from that stronghold to the newly founded city of Pātaliputra, Śiśunāga’s residence in the older capital points to a date earlier than that of the founder of the more famous metropolis. But the fact that Kālāśoka, son and successor of Śiśunāga, is known to have ruled in Pātaliputra shows that he came after Udāyin, the founder of that city. The further fact of removal of

1 We may go even further and characterise certain statements of the Purāṇa bards as self-contradictory. Thus (a) Pradyota is said to have been anointed when the Vitihotras had passed away, (b) Śiśunāga destroyed the prestige of the Pradyotas and became king, and yet (c) contemporaneously with these Śaiśunāga kings 20 Vitihotras (and other lines) are said to have endured the same time.

ete sarve bhavishyanti
ekakālaṁ mahākshitah (DKA, 24).

2 Dynasties of the Kali Age, 21; S.B.E., XI, p. xvi.

3 If the Dvārimātā-Puttalikā is to be believed, Vaiśāli continued to be graced by the presence of the king till the time of the Nandas.

4 Śiśunāga, according to the Mahāvamsaṭṭikā (Turnour, Mahāvamsa, xxxvii), was the son of a Lichchhavi rāja of Vaiśāli. He was conceived by a nagaṇaśobhini and brought up by an officer of state.
capital in his reign too—which must be regarded as a second transfer—shows that his predecessor had reverted to the older stronghold apparently as a place of refuge. The event alluded to in the words “śrayiṣhyati Girivrajam” need not necessarily imply that Girivraja continued to be the capital uninterruptedly till the days of Śisunāga.

The origin of the Haryaṅka line, to which Bimbisāra belonged according to Aśvaghosa, is wrapped up in obscurity. There is no cogent reason why this dynastic designation should be connected with Haryāṅga of Champā mentioned in the Harivaṃśa and the Purāṇas. Haryaṅka-kula may simply be an expression like “aulikara-lāṃchhāna ātma-vanīśa” of a Mandasor Inscription, pointing to the distinctive mark or emblem of the family. Bimbisāra was not the founder of the line. The Mahāvaṃśa states that he was anointed king by his own father when he was only 15 years old. He avenged a defeat of his father by the Aṅgas and launched Magadha into that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kāliṅga.

The Vajji (Vṛjji) territory lay north of the Ganges and extended as far as the Nepāl hills. On the west the river Gaṅḍak possibly separated it from the Mallas and perhaps also the Kosalas. Eastwards, it may have approached the forests that skirted the river Kośī and the Mahānandā. It

1 SBE, XI, p. xvi.
2 31, 49; Vāyu, 99, 108; J.C. Ghosh in ABORI, 1938 (xix), pp. i. 82.
3 Hari has the sense of ‘yellow’, ‘horse’, ‘lion’, ‘snake’, etc.
4 Geiger’s translation, p. 12. This disposes of the view of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (Carm. Lec., 1918) who makes Bimbisāra the founder of his dynasty and says that he was a general who carved out a kingdom for himself at the expense of the Vajjis.
5 Turnour, N. L. Dey and others mention Bhātiya or Bhaṭṭiya as the name of the father. The Tibetans, on the other hand, call him Mahāpadma. Turnour, Mahāvaṃśa, I. p. 10; J. A. S. B., 1872, i. 298; 1914, 321; Essay on Gupāḍhyāya, p. 173. The Purāṇas name Hemajit, Kshemajit, Kṣhetrojā or Kṣatrujā as the father of Bimbisāra. If the Purāṇic account is correct Bhātiya or Bhaṭṭiya may have been a secondary name or epithet comparable to the names ‘Seniya’ and Kūniya of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru respectively. But it is not safe to rely on an uncorroborated statement of the Purāṇas, particularly when there is hardly any unanimity with regard to the form of the name.
is said to have included eight confederate clans (āṭṭhaṅkura), of whom the old Videhas, the Lichchhavins, the Jñātṛikas and the Vṛjīs proper were the most important. The identity of the remaining clans remains uncertain. It may, however, be noted that in a passage of the Śūtrakṛṣṭāṅga, the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikṣvākas and the Kauravas are associated with the Jñātṛis and the Lichchhavins as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly. The Āṅguttara Nikāya, too, refers to the close connection of the Ugras with Vaiśālī, the capital of the Vṛjījan confederation.

The old territory of the Videhas had, as already stated in an earlier section, its capital at Mithilā which has been identified with Janakpur within the Nepāl border. The Rāmāyaṇa clearly distinguishes it from the region round Vaiśālī. But in Buddhist and Jaina texts the distinction is not always maintained and Videha is used in a wider sense to include the last-mentioned area.

The Lichchhavi capital was definitely at Vaiśālī which is represented by modern Besarh (to the east of the Gāndhak) in the Muzaffarpur district of Bihār. It is probably identical with the charming city called Viśālā in the epic.

Viśālāṁ nāgarīṁ ramyaṁ dṛvyāṁ svargoṇḍamāṁ tadā.

We learn from the introductory portion of the Ekapāṇa Jātaka that a triple wall encompassed the town, each wall a league distant from the next, and there were three gates with watch-towers.

The Lichchhavi territory may have extended northwards as far as Nepāl where we find them in the seventh century A.D.

2 I. 26; III. 49; IV. 208.
4 The Āchārāṅga Sūtra (II. 15, § 17; S. B. E., XXII, Intro.) for instance places the Sāminīvēla of Kūṇḍāgrāma near Vaiśālī in Videha. The mothers of Māhāvīra and Ajātaśatru are called Videha-dattā and Vedēhī (Vaidehī) respectively.
5 Rām. Ādi, 45. 10.
6 No. 149.
The Jnātikas were the clan of Siddhārtha and his son Mahāvīra, the Jina. They had their seats at Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma and Kollāga, suburbs of Vaiśālī. In the Mahā parinibbāna Suttanta, however, the abode of the "Nādikas" (identified by Jacobi with the Nātikas or Jnātikas) is distinguished from Koṭigāma (Kuṇḍagrāma?). Though dwelling in suburban areas Mahāvīra and his fellow clansmen were known as "Vesālie," i.e., inhabitants of Vaiśālī.

The Vrijis proper are already mentioned by Pāṇini. Kauṭilya distinguishes them from the 'Lichchhivikas'. Yuan Chwang too, draws a distinction between the Fu-lieh (Vrijji) country and Fei-shel (Vaiśālī). It seems that Vrijji was not only the name of the confederacy but also of one of its constituent clans. But the Vrijis, like the Lichchhavis, are often associated with the city of Vaiśālī (including its suburbs) which was not only the capital of the Lichchhavi clan, but also the metropolis of the entire confederacy. A Buddhist tradition quoted by Rockhill mentions the city proper as consisting of three districts. These districts were probably at one time the seats of three different clans. The remaining peoples of the confederacy, viz., the Ugras, Bhogas, Kauravas, and Aikshvākas resided in suburbs, and in villages or towns like Hatthigāma, Bhoganagara, etc.

1 Ch. 2.
2 S. B. E. XXII. Intro.
3 Hœrmle Uvāsaga-dasāo, II, p. 4 n.
4 IV. 2. 131.
6 Watters, II, 81. Cf. also DPPN, II, 814; Gradual sayings, III, 62; IV. 10. According to Smith (Watters, II, 340) the Vrij country is roughly equivalent to the northern part of the Darbhanga district and the adjacent Nepalese Tarāi.
7 Cf. Majjhima Nikāya, II, 101: The Book of the Kindred Sayings, I. (Samyutta Nikāya), by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 257—"A certain brother of the Vajjian clan was once staying near Vesāli in a certain forest tract".
8 Life of Buddha, p. 62.
9 For the Ugras and Bhogas see Hœrmle, Uvāsaga-dasāo, II, p. 139 (210); Brih. Up. III. 8. 2; S. B. E., XLV, 71n, in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, I. 26 (Nipāta I. 14. 6), the Ugras are associated with Vaiśālī (Uggo gahapati Vesāliko), and
We have seen that during the Brāhmaṇa period Videha (Mithilā) had a monarchical constitution. The Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas state that Viśāla, too, was at first ruled by "kings". The founder of the Vaiśālik dynasty is said to have been Viśāla, a son of Ikshvāku according to the Rāmāyaṇa, a descendant of Nabhāga the brother of Ikshvāku, according to the Purāṇas. Viśāla is said to have given his name to the city. After him came Hemachandra, Suchandra, Dhūmrāśva, Śrīnjaya, Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākutstha and Sumati. We do not know how many of these Vaiśālikas "kings" (nriṣas) can be accepted as historical and as having actually ruled as monarchs in North Bihār. A king named Sahadeva Śrīnjaya is mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa he is mentioned with Somaka-Sahadeva. None of these kings, however, are connected with Vaiśālī in the Vedic literature. The Mahābhārata speaks of a Sahadeva (son of Śrīnjaya) as sacrificing on the Jumna, and not on the Gaṇḍak. The presence of Ikshvākuids as a constituent element of the Vṛijian confederacy, which had its metropolis at Vaiśālī, is, however, as already stated, suggested by the Śāstraṅgika.

The Vṛijian confederation must have been organised after the decline and fall of the royal houses of Videha. Political evolution in India thus resembles closely the developments in the ancient cities of Greece where also

in IV. 212 with Hatthigāma. A city of Ugga is mentioned in the Dhammapada commentary, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 90, 184. Hoernle refers (Uvāsaka-dāsā, II, App. III, 57) to a place called Bhoganagara, or 'City of the Bhogas'. The Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta mentions Bhaṇḍagāma, Hatthigāma, Ambagāma, Jambugāma and Bhoganagara on the way from Vaiśālī to Pāvā (Dīgha, II, 122-26). Cf. also Sutta Nipāta, 194. The association of a body of Kauravas with the Vaiśāli group of clans is interesting. Kuru Brāhmaṇas, e.g., Uṣhasi Chākhāyāna had begun to settle in the capital of Videha long before the rise of Buddhism. For the Aikshvākas of Vaiśāli, see Ram. I. 47. 11.

1 I. 47. 11. 17.
2 Vāyu, 86. 16-22; Viṣṇu, IV. 1. 18.
3 II. 4. 4. 34.
4 VII. 34. 9.
5 Mbh. Hh. 90. 7. with commentary.
the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by aristocratic republics. The probable causes of the transformation in Greece are thus given by Bury: "In some cases gross misrule may have led to the violent deposition of a king; in other cases if the succession to the sceptre devolved upon an infant or a paltry man, the nobles may have taken it upon themselves to abolish the monarchy. In some cases, the rights of the king might be strictly limited in consequence of his seeking to usurp undue authority; and the imposition of limitations might go on until the office of the king, although maintained in name, became in fact a mere magistracy in a state wherein the real power had passed elsewhere. Of the survival of monarchy in a limited form we have an example at Sparta; of its survival as a mere magistracy, in the Archon Basileus at Athens."

The cause of the transition from monarchy to republic in Mithilā has already been stated. Regarding the change at Viśālā we know nothing.

Several scholars have sought to prove that the Līchchhavis, the most famous clan of the Vṛjjian confederacy (Vajjiratthavāsi hi pasalthā), were of foreign origin. According to Smith they had Tibetan affinities. He infers this from their judicial system and the disposal of their dead, viz., exposing them to be devoured by wild beasts.² Pandit S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa held that the name Līchchhavi (Nichchhivi of Manu) was derived from the

1 DPPN, II, 814.
² Ind. Ant., 1903, p. 233 ff. In the case of Tibet we have only three courts as against the seven tribunals of the Līchchhavis (viz. those of the Vīchchhaya mahamattas) (inquiring magistrates), the Vohārīkas (jurist-judges), Sutta-dhārīkas (masters of the sacred code), the Atthakulakas (the eight clans, possibly a federal court), the Senāpati (general), the Uparāja (Viceroy or Vicc-Consul), and the rājā (the ruling chief) who made their decisions according to the pārāṇī patthāka (Book of Precedents). Further, we know very little about the relative antiquity of the Tibetan procedure as explained by S. C. Das which might very well have been suggested by the system expounded in the Atthakathā. This fact should be remembered in instituting a comparison between Tibetan and Vṛjjian practices. Regarding the disposal of the dead attention may be invited to the ancient practices of the 'Indus' people (Vais, Excavations at Harappā, I. ch. VI.) and the epic story in Mbh. IV. 5. 28-31.
Persian city of Nisibis. The inadequacy of the evidence on which these surmises rest has been demonstrated by several writers. Early Indian tradition is unanimous in representing the Lichchhavis as Kshatriyas. Thus we read in the Mahā-parinibbāna Sutta: “And the Lichchhavis of Vasālī heard the news that the Exalted One had died at Kusināra. And the Lichchhavis of Vasālī sent a messenger to the Mallas, saying: ‘The Exalted One was a Kshatriya and so are we. We are worthy to receive a portion of the relics of the Exalted One.’” In the Jaina Kalpa Sūtra Trīśalā, sister to Cheṭāka of Vesālī, is styled Kshatriyāṇāṁ.

Manu concurs in the view that the Lichchhavis are Rājanyas or Kshatriyas.

Jhallo Mallascha rājanyād vrātyān Ṛṣichhivireva cha
Naṭascha Karaṇaschaiva Khaso Drāvida eva cha.

It may be argued that the Lichchhavis, though originally non-Aryans or foreigners, ranked as Kshatriyas when they were admitted into the fold of Brāhmaṇism like the Drāvidians referred to in Manu’s śloka and the Gurjara-Pratīhāras of mediæval times. But unlike the Pratīhāras and Dravīḍas, the Lichchhavis never appear to be very friendly towards the orthodox form of Hinduism. On the contrary, they were always to be found among the foremost champions of non-Brāhmaṇical creeds like Jainism and Buddhism. Manu testifies to their heterodoxy when he brands them as the children of the Vṛātya Rājanyas. The great mediæval Rājput families (though sometimes descended from foreign immigrants) were never spoken of in these terms. On the contrary, they were

1 *Ind. Ant.*, 1902, 143, ff; 1908, p. 78. There is very little in Vidyābhūshaṇa’s surmise except a fancied resemblance between the names Ničchhivi and Nisibis. Inscriptions of the Achaemenids are silent about any Persian settlement in Eastern India in the sixth or fifth century B.C. The Lichchhavi people were more interested in Yaksha Chaityas and the teaching of Mahāvīra and the Buddha than in the deities and prophets of Iran.


3 SBE, XXII, pp. xii, 227.

4 X. 22.
supplied with pedigrees going back to Śrī Rāma, Lakṣmana, Yadu, Arjuna and others. A body of foreigners who did not observe ceremonies enjoined in the Brāhmaṇic code, could hardly have been accepted as Kṣatriyas. The obvious conclusion seems to be that the Lichchhavis were indigenous Kṣatriyas who were degraded to the position of Vṛātya when they neglected Brāhmaṇic rites and showed a predilection for heretical doctrines. The Rāmāyaṇa, as we have seen, represents the Vaiśālika rulers as Ikṣvākuśā. The Pāli commentary Paramatthajotikā traces their origin to Benares. The comparison of the Lichchhavis to the “Tāvatiṃsa gods” hardly accords with the theory that represents them as kinsmen of snub-nosed peoples who lived beyond the Himalayas. “Let those of the brethren” we are told by a personage of great eminence “who have never seen the Tāvatiṃsa gods, gaze upon this company of the Lichchhavis, behold this company of the Lichchhavis, compare this company of the Lichchhavis—even as a company of Tāvatiṃsa gods.”

The date of the foundation of the Lichchhavi power is not known. But it is certain that the authority of the clan was well established in the days of Mahāvīra and Gautama, in the latter half of the sixth century B.C., and was already on the wane in the next century.

Buddhist tradition has preserved the names of eminent Lichchhavis like prince Abhaya, Oṭṭhaddha (Mahāli), generals Śīha and Ajita, Dummuṇha and Sunakkhattra. In the introductory portion of the Ekapanṇa and Chulla Kālinga Jātakas it is stated that the Lichchhavis of the ruling

---

2 S. B. E., XI, p. 32; DPPN, II, 779.

149.
201.
family numbered 7,707. There was a like number of viceroys, generals, and treasurers. Too much importance should not be attached to these figures which are merely traditional and may simply point to the large number of mahallakas or elders in the clan. The real power of administration especially in regard to foreign affairs seems to have been vested in a smaller body of nine Ganarājās or archons. The Jaina Kalpasūtra refers to the nine Lichchhavis as having formed a league with nine Mallakis and eighteen clan-lords of Kāśi-Kośala. We learn from the Nirayāvalī Śūtra that an important leader of this alliance was Chetaka, whose sister Triśalā or Videha dattā was the mother of Mahāvīra, and whose daughter Chellanā or Vaidehi was, according to Jaina writers, the mother of Kūṅika-Ajātaśatru.

1 Another tradition puts the number at 68,000 (DPNP, II. 781 n.). The Dhammapada Commentary (Harvard Oriental Series, 30, 168) informs us that the rājas ruled by turns.


3 Nava Mallā (Mallatī) nava Lechchhai (Lechchhartī) Kāśī Kosatagā (variant Kosalakā) aṭṭhārasa va ganavāyāno.

The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabahu, ed by Hermann Jacobi, 1879, Jainaavītra, p. 65 (§ 128); Nirayāvalīyā Sutta (Dr. S. Warren), 1879, § 26; MPH, XXII, 1884, p. 266.

Dr. Barua is inclined to identify the nine Lichchhavis and the nine Mallakis with the eighteen ganarājās who belonged to Kāśi and Kośala. He refers in this connection to the Kalpadrahamalakāravāhyā which represents the Mallakis as adhipas (or overlords) of Kāśi-deśa, and the “Lechchhakis” as adhipas of Kośala-deśa, and further describes them as sāmantas or vassals of Chetaka, maternal uncle of Mahāvīra (Indian Culture, Vol. II. p. 810). It is news to students of Indian history that in the days of Mahāvīra the kingdoms of Kāśi and Kośala acknowledged the supremacy of the Mallas and Lichchhavis respectively, and formed part of an empire over which Chetaka presided. Even Dr. Barua hesitates to accept this interpretation of the late Jaina commentator in its entirety and suggests that the nine Mallas and the nine Lichchhavis...derived their family prestige from their original connection with the dynasties of Kāśi and Kośala. The Paramatthā-jotika (Khuddaka-pāṭha commentary), however, connects the Lichchhavis not with the dynasty of Kośala but with that of Kāśi. The divergent testimony of these late commentators shows that they can hardly be regarded as preserving genuine tradition. There is no suggestion in any early Buddhist or Jaina text that either the Lichchhavis or the Mallas actually ruled over any grāma or nigama in Kāśi-Kośala (see Indian Culture, II, 808). The ganarājās of Kāśi-Kośala apparently refer to the Kāllamas, Śākyas and other clans in the Kośalian empire.
The league was aimed against Magadha. Tradition says that even in the time of the famous Bimbisāra the Vaiśālians were audacious enough to invade their neighbours across the Ganges. In the reign of Ajātaśatru the tables were turned, and the great confederacy of Vaiśāli was utterly destroyed.

The Malla territory, ancient Malla-raṭṭha, the Malla-rāṣṭra of the Mahābhārata, was split up into two main parts which had for their capitals the cities of Kusāvatī or Kusinārā and Pāvā. The river Kakutthā, the Cacouthes of the classical writers, identified with the modern Kuku, probably formed the dividing line. The division of the people is also known to the great epic which draws a distinction between the Mallas proper and the Dakshinā or Southern Mallas. There is no agreement among scholars regarding the exact site of Kusinārā. In the Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta it is stated that the Sāla Grove of the Mallas, the Upavattana (outskirt or suburb) of Kusinārā, lay near the river Hiranyavatī. Smith identifies the stream with the Gaṅḍak and says that Kuśinagara (Kusinārā) was situated in Nepāl, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the Little, or Eastern Rāptī with the Gaṅḍak. He, however, admits that the discovery in the large stūpa behind the Nirvāṇa temple near Kasiā on the Choṭa Gaṅḍak, in the east of the Gorakhpur district, of an inscribed copper-plate bearing the words “[parini]r vāṇa-chaitye tāmrapaṭṭa iti,” supports the old theory, propounded by Wilson and accepted by Cunningham, that the remains near Kasiā represent Kuśi-nagara.

---

1 Si-yu-ki, Bk. IX.
2 DPPN, II. 781-82.
3 VI. 9-34.
4 Kusa Jātaka, No. 531; Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 136 ff, 161-62.
5 AGI (1924), 714.
6 Mbh., II, 30, 3 and 12.
7 JRAS, 1906, 659; Dīgha, II. 157.
8 EHI, third ed., p. 159 n.
9 ASI, A. R. 1911-12, 17 ff; JRAS, 1915, 152. Kasiā is a village that lies about 35 miles to the east of Gorakhpur (AGI, 493).
Pāvā was identified by Cunningham with the village named Padaraoana, 12 miles to the N.N.E. of Kasiā, and separated from it by the Bāḍhi Nala (identified with the ancient Kakutthā). Carleyle, however, proposes to identify Pāvā with Fāzilpur, 10 miles S.E. of Kasiā and separated from it by the Kuku. In the Saṅgīti Suttanta we have a reference to the Mote Hall of the Pāvā Mallas named Ubbhaṭaka.

The Mallas together with the Lichchhavis are classed by Manu as Vṛātya Kshatriyas. They, too, like their eastern neighbours were among ardent champions of Buddhism.

Like Videha, Malla had at first a monarchical constitution. The Kusa Jātaka mentions a Malla king named Okkāka (Ikshvāku). The name probably suggests that like the Śākyas the Malla princes also claimed to belong to the Ikshvāku family. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta they are sometimes called Vāsetṭhas, i.e., "belonging to the Vasishṭha gotra." The Mahāsudassana Sutta mentions another king named Mahāsudassana. These rulers, Okkāka and Mahāsudassana, may or may not have been historical individuals. But the tales that cluster round their names imply that Malla-rattha was at first ruled by kings. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence of the Mahābhārata which refers to an overlord (adhipa) of the Mallas. During the monarchical period the metropolis was a great city and was styled Kusāvatī. Other important cities were Anupiyā and Uruvelakappa.

1 AGI., 1924, 498.
2 Kukutthā; AGI., 1924, 714.
3 DPPN., II. 194.
5 Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 162, 179, 181. Vasishṭha figures in the Rāmdyaṇa as the purohita of the Ikshvakus.
7 II. 30. 3.
8 Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 149. Dialogues, Pt. III (1921), 7: Gradual Sayings, IV. 293. Anupiyā stood on the banks of the river Anomā which lay thirty leagues to the east of Kapilavastu. It was here that the
Before Bimbisāra’s time the monarchy had been replaced by republics and the chief metropolis had sunk to the level of a “little wattle and daub town,” a “branch township” surrounded by jungles. It was then styled Kusinārā.

The relations of the Mallas with the Lichchhavis were sometimes hostile and on other occasions friendly. The introductory story of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka contains an account of a conflict between Bandhula the Mallian, Commander-in-chief of the king of Kośala, and 500 elders of the Lichchhavis. The Jaina Kalpasūtra, however, refers to “nine Mallakis” as having combined with the Lichchhavis, and the seigniors of Kāsi-Kośala against Kūnika-Ajātaśatru who, like Philip of Macedon, was trying to absorb the territories of his republican neighbours. The Malla territory was finally annexed to Magadha. It certainly formed a part of the Maurya Empire in the third century B.C.

Chedi was one of the countries encircling the Kurus, paritāḥ Kurūṇ, and lay near the Jumna. It was closely connected with the Matsyas beyond the Chambal, the Kāṣis of Benares, and the Kārushas in the valley of the Son, and is distinguished from the Daśārṇas who lived on the banks of the Dhasan. In ancient times it corresponded roughly to the eastern part of modern Bundelkhand and some

future Buddha cut off his hair and put on the robes of the ascetics. (DPPN, I. 81, 102).

2 Khudda-nagaraka, ujjangala-nagaraka, sākhā-nagaraka.
3 No. 465.
4 Pargiter, JASB, 1895, 253 ff; Mbh. I. 63. 2-58, IV. i. 11.

Santi rāmyā janapada
bhuvannāḥ paritāḥ Kurūṇ
Panchalāś-Chedi-Matsyaścha
Sūrasenaḥ Paṭachcharāḥ
Daśārṇā Navarāṣṭrāścha
Mallahā Sāruśa Yuvandharāḥ.

5 Mbh. V. 22, 25; 74. 16; 198. 2; VI. 47. 4; 54. 8.
6 Princesses of Daśārṇa were given in marriage to Bhīma of Vidarbha and Virabhā or Subāhu of Chedi (Mbh. III, 69. 14-15).
adjoining tracts. In the medieval period, however, the southern frontiers of Chedi extended to the banks of the Narmadā (Mekala-Sutā): —

Nadīnāṁ Mekala-sutā nṛpāṇāṁ Raṇangrahāṁ
dvārāṇāṁ cha Surānandaḥ Chedi-maṇḍala-maṇḍanaṁ.2

We learn from the Chetiya Jātaka3 that the metropolis was Sothtivatī-nagara. The Mahābhārata gives its Sanskrit name Śuktimātī, or Śukti-sāhvaya.4 The Great Epic mentions also a river called Śuktimātī which flowed by the capital of Rājā Uparichara of the Chedi-vaśayya (district).5 Pargiter identifies the stream with the Ken, and places the city of Śuktimātī in the neighbourhood of Banda.6 Other towns of note were Sahajātī,7 and Tripurī,8 the mediæval capital of the Janapada.

The Chedi people are mentioned as early as the Rīg-Veda. Their king Kasū Chaidya is praised in a Dānastīti (praise of gift) occurring at the end of one hymn.9 Rapson proposes to identify him with ‘Vasu’ of the Epics.

The Chetiya Jātaka gives a legendary genealogy of Chaidya kings, taking their descent from Mahāsammata

---

1 Pargiter (JASB, 1895, 253) places Chedi along the south bank of the Jamna from the Chambal on the north-west as far as Karwi on the south-east, its limits southwards may have been, according to him, the plateau of Malwa and the hills of Bundelkhand.
3 No. 422.
4 III. 20. 50; XIV. 83. 2; N. I. Dey, Ind. Ant., 1919, p. vii of Geographical Dictionary.
5 I. 63. 35.
6 JASB, 1895, 255, Mārkandeya P., p. 359.
7 Anuguttara, III. 355 (P.T.S.). Ayasmā Mahāchunḍu Chetisu viharaḥ Sahajātiyaḥ. Sahajāti lay on the trade route along the river Ganges (Buddhist India, p. 193). Cf. the legend on a seal-die of terra-cotta found at Bhita, 10 miles from Allahabad (Arch. Expl. Ind., 1909-10, by Marshall, JRAS, 1911, 128 f.)—Sahajātiye niganasa, in letters of about the third century B.C. see also JBORS, XIX, 1933, 293.
8 Tripurī stood close to the Nerubudda not far from modern Jubbalpore. In the Haṁakosa it is called Chedinagarā (JASB, 1895, 249). The city finds mention in the Mbh. III. 253. 10, along with Kośalā, and its people, the Traipuras are referred in VI. 87. 9 together with the Mekalas and the Kurubindas.
and Māndhāta. Upachara, a King of the line, had five sons who are said to have founded the cities of Hatthipura, Assapura, Sihapura, Uttarapaṇḍāla and Daddarapura. This monarch is probably identical with Uparichara Vasu, the Paurava king of Chedi, mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, whose five sons also founded five lines of kings. But epic tradition associates the scions of Vasu's family with the cities of Kauśāṃbi, Mahodaya (Kanauj) and Girivraja.

The *Mahābhārata* speaks also of other Chedi kings like Damaghosha, his son Śiśupāla Sunītha and his sons Dhṛishṭaketu and Sarabha who reigned about the time of the Bhārata war. But the *Jātaka* and epic accounts of the early kings of Chedi are essentially legendary and, in the absence of more reliable evidence, cannot be accepted as genuine history.

We learn from the *Vedabhāja Jātaka* that the road from Kāśi to Chedi was unsafe being infested with roving bands of marauders.

**Vanśa or Vatsa** was the country south of the Ganges of which Kauśāṃbi, modern Kosam, on the Jumna, near Allahabad, was the capital. Oldenberg is inclined to identify the Vanśas with the Vaśas of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. But the conjecture lacks proof. The *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* mentions a teacher named Proti Kauśāṃ-

---

1 Hatthipura may be identified with Hatthinipura or Hāṣṭina-pura in the Kuru country. Assapura with the city of that name in Aṅga, and Siha-pura with the town of Lāla from which Viśvamitra went to Ceylon. There was another Siha-pura in the Western Punjab (Wattier I. 218). Uttarapaṇḍāla is Ahichchhatra in Rohilkhand. Daddarapura was apparently in the Himalayan region. (DPPN, I. 1054).

2 I. 63. 1-2.

3 I. 63. 30.

4 Rāmāyaṇa, I. 32. 6-9; *Mahābhārata*, I 63. 30-33.

5 No. 48.

6 Rām. II. 52. 101.

7 Nariman, Jackson and Ogden, *Prajñā-pāramitā*, lxxxvi; the *Bṛhat-Kathā-Sloka-Saṅgraha* (4. 14, cf. 8. 21) explicitly states that Kauśāṃbi was on the Kālindī or Jumna. *Maṇḍalakeṣa*, *DPPN*, 1094. The reference in one text to the position of the city on the Ganges is possibly due to its proximity to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna in ancient times, or to a copyist's error.

8 *Buddha*, 393 n.
beya whom Harisvāmin, the commentator, considers to be a native of the town of Kauśāmbi. Epic tradition attributes the foundation of this famous city to a Chedi prince. The origin of the Vatsa people, however, is traced to a king of Kāśi. It is stated in the Purāṇas that when the city of Hastinapura was washed away by the Ganges, Nichakshu, the great-great grandson of Janamejaya, abandoned it, and removed his residence to Kauśāmbi. We have already seen that the Purānic tradition about the Bhārata or Kuru origin of the later kings of Kauśāmbi is confirmed by two plays attributed to Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kauśāmbi, is described in the Svapnavāsavadatta and the Pratijñā-Yangandharāyana as a scion of the Bhārata-kula.

The Purāṇas give a list of Nichakshu’s successors down to Kshemaka, and cite the following genealogical verse:

Brahma-kshatrasya yo yonir
vanaśo devarshi-satkritaḥ
Kshemakam prāpya rājānam
samsthāṁ prāpsyati vai kalau.

“The family honoured by gods and sages (or divine sages), from which sprang Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas (or those who combined the Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya status) will verily, on reaching Kshemaka, come to an end (or be interrupted) in the Kali Age.”

The criticism that has been offered in this work in regard to the Ikshvāku and Magadhan lists of kings applies with equal force to the Paurava-Bhārata line. Here, too, we find mention of princes (e.g., Arjuna and Abhimanyu) who can hardly be regarded as crowned nṛpas or monarchs.

---

1 Sat. Br., XII. 2. 2. 19.
2 See p. 70 ante.
3 Rām., I, 32. 3-6; Mbh., I. 63. 31.
4 Harivahsa, 29. 73; Mbh., XII. 49. 80.
5 Svapna, ed. Gaṇapati Sāstrī, p. 140; Pratijñā, pp. 61, 121.
6 Cf. Brahma-Kshatriyānāṁ kulā of the inscriptions of the Sena kings who claimed descent from the Lunar Race to which the Bharatas, including the Kurus, belonged.
It is also by no means improbable that, as in the case of the Ikshvākus and the royal houses of Magadha and Avanti, contemporaries have been represented as successors and collaterals described as lineal descendants. There is, moreover, no unanimity in regard to the names of even the immediate predecessors of Udayana, the most famous among the later kings of the family. These facts should be remembered in determining the chronology and order of succession of the Bhārata dynasty of Kauśāmbī. The earliest king of the line about whom we know anything definite is Śatānīka II of the Purānic lists. His father's name was Vasudāna according to the Purāṇas, and Sahasrānīka according to 'Bhāsa.' Śatānīka himself was also styled Parantapa. He married a princess of Videha as his son is called Vaidehīputra. He is said to have attacked Champā, the capital of Aṅga, during the reign of Dadhivāhana. His son and successor was the famous Udayana, the contemporary of the Buddha and of Pradyota of Avanti and therefore, of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru of Magadha.

The Bhagga (Bharga) state of Suṁsumāragiri, 'Crocodile Hill', was a dependency of Vatsa. The Mahā-bhārata and the Hari-vanīśa testify to the close connection of these two territories and their proximity to the principality of a Nishāda chieftain, while the Apadāna seems to associate Bharga with Kārūsha. The evidence points to the location of Suṁsumāragiri between the Jumna and the lower valley of the Son.

---

1 Buddhist India, p. 83.
2 Svāpaṇa-vāsavadatta, Act VI, p. 129.
3 JASB, 1914, p. 321.
5 II. 30. 10-11.
6 Vatsabhūmiṁcha Kaunteyo vijjye balavān balāt
   Bhargāṇāmaddhipaṁchaiva Nishāḍādhipatīṁ tathā.
   "The mighty son of Kunti (i.e. Bhīmasena) conquered by force the Vatsa
   country and the lord of the Bhargas and then the chieftain of the Nishādav".
7 29. 73. Pratardasaya putrau dvau
   Vatsa-Bhargau babhīvattuḥ.
   "Pratardana had two sons, Vatsa and Bharga."
8 DPPN, II. 345.
The Kuru realm was according to the Mahā-Sutasoma jātaka\(^1\) three hundred leagues in extent. The reigning dynasty according to the Pali texts belonged to the Yuddhiṣṭhila gotta, i.e., the family of Yudhishthira.\(^2\) The capital was Indapatta or Indapattana, i.e., Indraprastha or Indrapat near modern Delhi. It extended over seven leagues.\(^3\) We hear also of another city called Hatthinipura,\(^4\) doubtless, the Hāstināpura of the epic, and a number of nigamas or smaller towns and villages besides the capital, such as Thullakoṭṭhita, Kammāsadamma, Kuṇḍi and Vāraṇāvata.\(^5\)

The Jātakas mention the Kuru kings and princes styled Dhanañjaya Koravya,\(^6\) Koravya,\(^7\) and Sutasoma.\(^8\) We cannot, however, vouch for their historical existence in the absence of further evidence.\(^9\)

The Jaina Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra mentions a king named Ishukāra ruling at the town called Ishukāra in the Kuru country.\(^10\) It seems probable that after the removal of the elder branch of the royal family to Kausāmbī and the decline of the Abhipratāriṇas, the Kuru realm was parcelled out into small states of which Indapatta and Ishukāra were apparently the most important. "Kings" are mentioned as late as the time of the Buddha\(^11\) when one of them paid a visit to Raṭṭhapāla, son of a Kuru magnate, who had become a disciple of the Śākya Sage.

\(^1\) No. 537.
\(^2\) Dhūmakāri Jātaka, No. 413; Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka, No 495.
\(^3\) Jātaka, Nos. 537, 545.
\(^4\) The Buddhist Conception of Spirits; DPPN, II. 1319.
\(^5\) The epic (Mbh. V. 31. 19; 72. 15 etc.) has a reference to four villages, viz., Avisthala Vrīkasthala, Mākandī, Vāraṇāvata.
\(^6\) Kurudhamma Jātaka, No. 276; Dhūmakāri Jātaka, No. 413; Sambhava Jātaka, No. 515; Vidyura Paṇḍita Jātaka, No. 545. Dhanañjaya is, as is well-known, a name of Arjuna.
\(^7\) Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka, No. 495; Mahā-Sutasoma Jātaka, No. 537.
\(^8\) Mahā-Sutasoma Jātaka, Cf. the Mahābhārata, I. 95. 75 where Sutasoma appears as the name of a son of Bhīma.
\(^9\) S. B. E., XLV. 62.
\(^10\) DPPN, II. 706 f.
Later on, the little principalities gave place to a Saṅgha possibly, a republican confederation.¹

**Pañchāla**, as already stated, comprised Rohilkhand and a part of the Central Doāb. The *Mahābhārata*, the *Jātakas* and the *Divyāvadāna²* refer to the division of this country into two parts, viz., Uttara or Northern Pañchāla and Dakshiṇa or Southern Pañchāla. The Bhāgirathī (Ganges) formed the dividing line.³ According to the Great Epic, Northern Pañchāla had its capital at Ahichchhatra or Chhatravatī, the modern Rāmnagar near Aonlā in the Bareilly District, while Southern Pañchāla had its capital at Kāmpilya, and stretched from the Ganges to the Chambal.⁴ A great struggle raged in ancient times between the Kūrus and the Pañchālas for the possession of Northern (Uttara) Pañchāla. Sometimes Uttara Pañchāla was included in Kururaṭṭha (-rāṣṭra)⁵ and had its capital at Hāśtinapura,⁶ at other times it formed a part of Kāmpilla-raṭṭha (Kāmpilya-rāṣṭra).⁷ Sometimes kings of Kāmpilya-rāṣṭra held court at Uttara Pañchāla-nagara, at other times kings of Uttara Pañchāla-rāṣṭra held court at Kāmpilya.⁸

The history of Pañchāla from the death of Pravāhaṇa Jaivala or Jaivali to the time of Bimbisāra of Magadha is obscure. The only king who may perhaps be referred to this period is Dūrmukha (Dummukha), the contemporary of Nimi,⁹ who is probably to be identified with the penultimate sovereign of Mithilā.¹⁰ In the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* it is stated that Dūrmukha’s kingdom was styled Uttara Pañchāla-raṭṭha (-rāṣṭra): his capital was

¹ *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, 378.
² P. 435.
³ Mbh., I. 138, 70. For divisions in Vedic times see 70 f ante.
⁵ Somanāsa Jātaka, No. 505; *Mahābhārata*, I. 138.
⁶ Divyāvadāna, p. 435.
⁷ Brahmadattā Jātaka, No. 823, Jayaddisa Jātaka, No. 513 and Gaṇḍatindu Jātaka, No. 520.
⁸ Kumbhakāra Jātaka, No. 408.
⁹ Jātaka, No. 408.
¹⁰ Jātaka, No. 541.
not Ahichchatra but Kampilla (Kampilya)-nagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Kuruṇḍu, king of Kaliṅga, Naggai (Nagnajit), king of Gandhāra, and Nimi, king of Videha. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^1\) credits him with extensive conquests and names Brīhaduktha as his priest:

"Etam ha vā Aindram Mahābhīshekaṁ Brīhaduktha Ṛṣiṁ Durmukhāya Pañchāḷāya pravācha tasmādu Durmu-
khāḥ Pañcālo Rājā san vidyāyā samantāṁ sarvataḥ prithivīṁ jayan pariṣṭyaṁ."

"This great anointing of Indra Brīhaduktha, the seer proclaimed to Durmukha, the Pañcāla. Therefore, Dur-
mukha Pañcāla, being a king, by this knowledge, went round the earth completely, conquering on every side."\(^2\)

A great Pañcāla king named Chulani Brahmadatta is mentioned in the Mahā-Umnagga Jātaka,\(^3\) the Uttar-
ādhayaṇa Sūtra,\(^4\) the Svapna-vāsavadattā\(^5\) and the Rāmā-
yāṇa.\(^6\) In the last-mentioned work he is said to have married the daughters (kanyāḥ) of Kuśānābha who were made hump-backed (kubja) by the Wind-god. In the Jātaka, Kevatta, the minister of Brahmadatta, is said to have formed a plan for making Chulani chief king of all India, and the king himself is represented as having laid siege to Mithilā. In the Uttar-ādhayaṇa Brahmadatta is styled a universal monarch. The story of this king is, however, essentially legendary, and little reliance can be placed on it. The Rāmāyaṇic legend regarding the king is only important as showing the connection of the early Pañcālas with the foundation of the famous city of Kanyākubja (Kauṇa) whose name (city of the hump-

\(^1\) VIII. 23.
\(^3\) 546.
\(^4\) S. B. E., XLV. 57-61.
\(^5\) Act V.
\(^6\) I. 32.
backed maiden) is accounted for by the curse to which the story refers.\(^1\)

The *Uttar-ādhyāyāna Sūtra* mentions a king of Kāmpilya named Sañjaya who gave up his kingly power and adopted the faith of the Jinas.\(^8\) We do not know what happened after Sañjaya renounced his throne. But there is reason to believe that the Pañchālas, like the Videhas, Mallas and Kurus, established a Saṅgha form of government of the Rāja-śabda-opajīvīn type.\(^3\)

**Matsya** was the extensive territory between the hills near the Chambal and the forests that skirted the Sarasvatī, of which the centre was Virāṭa-nagara or Bairāṭ in the modern Jaipur State. The early history of the kingdom has already been related. Its vicissitudes during the period which immediately preceded the reign of Bimbisāra of Magadha are not known.\(^4\) It is not included by the *Kauḍīlaya Arthaśāstra* among those states which had a Saṅgha or non-monarchical form of government. The probability is that the monarchical constitution endured till the loss of its independence. It was probably at one time annexed to the neighbouring kingdom of Chedi. The *Mahābhārata*\(^5\) refers to a king named Sahaja who reigned over the Chedis as well as the Matsyas. It was finally absorbed into the Magadhān Empire. Some of the most famous edicts of Aśoka have been found at Bairāṭ.

A family of Matsyas settled in the Vizagapatam region in medieval times.\(^6\) We are told that Jayatśena, the lord

---

1. Cf. Watters, *Yuen Chwang*, I. 341-42. The point seems to be missed by Ratilal Mehta, *Pre-Buddhist India*, 43 n. The name Kanyākubja or Kānya-kubja is already met with in the *Mahābhārata*, I. 175. 3; V. 119. 4. Kānya-kubjī occurs in the *Mahābhāshya*, IV. 1. 2. (293), along with Āhichchhātri Kanñakujja appears in Pāli texts (DPPN, I. 498).

2. S.B.E., XLV, 80-81.

3. *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, p. 378. The Elders of this type of corporations or confederations took the title of Rāja. One of these rājās was apparently the maternal grandfather of Viśākha Pañchālīputra, a disciple of the Buddha (DPPN, II. 108).

4. 66 ff. ante.

5. V. 74. 16; cf. VI. 47, 67; 52. 9.

of Utkala, gave to Satyamārtanda of the Matsya family in marriage his daughter Prabhāvatī, and appointed him to rule over the Oḍḍavādi country. After twenty-three generations came Arjuna who ruled in 1269 A.D.

The Śūrasena country had its capital at Mathurā which, like Kauśāmbī, stood on the Jumna. Neither the country nor its metropolis finds any mention in the Vedic literature. But Greek writers refer to the Sourasenoī and their cities Methora (Mathurā) and Cleisobora. Buddhist theologians make complaint about the absence of amenities in Mathurā. They were apparently not much interested in its kettledrums,¹ or in the sāṭakas (garments) and kārṣṭhāpaṇas (coins) about which Patañjali speaks in the Mahābhāṣya.² A highroad connected the city with a place called Verañjā which was linked up with Śrāvasti and the caravan-route that passed from Taxila to Benares through Soreyya, Saṅkassa (Sāṅkāśya), Kaṇḍakujja (Kanyākubja or Kanauj), and Payāga-Patlīṭhāna (Allahabad).³

In the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas the ruling family of Mathurā is styled the Yadh or Yādava family. The Yādavas were divided into various sects, namely, the Vitihotras, Sātvatās etc.⁴ The Sātvatas were subdivided into several branches, e.g., the Daivāvṛiddhas, Andhakas, Mahā-bhojas and Vṛishṇis.⁵

Yadu and his tribe are repeatedly mentioned in the Rig-Veda. He is closely associated with Turvasa and, in one place, with Druhyu, Anu and Pūru.⁶ This association is also implied by the epic and Purānic legends which state that Yadu and Turvasu were the sons of the same parents, and Druhyu, Anu and Pūru were their step-brothers.

We learn from the Rig-veda⁷ that Yadu and Turvasa

---

¹ Gradual Sayings, II, 78; III. 188.
² I. 2. 48 (Kielhorn, I. 19).
³ Gradual Sayings, II, p. 66; DPPN, II. 498, 930, 1311.
⁴ Matsya, 43-44: Vāyu, 94-96.
⁵ Vīṣṇu, IV. 15. 1: Vāyu, 96. 1-8.
⁶ I, 118. 8.
⁷ I. 56. 18; VI. 45. 1.
came from a distant land, and the former is brought into very special relation to the **Parsus** or Persians.\(^1\) The Sātvatas or **Sattvata** also appear to be mentioned in the Vedic texts. In the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*\(^2\) the defeat by Bharata of the Sattvats and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, are referred to. The geographical position of Bharata’s kingdom is clearly shown by the fact that he made offerings on the Sarasvatī, the Jumna and the Ganges.\(^3\) The Satvats must have been occupying some adjoining region. The epic and Purāṇic tradition which places them in the Mathurā district is thus amply confirmed. At a later time, however, a branch of the Satvats seems to have migrated farther to the south, for in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*\(^4\) the Satvats are described as a southern people who lived beyond the Kuru-Pañchāla area, *i.e.*, beyond the river Chambal, and were ruled by **Bhoja** kings. In the Purāṇas also we find that a branch of the Satvats was styled Bhoja:\(^5\)

“**Bhajina-Bhajamāṇa-divy- Āndhuka-Devāvṛidha- Mahā-bhṛja-Vṛṣṇi-sāṁjñāḥ-Sātvatasya putrā babhūvuh......... Mahābhṛja-stāvatī dharmātmā tasyānva ye Bhoja-Mārtikāvātā babhūvuh.”

1 VIII. 6. 46. Epigraphic evidence points to a close connection between Western Asia and India from about the middle of the second millennium B.C. Rig-Vedic Gods like Sūrya (Shuriāv), Marut (Maruttash), Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, the Nāsatyas, and even Daksha (dakashi, stat. CAH. 1. 553) figure in the records of the Kassites and the Mitanni.

2 XIII. 5. 4. 21 *Satānikaḥ samantāsaśu medhyāmī Sātrājito hayam ādutta yajñānī Kāṭānva Bharataḥ Sātvatāmiva.

The *Mbh.*, vii. 66. 7 (*mā saltavāni vijjāh*) seems to miss the import of the Brāhmaṇic gāthā.


So śvamedhāsataneshṭvā Yamanānamu vīryavān triśaṁśaṁ Sarasvatīyāṁ Gaṅgāmanu chaṭuḥṣatān.

4 VIII. 14. 3.

It is further stated that several southern states, Māhishmati, Vidarbha etc., were founded by princes of Yadu lineage. Not only the Bhojas, but the Devārīdhra branch of the Sāvatas finds mention in the Vedic literature. Babhru Daivārīdhra is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa as a contemporary of Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, and of Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. The Andhakas and Vṛishnis are referred to in the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini. In the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra the Vṛishnis are described as a Saṅgha, i.e., a republican corporation. The Mahābhārata, too, refers to the Vṛishnis, Andhakas and other associate tribes as a Saṅgha, and Vāsudeva, the Vṛishni prince, as Saṅghamukhya (Elder or Seignior of the confederacy). The name of the Vṛishni corporation (gana) has also been preserved by a unique coin. It is stated in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas that Kaṁsa, like Peisistratus and others of Greek history, tried to make himself tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and that Kṛishṇa-Vāsudeva, a scion of the Vṛishni family, killed him. The slaying of Kaṁsa by Kṛishṇa is referred to by Patañjali and the Ghata Jātaka. The latter work confirms the Hindu tradition about the association of Kṛishṇa-Vāsudeva’s family with Mathurā (Uttara Madhurā).

1 Mat., 43. 10-29; 44. 36; Vāyu, 94. 26; 95. 35.
2 Vāyu, 96. 15; Vīṣṇu., 13. 3-5.
3 VII. 34.
4 IV. 1. 114; VI. 2. 34.
5 P. 12.
6 XII. 81. 25.
7 Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, p. 119; Allan, CCAI, pp. cvf, 281.
8 No. 454.
9 The city is so called to distinguish it from Madura in South India. The question of the historical existence of Kṛishṇa Vāsudeva has been discussed in my Early History of the Vaishnava Sect, 1st ed., pp. 26-35; 2nd ed., pp. 51 ff. and my Political History of Ancient India, 1st ed., 1923, p. 312.

Several scholars reject the identification of Kṛishṇa of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas with the historical Kṛishṇa of the Čhāndogya Upanishad (III. 17). But we should remember that—

(a) Both the Kṛishṇas have the metronymic Devakīputra, son of Devakī, which is rare in early times.
The final overthrow of the Vṛishinis is ascribed to their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas. It is interesting to note that the Vṛishnis and the Andhakas are branded

(b) The teacher of the Upamishadic Kṛishṇa belonged to a family (Āṅgirasa) closely associated with the Bhojas (Rig-Veda, III, 53. 7), the kindreds of the Epic Kṛishṇa (Mbh., II, 14. 32-34).

(c) The Upamishadic Kṛishṇa and his Guru Ghora Āṅgirasa were worshippers of Sūrya (the Sun-god). We are told in the Śāntiparva (335. 19) that the Śāvata-viśāhī taught by the Epic Kṛishṇa was prāk-Sūrya-mukha-mulśāna.

(d) An Āṅgirasa was the Guru of the Upamishadic Kṛishṇa. Āṅgirasi Śruti is quoted as ‘‘Sruti-nāmuttamā Śruti’’ by the Epic Kṛishṇa (Mbh., VIII, 69. 85).

(e) The Upamishadic Kṛishṇa is taught the worship of the Sun, the noblest of all lights (jyotir-uttamam), high above all darkness (tamasaśaśam). This has its parallel in the Gitā (XIII, 18—jyotishāmaṇi tajjyotis tamasaḥ pāram uchchytate).

(f) The Upamishadic Kṛishṇa is taught to value, not any material reward (dakshinā), but rather the virtues of tapodānam ājñavam ahūṁ satyavacanam. The Gitā also censures actions performed not for the material fruit thereof. Stress is laid in Gitā, XVI, 1-2, on the virtues enumerated in the Upamishads.

The Purāṇas no doubt represent Śāntipani, and not Ghora, as the great teacher of Kṛishṇa. But it has to be remembered that according to the Vishnu Purāṇa (V, 21. 19) Kṛishṇa went to the sage Śāntipani to learn lessons in the science of āstras (astrāvakrshā):

Tatāḥ Śāntipanum Kāśyam Avantiḥpuravāśīnam astārtham jagattmurvaru Baledeva-Janārādanau.

The Harivamśa, too, informs us (Vishnu Purāṇa, 33, 4 ff) that the residence of Kṛishṇa, who was already a śrutidhara, with his Guru Śāntipani was due to his desire of receiving lessons in the science of the bow (dhanurvedadikārṣṭḥ). The Veda that he learnt from this teacher is not termed akhila Veda, or Ṭrayī, but simply sāṅga-Vedam, the Veda with its auxiliary treatises. The only Veda that is expressly mentioned is the Dhanurveda (and not the Ṭrayī) together with its four divisions (chatuspāda), etc. The compiles of the Bhāgavata and Brahma-Vaivarta Purāṇas (Bhāg., X, 45, 31 ff.; BV, Janmādhana, 101-102) introduce details about the study of all the Vedas, Upamishads, treatises on law, philosophy, polity, etc., which are not found in the relevant passage of the Vishnu Purāṇa, which, according to critics like Bankim Chandra Chāṭopādhyāya, represents an earlier and more reliable tradition. Residence with Śāntipani, therefore, does not conflict with the view that Kṛishṇa accepted the discipleshhip of Ghora for purposes of religious and philosophical studies (see EHVS, 2nd ed., pp. 73-74. Śāntipani already knew him to be a śrutidhara (versed in the śruti or the Vedas; Harivahita, Vishnu Purāṇa, 33. 6).

Real discrepancies in regard to certain names are sometimes met with in Vedic and epic versions of several legends, e.g., the story of Śunāśepa. But even these are not regarded as adequate grounds for doubting the identity of the leading character of the Vedic Akhyāna with that of the corresponding epic tale.

as *Vṛāyas, i.e., deviators from orthodoxy in the *Drona parva* of the *Mahābhārata*. It is a remarkable fact that the *Vṛishṇi-Andhakas* and other *Vṛāya* clans, *i.e.*, the *Lichchhavis* and *Mallas*, are found in historical times on the southern and eastern fringe of the "*Dhruvā Madhyamā divi*" occupied by the Kuru-Paṁchālas and two other folks. It is not improbable that they represent an earlier swarm of Aryans who were pushed southwards and eastwards by the Pūru-Bharatas, the progenitors of the Kuru Paṁchālas. It may be remembered that the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* actually refers to the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats—the progenitors of the *Vṛishṇi-Andhakas*. And the Great Epic refers to the *exodus of the Yādavas from Mathurā* owing to pressure from the Paurava line of Magadha, and probably also from the Kurus.

The Buddhist texts refer to Avautiputta, king of the *Śūrasenas*, in the time of Mahā-Kachchāna, one of the chief disciples of Śākyamuni, through whose agency Buddhism gained ground in the Mathurā region. The name of the king suggests relationship with the royal house of Avanti. A king named Kuvinda is mentioned in the *Kāvya-Mīmāṁsā*. The *Śūrasenas* continued to be a notable people down to the time of Megasthene. But at that time they must have formed an integral part of the Maurya Empire.

*Assaka* (*Aśmaka*) was situated on the banks of the Godāvari. Its capital, Potali, Potali or Podana is possibly to be identified with *Bodhan* in the Nizam’s dominions. This accords with its position between Mūlaka (district

---

1 141. 15.
2 Cf. *Bahu-Kurucharā Mathurā*, Patañjali IV. 1. 1; *GEJ.*, p. 395 n.
3 M. 2. 85, DPPN, II. 498.
4 3rd ed., p. 50. He prohibited the use of harsh conjunct consonants.
5 *Sutta Nīpāta*, 977.
6 *Chulla-Kāliṅga Jātaka*, No. 301; D. 2. 295; Law, *Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective*, 74; *Muh.*, I. 177. 47. As pointed out by Dr. Sukthankar the older mss. give the name as Potana or Podana and not Paudanya. This agrees with the evidence of the *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* (*Assakānaṁcha Potanam*) and the *Pariśīhṭa parvan* (1. 92)—nagarā Potanābhidhe.
round Paithān) and Kaliṅga to which Pāli texts bear witness. In the Soma-Nanda Jātaka we find Assaka associated with Avanti. This may suggest that Assaka included at that time Mūlaka and some neighbouring districts and thus its territory approached the southern frontier of Avanti.

In the Vāyu Purāṇa Aśmaka and Mūlaka appear as scions of the Ikṣvāku family, and the Mahābhārata speaks of the royal sage Aśmaka (Aśmako nāma rājarśih) as having founded the city of Podana. This probably indicates that the Aśmaka and Mūlaka kingdoms were believed to have been founded by Ikṣvāku chiefs, just as Vidarbha and Daṇḍaka were founded by princes of the Yadu (Bhoja) family. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions Brahmādatta, king of the Assakas, as a contemporary of Sattabhū, king of Kaliṅga, Vessabhu, king of Avanti, Bharata, king of Sovīra, Reṇu, king of Videha, Dhataratthā, king of Aṅgā and Dhataratthā, king of Kāśi.

We learn from the Assaka Jātaka that at one time the city of Potali was included in the kingdom of Kāśi, and that its prince, Assaka, was presumably a vassal of the Kāśi monarch. The Chulla Kaliṅga Jātaka mentions a king of Assaka named Aruṇa and his minister Nandisena, and refers to a victory which they won over the king of Kaliṅga.

Avanti roughly corresponds to the Ujjain region, together with a part of the Narmadā valley from Māndhātā to Maheshwar, and certain adjoining districts. Late Jaina writers include within its boundaries Tumbavana or Tumain in the Guna district of the Gwalior state about

---

1 Sutta Nipāta, 977: Jātaka No. 391.
2 Cf. Bhandarkar, Carm. Lec., 1918, pp. 53-54. It appears from the Mahāgovinda Suttanta that at one time Avanti extended southwards as far as the Narmadā valley and included the city of Māhi-hmatī which stood on the banks of the famous river.
3 88. 177-178; Mbh., I. 177. 47.
4 Dialogues of the Budhā, Part II. p. 270. The last-mentioned prince is known to the Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 22.
5 No. 207.
50 miles to the north-west of Eran. The *Janapada* was divided into two parts by the Vindhya; the northern part drained by the Siprā and other streams had its capital at Ujjain and the southern part washed by the Narmadā had its centre at Māhissatī or Māhishmatī usually identified with the rocky island of Māndhātā.

Buddhist and Jain writers mention several other cities of Avanti, *viz.*, Kuraragha ("osprey’s haunt"), Makkarakaṭa, and Sudarśanapura. The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* mentions Māhissatī as the capital of the Avantis, and refers to their king Vessabhu. The *Mahābhārata*, however, distinguishes between the kingdoms of Avanti and Māhishmatī, but locates Vinda and Anuvinda of Avanti near the Narmadā.

The *Purāṇas* attribute the foundation of Māhishmatī, Avanti, and Vidarbha to scions of the Yādu family. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* also associates the Satvats and the Bhojas, branches of the Yādu family according to the *Purāṇas*, with the southern realms.

The *Purāṇas* style the first dynasty of Māhishmatī as Haihaya. This family is already known to the *Kautuḥiya Arthaśāstra* and figures in the *Shoḍaśa-rājika* and other

---

1 *Iha ma Jambudīpe* pāg Bhartārāha-ubhāshaṇam
   Avantitī deśo 'sti svargadeśīya riddhibhiḥ
tatvā Tumbavanaṃ uti vidyate sannvedanam.
   *Parīśhṭapaṭarvan*, XII. 2-3.

For the position of Tumbavana, see *Ep. Ind.*, XXVI. 115ff.

2 In J. V. 135 (DPPN, I. 195) Avanti is placed in Dakṣiṇāpatha. This is hardly reconcilable with the view that only the southern part is meant by the expression *Avanī Dakṣiṇāpatha* (Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lec.*, 54).

3 Pargiter in *Mark P.*, Fleet in *JRAS*, 1910, 444ff. There is one difficulty in the way of accepting this identification. Māndhātā lay to the south of the Pāriyātra Mts. (W. Vindhya), whereas Māhishmatī lay between the Vindhya and the Riksha—to the north of the Vindhya and to the south of the Riksha, according to the commentator Nilakantha (Harivarṇaṇa, II. 38. 7-19). For identification with Mahēsvara, once the residence of the Holkar family, see *Ind. Ant.*, 1875, 346ff. For Māndhātā, see *ibid.*, 1876, 53.

4 Lüders Ins. No. 465; *Gradual Sayings*, V. 31; Law, *Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes*, p. 158; DPPN, I. 195; *Kathākośa*, 18

5 *Narmadāmabhitaḥ*, *Mbh.*, II. 31. 10.


7 *Matsya*, 43. 8-29; *Vāyu*, 94. 5-26.

8 *Arthaśāstra*, p. 11; *Mbh.*, vii. 68, 6 etc.; *Saundarāṇanda*, VIII. 45.
episodes of the epic. The Haihayas are said to have overthrown the Nāgas who must have been the aboriginal inhabitants of the Narmadā region. The Matsya Purāṇa mentions five branches of the Haihayas, namely Vitihotras, Bhajas, Avantis, Kuṇḍikeras or Tumulikeras and the Tāla-jaṅghas. When the Vitihotras and Avantis (or the Vitihotras in Avanti) passed away, an amātya, minister or governor, named Pulika (Punika), is said to have killed his master and anointed his own son Pradyota in the very sight of the Kshatriyas. In the fourth century B.C. Avanti formed an integral part of the Magadhan Empire.

The kingdom of Gandhāra included within its boundaries the vale of Kaśmīra and the ancient metropolis of Takshaśilā, which lay 2,000 leagues from Benares, but nevertheless attracted students and enquirers from the most distant provinces.

The Purāṇas represent the Gandhāra princes as the descendants of Druhyu. This king and his people are mentioned several times in the Rig-Veda and apparently belonged to the north-west, a fact that accords with the Purānic tradition. Mention has already been made of the early king, Nagnajit, who is reported to have been a contemporary of Nimi, king of Videha, Durmukha, king of Pañchāla, Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, and "Karakaṇḍu," king of Kalinga. Jaina writers tell us that those princes

---

1 Cf. Nāgpur; and Ind. Ant., 1884, 85; Bomb. Gaz., I. 2, 313, etc.
2 43, 48-49.
3 We need not infer from this statement that the family of Punika sprang from one of the lower orders of society (e.g., cowherds). The point in the Purānic account is that the dynastic change was brought about by an amātya, a civil functionary (not a senāpati like Pushyamitra), and that the army (Kshatriyas) looked on, i.e., treated the matter with indifference or silent approval. In the time of Megasthenes soldiers (kshatriya, khattiya-kula) and councillors (amāyas, amacheha-kula) were distinct orders of society (cf. also Fick, Ch. VI). The Tibetans style Pradyota's father Anantanemi, Essay on Gunaḍhya, p. 173.
4 Jātaka, No. 406; Telapatto Jātaka, No. 96; Suśma Jātaka, No. 103.
5 Matsya, 48, 6; Vāyu, 99-9.
6 Vedic Index, I. 985.
7 Kumbhakārā Jātaka; Ait. Br., VII. 94; Sat. Br., VIII. 1. 4. 10; Uttarādhayana Sūtra. A Nagnajit also appears in the Mahābhārata as the Gandhārian contemporary of Krishna V. 48, 75. But the same epic mentions Śakuni as the King of Gandhāra in the time of Kṛishṇa and the Pāṇḍavas.
adopted the faith of the Jainas. As Pārśva (777 B.C.?) was probably the first historical Jina, Nagnajit, if he really became a convert to his doctrines, should have to be placed between 777 B.C. and cir. 544 B.C., the date of Pukkusāti, the Gandhārian contemporary of Bimbisāra. The conversion to Jainism, however, does not accord with the story related in the Jañaka about his own elevation and that of his confrères to the status of Pachcheka Buddhas, or with the interest which the king or his son Svarjit evinced in Brāhmaṇic ritual. It is, however, to be noted that the views of the family in such matters were not treated with respect. The rival claims of different sects need not be taken too seriously. The only fact that emerges is that tradition knew the family to be interested in religious matters and holding views that did not strictly conform to traditional Brāhmaṇism.

In the middle of the sixth century B.C. the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Pukkusāti (Pushkarasārin), who is said to have sent an embassy and a letter to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, and waged war on Pradyota of Avanti who was defeated. He is also said to have been threatened in his own kingdom by the Pāṇḍavas who occupied a part of the Pañjab as late as the time of Ptolemy. In the latter half of the sixth century B.C. Gandhāra was conquered by the king of Persia. In the Bahistān inscription of Darius, cir. 520-518 B.C., the Gandhārians (Gadara) appear among the subject peoples of the Achaemenid or Achaemenian Empire.

Kamboja is constantly associated with Gandhāra in literature and inscriptions. Like Gandhāra it is included

---

1 SBE, XLIV. 87 2 Sat. Br., VIII 1. 4. 10. Vedic Index, I 432
3 Buddhist Ind. J., p. 28. DPPN, II. 215; Essay on Gandhāra p. 170
5 Mbh., XII. 207. 43; Aṅguttara N., P. T. S., I. 213; 4. 252. 256. 261; Rock Edict V of Aśoka. Quite in keeping with the association with Gandhāra, famous for its good wool (Rig. V. 1. 126. 7), is the love of Kambojas for blankets (Kambala) to which Yāska (11. 2) bears testimony. In the Pāla-Prathāra age they are also found in Pehoa (Ep. Ind. I. 247) and Bengal.
in the \textit{Uttarāpatha}, i.e., the Far North of India.\(^1\) It should, therefore, be clearly distinguished from "Kambuja" in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula (\textit{i.e., Cambodia}),\(^2\) and must be located in some part of North-West Indo-Pakistan close to Gandhāra. The \textit{Mahābhārata} connects the Kambojas with a place called Rājapura.\(^3\) -- "Kaṇṭha Rājapurain gatvā Kāmbojā nirjītā-stvayā."\(^4\) The association of the Kambojas with the Gandhīrās enables us to identify this Rājapura with the territory of that name mentioned by Yuan Chwang\(^5\) which lay to the south or south-east of Punch. The western boundaries of Kamboja must have reached Kāfrīstān. Elphinstone found in that district tribes like the ‘Caumojee,’ ‘Camoze,’ and ‘Camoje’ whose names remind us of the Kambojas.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Cf. \textit{Mbh.}, XII 207. 43. \textit{Rājarangam}, IV 163-165. The chronicle does not place Kamboja to the north of Kashmir. It simply places the territory in the Uttarāpatha, and clearly distinguishes it from the land of the Tukhāras, apparently lying further to the north.


\(^3\) \textit{Mbh.}, VII. 2. 5

\(^4\) "Kaṇṭha having gone to (gatvā) Rājapura" vanquished the Kambojas. The passage can hardly imply that Kaṇṭha marched to Kamboja "via Rājapura." It is also futile to suggest that Rājapura had anything to do with Rājagrīha in Bactria (as is done by a writer in the \textit{Proceedings and Transactions of the Sixth Oriental Conference}, Patna, p. 106). The \textit{Rām.}, I. 6. 22; the \textit{Mbh.}, VII. 119. 14. 26, and the \textit{Mudrārākṣasa}, II, clearly distinguishes Kamboja from Bālhiṅka (Bactria)

\(^5\) Watters, \textit{Yuan Chwang}, Vol. I. p. 281 Cunningham (AGI, 1924, p. 148) identifies Rājapura with the chieftain of Rājaurī to the south of Kashmir. The fact that the \textit{Mahābhārata} (II. 27) makes separate mention of Kamboja and Abhīsāra (with which the Rājaurī region is identified) need not mean that the two were absolutely distinct entities in all ages. Does not the Great Epic (II. 30. 24-25) distinguish between Suhma and Tāmralipti, and does not the \textit{Dakṣināmūrya-charita} with equal emphasis place Dāmalipta in Suhma? The truth is that Rājaurī formed only a part of Kamboja which included other areas as well. The ruling family of Rājaurī (Rājaurī) in later times were the Khaśas (Stein in JASB, 1899, Extra No. 2. 28).

\(^6\) Elphinstone, \textit{An Account of the Kingdom of Kābul}, Vol. II, pp. 375-377; \textit{Bomb. Gaz.}, I. 1. 498 n; \textit{JRAS}, 1843, 140; JASB, 1874, 260 n; Wilson, \textit{Vishnu P.}, III. 293. With the expression \textit{asaṅgam ayatanam}, 'land of horses' used by Pāli texts in reference to the Kambojas (\textit{DPPN}, I. 526. cf. \textit{Mbh.}, vi. 90. 3) may be compared to the names Aspasioi and Assakenoi given by classical writers to the sturdy tribes living in the Alishang and Swat valleys in the days of Alexander (\textit{Camb. Hist. Ind.}, I. 352 n).
Kamboja may have been a home of Brähmanic learning in the later Vedic period. The *Vamśa Brāhmaṇa* actually mentions a teacher named Kāmboja Aupaman- yava.¹ The presence of Āryas (Ayyo) in Kamboja is recognised in the *Majjhima Nikāya*.² But already in the time of Yāska the Kambojas had come to be regarded as a people distinct from the Aryans of the interior of India, speaking a different dialect.³ We have further changes in later ages. And in *Bhūridatta Jātaka*⁴ the Kambojas are credited with savage (Non-Aryan) customs:

\[
\begin{align*}
ete hi dhāmmā anāriyarūpā & \\
Kambojakānam vitathā bahunnan ti & .
\end{align*}
\]

These are your savage customs which I hate,

Such as Kamboja hordes might emulate.⁵

This description of the Kambojas agrees wonderfully with Yuan Chwang’s account of Rājapura and the adjoining countries. “From Lampā to Rājapura the inhabitants are coarse and plain in personal appearance, of rude violent dispositions ...they do not belong to India proper, but are inferior peoples of frontier (i.e., barbarian) stocks.”⁷

The Kambojas in the Epic period had their metropolis probably at Rājapura. Dvārakā, mentioned by Rhys Davids as the capital in the early Buddhist period; was not really situated in this country, though it was connected with it by a road.⁸ A real city of the Kambojas was apparently Nandi-nagara mentioned in Lüders’ Inscriptions Nos. 176 and 472.

The Vedic texts do not mention any king of Kamboja. But, as has already been pointed out, they refer to a teacher named Kamboja Aupamanyava who was probably

---

¹ *Vedic Index*, I. 127, 198; Yāska, II. 2.
² II. 149.
³ II. 2; JRAS, 1911, 801 f.
⁴ No. 543.
⁵ *Jātaka*, VI. 208.
⁶ Cowell’s *Jātaka*, VI. 110.
⁷ Watters I. 284; for the Kambojas, see also S. Lévi: “*Pré-Aryen et Pre-Dravidien dans l’Inde*,” JA, 1923.
connected with this territory. In the Mahābhārata the Kambojas are represented as living under a monarchical constitution. The Epic makes mention of their kings Chandravarman and Sudakshiṇa. In later times the monarchy gave place to a Saṅgha form of government. The Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra speaks of the Kambojas as a “vārtā-śastr-opaṭīvin” Saṅgha, that is to say, a confederation of agriculturists, herdsmen, traders and warriors. Corporations of Kambojas (Kambojānāṁcha ye ganāḥ) are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata.

Section II. An Epic Account of the Mahājanapadas

An interesting account of the characteristics of the peoples of most of the Mahājanapadas described above is to be found in the Karna parva of the Mahābhārata.

The Kurus, Pañchālas, Matsyas, Kosalas, Kāṣis, Magadhas, Chedis and Śūrasenas receive praise. Patriots hailing from Aṅga include their country in this list:

Kuravah saha Pañchālāḥ Śālvā Matsyāḥ sa-Naimishāḥ Kosalāḥ Kāśayo' ngāścha Kaliṅgā Māgadhāstathā Ghedayaśca mahābhāgā dharman jānanti sāsvatam brāhmaṁ Pañchālāḥ Kauraveyāstu dharman Satyaṁ Matsyāḥ Śūrasenaśca yajñam.

“The Kauravas with the Pañchālas, the Śālvas, the Matsyas, the Naimishas, the Kosalas, the Kāṣis, the Aṅgas, the Kaliṅgas, the Magadhas, and the Chedis who are all highly blessed, know what the eternal Law of Righteousness is. The Pañchālas observe the Vedic code, the Kauravas the law of right conduct, the Matsyas truth, and the Śūrasenas sacrificial rites.”

1 Cf. I. 67. 32; II. 4. 22; V. 165. 1-3; VII. 90. 59, etc.
2 P. 378.
3 VII. 89. 98.
4 Mahābhārata, VIII. 40. 29; 45. 14-16; 28; 34; 40.
5 The Naimishas occupied Nimār, 20 miles from Sitāpur, on the left bank of the Gumti river (Ayyar, Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India, 91).
The Magadhas comprehend hints, the Kosalas understand from what they see,—the Kuruś and Pañchālas gather the sense from half-expressed words, while the Śālavas need full instruction.

Ṛṣiṣṭaṃśaḥ Magadhaḥ prakṣhitajnāśca Kośalāḥ,
addhoktiḥ Kun-Pañcchālaḥ Śālavāḥ āptamānavanāḥ.

The Aṅgas had their detractors and come in for a good deal of condemnation along with the Madras and the Gandhāras:

Āturāṇāṁ purityāgaḥ sadāra-suta-vikravyah
Aṅgeshu vartate Kṛṇa yeshām adhipatir bhavān.

“The abandonment of the afflicted and the sale of wives and children are, O Kṛṇa, prevalent among the Aṅgas whose overlord thou art.”

Madrakeshnu cha saṁsryśtaṁ
śauhaṁ Gāṇḍhaṅkeshnu cha.
rāja-vājaka-vājve cha
nāshtāṁ dattāṁ havir bhavet.

“Amongst the Madrakas all acts of friendship are lost as purity among the Gāṇḍhārakas, and the libations poured in a sacrifice in which the king is himself the sacrificer and priest.”

The verses quoted above give a fair idea of the attitude, mainly of poets of the western part of the Madhyadeśa towards most of the Mahājanapadas of Northern India.

Section III. The Fall of Kāśi and the Ascendancy of Kosala

Kośalo nāma muditaḥ sphūto janapado mahaṁ
—Rāmāyaṇa.

The flourishing period of the sixteen Mahājanapadas ended in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. The history of the succeeding age is the story of the absorption of these states into a number of powerful kingdoms, and ultimately into one empire, namely, the empire of Magadha.

Kāśi was probably one of the first to fall. The
Mahāvagga and the Jātakas refer to bitter conflicts between this kingdom and its neighbours, specially Kosala. The facts of the struggle are obscure, being wrapped up in legendary matter from which it is impossible to disentangle them. The Kāśis seem to have been successful at first, but the Kosalas were the gainers in the end.

In the Mahāvagga¹ and the Kosambī Jātaka² it is stated that Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, robbed Dīghati, king of Kosala, of his realm, and put him to death. In the Kunāla Jātaka³ we are told that Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, owing to his having an army, seized on the country of Kosala, slew its king, and carried off his chief queen to Benares, and there made her his consort. The Brahāchattā⁴ and Sona-Nanda Jātakas⁵ also refer to the victories of Kāśi monarchs over Kosala.

Success, however, did not remain long with the Kāśis.⁶ In the Mahāśilāva Jātaka⁷ king Mahāsilāva of Kāśi is said to have been deprived of his realm by the ruler of Kosala. In the Ghaṭa and Ekaśāya Jātakas⁸ Vāṇika and Dabbasena, sovereigns of Kosala, are said to have won for their country a decided preponderance over Kāśi. The final conquest of the latter kingdom was probably the work of Kaṇisa, as the epithet Barānasīggha, i.e., “seizer of Benares” or Kāśi is a standing addition to his name.⁹ The interval of time between Kaṇisa’s conquest of Kāśi and the rise of Buddhism could not have been very long because the memory of Kāśi as an independent kingdom was still fresh in the minds of the people in the Buddha’s time and even later when the Aṅguttara Nikāya was composed.

¹ S.B.E., XVII. 291. 99.
² No. 428.
³ No. 540.
⁴ No. 326.
⁵ No. 532.
⁶ No. 532.
⁷ No. 51.
⁸ No. 355.
⁹ No. 593.
¹⁰ The Sṛṣya Jātaka, No. 282; the Tevakuna Jātaka, No. 721: Buddhist India, p. 25.
In the time of Mahākosalā (about the middle of the
sixth century B.C.) Kāsi formed an integral part of the
Kosalan monarchy. When Mahākosalā married his
daughter, the lady Kosalādevi, to king Bimbisāra of
Magadha, he gave a village of Kāsi producing a revenue
of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money.\(^1\)

In the time of Mahākosalā’s son and successor,
Pasenadi or Prasenajit, Kāsi still formed a part of the
Kosalan empire. In the Lohichcha Sutta\(^a\) Buddha asks
a person named Lohichcha the following questions: “Now
what think you Lohichcha? Is not king Pasenadi of
Kosalā in possession of Kāsi and Kosala?” Lohichcha
replies, “Yes, that is so, Gotama.”\(^b\) We learn from the
Mahāvagga\(^c\) that a brother of Pasenadi acted as the viceroy
of Kāsi.

The Samyukta Nikāya\(^d\) speaks of Pasenadi as the head
of a group of five Rājās. One of these was probably his
brother, the viceroy of Kāsi. Among the remaining
princes and chiefs we should perhaps include the rājanya
Pāyāsi of Setavyā mentioned in the Pāyāsi Suttanta\(^e\) and
the ruler of the Kālāmas of Kesaputta.\(^f\)

Another Rājā of the group was apparently the śākya
chief of Kapilavāstu. His political subordination to the
Kosalan monarchs appears from several texts.\(^g\) The ruler
of Devadaha may have ranked as another notable vassal of
Kosalā.\(^h\)

---

\(^{1}\) Harita Māta Jātaka, No. 239; Vodāhaki Sūkara Jātaka, No. 289.


\(^{3}\) Cf. Gradual Sayings, V. 40. “As far as the Kāsi-Kosalans extend, as
far as the rule of Pasenadi, the Kosalan rājā, extends, therein Pasenadi,
the Kosalan Rājā, is reckoned chief.”

\(^{4}\) S.B.E., XVII, 195.

\(^{5}\) The Book of the Kindred Sayings, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, I.,
p. 106.

\(^{6}\) Cf. Milinda, IV. 4. 14: the Vimāna-vatthu commentary; Law, Heaven
and Hell, 79, 89. Pāyāsi occurs as the name of a village in a Saheti Mahet
Inscription. It has been identified with a village close to the findspot of the
record (Ray, DHNI, I, p. 521).

\(^{7}\) Indian Culture, II, 808; Āṅguttara, I, 188.

\(^{8}\) See Suśra, p. 99.

\(^{9}\) Kapilavastu, Devadaha and Koliya are sometimes mentioned as three
It was probably during the reign of Mahākosalā, that Bimbisāra was anointed king of Magadha. With the coronation of this famous ruler ends the period with which this part of the work deals.

SECTION IV. KINGSHIP.

We have endeavoured to give in outline the story of the political vicissitudes through which Northern India and a considerable portion of the Deccan passed from the accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisāra. We shall now attempt a brief survey of some of the institutions of the age without which no political history is complete. We have seen that during the major part of the period under review the prevailing form of government was monarchical. The later Vedic texts and auxiliary treatises give us a few details about the rank and power of the rulers in the different parts of India, their social status, the methods of their selection and consecration, the chief members of their household, the civil and military services, the limitations of royal authority and popular participation in affairs of the state. Even when all scraps of information are pieced together, the picture is dim. The facts gleaned from Vedic sources which alone can, with confidence, be referred to the period before 500 B.C. have to be elucidated or supplemented by post-Vedic data embodying traditions about the heroic age that preceded the rise and growth of the Magadhan Empire.

The various kinds of rulership prevalent in different parts of India are thus described in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.¹

"Etasyāṁ Prāchyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Prāchyaṁāṁ

¹ VIII. 14.

distinct states (DPPN, I, 1021). The subordination of the Śakyas to the King of Kosala necessarily implies the latter’s control over Devadaha which was in part, at any rate, a Śākyan city.
rājānaḥ Sāmṛājyāyaiva te’bhishichyante Samrāṭ ityenaṁ-abhishiktan āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Dakśiṇāyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ Rājānaṁ Bhaujya īva te’bhishichyante Bhoj-jetyenaṁ-abhishiktan-āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Pratīchyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Nīchyaṁ Rājānaṁ ye’ pāchyaṁ Bāvarjhāyavya te’ bhishichyante Svarāṭ-irtyenaṁ-abhishiktan āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Uḍīchyaṁ diśi ye ke cha parena Himavantaṁ Janapada Uttara-Kurava Uttara-Madra iti Vairājyāyaiva te’bhishichyante Virāṭ-irtyenaṁ-abhishiktan āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ dhruvāyaṁ Madhyamāyaṁ pratīshṭhāyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Kuru-Pańchalaṁ Rājānaḥ sa Vas-Ośinaṁ Rājāyaiva te’bhishichyante Rāj-irtyenaṁ-abhishiktan āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.”

“In this eastern quarter, whatever kings there are of the eastern peoples they are anointed for overlordship (Sāmṛājya): ‘O Overlord’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In the southern quarter whatever kings there are of the Satvats, they are anointed for paramount rule (Bhaujya): ‘O Paramount Ruler’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this western quarter, whatever kings there are of the southern and western peoples, they are anointed for self-rule (Svārājya): ‘O Self-Ruler’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this northern quarter, the lands of the Uttara-Kurus and the Uttara-Madras, beyond the Himavat, their (kings?) are anointed for sovereignty (Vairājya): ‘O Sovereign’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this firm middle established quarter, whatever kings there are of the Kuru-Pańchālas with the Vaśas and Uśīnars, they are anointed for kingship; ‘king’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods.”

Several scholars assert that Vairājya means a kingless state. But in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa¹ a king consecrated with Indra's great unction is called Virāt and worthy of Vairājya. When a king consecrated with the Punara-bhisheka (renewed anointment) ascends his Āsandī or throne, he prays for attaining Vairājya as well as other kinds of royal dignity. Sāyaṇa takes the word Vairājya to mean pre-eminence among kings, itarebhyo bhūpatibhyyo vaisishtyam. This is virtually the sense of the word that Dr. Keith accepts in his translation.

The Śukranīti,² too, understands Virāt to denote a superior kind of monarch. In the Mahābhārata Krishna is lauded as Samrāt Virāt Svarāt and Sura-rāja.³ If the Uttara-Kurus and the Uttara-Madras are to be regarded as republican, it is not because of the use of the term Vairājya, but because in their case it is not the rājan but the janapada which is said to be anointed for sovereignty. It should, however, be remembered that already in the Brāhmaṇa period Uttara-Kuru has become a devakshetra which the arms of a mortal could not reach.⁴

It is not easy to decide whether all the terms Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārājya, Vairājya and Rājya referred to essentially different forms of royal authority in the Brāhmaṇic period. But two terms at least, namely, Sāmrājya and Rājya are clearly distinguished from each other by the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.⁵

Rājā vai Rajasūryeneshtvā bhumati, Samrād Vājapeyenāvarain hi Rājyaṁ paraṁ Sāmrājyaṁ. Kāmayeta vai Rājā Samrād bhavatīm avarain hi rājyaṁ paraṁ Sāmrājyaṁ. Na

¹ VIII. 17.
² B. K. Sarkar's Translation, p. 21: Kautūha (VIII. 2), however, takes Vairājya to mean a system of government which comes into existence by forcible seizure of a country from the legitimate ruler for purposes of exploitation.
³ XII. 43. 11; cf. 68. 54.
⁴ Ait. Br. vii. 23. The existence of Gānas and of Gana-jyesthas are hinted at Rig. V. I. 29; II. 23; I. X. 34. 12; 112. 9; Sat. Br. XIII 2. 8. 4. etc.
⁵ V. I. 12-13: cf. Kātyāyana Saūta Sūtra, XV. 1. 1. 2
Samrāt kāmayeta Rājā bhavitum avarāṁ hi rājyaṁ paraṁ Sāmrājyaṁ.

"By offering the Rājasūya he becomes Rājā and by the Vājapeya he becomes Samrāj, and the office of Rājan is the lower and that of Samrāj, the higher; a Rājan might indeed wish to become Samrāj, for the office of Rājan is the lower and that of Samrāj the higher; but the Samrāj would not wish to become a Rājā for the office of Rājan is the lower, and that of Samrāj the higher."

In the Rig-Veda, and later on in the Purānas, Bhoja appears as a proper name. But the Brāhmaṇas regard it as a royal designation, applicable to the consecrated monarchs of the southern region. The word Caesar furnishes a parallel. Originally the name of a Roman dictator and of members of his family, it is used, in later ages, as a title by Roman and German Emperors. As to Svārājya it is sometimes taken to mean uncontrolled dominion, and is opposed to Rājya.

The king was usually, though not always, a Kshatriya. The Brāhmaṇas were considered to be unsuited for kingship. Thus we read in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa—"To the king (Rājan) doubtless belongs the Rājasūya: for by offering the Rājasūya he becomes king, and unsuited for kingship is the Brāhmaṇa."

Rājña eva rājasūyam. Rājā vai rājasūyeneshṭvā bha-vati na vai Brāhmaṇo rājyāyālam avarāṁ vai rājasūyam paraṁ Vājapeyam.

A Brāhmaṇa king is, however, contemplated in a passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. We have references

---

1 III. 53. 7.
2 'Bhoja' may have reference to the king or chieftain as ruler, protector or devourer of his people (tisāmati). It appears as an official designation in several inscriptions of Southern India (Ind. Ani. 1876, 177; 1877, 25-28). In Mbh. I, 81. 22, it is applied to a ruler and his family who are deprived of many of the attributes of sovereignty (arājā Bhojasabdam tuvāṁ tatra pṛāpyasi sānvayaḥ).
3 Kāśyapa Saṁhitā, XIV. 5; Maitrāyaṇi Saṁhitā, I, 11, 5, etc., Vedic Index, II. 221.
4 V. 1. 12; SBE, XL; Eggeling, Sat. Br., Part III, p. 4.
5 VIII. 23 (story of Atyārī's offer to Vāishātha Satyahavya).
to Śūdra, Āyogava and even non-Aryan kings in other Vedic texts. King Jānaśruti Paurāyana is branded a Śūdra in the Chāndogya Upanishad. King Marutta Āvikshita is styled “Āyogava” in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Āyogava denotes, in legal codes, a member of a mixed caste, a descendant of a Śūdra by a Vaiśya wife. Nishāda sthāpati (kings or chieftains) figure in a Śravāṇa śūtra and the Rāmāyaṇa. In the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa it is stated that even an anārya “obtains,” prāhnoti, kings. This points either to non-Aryan kings or to the admission of anāryas into the dominions of Aryan rulers. The Jātakas and the Great Epic refer to kings of various castes including Brāhmaṇas.

Kingship was sometimes hereditary, as is indeed shown by several cases where the descent can be traced. Mention may be made in this connection of the Pārikshitas and the kings of Janaka’s line: hereditary kingship is also suggested by the expression Daśapurushāmrāja—a kingdom of ten generations—occurring in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. But elective monarchy was not unknown. The selection was made sometimes by the people and occasionally by the ministers. The choice was ordinarily limited to the members of the royal family only, as is

---

1 IV 2. 1-5. Apparently Śūdra kings were not unknown in the age
2 XIII. 5. 4. 6.
3 Manu-Saṃhitā, X. 12.
5 Cf. Jātaka, 73. 452. Mbh., i. 100. 49f. 198. 70.
6 XII. 9. 3. 1-3; cf. also the reference to the birth of an heir to the throne (Ait. Br. VIII. 9) and to the king as Rājapati, VIII. 17.
7 Reference may be made in this connection to the passages of the Asotvya Brāhmaṇa (e.g., VIII. 12) describing the choice and consecration of divine rulers (Ghoshal, A History of Hindu Political Theories, 1927, p. 26) and notices of royal election in post-Vedic texts looking back to an early period. For instance, Mbh., I. 94. 49—rajas tu saḥ prajāh sarvā dharmajñā iti vapi etc. The expression king-maker (rāja-kartṛ, Ait. Br., VIII. 17; Sat. Br., III. 4. 1. 7) points to the important part played by officials including headmen of villages in the choice of the ruler. Both in the Vedic texts (Ait. Br., VIII. 12) and the epic emphasis is laid on the possession of moral qualities. The leader on whom the choice falls is aṣṭiḥṣa, balishṭa, sahishṭa, sattamaḥ, pāraishnantama, dharmajñā. In the fourth century B. C. physical beauty carried the palm in one territory (Kathaia in the Punjab according to Onesikritos).
shown by the legend in Yāska of the Kuru brothers Devāpi and Saṁtanu, and the story in the Saṁvara Jātaka of the Kāśi princes Uposatha and Saṁvara. In the Jātaka the councillors ask a reigning king, "When you are dead, my lord, to whom shall we give the white umbrella?" "Friends," said the monarch, "all my sons have a right to the white umbrella. But you may give it to him that pleases your mind."

At times the popular choice fell on persons who did not belong to the ruling dynasty. Such may have been the case when the Śrīnāyās expelled their hereditary ruler together with the Sthapati. Clear instances of popular preference for individuals outside the royal family are furnished by the Jātakas. The Pādañjali Jātaka, for instance, tells us that when a certain king of Benares died, his son, Pādañjali by name, an idle lazy loafer, was set aside, and the minister in charge of things spiritual and temporal was raised to the throne. The Sachchāṁkira Jātaka, relates a story how nobles, Brāhmaṇas and all classes slew their king and anointed a private citizen. Sometimes the candidate comes from a place outside the realm. The Darśāmukhā and Sonaka Jātakas tell us how on failure of heir at Benares a prince of Magadha was elected king.

The monarch during the Brāhaṇa period was usually allowed to have four queens, viz., the Mahishā, the Pārvṛtī, the Vāvālā and the Pālāgālī. The Mahishā, was the chief wife, being the first one married according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Pārvṛtī was the neglected or discarded wife, probably one that had no son. The Vāvālā is the favourite, while the Pālāgālī was the daughter

---

1 Nirukta, II 10; Ved. Ind., II, 211.
2 No. 452.
3 śat Br., XI. 9. 3. 1 ff.
4 No. 247.
5 No. 73.
6 No. 378; cf. No. 401.
7 No. 539.
8 VI. 5. 3. 1. Ved. Ind., I. 478.
of the last of the court officials.\footnote{1} The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,\footnote{2} however, refers to the "hundred" wives of king Harīśchandra. In the Jātaka period several kings kept a bigger harem. We are told in the Kusa Jātaka\footnote{3} that king Okkako (Ikshvakū) had sixteen thousand ladies in his harem among whom Sīlavaṭī was the chief (aggamahishī). The king of Benares according to the Dasaratha Jātaka,\footnote{4} had the same number of wives. In the Suruchi Jātaka,\footnote{5} a king of Mithilā says, "Ours is a great kingdom, the city of Mithilā covers seven leagues, the measure of the whole kingdom is 300 leagues. Such a king should have sixteen thousand women at the least." Sixteen thousand appears to have been a stock phrase. The number is evidently exaggerated. But it indicates that the kings of the Jātaka period were extreme polygamists who frequently exceeded the Brāhmaṇic number of four or even a hundred queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession or election with an elaborate \textit{ritual} which is described in several Brāhmaṇas, and for which the appropriate formulas (\textit{mantras}) are given in the Vedic Saṁhitās. Those who aided in the consecration of the king were called Rājakartṛi or Rājakrit, \textit{i.e.}, "king-maker." In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\footnote{6} the persons meant and specified are the Sūta (minstrel, chronicler or charioteer), and the Grāmanī, leader of the host or of the village.\footnote{7} Prof. Rādhākumud Mookerji observes:\footnote{8} "It is apparent from the lists of persons aiding in the royal coronation that both official and non-official or popular elements were represented in the function." The principal ceremonies or \textit{sacrifices of royal inauguration}\footnote{9}...
were the Vājapeya, the Rājasūya, the Punar-abhisheka and the Aindra Mahābhisheska.

The Vājapeya (lit. "the drink of strength") bestowed on the performer a superior kind of kingship called "Sāmrājya," while the Rājasūya or royal inauguration merely conferred the ordinary monarchical dignity. The Punar-abhisheka, or renewed consecration, made the king elect eligible for all sorts of royal dignity, viz., Rājya, Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārājya, Vairājya, Pārameshṭhyā, Māhārājya, Ādhipatyā, Svāvaśya and Atishṭhatva. The object of the Aindra Mahābhisheska (the great anointing of the king of the celestials) is thus described:

"Sa ya ichchhed evaṁhit Kshatriyaṁ ayām sarvā jītir- 
jayetāyaṁ sarvāṁlokaṁ vindetāyaṁ sarveshāṁ Rājñām 
Śrāśṭhyāṁ, Atishṭhāṁ, Paramatāṁ, gachchheta, 
Sāmrājyaṁ, Bhaujyaṁ, Svārājyaṁ, Vairājyaṁ, Pārameshṭhyāṁ. 
Rājyaṁ, Māhārājyaṁ Ādhipatyāṁ, ayām samanta-paryāyī 
śyāt Śrāvabhaunaḥ sārasyusha āntād ā parārdhāḥ prithiv- 
vyai samudrāpyantāya Ekarāt iti tametena Aindreṇa 
Mahābhisheskeṇa kshatriyaṁ sāpayitāḥ bhāshiñcet."

"If he who knows thus should desire of a kshatriya, 
'May he win all victories, find all the worlds, attain the 
superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all kings 
and overlordship, paramount rule, self-rule, sovereignty, 
supreme authority, kingship, great kingship and suzerainty, 
may he be all-encompassing, possessed of all the earth, 
possessed of all life, from the one end up to the further 
side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler; he 
should anoint him with the great anointing of Indra, after 
adjuring him".1

1 Rājya, cf. Sat. Br., V. 1. 1, 12-13; some texts while agreeing that the 
Vājapeya is a Samrāt ava says that the Rājasūya is a Varuṇa-sava, consecrated 
to the universal sway wielded by Varuṇa. Tait. Saṁh. (V. 6. 2. 1) and Br. 
(II. 7. 6. 1); Sat. Br., V. 4. 3. 2; Keith, The Religion and Philosophy of the 
Veda and Upanishads, 340; Mahābhārata, Bk. II. 12. 11-13, etc.

2 Ait. Br., VIII. 6. For the meaning of these terms see Keith's translation 
quoted below. Keith's rendering of some of the expressions, e.g., Bhaujya 
and Vairājya, is, however, hardly satisfactory.

3 Ait. Br., VIII. 15.

4 Keith, HIS, Vol. 25.
The Vajapeya rites\(^1\) include a race of 17 chariots, in
which the sacrificer is allowed to carry off the palm, and
from which, according to Eggeling, the ceremony perhaps
derives its name. Professor Hillebrandt would claim for
this feature of the sacrifice the character of a relic of an
old national festival, a kind of Indian Olympic games.
After the chariot race the next interesting item is the
mounting of a pole, having a wheaten ring or wheel\(^2\) on
the top, by the sacrificer and his wife, from which homage
is made to the mother earth. The Satapatha Brähmana
says, "Truly he who gains a seat in the air gains a seat
above others."\(^3\) The royal sacrificer having descended
from the pole, is offered a throne-seat with a goatskin
spread thereon and addressed by the Adhvaryu (priest) in
the following words: "Thou art the ruler, the ruling
lord (yantṛi, yamana)—thou art firm and steadfast (dhruva,
dharuna)—(here I seat) thee for the tilling, for peaceful
dwelling (ksīma), for wealth (rayi), for prosperity (posha),
i.e., for the welfare of the people, the common weal."

The Rājasūya consisted of a long succession of sacrificial
performances which began on the first day of
Phālguna and spread over a period of upwards of two
years.\(^4\) The rite is described at great length in the
Satapatha Brähmana.\(^5\) Besides much mere priestly elab-
oration, the ritual contains traces of popular ceremonial.
The popular features are chiefly these:—

(1) The Ratninaṁ havīṅshi\(^7\) or presents to the divin-
ities of the bejewelled ones (or those possessed of the
jewel offering), viz., the chief queen and court officials;

\(^1\) Sat. Br., V. 1. 1. 5 ff; S.B.E., xli; Vedic Index, II. 281; Keith, Black-
yajus, cviil-cxii; RPVU, 396.

\(^2\) Gaudhūmaṁ cha shālam, "a wheaten headpiece (Eggeling)" "a wheel-
shade garland of meal" (S. B. E., xli. 31; Keith, RPVU, 399; Sat. Br.,
V. 2. 1. 6).

\(^3\) Sat. Br., V. 2. 1. 22.

\(^4\) Sat. Br., V. 2. 1. 25; The Fundamental Unity of India, p. 80.

\(^5\) Keith, Black Yajus, pp. cxi-cxiii, RPVU, 341; Vedic Index, II. 219;
SBE., xli. p. xxvi.

\(^6\) V. 2. 3. 9. (et seq.) S.B.E., xli, 42-113.

\(^7\) Sat. Br., V. 3. 1. M. Louis Renou says—"les offrandes ne sont pas faites
aux ratnin mais aux divinités dans les maisons de chaque ratnin."
(2) The *Abhishecanīya* or besprinkling ceremony;
(3) The *dig vyāsthāpanā* or the king's symbolical walking towards the various quarters as an indication of his universal rule;
(4) Treading upon a tiger skin,* thus gaining the strength and the pre-eminence of the tiger;
(5) Narration by the *hotṛ* priest of the story (*akhyāna*) of Śunahṣeṣa.*
(6) A mimic cow raid against a relative*; or a sham fight with a member of the ruling aristocracy (*rājanya*).*
(7) Enthronement;*
(8) A game of dice in which the king is made to be the victor.*

The recipients of the sacrificial honours called "Ratnīnāṁ havīmishī" were the divinities in the houses of the *

**Ratnins, i.e.,** of the chief members of the royal household and of the king's civil and military service, viz.—

1. The *Senāṇī* (Commander of the army).*
2. The *Purohita* (Royal Chaplain).
3. The *Mahishī* (Chief Queen).
4. The *Śūta* (Charioteer and Bard).*
5. The *Grāmanī* (Leader of the Host or Village Headman).*

6. The *Kshattṛi* (Chamberlain)—forerunner of the Antarvāṁśika or Superintendent of the Seraglio of later times.*

---

1 Sat. Br., V. 3. 34.
2 Sat. Br., V. 4. 1. 3; Keith, *Black Yajus*, op. cit.
3 Sat. Br., V. 4. 1. 11.
5 RPVU, 342; cf. Sat. Br., V. 4. 3. 3 et seq.
6 Cf. Taitiriya Sanhitā, 1. 8. 15 with commentary: *Vedic Index*, II. 219
7 SBE, xli, 100, n. 1.
8 Sat. Br., V. 4. 4. 1.
11 The importance of this office is shown by the cases of Sumantra and of Sañjaya who is called a *Mahāmātra* (*Mbh. XV. 16. 4*).
12 Cf. the *Adhikritas* appointed for grāmas or villages by the paramount ruler (*Samrāṭ*) mentioned in the *Praśna Upanishad* (III. 4).
13 Vidura was the *Kshattṛi* (*Mbh.*, I. 300, 17; II. 66. 1, etc.) at the Kura Court. For the views of different commentators see *Vedic Index*, I. 201.
7. The \textit{Saṁgrahītṛi} (Treasurer)—forerunner of the \textit{Sannidhāṭṛi} of the \textit{Arthaśāstra}.

8. The \textit{Bhāgadūgha} (Collector of the Royal Share, \textit{i.e.}, Taxes)—forerunner of the \textit{Samāhārtṛi}.

9. The \textit{Akṣhāvāpa} (Keeper of the Dice).\footnote{Cf. the position of Kaṅka (Yudhīśhṭhira) at the Matsya Court.}

10. The \textit{Go-vikartana} (lit. Cutter-up of Cattle, \textit{i.e.}, the King’s Companion in the Chase).

11. The \textit{Pāḷāgala} (Courier)—forerunner of the \textit{Dūta} (Śāsanahara, etc.).\footnote{Curiously enough, this list of \textit{ratnīnas} does not include the \textit{sthapati}, probably a local ruler, vassal chief, or governor who is, however, mentioned in \textit{Sat. Br.}, V. 4. 4. 17, in connection with the concluding ceremonies of the \textit{rājasūya}. The sacrificial sword (\textit{sṛṣṭa}) given by the priest to the king is passed on successively to the king’s brother, the \textit{sūtra} or the \textit{sthapati}, the grāmaṇi and finally to a tribesman (sajāta). The post of \textit{sthapati} was held by \textit{Upairhas} or governors of \textit{Bhuktis} (provinces) in the Gupta period (Fleet, CII, p. 120). Slightly different lists of \textit{ratnīnis} are found in the \textit{Tattvārthīsa} texts. A group of eight \textit{vāras} finds mention in the \textit{Pañcarahita Brāhmaṇa} (Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 151). In \textit{Sat. Br.}, XIII. 5. 4. 6. we have reference to the \textit{Pariśeshṭṛi}, the \textit{Ksatṛti} and the \textit{Sabhāsads} in connection with a performance of the horse-sacrifice.}

The most essential part of the \textit{Rājasūya} was the \textbf{Abhisheka} or besprinkling. It began with offerings to the deities Savitā Satyaprasava, Agni Gṛihapati, Soma Vanaspati, Bṛihaspati Vāk, Indra Jyeshṭha, Rudra Paśupati, Mitra Satya and Varuna Dharmaṇapati. The consecration water (\textit{Abhishechārtṛi Āpaḥ}) was made up of seventeen kinds of liquid including the water from the river Sarasvatī, sea-water, and water from a whirlpool, a pond, a well and dew. The sprinkling was performed by a Brāhmaṇa priest, kinsman or brother of the king-elect, a friendly Rājanaya and a Vaiśya.

The two most important kinds of \textit{Abhisheka} were the \textit{Punar-abhisheka} and the \textit{Aindra Mahābhishēka}.

The \textbf{Punar-abhisheka} or Renewed Anointment is described in the \textit{Aitareya Brāhmaṇa}.\footnote{VIII. 5.11.} It was intended for Kshatriya conquering monarchs. The first interesting part of the ceremony was the king’s ascent to the throne or \textit{Āsandī} which was made of \textit{udumbara} wood with the
exception of the interwoven part (vivayana) which consisted of muñja grass. Then came the besprinkling. Among other things the priest said: "Do thou become here the overking of kings; the great of the great people, the supreme ruler of the people (or the peasantry).""7 Rājāṁ tvam Adhirāja bhaveha; Mahāntam tvā mahāṁ Samrā-jaṁ charshanānām." The king was next required to get down from the throne and make obeisance to the holy power (Brahman); "Brahmaṇa eva tat Kshatraṁ vaśam eti tad yatra vai Brahmaṇah Kshatraṁ vaśam eti tad rāṣṭraṁ samṛiddham tad viṇavandāhāśmin viṁo jāyate," "verily thus the lordly power (Kshatra) falls under the influence of the holy power (Brahman). When the lordly power falls under the influence of the holy power, that kingdom is prosperous, rich in heroes; in it a hero or heir (vīra) is born." Here there is provision for the prevention of royal absolutism.

Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, was evidently consecrated with the Punar-abhisheka.5

The Aindra Mahābhhisheka 6 or Indra's great unction consisted of five important ceremonies. In the first place, an Oath is administered by the priest to the king-elect: "From the night of thy birth to that of thy death for the space between these two, thy sacrifice and thy gifts, thy place, thy good deeds, thy life and thine offspring let me take, if thou play me false."" Next follows the Ārohaṇa or enthronement. When the king is seated on the throne we have the Utkrośanā or proclamation. The king-makers should say "The Kshatriya, if not proclaimed, cannot show

1 Keith, HOS 25 (slightly emended).
4 Keith.
5 Ait. Br., VIII. 11. A second coronation of the Ceylonese king Devānām- piya Tissa is referred to by the chronicles (Geiger’s trans. of the Mahāavata, pp. xxxii).
7 Keith, Ait. Br., VIII. 15.
8 Ait. Br., VIII. 17.
his strength, let us proclaim him.” “Be it so” (the people reply). Him the king-makers proclaim saying:

“Him do ye proclaim, O men (janāḥ) as king and father of kings . . . The sovereign lord of all beings (Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati) hath been born, the eater of the folk (Viśamattā) hath been born, the destroyer of enemies (Amitrāṇāṁ hantā) hath been born, the protector of the Brāhmaṇas (Brāhmaṇānāṁ goptā) hath been born, the guardian of the law (Dharmasya goptā) hath been born."

Here we have the important attributes of kingship. In the words Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati (supreme lord of all beings) we have a reference to the king’s sovereignty and imperium. The expression Viśamattā, devourer of the folk, alludes to his power of taxation. As Amitrāṇāṁ hantā he exercises supreme command to weed out enemies. The epithet Brāhmaṇānāṁ goptā gives expression to his special relations with the hierarchy, while the style Dharmasya goptā points to his duties in connection with the preservation of the laws and their proper administration for the promotion of the common weal (yoga-kshema).

When the king has been proclaimed there is an address with the formula, abhimatrāṇa.1

. Varuṇa the Wise One
Hath set him down, preserving order.
. . . . . . . for kingship . . . . . .

Then comes the anointment (abhishechna).

The following kings are said to have been consecrated with the Aindra Mahābhisheka; Janamejaya Pārikshita, Śāryāta Mānava, Satānīka Sātrājita, Āmbāṣṭhya, Yudhāmśraushṭi Augrasainya, Viśvakarmā Bhauvāna, Sudās Paijavana, Marutta Āvikshita, Aṅga Vairochana and Bharata Daunshyanti.2 The first mentioned king, and probably the third, fourth, fifth and ninth also, belonged to the post-Parikshit period.3 Durmukha Pāṇchāla and Atyarāti

1 Ibid., VIII. 18.
2 Ibid., VIII. 21-25.
3 Satānīka defeated Dhṛtarāṣṭra of Kāsi who, according to the Mahāgovinda Suttanta was a contemporary of Sattabhu of Kaliṅga and of Brahma
Jānantapi were informed of the efficacy of the rite. The first made good use of the advice. But the latter who neglected his priest, and wanted to conquer the Uttara-Kurus, whom “no mortal man could vanquish,” perished at the hands of a king of the Śibis.

Closely connected with the Ainda maḥābhisheka was another important ceremonial called the Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice. All the kings who were, according to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, actually consecrated with Indra’s great function are represented as “going round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offering the horse in sacrifice” (samanantar sarvataḥ prthivīṁ jayan pariśyāśvena cha medhyeneje). To the list of kings and princes who performed the famous rite the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa adds the names of the Pārīkṣitas (or Pārīkṣitīyas) Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena; the Kosalan king (Kausalyarāja) Para Āṭṭāra Hairanyaṇābha; the Aikshvāka king Purukṛtsa Daurgaha; the Pāṇḍala kings Kṛṣṇa, the superman of the Krivis (Krīvīṇam atipurusha) and Śona Sātrāśāha; the Matsya king Dvāsana Dvaitavana, and the Śvīkna king Rishabha Yājñātura. The Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra says that a paramount king (Sārvabhauma Rājā) may perform the Aśvamedha. The Aśva or steed for a year

datta of Assaka. As the Deccan kingdoms are not referred to in pre-Pārīkhita works, it is probable that Śātanika and his contemporaries flourished after Pārīkṣita. Ambāṅghya and Yudhiṁśraushti were contemporaries of Parvata and Nārada who were very near in time to Nagnajit, the contemporary of Nimi, probably the penultimate king of Videha. Aṅga was probably the immediate predecessor of Dadhīvāhana who, according to Jaina evidence, flourished in the 1st century B.C.

1 XIII. 5. 4. 1-23.
2 XX. 1. 1. Variant readings (e.g. apyasārvabaumah) of the relevant text seem hardly acceptable; cf. Baudh. XV. 1. Even as late as the time of Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.) the Aśvamedha was looked upon as “the super-eminent touchstone to test the might of warriors conquering the world and an indication of the conquest of all the warriors”—Aśvamedha iti viṣva-vijayaṁ Kṣatriyaṁāṁ jayasyavah sarva-kṣatriyaṁ-pañjabhaṁ mahānuktharsha-nishkasam (Uttara-Rāma-charitām, Act IV, translated by Vināyak Sadāśiv Patwardhan). The sacrifice seems also to have been performed in early times to atone for sinful work. There was also a Viṣṇuite adaptation of the famous rite—no animals being killed on the occasion, and the obligations prepared in accordance with the precepts of the Āranyakas. Reference may be made to the story of Uparichara Vasu in the Sāhitaparva of the Mahābhārata,
roamed under guardianship of a hundred princes, and a
hundred nobles, a hundred sons of heralds (or charioteers)
and village headmen, a hundred sons of warriors and treasurers\(^1\) (chamberlains?) equipped with various kinds
of defensive and offensive weapons. If the year were
successfully passed the steed was sacrificed. The features
of the rite included panegyrics of the sacrificer along with
righteous kings of yore by lute-players including a Rājanya
who sings to the lute three songs made by himself, “such
war he waged, such battle he won.” There is also a “circle
of tales,” Pārīplava Ākhyāna\(^2\) which lasts by series of ten
days for the whole year.

The kingship disclosed in Brāhmaṇic songs and ritual
is not merely a “Patriarchal Presidency.” The monarch
is not merely a chief noble, the first among equals, ‘President
of a Council of Peers.’ In a famous Atharvanic laud
the rājā of the Kurus, is extolled as a deva who surpassed
mere mortals (martyas). The consecrated king is the lord
of all beings. He is called “viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati,”
and is further described as the devourer of the people—
viśāmattā.\(^3\) “Rājā ta ekam mukham tena mukhena
viśo’tsi.”\(^4\) He is surrounded by armed kinsmen and re-
tainers.\(^5\) He can “banish a Brāhmaṇa at will, mulct and
overpower a Vaiṣya at will, and exact labour from or slay
a Śūdra at will.”\(^6\) Further he claims the power of giving
his kingdom away to anybody he liked. In the Briha-

---

Ch. 385-339 (Raychaudhuri, EHI'S., 2nd ed., 192). Regarding the significance
of the Āsvamedha see also D. C. Sircar’s note in Indian Culture, I. pp. 311 ff;
II. 78ff.

\(^1\) Sat. Br. XIII. 4. 2. 5. tasyaite purastād rakshitāra upāklipta bhavanti.
Rājaputraḥ kavachinaḥ satam rājanyā nishangaḥ satain sūta-rāmānyayān
putra ighuparshinaḥ satain Kshatra Saṅgahaṇīraṁ putra daṇḍinaḥ satam-
śvastaram nirāśataṁ niramaṇam yasvin menāmaḥ uṣyati vrahanti.

\(^2\) S. B. E. xlv. pp. 298ff; Pārīplava Ākhyāna in Sat. Br. XIII. 4. 3. 9;
Keith, Black Yajus, pp. cxxii f; RPVU, 343 ff; Hopkins, GEI 965. 386.

\(^3\) Ait. Br., VIII. 17.

\(^4\) Kaush. Utp., II. 6.

\(^5\) Ait. Br. iii. 48. “Sixty-four armed warriors assuredly were his (a Kuru’s)
sons and grandsons.” When a Paṇḍava king makes an offering there arise
“Six thousand and three and thirty warriors clad in mail.” Sat. Br. XIII
5. 4. 16; cf. 4. 2. 5.

\(^6\) Ait. Br. vii. 29.
**dārapyaka Upanishad** Janaka says to Yājñavalkya, "So'ham Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi māñchāpi saha dāsyayeti."

The king, however, was **not an absolute despot** in practice. His power was checked, in the first place, by the Brāhmaṇas. We have seen that the most powerful sove-reigns, even those who were consecrated with the Punarabhisheka, had to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the 'holy power' (Brahman) that was the repository of culture and education in those days. We learn from the **Attareya Brāhmaṇa,** and the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra that even a powerful king like Janamejaya was humbled by the Brāhmaṇas. Karāla Janaka met his doom for a crime against a Brāhmaṇa maiden. The Vṛishṇis perished on account of their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas. This shows that not only kings, but republican corporations (Saṅgha), too, had to cultivate friendly relations with the Brāhmaṇas.

The second check was supplied by the ministers individually or in council, and village headmen who aided in the consecration of the king and whom the king consulted on important occasions. In the Vedic texts the Sūta and the Grāmaṇī are styled Rājakartṛ or Rājakṛit, i.e., **Kingmaker, "Rājakṛitah Sūta-Grāmanaḥ."** The very title indicates their importance in the body politic. They, as well as the other Ratnins, figure prominently in the sacrifice of royal inauguration.

The existence of a Royal Council (Sabhā) is clearly suggested by references to sabhāsāds in Vedic texts, particularly in connection with king Marutta Āvikshita. In the Rāmāyaṇa the sabhā is clearly a body in which the Rājakartṛs have a place along with the amāṭyas and the

---

2. VII. 27.
5. *Sat. Br.*, III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18; In *Rām.* II. 67. 2. 79. 1. The king-makers are dvaṭṭayāh.
7. II. 67. 2. 4.
Rājapurohita (royal chaplain). The claim of the ministers and headmen to be consulted is recognised in Pāli texts while dealing with the period down to the time of Bimbisāra. The Mahāvagga says, “King Brahmadatta of Kāsi, O Bhikkhus, having entered Benares, convoked his ministers and counsellors (Amaçce Pārisajje sannipātā petvā) and said to them: ‘If you should see, my good sirs, young Dīghāvu, the son of king Dīghīti of Kosala, what would you do to him?’ The Mahā Assāroha Jātaka2 refers to a king who by beat of drum through the city gathered together his counsellors (amachcha, amātya). The Chullasuta Sulasoma Jātaka refers to the eighty thousand counsellors of a king headed by his general,3 (Senāpati-pamukhānī asitī amachcha-sahassānī). The power of counsellors (amātyas) to depose a prince and elect a king is recognised in the Pādaṇjali, Sanivara, and Sonaka Jātakas respectively. There is evidence regarding special gems of village headmen. We are told that “when Seniya Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, was holding an assembly of the eighty thousand Grāmikas (Village headmen) he sent message to Soṇa Kolivisa.”4

Another check was supplied by the general body of the people (Jana. Mahājana) who were distinct from the ministers and Grāmāquīs, or Grāmikas, and who used to meet in an assembly styled Samiti or Parishad in the Upanishads.5 In the Utkroṣana passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa6 the people (Janāḥ) are clearly distinguished from the Rājakartārāḥ among whom, according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa7 were included the Sūta and the

---

2 No. 902.
3 Cowell’s Jātaka, V, p. 97 (No. 58); eighty thousand is a stock number and should not be taken too literally.
5 In the Jaim. Up. Br. II. 11. 4. we find a reference to the Parishad, the Sabhā and the Sarhsad. It is not clear, if these are distinct institutions. The sabhā and the samiti are, however, distinguished in the Atharva-Veda.
7 III, 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18.
Grāmanī. That the Samiti or Parishad was an assembly of the whole people, is apparent from such expressions as "bhūyishṭhāḥ Kuru-Paṁchālāsāgataḥ bhavitāraḥ . . ."; "Paṁchālānāṁ Samitim eyāya", "Paṁchālānāṁ Parishadam ājagāma," "samagga Śivayo hutvā". The Chhāndogya Upanishad mentions the Samiti of the Paṁchāla people presided over by king Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, Śvetaketurh Ārunevāḥ Paṁchālānāṁ Samitim eyāya; tam ha Pravāhaṇo Jaivalir uvācha." The Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad uses the term Parishad instead of Samiti, "Śvetaketur ha vā Ārunevāḥ Paṁchālānāṁ Parishadam-ājagāma." The analogy of the Lichchhāvi Parishā and of similar assemblies mentioned in Buddhist works shows that the functions of the Kuru and Paṁchāla Parishads were not necessarily confined to philosophical discussions only. The Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa refers to disputations (samvāda) and witnesses (upadrashti) in connection with popular assemblies, and informs us that the procedure among the Kurus and the Paṁchālas was different from that of Śūdras. The people took part in the ceremony of royal inauguration. The Dummedha Jātaka refers to a joint assembly of ministers, Brāhmaṇas, the gentry, and the other orders of the people.

That the people actually put a curb on royal absolutism is proved by the testimony of the Atharva-Veda where it is stated that concord between king and assembly was essential for the former's prosperity. We have evidence that the people sometimes expelled and even executed their

---

2 "Most of the Kuru-Paṁchālas shall be assembled together." Jaim. Up ur. III. 7. 6.
3 V. 3. 1.
4 VI. 2. 1.
5 III. 7. 6.
6 Ait. Br., VIII. 17.
7 No. 50; cf. Vessantarā Jātaka (No. 547), Vol. VI, pp. 490 ff. The whole Śivi people assembled to discuss a matter of public importance, to give advice to the king and to inflict punishment on a prince.
8 VI. 88. 3.
princes together with unpopular officials. Thus it is stated in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*¹: "Now Dushṣṭaritva Pauṁṣāyana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come to him through ten generations, and the Śṛiṇjayas also expelled Revottaras Pāṭava Chākra Sthapati."² The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*³ refers to personages who were expelled from their kingdoms (*rāṣṭras*) and who were anxious to recover them with the help of the Kshatriya consecrated with the *Punarabhisheka*. Such persons were the Indian counterparts of the French "emigrants" who sought to reclaim revolutionary France with the help of the troops of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns.¹ We learn from the *Vessantara Jātaka*⁴ that the king of the Śvis (Śiśis) was compelled to banish prince Vessantara in obedience to "the people's sentence" (*Śivīnaṁ vachanaṁthena samhā raṭṭhā nirajjati*).

The king was told:

"Sache tvam na karissasi Śivīnaṁ vachanaṁ idam maṁ ne taṁ saha puttena Sūvhitthe karissare ti"

The bidding of the Śivi folk if you refuse to do
The people then will act, methinks, against your son and you.

The king replied:

"Eso che Śivīnaṁ chhando chhandavi na paṇudāmase"

Behold the people's will, and I that will do not gainsay.

The *Padakusalamānaṇa Jātaka*⁵ tells a story how the town and the countryfolk of a kingdom assembled (*jānapadā negamā cha samāgatā*), beat the king and priest to death as they became a source, not of weal, but of woe (lit. fear, *yato khamam tato bhayaṁ*), and anointed a good man as king. A similar story is told in the *Sachchaṁkira Jātaka*. We are told in the *Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka*⁶ that

---

¹ XII. 9. 3. 1 et seq.; Eggeling, V. 269.
² For the designation "Sthapati" see ante, p. 157.
³ VIII. 10.
⁵ No. 547; Text VI. 490-502. The Śiśis are known to *Ait. Br.* viii. 23.
⁶ No. 432.
⁷ No. 73.
⁸ No. 542.
the people of one kingdom killed the minister, deposed
the king, made him an outcaste and anointed a prince
as king. The ex-king was not allowed to enter into
the capital city. Fick\(^1\) points out that in the Telapatta
Jātaka a king of Takshaśilā says that he has no power
over the subjects of his kingdom. This is in striking
contrast with the utterance of Janaka quoted above.\(^2\)
Evidently the Royal power had declined appreciably,
at least in some of the north-western Janapadas, since the
days of Janaka.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) The Social Organisation in North-East India, trans. by Dr. S. K. Maitra,
pp. 113-114. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar follows him in Carmichael Lectures,
1918, 131f.

\(^2\) P. 172, “Bhagavate Vidchān dadāmi”.

\(^3\) Note the references to elected kings (e.g. amongst the Kathaioi) and auto-
nomous folks by the historians of Alexander in the fourth century B.C. The
Ambashṭhas had a strong monarchy in the Brāhmaṇa period (Ait. Br. viii. 21).
In the days of Alexander (Inv. Alex. 253) the constitution was democratic.