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TREATISE ON THE

...
PREFACE.

For about the last ten years I have been thinking whether a systematic enquiry into the chronology of Vedic India with glimpses into her political history can be carried on on scientific lines with the wealth of materials interspersed in her vast ancient literature. I saw with extreme regret that workers in this field were few, whether in India or abroad, although it is well-known that the last generation of scholars in Europe have contributed something substantial though somewhat in their own way. I also perceived that text-books on the history of India practically begin with the age of Gautama Buddha, although a civilization coming almost from a hoary antiquity, and not less important in cultural value, lies at its back. I welcomed with joy the interesting enquiries into the maritime activity, the corporate life, the council government &c. of ancient Indians, but cannot help pronouncing that most of these enquiries are of the static type, very few having taken up a dynamic work relating to ancient India, although many realize that undated history is no history at all. These are the thoughts that impelled me to utilize my leisure hours for a systematic study of the chronology of Vedic, Brahmanic and Buddhist India.

Realizing the importance of the subject, I studied the Rgveda and found that most of the kings and Rśis mentioned there, are also mentioned in the Purāṇas, the Mahābhārata, the Rāmaṇyaṇa, the Brāhmaṇas, the Āraṇyakas, the Upaniṣats, the Śrauta Sūtras &c. It became at once clear to me that the Puranic genealogies were originally intended for describing the various dynasties of kings who parcelled out and ruled India of the Vedic Period and that epics like the Rāmaṇyaṇa and the Mahābhārata have developed round
historical personages belonging to the Vedic Age. I cannot help emphasising this point very strongly for I find that even such a modern man as Dr. Abinash Chandra Das has posited the existence of a Puranic Period which is a misnomer, to say the least of it, and that expressions like 'History of Vedic and Epic India' used by some University men are unhappy for epics were written on Vedic characters.

When I examined carefully the accounts and the dynastic lists preserved in the Purāṇas I perceived some of these lists were incorrect at some places. This inference forced itself on me when I noticed that Puranic evidences were sometimes conflicting. But as there were here and there very valuable synchronisms furnished by them, the positions of kings and Rṣis could be deemed as finally fixed only if they did not run counter to the evidences derivable from the Rgveda and other Vedic works. Accordingly I chose to attack the subject on the ground of ancient Indian genealogies and traditions preserved in the secular works such as the Purāṇas and Epics, checked and confirmed by the very valuable informations and evidences derivable from a study of Vedic literature in general.

Penetrating into the subject, I realized that it was one of the most difficult ones and would tax me my life-long labours in this direction. For this reason I have at present confined myself to the Chronology of the later Rgvedic Period only. By the later Rgvedic Period I mean the period between the age of the famous Rgvedic King Atithigva Divōdāsa and the time of the events of the Mahābhārata.

It is sufficiently well-known that Vyāsa Pārāśarya, the putative father of Pāṇḍu and Dhrṛtarāṣṭra complied and grouped the Vedas. For this reason this island-born (= Dvaipāyana) sage was well-known as Vedavyāsa. I have discovered that the Rgvedic hymns were composed even up to the time when the forest of Khāṇḍavaprastha was burnt down by Arjuna Pāṇḍava. Hence the lower limit
of the Rgvedic Period extends right up to some of the incidents described in the Mahābhārata. Accordingly by the later Rgvedic Period I have understood the period ranging between the time of Divodāsa to that of the events of the Mahābhārata just referred to.

A brief general character of the informations supplied by the Purāṇas is set out here. The Purāṇas profess to give us the ancient history of Aryan India. In doing so they begin from the earliest Rgvedic Period describing genealogies of kings who established kingdoms and principalities and thus parcelled out and ruled ancient India. Occasionally the feats and achievements of kings and Rṣis are related, battles mentioned and described, noticeable incidents and happenings recorded and very valuable synchronisms noted down. In this their business, the Purāṇas sometimes naturally conflict; sometimes the same Purāṇa makes though rarely different statements in different places; very often they corrupt the names of persons; sometimes one dynasty is merged or interwoven into or tacked on to another owing to the corrupt reading that have crept in, the result being a preposterously long line of kings; sometimes collateral successions are described as lineal; sometimes the orders of succession are reversed; sometimes dynasties are lengthened owing to various kinds of corrupt readings, even a synchronism has been found to be misplaced owing to a similarity of names; divergent synchronisms have been recorded. For these reasons, it is of utmost importance to compare the various Puranic accounts, amongst themselves, to correct them in the light of Vedic, Buddhistic and other external evidences, in order that the ancient Indian history may be properly understood.

The evidences derived from the Vedic literature are indeed very strong and generally carry more authority inasmuch as many of them are either directly contemporary records or are traditions derived from contemporary evidences.
This is particularly the case with these of the Ṛgveda. Even the synchronisms mentioned in the Ākhyaṇas or narratives recorded in the Brāhmaṇas and Anukramaṇīs to the Ṛgveda such as the Brhaddevata &c. fit in exactly with the exigencies of the genealogies as adjusted by us and their fairly large number connecting the various dynasties in an admirable way compels the historian to accept their value and their efficiency as sources of historical evidence. But too much reliance on them as is placed by some religiously disposed Indians (calling them revelations), is dangerous. For example, it should be recognised that the Vanśa Brāhmaṇa which is a very late Brāhmaṇa has wrongly placed Rṣyaśṛṅga Kāśyapa above Vibhāṇḍaka Kāśyapa whose son Rṣyaśṛṅga really was. The Śāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa in giving us a list of teachers omits steps between Jaimini and Pauspaṇḍya rightly filled up by the Vāyu which inserts Sumantu, Suvan, and Sukarman between them. Similarly small lists of teachers in the Brāhmaṇas are sometimes to be used with caution. Too much importance as Sankara has said can be attached to nothing but reason. Generally it has been taken for granted that a detailed information from a particular source is an indication of the source being well-informed, for a detailed information is only possible from a well-informed true tradition and hence may be used as a historical matter excepting what is a manufactured tale or a mythology derived from blind popular beliefs.

There have been several stages of compilation of the Purāṇa. The first was that by Vyāsa Pārāśarya from various sources probably of floating literature such as the Gāthās, the statements and songs of Sūtas, Māgadhās, Paurāṇikas, Purāṇajīnas and Purāvīts. &c. The second redaction was that at the beginning of reign of Senajit, the Māgadha king who was 15 steps above the last Bārhadratha king Ripuṇjayya. A long time probably elapsed bet-
ween the second and the third redaction as can be inferred from the Puranic confusion about—the Pradyōta, the Śisu-
nāga, the Bimbisarian, and the Nanda dynasties, both as regards their succession and chronology. It was during this interval that the succession of the first Andhra king to the last Kāṇva king was wrongly recorded. This third redaction incorporated historical matter in prophetic guise. The fourth redaction took place in the Gupta Period, the Vāyu and the Matsya earlier in that Period than the Viṣṇu and the others. The Bhāgavata was much later and drew from the Viṣṇu. The Padma was later than Sankarācārya whom it calls a disguised Buddhist. Evidently at the time of the fourth redaction the several modern Purāṇas as we now possess them sprang into existence owing the existence of several religious sects.

I propose to give here a brief review of the scheme I have followed and the results I have obtained. In Chapter I of my enquiry, I have found that the famous king Atithigva Divodāsa of the Rgveda was no other than Divodāsa, the brother of Ahalyā, of the Purāṇas. In Chapter II I have found out what kings of other dynasties were contemporaries of Divodāsa. The latter were the king Satvānt of the Yadus, the king Vitahavya of the Haihayas, the Paurava king Kṛta whose son Uparicara Vasu occupied the country of Cedi, the king Sārvabhauma or Rkṣa, the son of Viduratha of the line of Hastināpura, the Southern Pāṇcāla king Senajit, Rūmapāda-Daśaratha of the dynasty of Anga Vāleya, the Aikṣvāka king Daśaratha the father of Rāma, the king Siradhvaja of the Janaka dynasty, the Southern Kōśala king Sudāsa, the father of Kalmāṣapāda, the descendant of R güçlü Aikṣvāka.

In Chapter III, I have given a detailed description of the dynasty that sprang from the Yādava king Satvānt. In this connection, I have found that all the Purāṇas excepting the Vāyu and the Matsya are wrong in supposing that the
father of king Purarvasu was Abhijit. From the Vāyu 96, 118-119 I have proved that the Yādava king Bhava surnamed Candanōdakadundubhi instituted an Aśvamedha sacrifice for a son to be born to him, and during the session of the Aśvamedha when Stōtras were being chanted in the Abhijit Atirātra sacrifice of that session, Punarvasu (the son of Bhava-Candnōdakadundubhi) rose from the centre of the Sadas (Sadōmadhyāt). The Vāyu appears to me to have preserved a text faithfully describing the incidents and containing terms technical to sacrificial literature, which in later times were not properly understood, with the result that the other Purāṇas except the Matsya have in some places paraphrased the Vāyu with indifferent variants and wrong interpretations. On this and other grounds I have established the priority of the Vāyu over the other Purāṇas so far as the Vedic Age is concerned. Thus the number of successive lineal descendants of the Yādava king Satvant through Andhaka and Kukura down to Kauṣa Augrasenya has been determined to show that Kauṣa, the uncle of Śrīkrṣṇa, was removed by eleven generations from his ancestor, the king Satvant. And as Satvant was a contemporary of Divōdāsa, the latter was separated by twelve generations from Śrīkrṣṇa and therefore from the events of the Mahābhārata.

In Chapter IV, I have determined the dynasty that sprang from the Haihaya king Vitahavya and have shown that both the Gauḍa and the Kumbakōnam recensions are wrong in their attempt to give us the dynasty. This dynasty has been correctly adjusted with the help of the Aśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtras and tends to show that Divōdāsa was earlier than the events of the Mahābhārata by about 14 generations.

In Chapter V, I have taken up to describe the Māgadha dynasty in detail. In doing this, I have found that the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata are wrong in supposing that the mother of Vedavyāsa was the daughter of Uparicara Vasu,
The error of the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata has been due to the mythological attempt made in later times by the writers of the Mahābhārata to ascribe high connections to Veda-vyāsa on the mother’s side. Thus the Māgadha dynasty as adjusted by me tends to show that Divōdāsa was approximately 13 generations earlier than the Mahābhārata episode.

In Chapter VI, I have described the Hastināpura line Viduratha’s son Sarvabhauma and have shown that the dynasty has been very roughly handled by the Paurāṇikas and that the two Mahābhārata accounts of this dynasty are not satisfactory. This dynasty adjusted by me tends to show that Sārvabhauma who was a contemporary of Divōdāsa was earlier than the events of the Mahābhārata by about 15 generations.

In Chapter VII, I have given a detailed description of the Northern Pāñcālas and have shown that the Purāṇas are all defective and incomplete in this respect and that this dynasty as adjusted by Mr. Parjiter in J. R. A. S. 1910 is likewise unsatisfactory. In this connection, I have pointed that Pijavana, the father of the famous Rgvedic king Sudās is mentioned in the Purāṇas, and nearly correctly in the Vāyu (Pi-Cyavana). I have completed the Northern Pāñcālas from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and thus have proved from sources entirely Vedic that Divōdāsa was earlier by 12 generations that the time of the Mahābhārata episode.

In Chapter VIII, I have described the Southern Pāñcāla line and have shown that the statement in the Harivamśa about the contemporaneity of Brahmadatta and Pratīpa, as well as the statement in all the Purāṇas that Brahmadatta’s father Anūha married Kṛtvi, the daughter of Suka Kārṣṇi are irreconcilable. As both these traditions can be supported by evidences from the Mahābhārata, the situation becomes really difficult to solve. If the former i.e. the Harivamśa account is credited, then Senajit, the contemporary of
Divódása becomes 15 generations earlier than the Mahá-bharata episode, while if the latter account is held as correct the period intervening between Divódása and Dhṛṣṭa-dyumna becomes one of approximately 11 generations.

In Chapter IX, I have examined in detail the dynasty that sprang from the Anga king Rómapáda-Dáśaratha and have shown that all the Puráñas are more or less defective. I have correctly adjusted the dynasty which goes to show that the period between Romapáda and Karná (i. e. the period between Divódása and Dhṛṣṭadyumna) was one of 13 generations.

In Chapter X, I have critically examined the Aikṣváka dynasty in detail from Dáśaratha downwards. The Puráñas are unanimous in stating the names of the successive lineal descendants of Dáśaratha down to Ahínagu. After Ahínagu, the Puráñas diverge and may be classed into two schools, the Váyu school and the Matsya school. I have shown that the Váyu school of Puráñas are wrong in so far as they appear to describe Sala, Dala and Bala as the successive lineal descendants after Páriyátra the son of Ahihagu. I have proved that Sala, Dala and Bala were really brothers and hence the succession here was collateral and not lineal as represented in the Puráñas. After this, I have proved that Bala's son Ukakha lived when Yudhiṣṭhira Pándava performed the Rájasúya sacrifice previous to which Uktha was defeated by Bhíma Pándava. Proceeding downwards with the lineal descendants of Uktha, I have discovered that Hiraṇyanáha Kausalya was the contemporary of Janamejaya Párikśita, the grandson of Abhimanyu Árjuni. Thus I have broken up the Ikṣváku dynasty into two, one of the descendants of Kúśa, the other of the descendants of Lava, and have proved that Bṛhadvala was a descendant of Lava and belonged to the Śravasti line. The number of lineal descendants of Kúśa as well as of Lava, tends to show that the age of Dáśaratha Aikṣváka or Páncála Divódása
was earlier by 15 generations than the time of the events described in the Mahābhārata.

In Chapter XI, I have critically examined the Janaka dynasty from Siradhvaja Janaka downwards. I have proved that the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata have made a mess about this dynasty, in tacking one branch on to the last member of the other and that the Bhāgavata Purāṇa has interwoven the Sāṅkāśyā line into the Mithilā line and that the Vāyu is perfect so far as one branch is concerned. Both the branches of the Janaka dynasty however go to show that Siradhvaja Janaka was earlier than the Mahābhārata episode by approximately about 15 generations.

In Chapter XII of my enquiry I have described the Southern Kōsala branch of the Ikṣvāku dynasty and have shown that Rūpaparna was the king not of Ayōdhya in the Āryāvarta, but of the Southern Kōsala situated south of the Vindhyaas. I have further pointed out that the town named Paudanya which the Mahābhārata describes as having been founded by Aśmaka, the son of Kalmāsapāda, was no other than Pōtana of the Assakas during the Buddhist period.

In Chapter XIII I have supported the subject of my enquiry with the evidence derived from the Kaśi dynasty that sprang from Divōdāsa and have proved that Divōdāsa was earlier by 13 generations than Sukumāra who took part in the Mahābhārata war.

In Chapter XIV, I have supported the subject of my enquiry with the evidence derived from the Vamsa Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma-veda and thus have proved from an entirely Vedic source that the age of Vībhāṇḍaka Kāśyapa, a contemporary of Daśaratha and therefore of Divōdāsa, was earlier than the events of the Mahābhārata by a period during which 13 successive teachers taught.

In Chapter XV I have collected very important informations about the distinguished Rṣis belonging to the period dealt with by me. They were Bharadvāja Vājineya, Rkṣa
Vālmiki (=the son of Vālmika Bṛrgava), Vāk,—the daughter of Ambṛṇa, Jaigīśavya, Asita, Devala, Dhaumya &c.; I have then identified the Rṣi Nārāyaṇa, the author of the Puruṣa sūkta of the Rgveda with the famous Rṣi Nārāyaṇa of Viśāla Badarī or Badarikāśrama and have discovered that the word Nārāyaṇa, after all, was the name of a historical personage belonging to an ancient age. After Nārāyaṇa, I have taken up the case of Vedavyāsa and have discovered that this Rṣi compiled and grouped the Vedas after his youthful grandson Arjuna Pāṇḍava burnt down the forest of Khāṇḍavapraśṭha.

Thus after fully going over the later Rgvedic Period particularly its genealogical aspect, I have, in Chapter XVI, deduced the chronology of the later Rgvedic Period from genealogical considerations taking into account the characteristic differences of different families with respect to adolescence, puberty and longevity, and have, in Chapter XVII examined in detail the Vedic chronology of Dr. Abinash Chandra Das, as developed in his ‘Rigvedic India,’ and have proved that the chronological attitude of Dr. Das is scarcely tenable. In this connection, I have pointed out that Dr. Das has apparently used all the arguments, vague as they are, of Mr. N. B. Pavjee embodied in the book entitled Āryāvartīc Home or the Cradle of Sapta-Sindhu. In the same Chapter, I have briefly noted the views of scholars outside India.

In Chapter XVIII, I have endeavoured to prove that the astronomical system built up by Tilak in his ‘Orion’ rests on an unstable basis.

In Chapter XIX I have taken up the much vexed question of the Aryan Settlement of India during the Rgvedic Period and have proved that the Rgvedic Period represents a full-fledged Indo-Aryan civilization spread almost all over the Āryāvarta with the non-Aryans scattered here and there. Not to speak of the Āryāvarta, even a portion of the Dak-
śīnāpatha was already occupied sometime before the famous Rgvedic king Atīthigya Divodāsa. Thus I have proved that the view of Dr. Abinash Chandra Das. that the Rgvedic Aryans were couped up in the Punjab to the west of the Sarasvatī has no ground to stand upon.

Thus after finishing my enquiries about the later Rgvedic Period I have devoted the four subsequent chapters to the determination of the date of the Mahābhārata war. To do this, I have, in Chapter XX, determined the succession from Bimbisāra to Chandragupta Maurya and have tried to bring about an agreement amongst the Purāṇas, the Buddhist Pāli Canon and the Jain evidences. Next I have, in Chapter XXI, adjusted the Pradyotā dynasty proving that the Puranic account of that dynasty is anything but satisfactory and then I have found that the last 5 years of the reign of Caṇḍa Pradyotā coalesced with the first 5 years of the reign of Ajātaśatru. In Chapter XXII, I have deduced the important dates of accession of Caṇḍa Pradyotā, of Udayana, the king of Kauśāmbī, and of Prasenajit, the king of Kōśala. With these dates as my starting points, I have, in Chapter XXIII, calculated the date of the Mahābhārata war from genealogical considerations of the Kōśala line of the descendants of Bṛhadvala, the Māgadha line of the descendants of Sahadeva Jārāsandhi, and the Paurava line of the descendants of Arjuna Pāṇḍava. In this connection, I have shown that Dr. Fleet’s calculation of the reign-period of Yudhīśṭhira Pāṇḍava having been one of 20 years only is untenable. After this I have supported by calculation of the date of the Mahābdārata war by the Puranic figures given for the reign-periods of the successive kings of the Bārhadratha dynasty. In conclusion, I have supported the same calculation of the date of the great war by an astronomical calculation based on the position of solstitial colures. In doing this, I have shown that the method of calculation adopted by Babu Bankim Chandra
Chattoypadhyaya is defective. According to me, Archdeacon Pratt’s method which I have appended to my calculation, is the neatest of all, although I have chosen to strike out a slightly different path.

Some scholars may suspect that I have tried to bring down the Vedic civilization to comparatively late times but I may assure them that I took up my subject with quite an open mind with a sincere desire to arrive at truth. I should as well mention here that as I have proceeded on my enquiry it has been forced upon me that to rely exclusively on the Vedas for the history of Vedic India is to be on a perfectly wrong track. The Vedas authentic as they surely are, throw light on but certain towering land-marks ; it is the Puranas which can supply us with the connecting links, and the portions only of the long chain are illuminated by the flash-light of the Vedas.

My thanks are due to my former colleague Professor Vanamali Vedantatirtha M. A. whose constant encouragement and keen interest in me were a source of perpetual inspiration to my activities. My thanks also are due to late Sir Ashutosh Mukhopadhyaya Kt., C. S. I., &c. &c. but for whose kind patronage and appreciation this volume would not have seen the light. It was solely due to his efforts that I was able to secure the permission of the Syndicate of the Calcutta University to appear for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy although I was a votary of Natural Philosophy.

An excuse is probably necessary for the delay in the publication of the book. I submitted this thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Calcutta in the 1st week of July 1921. It was approved and I was admitted into the Degree in 1922. It was after the Annual Convocation of 1922 held in March 1923 that the thesis was accepted by the University for publication. Unfortunately I was attacked with Neurasthenia in August
1923 and became unable to go through the proof-sheets and the work of printing had to be stopped. I recovered and took up the work in November 1924, and after that time the extreme dilatoriness of the Cotton Press in which it was placed is solely responsible for the delay in printing.

I now lay the fruits of my labour continued through about ten years before scholars who will, I am confident, take them for what they are worth.
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Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka (Ānandāsrāma Press edition by Śrīdhara Shastri Pathaka) .... Sankh. Ar.

Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (Bengal Asiatic Society edition by Alfred Hillebrandt) .... Sankh. Srau.
Āpastamba-Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the Taittirīya Samhita with the commentary of Rudradatta edited by Dr. Richard Garbe Ph. D. and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal .... Apst. Srau.
Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra with the commentary of Agniswami edited by Ānanda candra Vedāntavāgiśa and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal .... Lat. Srau.
Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the to the Taittirīya Samhita edited by Dr. W. Calland and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal .... Baudh. Srau.
ABBREVIATIONS.  

Rāmāyaṇa (Vangavāsi Press edition)  ..  V. Ram.  
Mahābhārata (Kumbakōṇam edition by  
Kṛṣṇācārya and Vyāsācārya)  ..  Kumb. MBh.  
Mahābhārata (Vangavasi Press edition of  
VardhamānaRājabāṭir Mahābharata)  
by Pancānana Tarkaratna)  ..  Gd. MBh.  
Bṛhaddevatā (Harvard Oriental Series  
edition, by Dr. Macdonell)  ..  Br. Dv.  
Nirukta of Yāska (Nīrnaya Sāgara Press  
edition by Vāsudeva Sarman Panasikar)  
Nirukta of Yāska, Gottingen edition, by  
Dr. Rudolph Roth.  
Sanskāra Ratnamāla of Gopinathabhatta  
(Anandasrama Press edition by Ve. Śā.  
Rā. Kāsinatha Shastri Āgāshe and Ve.  
Śā. Rā. Bābāshastri Phadake)  
Sarvānukramaṇi to the Rgveda by Kātyā-  
yana, with the Vedārthadīpikā of  
Śaḍguruśliya (Oxford University  
Press by Dr. Macdonell)  ..  Sarv. Kram.  
Twenty Dharmashastras namely of  
Manu, Atri, Viṣṇu, Hārīta &c.,  
Vāyu Purāṇa (Ānandāśram Press  
edition)  ..  Va.  
Vāyu Purāṇa (Vangabāsi Press edition by  
Pancānana Tarkaratna,  
Matsya Purāṇa (Ānandāśrama Press edition)  
Matsya Purāṇa (Vangavasi Press edition  
by Pancānana Tarkaratna, Tarakanta  
Kavyatirtha, Kṛṣṇadāsa shasti, Sriram-  
a Shastri, Kudarāma Kāvyaratna)  
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa (Venkatesvara Press  
edition)  ..  Bd.  

D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Editor/Translator</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa</td>
<td>From Pargiter’s Texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pančānana Tarkaratna</td>
<td>Vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu Purāṇa</td>
<td>Wilson’s Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrma Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pančānana Tarkaratna</td>
<td>Km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liṅga Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pañcānana Tarkaratna</td>
<td>Lg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pančānana Tarkaratna</td>
<td>Ag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pančānana Tarkaratna</td>
<td>Sv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saura Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pančānana Tarakaratna, Jagannatha Vidyāratna, Viresh Chandra Kāvyatīrtha)</td>
<td>Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padma Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vangavāsi Press edition by Pančānana Tarkaratna</td>
<td>Pd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantravārtika of Bhaṭṭakumārila, transla-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS.

Ted by Mahâmahâpâdhyaya Dr. Gangânath Jha M. A., D. Litt., published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Carmichael Lectures on the Ancient History of India by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Calcutta University Press)

Sthâvirâvalicarita of Hemacandra, edited by Dr. Hermann Jacobi Ph. D., and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal

Sûrikalpasûtram of Bhadrabâhusûri with the Subodhikâ commentary of Vinaya Vijayaganin edited by Vijayananda Sûri and Vallabhavijaya MunimatalLikâ and published by Vallabhâdâsa Trîbhuvanadâsa Gandhi, secretary Srijaina Atmânanda Sabhâ, Bhavanagara.

Kalpasûtra, Leipzig edition, by Hermann Jacobi.

Kathâsarat Sâgara (Nirnaya Sâgara Press edition by Pandit Durgâ Prasâda and Kasinath Pandurang Parab)

Râjatarangini (Nirnaya Sâgara Press edition by Pandit Durgâ Prasâda)

Translation of Râjatarangini by Dr. Stein Historical works of Ramadasa Sen.

Yajña Kathâ by Ramaendra Sunder Trivedi,

Vicitra Prasanga of Ramendra Sunder Trivedi by Bipin Bihari Gupta.

Anguttara Nikâya Published for the Pâli Text Society

Majjhima Nikâya published by the Pâli Text Society edited by R. Chalmers

Mahâvamsâ, translated by Dr. W. Geiger

Tantr. Vart.

Car. Lee.

Sthav. Car.

Kalpa. Sutra.

Kat. Sar. Sag.

Raj. Tar.

Ang. Nik.

Majjh. Nik.

MV.
Mahābodhivamsa, edited by A. S. Strong for the Pāli Text Society.  
Digha Nikāya published by P. T. S.  
Samyutta Nikāya published by P. T. S.  
Vinaya Piṭaka Vol. I, the Mahāvagga edited by H. Oldenberg, published by Williams and Norgate  
Svapnavaśavadattā, edited by Ganapati Shastri  
Bṛhat Samhita of Varāhamihira Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara edition  
Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, edited by Dr. Keilhorn Ph. D.  
Kṣitīṣa Vamsāvaliçarita  
Śīsupalabadha of Māgha.  
Mudrārākṣasa of Visākhadaṭṭa, Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya.  
Works of Kalidāsa.  
Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India by Mr. Nundo Lal Dey.  
A note on the Ancient Geography of Asia compiled from the Vālmīki Rāmā-
yāna by Nabin Chandra Das published by the Buddhist Text Society.
Pāli Jātakas, edited by Mr. Cowell.
Journal of the Behar and Orissa Research Society for 1915
Indian Antiquary for 1918 consulted in January 1922 i.e. 7 months after the thesis was submitted in the 5th July 1921
Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1910 and 1914
British Nautical Almanacs for 1913 and 1921.
Touts' advanced History of Great Britain.
V. A. Smiths' Oxford Students' History of India.
Various works on Astronomy.
The Orion by B. G. Tilak.
Rigvedic India by Dr. A. C. Das.
History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature by Professor Max Müller.
Kāvyā Mīmāṁsa of Rājashekhara Gaekwad Oriental Series.
Word-index of the four Vedas, Gaekwar Oriental Series
Āryāvartic Home or the Cradle of Sapta-Sindhu by N. B. Pavjee.
Other abbreviations are readily intelligible.
TRANSLITERATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>Roman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>এ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ই</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঈ</td>
<td>ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>উ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঊ</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঋ</td>
<td>r̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এ</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঐ</td>
<td>ò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ও</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঔ</td>
<td>k̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এক্ষ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এখ</td>
<td>g̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এং</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এচ</td>
<td>c̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এজ</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এই</td>
<td>j̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এহ</td>
<td>j̥h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এই</td>
<td>ñ̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এহই</td>
<td>ō̥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>Roman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ভ</td>
<td>d̠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ধ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ন</td>
<td>n̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ত</td>
<td>t̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থ</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>দ</td>
<td>d̠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ধ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ন</td>
<td>n̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>প</td>
<td>p̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ফ</td>
<td>ph̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব</td>
<td>b̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভ</td>
<td>bh̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ম</td>
<td>m̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>য</td>
<td>y̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>র</td>
<td>r̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ল</td>
<td>l̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব</td>
<td>v̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>শ</td>
<td>s̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>স</td>
<td>s̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হ</td>
<td>h̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ক</td>
<td>k̥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>স</td>
<td>m̥ or ḿ̥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I.

DIVODASA AND DASARATHA

There was a king named Ajamilyha who belonged to the dynasty of Puru, the son of Yayati Nahu'a. Ajamilyha and Purumilida were brothers and were joint authors of Vedic hymns. Purumilida died without issue.

Ajamilyha had three wives Nilini, Kesini and Dhumin. By his first wife Nilini, Ajamilyha had a son named Nila and two other sons named Dusmanta and Paramesthin. The sons of Dusmanta and Paramesthin became known as the Pancales while Nila became the father of a son named Santi. Santi's son was Susanti, the father of Purujanu. After Purujanu, we have Riksa according to the Vayu, Caksu according to the Visnu, Arka according to the Bhagavata and Prthu according to the Matsya. The real name of the son of Purujanu is Triksa and not Arka of the Bhagavata, which Mr. Pargiter has accepted, for Triksa is indicated in the Asvalayana Srauta Sutra.

1 Va. 99, 166; Vs. IV, 19, 10; Mt. 49, 43; Ag. 278, 15; Hv. I, 32, 41; Brm. 13, 81; Bh. IX, 21, 21.
3 Bh. IX, 21, 30.
4 Va. 99, 167; Mt. 49, 44.
5 Va. 99, 194; Mt. 50, 1; Vs. IV, 19, 15; Bh. IX, 21, 30.
6 वाच्य पूर्वायु नीली दशमनयमेडिनी II—Gd. MBh. I, 94, 32.
7 Gd. MBh. I, 94, 33.
8 Vs. IV, 19, 15; Bh. IX, 21, 31.
9 Vs. IV, 19, 15; Bh. IX, 21, 31.
10 Va. 99, 195; Bh. IX, 21, 31; Hv. I, 32, 64; Brm. 13, 93; Ag. 278, 19.
12 Vs. IV, 19, 15.
13 Bh. IX, 21, 31.
14 Mt. 50, 2.
Similarly, Tr̥ksa’s son is named variously in the Puranas. We have the names Bharmyāśva¹, Bhadrāśva², Bāhyāśva³ and Haryaśva⁴ etc. Kātyāyana uses the patronymic Bhārmyaśva⁵. From this patronymic form Sāyana seems to infer that the personal name of the man was Bharmyaśva⁶, that being the form given in Professor Max Müller’s edition. The Bombay edition of Sāyana gives us the form Bharmyaśva. But both these forms appear to be corrupt, as we find the form Bhṛmyaśva used and explained by Yāska. In his Nirukta he makes the name mean ‘one whose horses are active’ [चयन: चर चक्स: ] or ‘one who maintains horses’[चयःचरयः चक्सः]⁷. We take the form Bhṛmyaśva as correct. Bhṛmyaśva is stated in the Puranas⁸ to have been the father of five sons Mudgala, Sr̥njaya, Br̥hadīṣu, Yaviyān and Kāmpilya. After this, the Vāyu says⁹ “Mudgala’s eldest son was the far-famed Brahmīṣṭha; from him (i.e. Brahmīṣṭha) Indrasena, his wife, got a son named Vadhyāśva”. Now this is a serious error in the Vāyu; and this has misled Mr. Pargiter. The Matsya makes the confusion worse confounded¹⁰ by making Indrasena the son of Brahmīṣṭha, and Vindhyāśva the son of Indrasena. The Harivamśa gives¹¹ still another account and makes Brahmārshi, the son of Mudgala’s son, and Indrasena the wife of this Brahmārshi. The Brahma follows¹² the Vāyu.

¹ Bh. IX, 21, 31. ² Mt. 50, 2. ³ Ag. 278, 19; Hv. I, 32, 64; Brm. 13, 93. ⁴ Vs. IV, 19, 15. ⁵ Sarv. Kram. to Rv. X, 102. ⁶ Say. Kram. to Rv. X, 102. ⁷ Nir. IX, 24. ⁸ Va. 99, 196; Vs. IV, 19, 15; Mt. 50, 3; Bh. IX, 21, 31-32. ⁹ सुन्दरस्य सूती अः हो अर्धः सुमहाययः। मुद्गले यतो गम्भि व्यात्र व्रत्यपवत्॥—Va. 99, 200. ¹⁰ सुन्दरस्य सूती यतो व्रत्य व्यात्रः सुमहाययः। मुद्गले यतो गम्भि व्यात्र व्रत्यपवत्॥—Mt. 50, 6. ¹¹ मोक्षस्य सूती अः हो तत्वाभिषक्तः सुमहाययः। मुद्गले ( ना ? ) यतो गम्भि व्यात्र व्रत्यपवत्॥—Hv. I, 32, 69. ¹² सुन्दरस्य तु दयादिः मोक्षः सुमहाययः। मुद्गले यतो गम्भि व्यात्र व्रत्यपवत्॥—Brm. 13, 97.
but differs as to the names. Thus there are hopelessly divergent statements in the Puranas each contradicting the others; and Mr. Pargiter cannot be much blamed for his having been misled as regards the descendants of Mudgala. The Viṣṇu, however, says\(^1\) quietly that Mudgala’s son was Vṛddhaśva, and the latter had Divōdāsa and Ahalyā as his son and daughter. It is evident that Vṛddhaśva in the Viṣṇu stands for Vadhyāśva of the Vāyu, and for Vadhrṣyaśva of the Harivyāṃśa. The correct spelling however is Vadhrṣyaśva, as sanctioned by the Rgveda. The name Vadhrṣyaśva means ‘an impotent horse’, or ‘one whose horses are impotent’, ‘Vadhri’ meaning ‘impotent’.

Now the Rgveda corrects the confusion amongst the Puranas, as to whose wife Indrasenā was. We see there\(^2\) that Indrasenā was the wife of Mudgala and not of his son. She drove the chariot of her husband in a fight with the Dasyus, their enemies, and made huge captures of cows from them. We also find\(^3\) that Mudgala fastened the rim of the wheel of the chariot, and employed a bull for pulling the chariot into the fight, and the bull ran very swiftly. We find again\(^4\) that Mudgala held the reins made of leather and driving the chariot well, made huge captures of cows.

Then again in the Sāyanānukramaṇi we find\(^5\) that the author of the hymn (X. 102) was Mudgala, the son of Bhṛmyaśva, and we have already seen in several rks of this hymn,

---

1. सुन्दरलाल वर्ष, हरिवर्ष, दियाशिंदल च मियानमभूत |—Vs. IV, 19, 16.

2. उत्सुक वाति व्हाति वामो चेता चरितं यद्रत्ता सहस्त्र | रय्यरेतु सुन्दरलाली गाहिरी भरे कांत केशदिनसेना |—Rv. X, 102, 2.

3. उत प्रविवेशद्विस्क हिणानुसमव समवत सिईचुं | इस उदासुपितमुकुंमासारंहत पकाभि; कक्कुवानि |—Rv. X, 102, 7.

4. सुन्दरलालवर्ष कपोली सर्वां दासवनकामानि; | सुभ यस्म दासां जनय गां प्रयाणश्रवित्वत |—Rv. X, 102, 8.

that Indrasena was the wife of Mudgala who himself seems to have composed this hymn after their return from the battle. Hence it is clear that Indrasena was the wife of Mudgala and not of his imaginary son Brahmiṣṭha. That particular line in the Vāyu Purana originally ran as सुध्रतस्य सुनौ चेत; &c. instead of as सुध्रतस्य सुनौ चेत; &c. and the error is evidently the scribe’s error; ‘व्रिहित’ is clearly a qualifying adjective to ‘सुर्भ’. This accords well with the sense of the preceding lines in the Vāyu. The total purport is that Bṛṛmyaśva had five sons, viz., Mudgala, Sṛṇjaya, Bṛhadiṣu, Yaviyān and Kāmpilya; and of these, Mudgala was the eldest, thoroughly proficient in the Vedas, and by far the most famous amongst them. The word ‘व्रिहित’ undoubtedly refers to his having been an author of Vedic hymns.

Who was this Indrasena, the wife of Mudgala? In the Mahābhārata we find1 that the famous King Nala of Nisadha had a son named Indrasena and a daughter named Indrasena by his wife Damayanti. The relative positions of Rūtaparna, the Ikṣvāku king, in the genealogical list of the Ikṣvākus, and of Mudgala in the Paurava genealogy, led me to suspect that Nala’s daughter might be Mudgala’s wife. To my agreeable surprise, I found after a long year’s search that the Mahābhārata corroborates my suspicion. In the Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata I found Lōmaśa Muni relating to Yudhiṣṭhira how Lōmapāda’s daughter Sāntā wandered in the woods with her husband Ṛṣyaśṛṅga. Lōmaśa says2 “Oh king, Oh descendant of Ajamiḍha, Sāntā served Ṛṣyaśṛṅga in the woods with love, just as Indrasena, the daughter of Nala (Nālāyanī Cendrasena) was ever obedient to Mudgala”. Indrasena is here called Nālāyanī i.e. Nala’s daughter. She is also called the daughter of Damayanti in another place of the

1 दमयनाया संह सर्व ब्रजार्थरार्थीयम्।
   जन्मामायं च ततो दमयनाया महामना।।
   दस्तेन सुध चेत्रा दस्तेन च कस्यकाम ॥—Gd. MBh. III, 57, 46.
2 Kumb. MBh. III, 114, 24.
Mahābhārata\(^1\). But there Maudgalya, instead of Mudgala, appears to be the name of her husband\(^2\). But the reading 'Maudgalya' can be pronounced to be corrupt on the authority of the Ṛgveda which calls Indrasenā, Mudgalānī. Besides, the reading in one place of the Mahābhārata is in agreement with the Ṛgveda. Accordingly we take Indrasenā, the daughter of Nala, to have been the wife of Mudgala Bhārmyaśva.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Kumb. MBh. I, 212, 25.  
\(^2\) Kumb. MBh. I, 212, 4.  
\(^3\) A friend of mine points out to me that Dr. Venkatasubbiah arrived at a similar result which he published in the Indian Antiquary, 1918, p. 280. As for myself I may state that I knew nothing of this, and I relate here the whole history of my discovery of the fact that Naiśadha Nala was the father-in-law of the Ṛgvedic Rṣi Mudgala. I have been engaged in correctly adjusting the defective and incomplete genealogies of the Puranas for about the last ten years. It was as a result of this adjustment of various dynasties from Manu Vaivasvata downwards that I found sometimes in March 1918 that the position of the Ikṣvākū king Ṛtuparna was just a step above that of Mudgala. This led me to suspect that Mudgala might be the son-in-law of Nala, the king of Niśadha, as I already knew that Indrasenā was called Mudgalānī in the Ṛgveda and that Nala's daughter was called Indrasenā in the Mahābhārata. I searched for any statement in our vast ancient literature for Nala's daughter having been called Mudgala's wife, and found after a year's search (sometime during the summer vacation of 1919) that in the Vangavasi edition of the Mahābhārata, Indrasena Nārāyaṇi has been called the wife of Mudgala. My suspicion became stronger, as in Sanskrit, Nala, Nāḍa, and Nara were interchangeable. Sometime after the reopening of the College in August 1919, I informed my learned colleagues Professor Vanamali Vedāntatīrtha, M.A., and Professor Surendralal Kundu, M.A. that I strongly suspected that Indrasenā Mudgalānī of the Ṛgveda was most probably the same Indrasenā as the daughter of Nala, for, I told them that I found Indrasenā, spoken of as Nārāyaṇi in the Vanaparvan of the Vangavasi edition of the Mahābhārata, and that Nara Nala, Nāḍa were interchangeable, and that the relative position of Ṛtuparna and Mudgala on my genealogical table was strongly in favour of this inference. At that time, I possessed no copy of the Kumbakonam edition of the Mahābhārata and I asked Vanamali Babu to see if in his Kumbakonam edition, the reading was 'Nālāyaṇi' instead of the Vangavasi reading 'Nārāyaṇi'. After about an hour, Vanamali Babu sent his servant to me with a slip of paper in which he wrote, "मायल घन्युरालय कोकल बिलामा छाँि |
The parallelism drawn by Lōmaśa is an exact one, inasmuch as both Indrasenā and Śāntā were the daughters of kings and wives of Rṣis. Like her father Nala, the daughter was an expert in driving chariots, and this she did, as related in the Rgveda, when her husband fought the Dasyus and made captures of cows. Thus we see that it is not necessary to pounce upon Bhimaratha, the Yadu King, as the father of Damayantī, as Mr. Pargiter has done. This necessarily demolishes the Ikṣvāku genealogy of Mr. Pargiter who has raised Rūtparna up to a step below Bhimaratha.

Now in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, Vadhryaśva is spoken of as Vadhryaśva Anūpa. The same Vadhryaśva is probably meant, and Anūpa was very probably the surname of Mudgala or an ancestor of his. Or Vadhryaśva, the son of Mudgala belonged to the Anūpa country. In the Rgveda we get more information about Vadhryaśva. We find that his son Sumitra composed prayers to the fire named after his father Vadhryaśva. Vadhryaśva’s fire is also mentioned in several Rks of the same hymn. In addition to Sumitra who became a Rṣi, Vadhryaśva had other children.

He had, by Menakā, a son named Divōdāsa and a daughter named Ahalyā. The Rgveda supports the Puranas in an admirable way. In the Rgveda we find Bharadvāja addressing

कुश्चीत्व महाभारते नातायणी गात्। चरणमिति प्रार्थितार्क याविषयाय।

I write all this in detail in order that posterity may not deny me the credit of not only independently finding out but also of actually predicting the long forgotten relationship between Naiṣadha Nala and Mudgala.

1 एतेऽने व । वा जसान पुः पशुरूप भुवानमचादृ च ॥ —Panc. Bra. X iii, 3, 17.
2 भवे शुँको वालक्रीति गोपये मा ला तारोदिधिधारतितिः नामं च।
   पूरे च चस्मुदाणवः । उदित्वः; पु नो वो च वालक्रीति नाम। —Rv. X, 69, 5.
3 Rv. fX, 69, 1 ; 2 ; 4 ; 5 ; 9 ; 11 ; 12 ; &c.
4 वालक्रीतिः च समेत वालक्रीति श्रेये वियमातिवादिः।
   रितोदयथ राजायरि रुखः च देयसिस्मि ॥ —Va. 99, 200; cf. Hv. I, 32, 70;
   cf. Vs. IV, 19, 16.
the river Sarasvatī thus¹: "This goddess Sarasvatī gave to Vadhryaśva the impetuous son Divōdāsa, who has cleared the debts" (i.e. debts to the Devas, the Pitṛs and the Rṣis).

Now we shall proceed to show that Divōdāsa, the brother of Ahalyā, of the Puranas is the famous Atithigvya Divōdāsa of the Vedas.

In the Rgveda we find Bharadvāja calling himself the son of Vājini²; and the same Bharadvāja, we know, was the son of Mamatā³ Bhārgavī⁴. Vājini was an appellation of Mamatā.

In the same hymn where he introduces himself as the son of Vājini, Bharadvāja says⁵: "Oh Indra, thou art the slayer of enemies; thou hast done praiseworthy deeds; for oh hero, thou hast rent asunder hundreds and thousands of Śambara's soldiers; thou hast killed Śambara who came out of the mountains, and hast saved Divōdāsa with wonderful means of safety". Bharadvāja mentions the same incident viz. the killing of Śambara by Atithigvya Divōdāsa in various other places⁶.

His son was Garga⁷ who received presents from Atithigvya Divōdāsa, and from Prastōka, the son⁸ of Srṣijaya. Garga

¹ इयमददर्भस मुख्ष्यति तद्विदौरशं ब्राह्मण दाषे।
स्य शक्ताचाचार्यास विन्ययो तते न दाषे तिल ब्राह्मण।
--- Rv. VI, 61, 1.

² लां वाजनी चबूते बाद्यानीयो मये बाज्युष गधवयु साती।
तां छबू विवद समुदरं तत्र तां चबू शुद्धिन्द्रा गोपु शुद्धम।
--- Rv. VI, 26, 2.

³ सबौतानु नुमात्र तद्विद ब्राह्मण रीतैः।
समिथायमि रहें खे वे त्रह तिल इदेकहाय।
--- Va. 99, 149.

⁴ चायरीधव्याययात्मा त मेताना नाम भागीवी।
--- Br. Dv. IV, 11.

⁵ ल्युक्यायस्य बन्धु नृस्त्र मन्य्यता सुख्या पुर दार्शी।
यथा गार्भवेद जगद्या हस्त्राती दृश्वतातार्किमत।
--- Rv. VI, 26, 5.

⁶ Rv. VI, 26, 3; Rv. VI, 43.

⁷ भरात्राजस्य गोपायथास्य ||--- Rv. Say. Kram. VI, 47.

⁸ स्त्रीश नम प्रशोकः दान्तुद्वित ||--- Rv. Say. Kram. VI, 47.

प्रशोक रुपायार्यायं श्रेयम्युग्या राश्य ||--- Rv. Say. Kram. VI, 47.

अभावती हृदयानाम् प्रशोकेः स संभवे या।
जालक्षेत्रसंपन्न सत्ती नारायणामुः पि।||--- Br. Dv. V, 124.
Bhāradvāja says,¹ "Oh Indra, Prastōka has given me ten gold purses and ten horses; what Atithigva won by defeating Śambara we have received (that) from Divōdāsa". This shows that Garga, Atithigva Divōdāsa and Prastōka, the son of Śṛṇjaya, were contemporaries; it further shows that Garga was the son of no other Bharadvāja than Vājineya Bharadvāja, as both of them mention the killing of Śambara by Atithigva Divōdāsa from whom Garga received presents; it further shows that Prastōka, the son of Mudgala's second brother (i.e. Śṛṇjaya), could be an older contemporary only of Vadhrayaśva's son Divōdāsa; and we have just now seen that Prastōka Sāṛṇjaya was the contemporary of Atithigva Divōdāsa, the slayer of Śambara. It necessarily follows that Vadhrayaśva's son Divōdāsa and Atithigva Divōdāsa were one and the same person.

There is a second reason for arriving at this conclusion. We have seen before that Bharadvāja, the author of the 61st hymn of Mandala VI, speaks of Divōdāsa as the impetuous son of Vadhrayaśva, and says that Sarasvatī has been pleased to favour Vadhrayaśva with such a son. We have seen again that Vājineya Bharadvāja speaks of Divōdāsa as the killer of Śambara in the 5th Ṛk of 26th hymn of Manḍala VI. We have seen further that Garga, the son of Vājineya Bharadvāja, received presents from Divōdāsa. It follows from these three data that the authors of the 61st hymn and of the 26th hymn were one and the same person namely Vājineya Bharadvāja; the contrary supposition that these were two Bharadvājas and two Divōdāsas, and that the first Bharadvāja was a contemporary of the first Divōdāsa and the second Bharadvāja was a contemporary of the second Divōdāsa,—seems to be at present uncalled for. Hence it may be admitted that Vadhrayaśva's son Divōdāsa of the Puranas was the famous Divōdāsa of the Vedas.

¹ प्रस्थोक द्रू पारम्पर द्रू दमकोणवीद्ध वाजीनेवादप।
दिवोदसादतिसीवद्य राघु शामरवस्व प्रवदोभासम् II—Rv. VI, 47, 22.
There is still a third ground on which such a conclusion becomes inevitable. The simultaneous occurrence of Bhrmyaśva, Mudgala, Indrasena, Vadhryaśva, Divodasa &c. both in the Puranas as well as in the Rgveda cannot be called a chance coincidence, especially when their relationships to each other coincide in both. The Puranas give us the information that Mudgala’s son by Indrasena was Vadhryaśva, which the Rgveda has not supplied; but the Rgveda informs us that Śrñjaya’s son was Prastōka, and Vadhryaśva had another son Sumitra in addition to Divodasa. Accordingly we conclude that the Pāñcāla Divodasa of the Puranas was the same as the famous Atithigya Divodas of the Vedas.

Now the Puranic statement that Bhrmyaśva was the father of Śrñjaya¹ as well as of Mudgala cannot be accepted. We have found that Prastōka was the son of Śrñjaya², and Garga, the son of Bharadvāja Vājineya, received presents both from Atithigya Divodasa and Prastōka³ [Prastōka and Divodasa were different persons—vide the chapter on the Northern Pāñcālas]. We observe that Śrñjaya was the son of Devavāta⁴, and that Devavāta and Devaśrvas were the two descendants (or more probably sons) of a certain Bharata⁵. We find again Bharadvāja declaring that Abhyāvartin, the son of Cayamāna, defeated and killed the Vṛcīvants, the sons of Varaśikha, in fight on the east bank of the river Hari-

¹ Va. 99, 196.
² śaṣṭha yasas pratīkṣaya daṇḍavyaḥ śiṣyate ।—Rv. Say. Kram. VI, 47.
šrñjaya pratīkṣaya bhāgavatāc ca ।—Rv. Say. Kram. VI, 47.
śrñjaya pratīkṣaya bhāgavatāc ca ।—Rv. Say. Kram. VI, 47.
śrñjaya pratīkṣaya bhāgavatāc ca...
³ pratīkṣaya bhāg avatāḥ prastōkāḥ ।—Rv. VI, 47, 22.
⁴ prastōkāḥ bhāgavatāḥ prastōkāḥ ।—Rv. IV, 15, 4.
⁵ vṛcīvantī vṛcīvantī vṛcīvantī... ।—Rv. VI, 27, 7.
We also find there that a Turvaśa and the Vṛciivants, the sons of Varasikha, submitted to Śrījaya, the son of Devavātā. Bharadvaśa further declares that emperor Abhyāvartin, the son of Cayamāna and descendant of Prathu, gave him chariots women and cows. In the Brhaddevatā, we find that Abhyāvartin, the son of Cayamāna, and Prastōka, the son of Śrījaya, being defeated by the Vāraśikhas in fight, approached (Vājineya) Bharadvāja who thereupon ordered his son Pāyu to perform sacrifices for the two kings; after the sacrifices, these two kings marched against the Vāraśikhas and defeated them on the bank of the river Haryupiśyā.

From all these the following conclusions may be drawn:—

(i) Śrījaya, the father of Prastōka, was the son of Devavātā.

(ii) Devavātā as well as Devasravas were the sons of Bharata who must be distinguished from Bharata Daśmānti.

(iii) Abhyāvartin Cayamāna, who was an ally of Prastōka, the son of Śrījaya, was a descendant of Devavātā.

(iv) Trkṣa was the father of Bhṛmyaśva as stated in the Āsvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra.

(v) Cayamāna’s son Abhyāvartin, Śrījaya’s son Prastōka and Vadhryaśva’s son Divodāsa were contemporaries and friends and belonged to the same family.

---

1 वैदिन्तो श्रमिष्यस मेषीनाथतितिन चायमानाय मिदुपु।
वैचैत्य यदियुदियायं दन्त पूर्व अप्रें विपधाय परो दलिन्॥—Rv. VI, 27, 5.
2 वधासाभाया सुष्णासुर शतकां चु चरतो रोरिल्हाया
स रक्षात्य तुपः रायादु चौकों देवभावाय मिदुपु।—Rv. VI, 27, 7.
3 दधाय रक्षान्त नियंगति गा गद्र्मतो मष्ट्या मष्ट्या कंशादु।
अनावरतिः चायमानो दशाति &c. &c.॥—Rv. VI, 27, 8.
Cf. also वधासाभाया क्रोधी ताज्ञि प्रकाशें च साख्ये च। साखि स्मान—Samkh. Srau. XVI, 11, 11.
5 Rv. VI, 27, 7.
(vi) Mudgala's son Vadhryaśva, Devavāta's son Sṛṇjaya and Cayamāna were contemporaries.

(vii) Bhṛmyaśva's son Mudgala, Bharata's sons Devavāta and Devaśravas were contemporaries.

(viii) Bharata and Trkṣa's son Bhṛmyaśva were contemporaries.

The genealogy may then stand thus:—

\[
\text{Trkṣa} \\
\text{bhṛmyaśva} \quad \text{Bharata} \\
\text{Mudgala} \quad \text{Devavāta} \\
\text{Vadhryaśva} \quad \text{Sṛṇjaya} \quad \text{Cayamāna} \\
\text{Ahalyā} \quad \text{Divodāsa} \quad \text{Prastōka} \quad \text{Abhyāvartin}
\]

There is no ground for holding Devavāta and Bhṛmyaśva to be one and the same person, as Mr. Pargiter has done, because Devavāta and Devaśravas have been explicitly stated to have been the sons of Bharata, whereas Bhṛmyaśva was the son of Trkṣa.

We have seen before that Divodāsa had a sister, the famous Ahalyā who was given in marriage to Saradvant Gautama. Rāma Dāśarathī on his way to Mithilā with a Viśvāmitra went to the hermitage of Gautama and accepted the

1 JRAS, 1910.
2 Va. 99, 201 ; 202 ; Hv. I, 32, 71 ; Mt, 15, 8 ; Vs. IV, 19, 16 ; Bh. IX, 21, 34.
3 राज्यो तु तदा तस्माद् पादी जग्धहृतस्व द्वा।
कर्त्तव्यो मौत्मुखः प्रतिज्ञाय गता रिति तो।
पाठमयं तदात्तिथिः चाकार सुप्रसाधिता।
प्रतिज्ञायां काकुन्यिः विविष्ठतेन क्रमेयं। N. Ram. I, 49, 17 ; 18.
चर्चितं ग्रामिनसं का पादस्थावं चक्रत्य।—Bṛm. 123, 100.
hospitality of Ahalyā. She was the mother of Śatānanda who was the officiating priest of Siradhvaja Janaka. She committed adultery with a certain person, and for this, was temporarily divorced by her husband. Saradvant Gautama ordained that she should expiate what she had done, by performing suitable penances and that she might be accepted back if Rāma Dāśarathī would come to her and receive her hospitality. It is easy to understand the reason of the introduction of Indra, the Vedic God, into this ancient history. The Rṣis of the Vedic age were in the habit of ascribing various deeds to their gods Indra, Varuṇa, the Aśvins, the Maruts. For example, the famous Pāṇcāla king Divodāsa destroyed the ninety-nine towns of the Dāsa chief Śambara and killed Śambara and Varci in the country of Udabraja. The Vedic Rṣis used to ascribe these heroic deeds to the Vedic God Indra by saying that Indra rent the ninety-nine cities of Śambara for Divodāsa and “saved Divodāsa with wonderful means of safety”. It was the famous king Purukutsa of the Ikṣvāku race, who destroyed the seven strongly fortified cities of the Dāsa chief Śarad. The Vedic Rṣis used to say “Oh Indra, thou hast destroyed the seven cities of Śarad for

1 विशाचितवननुमाण्‍चुला नूपवरवद्रा।
भवतानन्द’पुरुस्करण प्रेषीष्ठामन्निनिन्द।—N. Ram. I, 50, 6.

2 वातचित्वं चित्तां कर भवदुःखायिनी।
वथवर्धनं पुष्पमाणामाश्रिताय विषयायिन।—N. Ram. I, 48, 30.

3 यदा लोको वने चोरो रामी दयालमुक्ता।
चारिविषयति दृष्टिर्ग्राम्यादुःखा भविष्यति।—N. Ram. I, 48, 30.


5 Rv. VI, 26, 5; 26, 3; 31, 4; 43, 1; 47, 2; 21; IV, 26, 3; 30, 14; 30, 20; II, 19, 6; 14, 6; I, 51, 6; X, 49, 8; VII, 99, 5; I, 54, 6; &c.

6 Rv. I, 63, 7; I, 174, 2; VI, 20, 10; X, 49, 8.
Purukutsa". It was the Rṣi Namī Sāpya ("Vaidehō Rājā") who killed the Dāsa chief Namuci.¹ The Vedic Rṣis have recorded this by saying² that Indra could kill Namuci with the help of the Rṣi Namī. It was Kavi, the son of Bṛgpu, who killed the Dāsa chief Atka in battle. The Vedic Rṣi says³ that Indra killed Atka for Kavi. It was Turvasu and Yadu, the two sons of Yayāti Nāhuṣa, who killed the Dāsa chief Ahnavāhya in a great battle. The Vedic Rṣi says⁴ "Knowing the actions of Yadu and Turvasu to be true, Indra, for them, laid down Ahnavāhya in battle". The famous Rgvedic Rṣi and fighter Kutsa killed the Dāsa chiefs Susna, Asuya and Kuyava. The Vedic Rṣis used to ascribe this heroic deed to Indra by saying⁵ "Oh Indra, thou hast killed Susna, Asuya and Kuyava for Kutsa". [I find that none of my predecessors have understood the real nature of Susna, Asuya and Kuyava and have tried to explain them away allegorically. I shall deal with them at a greater length when I shall take up the early Vedic Age in future, and prove that they were historical personages.] The famous Rgvedic Rṣi and king, Rjiśvan, the son of Vidathin Bharadvāja, killed the Dāsa chief Pipru in a battle. The Vedic Rṣi says⁶ that Indra killed Pipru by making friends with Rjiśvan Vaidathina. Thus it will be realised that the Rṣis of the Vedic Age were in the habit of ascribing heroic deeds to Indra. Why did they use to do that? Because they sincerely believed that these deeds were possible only through the favour of that mighty godhead. It was a question of belief pure and simple. Thus Indra was believed to have been born into this world as Menā, the daughter of the

¹ Many have tried to explain away Namuci allegorically without understanding his real nature.
² Rv. I, 53, 7; VI, 20, 6; Panc. Bra. XXV, 10, 17.
³ Rv. X, 49, 3; 99, 3.
⁴ Rv. VIII, 45, 27.
⁵ Rv. II, 19, 6; IV, 16, 9-12; IV, 30, 13; II, 14, 5; VI, 20, 4-5; I, 121, 9; I, 33, 12; 14; I, 51, 6; 11; I, 101, 2; I, 103, 8; I, 104, 3; I, 49, 3;
⁶ Rv. X, 138, 3; 99, 11;
king Vṛṣaṇaśva. Indra was believed to have been born into this world as Gāthin, the son of Kuśika. The Aśvins were believed to have effected a cure of Viśpalā, the lame wife of the king Khela whose priest was Agastya. The Maruts were believed to have helped Śyāvāśva Āracaṇānasa in composing Rgvedic hymns. The Aśvins were believed to have bestowed youthful vigour on Cyavana Bhārgava, and to have effected marvellous cures of various diseases of various persons (Consult the compositions of the Rgvedic Rṣi Kakṣīvant and others). Ātreyi Apālā was made beautiful by the Vedic God Indra who was believed to have passed her through the carriage aperture. Ghōśā, the daughter of Kakṣīvant was cured of leucoderma by the Aśvins who were believed to have effected this cure by entering her organ. It will thus be perceived how very various and curious acts were believed by the Vedic Rṣis to have been performed by the Vedic gods. Similarly, Indra was believed to have become a lamb for carrying the R.i Medhātithī Kāṇvāyana to heaven, to have been born as Menā, the daughter of the king Vṛṣaṇaśva, and to have become the secret lover of Ahalyā, as recorded in the Rgveda, and Vedic works like the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, the Saḍvīṃśa Brāhmaṇa, the Taittirīya Āranyaka and so forth.

1 Rv. I, 51, 13;

2 Rv. I, 10, 11.


4 Rv. V, 61; Br. Dv. V, 50-81; Nitimanjari, Saḍgurusisyā, Sayana on Rv. V, 61;

5 Rv. I, 116, 16; 15; 16; 22; 23; I, 117, 7; 8; 11; 13; 17; 19;

6 X, 39, 4.

7 Rv. VIII, 91, 3; 4; Br. Dv. VI, 99-106; Nitimanjari, Saḍgurusisyā, Sayana on Rv. VIII, 91;

8 Rv. I, 117, 7; X, 39, 3; 5; 6; X, 40, 11; Br. Dv. VII, 42-48; Nitimanjari, on Rv. I, 117, 7;


—Vedic Index.
Now because myths happen to be connected with Vṛṣaṇāśva’s daughter Mena, Vadhryaśva’s daughter Ahalyā, and Kaṇva’s son Medhatithi &c., it would be unwise to doubt their historicity, as we have just now seen that these mythologies represent the mental background of the Ṛṣis of the Vedic Age. In fact mythologies, it appears to me, cannot stand in the way of constructing our ancient history. I try to make my attitude clearer.

We learn from the Kathāsarit Sāgara, the Brhatkathā Mañjarī, and the account of Yuan-chwang that the great god Śiva residing in the Himālaya mountains, was approached by Pāṇini, the disciple of Varṣa. Being asked by Pāṇini, the god promised help and approved of his (i.e. Pāṇini’s) purpose of writing a Treatise on Etymology. Pāṇini was successful in his attempt and defeated his rival Kātyāyana in a disputation which lasted for eight days through the grace of Śiva Maheśvara. No sane scholar would doubt the historicity of Pāṇini on the ground of his mythological connection with the ancient godhead Śiva. Similarly, no one can doubt the historicity of Padmapādacārya who was believed to have walked on the surface of water with his foot-steps placed on lotuses, at the bidding of his master Śrī Saṅkaracārya who was believed to be no other than Śiva. No one can doubt the historicity of Sivāji who, the Moguls believed, could jump 100 cubits with his sword in the hand through the grace of Satan, the god of Vice. Finally no one is entitled to doubt the historicity of Rājā Pratāpāditya of Yasōhara on the ground of his mythological connection with the war-goddess Kāli who, the people believed, used to lead the forces of the Rājā and talked with him when finally bidding adieu to him. Similarly no one is entitled to doubt the historicity of Vadhryaśva’s daughter Ahalyā on the ground of her mythological connection with the Vedic god Indra, and it is pitiful to find Bhaṭṭa Kumārila trying to explain away this real history about Ahalyā with allegory1 at the sacrifice of Vedic history.

1 Tantr. Vart. I, 3, 4 (a), Siddhanta on Sutra (7).
Now the tradition about Ahalyā having been visited by Rāma Dāsarathi, is a most important event that supplies us with the synchronism between Aikṣvāka Daśaratha and Atithigva Divōdāsa—a synchronism so essential for the rational construction of India’s ancient history. When Śrī Rāmacandra, the descendant of Manu Vaivasvata, and the heir to one of the most famous Aryan dynasties, came to the hermitage of Gautama and accepted the hospitality of Ahalyā, all her social blame was considered to be removed, and Gautama accepted her back as his wife. This shows how the stricter conception of chastity had not yet dawned upon the Aryan society.

There is a second reason for the synchronism between Daśaratha and Divōdāsa. In the Rāmāyaṇa we find\(^1\) that Daśaratha together with other Rājarsīs proceeded towards the south to fight against Śambara who used to live in a city named Vaijayanta, the capital of Śambara’s territory, lying adjacent to the forest of Daṇḍaka. Once during the progress of the battle which seems to have lasted for several weeks, the soldiers of Śambara made a night-attack on, and killed many of, the Aryan soldiers, by forcibly throwing them out of their beds on which the latter were sleeping after being wounded and tired in their day’s fight. In that nocturnal fight the

\(^1\) सुरा देवसुरे सुधे सह राजसिंहि; पति; ||
वेदांतां लानुपाय देवराजवा सांधुकु ||
दिलामात्राय कैलेि दुस्चुणा दलकानु प्रति ||
वेदांतांतिति ख्यात; उरे यश तिर्यम्वञ; ||
स श्रावर दिति ख्यात; शतमायी महासुरे ||
ददी शक्षम स चाम देवसम्बरलिति; ||
तविन्न महति संयामे दशकानु चतविचंतान् ||
रावि प्रसुकानु प्रथि क तस्मायाया राचोणा; ||
वतवशतो व सतासुल राजा दशरथवदा ||
धसुरध महासुलुः श्रेष्ठ यश श्रावणिविव ||
महानाराध्व व्यव देवी संदोधा नरः ||
ततावारे ब्रह्माः; वलि; पतिष्ठि राचात्कयथा —N. Ram. II, 9, 11-16.
Aryans were almost ousted but for Daśaratha who fiercely engaged the soldiers of Śambara with the result that the King of Ayōḍhya received several wounds on his body and lay unconscious in his chariot which was being driven by his wife Kaikeyī. She saved her husband’s life by driving the chariot out of the battle-field. Daśaratha promised Kaikeyī two boons which were the ultimate causes of the exile of Rāma. Mark the word “राजविभि:” in the 11th śloka referred to and mark also the appellation “राजविणि” which the Puranas have always given to Atithigya Divōdāsa, and remember that Abhyāvartin, Prastōka and Divōdāsa were contemporaries and belonged to the same family. Consider again the evidence of the Brahma Purana from which we learn that when Daśaratha the great Ikṣvāku King ruled in Ayōḍhya there was a great battle between the Devas and Dānavaś for the possession of kingdoms in this country. Daśaratha was invited to fight on the side of the Devas. The Dānavaś who were the kinsmen of Namuci, shot with sharp arrows the axle of Daśaratha’s chariot which was driven by his wife Kaikeyī, although the axle was broken by the shooting of enemy’s arrows. The Rāmāyana seems to preserve some historical truth when it says that the enemy’s personal name was Timidhvaja and that he was titled as Śambara, so that his full name was Timidhvaja Śambara. The Rgveda gives us the name of his ancestor as Kulitara. Pradyumna, the son of Śrikrṣna, killed another Śambara whose full name was Kāla-Śambara. It appears from all this that in the great war, in which ninety-nine towns of Timidhvaja Śambara, the descendant of Kulitara, were destroyed and the hundredth town taken by storm, Daśaratha Ājeyā was invited by, and became the ally of Atithigya Divōdāsa.

1 Va. 99, 200. 2 Brm. 123, 7-17 ; 19 ; 24 : 27.
3 N. Ram. II, 9, 12 ; 13. 4 Rv. IV, 30, 14.
Consider, thirdly, the ancient tradition preserved in the Siva P. (VI, 13) which informs us that Maya’s two daughters Māyāvatī and Mandōdārī were given in marriage to Śambara and Rāvaṇa respectively. The over-libidinous king of Laṅkā, who forcibly polluted Vedavatī Āṅgirāsī and many other girls and who was finally killed for attempting the same on Sītā, tried once to take off the bride of Śambara (i.e. his wife’s sister) with the result that he with his companions Prahasta &c. were captured in the streets of Śambara’s capital by soldiers and guards clad in iron-armour and afterwards released by his powerful brother-in-law Śambara on the request of Maya who was the father-in-law of both.

This adds another evidence to our synchronism between Daśaratha and Atithigva Divōḍāsa, Śambara and Rāvaṇa being the connecting links.

There is yet a fourth ground for this synchronism between Daśaratha and Divōḍāsa, the Yajamāna of Bharadvāja Vājineya; for we find that Rāma Daśarathī on his way back from Laṅkā repaired to the hermitage of Bharadvāja who received him hospitably².

The fifth ground for the same synchronism is afforded by the fact that Ahalyā’s son Śatānanda was the officiating priest of Siradhvaja Janaka.³ Accordingly we conclude that Aikṣvāka Daśaratha was a contemporary of Paṇcāla Divōḍāsa who is well known as Atithigva Divōḍāsa in the Vedas, and who probably ruled also over the Kingdom of Kāśi as we shall see in the next chapter.

¹ Sv. VI, 13, 19 ; 20 ; 23 ; 24 ; 25 ; 26.
² Va. 45, 114 ; N. Ram. VI, 124, 1.
³ N. Ram. I, 50, 6.
CHAPTER II.
KINGS OF OTHER DYNASTIES, CONTEMPORARY OF DIVODASA.

Now we take up the line that sprang from Ajamiṣṭha by his wife Dhūminī. After Ajamiṣṭha, we have successively Brhadisuṣṭa, Brhadvasuṣṭa, Brhadvisṇuṣṭa, Brhanmanasūṣṭa, Brhaddhanuṣṭa, Brhatkarmanuṣṭa (Brhatkāya), Jayadrathaṣṭa, Viśvajitṣṭa, and Senajitṣṭa; so that Senajit of the Southern Pāṇcāla dynasty was the ninth in descent from Ajamiṣṭha and we have already seen that Divodasa also was a descendant of Ajamiṣṭha in the ninth degree. Hence the Southern Pāṇcāla King Senajit was a contemporary of the northern Pāṇcāla Divodasa.

Experience shows that when the succession is collateral synchronisms do not generally break in seven or eight generations. Hence Senajit may be taken to have been a contemporary of Atithigva Divodasa, younger or older. This is also proved by the number of kings that follow him (Senajit) down to the age of the Mahābhārata. Again, it is stated in the Puranas that when very advanced in years Dhūminī had her son Rksa who being the youngest of all was kept by Ajamiṣṭha at Hastinapura. His son Sambaraṇa reigned for a number of years at Hastinapura, and in a war with a Pāṇcāla king, fled from his kingdom, spent a number of years on the banks of the Indus, married a girl named

1 Vs. IV, 19, 11; Bh. IX, 21, 22.  2 Vs. IV, 19, 11; Va. 99, 170.
3 Va. 99, 171.  4 Mt. 49, 48.
5 Bh. IX, 21, 22; Mt. 49, 48.
6 Vs. IV, 19, 11; Va. 99, 171; Bh. IX, 21, 22.
7 Vs. IV, 19, 11; Va. 99, 171; Bh. IX, 21, 22; Mt. 49, 49.
8 Vs. IV, 19, 11; Va. 99, 172; Bh. IX, 21, 23; Mt. 49, 49.
9 Vs. IV, 19, 11; Va. 99, 172; Bh. IX, 21, 23; Mt. 49, 49.
10 Va. 99, 211; 212; 213; 214.
11 Gd. MBh. I, 94, 38; 39; 40; &c.
Tapatî Vaivasvatî (the daughter of a Rṣi named Vivasvant) and at last recovered possession of his kingdom of Hastināpura with the help of a certain seer Vasiṣṭha.

This war of Sambaraṇa, the son of Rkṣa against the Pāncała king seems to refer to the battle of ten kings, as the Bhāratas are herein described to have been put to a great distress and fled to a part of the Punjab. Hence Sambaraṇa’s son Kuru,¹ by Tapatî Vaivasvatî, ranks four steps below Ajamīḍha. Kuru therefore was a contemporary of Purujānu, the father of Trkṣa. Kuru had a son named Avikśit by Vāhīni² and this Avikśit’s son was Parikśit³. Parikśit again had a son named Janamejaya.⁴ Janamejaya’s son is named Suratha⁵ in many of the Puranas but the Agni Purana calls him Trasādasyu⁶. Suratha-Trasādasyu thus becomes the contemporary of Vadhrasyva, the father of Atithigva Divōdāsa.

From Jahnu, another descendant of Kuru, sprang the main Hastināpura line that had begun with Rkṣa, the father of Sambaraṇa. We know that according to the most Puranas, Kuru had four beloved sons⁷ namely Sudhanvan, Jahnu, Parikśit and Arimardana. But the earlier and therefore the more creditable account in the Mahābhārata says⁸ that Kuru had five sons by his wife Vāhīṇī namely Aśvavant-Avikśit⁹, Abhiṣyanta, Caitraratha, Muni and Janamejaya.

We have also seen that Parikśit was the son of Avikśit¹⁰. Parikśit thus becomes not the son but the grand-son of Kuru. Accordingly Jahnu, Sudhanvan and Arimardana may be considered as the grandsons of Kuru. Jahnu had Suratha, and the latter had Viduratha as his son¹¹. The similar sounding names Suratha, Viduratha indicate that Caitraratha might be the grand-father of Suratha and that the full name of

---

¹ Gd. MBh. I, 94, 48. ² Gd. MBh. I, 94, 51. ³ Gd. MBh. I, 94, 52
⁴ Gd. MBh. I, 94, 53; Va. 99, 229; Ag. 278, 31.
⁸ Gd. MBh. I, 94, 50; 51. ⁹ Nilakantha in the commentary.
Jahnu might be Jahnuratha. Instances of similar-sounding names of successive kings of the same dynasty are not rare in India. The case of Pusyamitra, Agnimitra, Vasumitra of the Śuṅga dynasty is a parallel. There are other instances.

Hence Kuru's son Caitraratha by Vāhinī is tentatively assumed to be the father of Jahnu (-ratha?). Jahnu's grandson Viduratha thus becomes the contemporary of Vadhrayaśva. Viduratha had a son named Sārvabhauma¹ who became the king and who accordingly was the contemporary of Atithigva Divōdāsa. Now, in addition to Sārvabhauma, Viduratha had two other sons whom most of the Puranas have forgotten. These two other sons of Viduratha were Rkṣa and Bharadvāja as stated in the Brahma². Both Rkṣa and Bharadvāja entered the order of Āṅgirasa teachers and have left 'pravaras' behind them, as stated in the Matsya³. Ajamīḍha⁴, Mudgala⁵, Priyamedha became Āṅgirasa teachers while Vadhrayaśva⁶ and his son Divōdāśā⁷ of the same family entered the Bhārgava order perhaps after their retirement from the world.

Now the cyclopedic Mahābhārata says⁸ that because the son of Viduratha of the dynasty of Puru, was brought up by bears (Rkṣas) in the Rkṣavānt mountain, therefore he was named Rkṣa. Thus it is found that Viduratha's son was a second Rkṣa. It was this second Rkṣa who was a contemporary of Atithigva Divōdāsa. Ajamīḍha's son will be called Rkṣa I and Viduratha's son, Rkṣa II. It may be noted in this connection that the real name of Bhārgava Vālmiki, the author of Rāmāyaṇa, was Rkṣa⁹. Mr. Pargiter¹⁰ has supposed, not unreasonably, that Rkṣa I, the father of Sambarāṇa, was a contemporary of Atithigvā Divōdāsa and has created a gap between Ajamīḍha and his youngest son Rkṣa I. He has created yet another gap between Rkṣa I and his son.

¹ Va. 99, 231. ² Brm. 13, 111; 112. ³ Mt. 196, 49. ⁴ Mt. 196, 46. ⁵ Mt. 196, 41. ⁶ Mt. 195, 42. ⁷ Mt. 195, 42. ⁸ Gd. MBh. XII, 49, 76; Kumb. MBh. XII, 48, 82. ⁹ Km I, 61, 8 &; Vs. III, 3, 17; 18. ¹⁰ JRAS, 1910.
Sambarana under the impression that Sudasa Pajavana fought Sambarana. It will be clear afterwards that Mr. Pargiter's adjustment of the Ikshvakus dynasty cannot stand, and as all the dynasties are intimately connected with one another, his adjustment of the Pauravas is defective.

According to the Purans, there was yet another Rksa in the Paurava line ruling at Hastinapura. He was1 the son of Devatithi, and the father of Bhimasena and hence is much below in the genealogical list; we call him Rksa III. Thus in the main Hastinapura line we have two Rksas namely Rksa I, the father of Sambarana, and Rksa III; while Rksa II probably established a principality somewhere else, and ultimately became an Angirasa teacher, as we have seen before. This does not clash with the statement2 in the Harivamsha that there were two Rksas in the line of Hastinapura kings. The Harivamsha and the Brahmas are confounded3 about Rksa II and Rksa III and omit the intermediate names between Viduratha and Rksa III.

We proceed with the lineal descendants of Sudhanvan, the grandson of Kuru, till we reach Krtas who thus ranks five steps below Kuru4 and hence was a contemporary of Atithigya Divodasa. It is stated in the Puranas that he had to perform many sacrifices till he got a son in his old age.5 The name of this son was Caidya Uparicara. (He was the king of Cedi.) Hence he ranks two steps below Krtas. It was his eldest son Bhradhratha I who founded the kingdom of Magadha. Hence it is probable that at the time of Divodasa and Dasharatha there was no existence of the Aryan kingdom of Magadha.

Next we come to Romapada, the descendant of Anu. He is mentioned as a friend and contemporary of Dasharatha, the father of Rama. His daughter Sant was married to

---

1 Va. 99, 233.
2 Hv. I, 32, 104.
3 Brm. 13, 111-113; Hv. I, 32, 103-105.
5 Va. 99, 219; 220.
Rṣyaśṛṅga who officiated in the Horse Sacrifice of Daśaratha who was anxious to have a son born to him. Hence Rōmapāda was also a contemporary of Daśaratha or Atithigva Divōdāsa.

Then we come to Yadu’s line and mark that Satvata’s son Bhima-Sātvata is mentioned in the Harivaṃśa as the king of the Yādavas, who reigned about the same time\(^1\) when Rāma Dāśarathī was ruling the earth. It is also stated there that Bhima-Sātvata’s son Andhaka reigned about the same time\(^2\) when Rāma’s son Kuśa was ruling his kingdom. Andhaka had two sons Kukura and Bhajamāna.

Next we come to Pratardana of the Kāśī line. He is probably the same as Pratardana Daivōdāsi who is a bit higher up in the genealogical list and who is represented in the Puranas\(^3\) and in the Mahābhārata\(^4\) as the half-brother (by the same mother, Drṣadvatī) of Śivi, Vasumanas and Aṣṭaka. It is related in detail in Ch. 114 and the following chapters in Book V of the Mahābhārata (Gauḍa recension) how Viśvāmitra’s disciple Gālava, after securing the daughter of a certain king Yayāti, (not to be confused with Yayāti Nāhūṣa) the king of the Kāśī, gave her in marriage by turns to Haryaśva the king of Ayōḍhya, Divōdāsa the king of Kāśi, and Uśīnara a famous king of the line of Anu, and last of all to his preceptor Viśvāmitra himself. These four people produced one son each and the sons were Vasumanas, Pratardana Śivi and Aṣṭaka respectively. The same contemporaneity is attested

---

\(^1\) Hv. II, 38, 38. Hv. II, 38, 39.
\(^2\) Hv. II, 38, 43.
\(^3\) Va. 99, 21; Va. 88, 76; Va. 92, 64; Va. 91, 103.
\(^4\) चतुर्दशमाग्रोऽपि रघुनाथस्य सन्तानस्य सप्तसदिराजाः स्नायुक्तज्ञ, श्रीनिवासी देहितं संसारवर्षो धृतभिः। महाराज गौरकुलसम्मिलातः परार्द्धेऽवासे रघुनाथस्य भवनिविषेद्वारं || 2 || Gd. MBh. III, 197, I-2.

तत्तत्त्तस्त्रका प्रेमस्वरूप श्रवणन्त्व श्रवणमािति चतुर्दशमान्।
राजा बन्धुभर राजैष्ठरेजेन च राजैष्ठानि।
प्रतर्दनेन स्वरुपणा समेत नित्य संसादिः — Gd. MBh. I, 86, 5

\(^5\) Gd. MBh. V, 115, 2.
by all the Puranas which say that these four were the sons of the same mother Drṣadvatī. Thirdly, it is supported by the Śayanānukramanī of the Rgveda where Śivi, Pratardana and Vasumanas are mentioned as the joint authors of one and the same hymn namely the 179th hymn of the 10th Maṇḍala just as Viśvāmitra and his nephew Jamadagni were the joint authors of III, 62 and of X, 167 hymns; or just as Nārada and his nephew Parvata were the joint authors of IX, 104-105 hymns. Fourthly, it is evident from the genealogical list that Pratardana ranks exactly the same number of steps below Manu Vaivasvata as Śivi and Aṣṭaka. (We shall take up the case of Vasumanas of the Ikṣvāku dynasty in future and prove that he too ranks exactly at the same step with Śivi, Pratardana and Aṣṭaka). Now there is a difference of ancestry of the king Pratardana. The Puranas say that the grandfather of Pratardana was Bhīmaratha and that his great grandfather was Kētumant; while the Mahābhārata very explicitly says that Pratardana’s grandfather was Sudeva, the son of Haryāśva; and that he (i.e. Pratardana) fought Vitahavya, a powerful king of the Haihayas and Tālajaṅghas. The Mahābhārata also says that the grandfather of Pratardana was called Bhīmasena (which is evidently a variant for Bhīmaratha). Haryāśva and Sudeva were very probably also named Kētumant and Bhīmaratha respectively. Fifthly, the contemporaneity is evidenced by the Rāmāyana where we find that Pratardana

1 Va. 92, 64; Va. 88, 76; Va. 91, 103; Va. 99, 2.
2 त्रिनोन्नागसंधीयानम् राजा प्रभुवालय! कविता! ।
काशीनामानशपति! प्रतवेन्द्रि नाम भु तौरयाय! ।
रौग्रदहङ्करसुवस्मना नाम श्रीयायाय! ॥—Say Kram R. X, 79.
5 Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 13; 15.
6 Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 44; 45.
7 Gd. MBh. V, 117, 1.
8 ते विद्वृत्त ततो राजो वस्त्रायक्षुकोभयः ।
प्रतादं न काशिपिति परिधानं दंडन्तो ॥—N. Ram. VII, 38, 15.
the brave king of Kāśi was of the same age as Rāma Dāśarathī and that he came to Aŷōdhya at the coronation of Rāma.

Sixthly, this is probably supported by the Rgveda where we find that Vājineya Bharadvāja, who was a contemporary of Atithigva Divōdāsa and consequently of Daśaratha, says,1 “Oh Lord Indra, we are your friends and votaries; may we become your favourite by these prayers composed for getting riches; may Pratardana’s son Kṣattrāśrī, my institutor of sacrifice, become great by killing enemies and securing riches”.

It will not do objecting that the word ‘Prātardani’ means a distant descendant of Pratardana. That the suffix is almost invariably applied in the sense of son will be abundantly clear when we remember that Virēcana is called Prāhlādi; Ambarīśa, Nābhagi; Aṣṭaka, Vaiśvāmitri; Ugrāyudha, Kārti; Rāma, Daśarathī; Bharata, Dausmanti; Jahnu I, Sauhōtri; Sahadeva, Jārāsandhi; Uttara, Vairāṭi; Jayadratha, Vārdhakṣatri; Śomaka, Sāhadevi; Atyārāti, Jānantapi; Indrajit, Rāvani; Sañjaya, Gāvalgani; Ugraśravas, Laumahārṣanī; Aśvatthāman, Drauṇi; Abhimanyu, Phālguni; Brāhaduktha, Daivarāti. A host of other instances can be mentioned to show that the suffix is almost invariably applied to the name of a person to denote his son. It is not rational therefore to say that ‘Prātardani’ does not mean the son of Pratardana here.

We describe the fight between Pratardana and Vītahāvyā, the Haihaya. A feud between the Kāsīs and the Haihayas was continuing through generations since a very early time. The Haihayas were very powerful under Arjuna Kārtavīrya who conquered neighbouring states and became a ‘cakravartin’. Arjuna’s haughtiness caused by power and his ruthless massacre of Brāhmaṇas finally brought about his death at the hands of Rāma Jāmadagnya. Arjuna’s grandson Tālājāṅgha was the ancestor of a set of terrible fighters known

1 1—Rv. VI, 26, 8.
as the Tālajaṅghas. From Tālajaṅgha the dynasty branched off into two: The last kings of these two branch dynasties were Vṛṣṇi and Supratīka. There is no mention in any of the Purans of any other Haihaya king after Vṛṣṇi and Supratīka, but the Vāyūn and the Matsya remarks that the descendants of the Haihaya king Vitiḥōtra continued to rule in Avanti.

The power of the Haihayas was crushed. Now sometime before the time of the very powerful king Arjuna Kārtavīrya, the Haihayas were gaining in power. They invaded the kingdom of Kāśi, and killed its king Haryaśva in an action which took place near the junction of the Ganges and the Jumna. During the reign of his son Sudeva, the Haihayas again invaded Vārāṇasī, defeated the king Sudeva, and plundered the capital. After the death of Sudeva, his son Divōdāsa was installed as king. He built the capital strongly as he quite knew what the Haihayas were worth. As usual, the Haihayas came and invested the capital, whereupon Saudeva Divōdāsa came out of Vārāṇasī and gave them battle. After a long fight which continued for a hundred days, Divōdāsa Saudeva was defeated, abandoned the capital and took refuge in the hermitage of Bharadvāja. The Rṣi after hearing of the plight to which Saudeva Divōdāsa was put, performed sacrifices for a heroic son to be born to him. His son Pratardana was born a great hero. In his youth, he was very brave and well-trained in the use of arms.

When Pratardana was considered strong enough to measure his strength with the Haihayas, he was sent by his father to punish them. Accordingly, Pratardana crossed the Ganges and led an aggressive war on the Haihayas by invading their capital. The forces of the Haihaya king Vitahavya were completely routed in the conflict, and victorious Pratardana pursued Vitahavya to the very hermitage of a Bhrigu. Vitahavya exchanged the sword for the scriptures and became a Bhrāgava teacher and thus his
life was spared. The Pancavimśa Brāhmaṇa (XV, 3,7.) also says that Bharadvāja was the Purōhita of Divōdasa; and the Kāthaka Samhitā (XXI, 10) says that Bharadvāja gave Pratardana the kingdom. Now it is stated in the Mahā-bhārata that the son of this Bhārgava Vitahavya was that famous Gr̥tsamada whose appearance was like that of Indra and who was assaulted by the Daityas who thought him to be Indra himself⁴. It is also stated that his compositions, preserved in the Ṛgveda, were among the very best².

From the Sarvanukramaṇi of Kātyāyana, Sāyana quotes³ that Gr̥tsamada who was the son of Sunahōtra of the Aṅgiras family and who entered the Br̥hrgu family by being a Saunaka saw the second Maṇḍala”; Sāyana further says⁴ that Gr̥tsamada, the son of Sunahōtra of the Aṅgiras family, was captured by the Asuras and rescued by Indra.

It is related in the Br̥haddevatā that Gr̥tsamada⁵ having applied himself to austerity, looked like Indra. Then two Daityas of terrible prowess, Dhuni and Cumuri, thinking him to be Indra himself, fell upon him, armed. Then being aware of their intention, the Rṣi glorified Indra who being pleased by the hymns of Gr̥tsamada killed the two Daityas. The particular hymn composed by Gr̥tsamada on this occasion is mentioned as that beginning with "वो जात &c.” i.e. the 12th hymn of Maṇḍala II of the Ṛgveda. Gr̥tsamada is also described in the Br̥haddevatā as the son of Sunahōtra⁶ and as a Bhārgava in the Saṃkhāyana Brāhmaṇa.⁷

---

1 तथा रस्तुसमेदः; एवो रूपेणेन्द्र इत्यापि।
   श्रवत्तिमिति तत् दैव निर्महीतं विजातं।—Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 58 ; 59.
2 महयेदे वचं चत्रया चुतिष्ठया स्माहम्;—Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 59.
3 तथा चानुषकौमिका। य आदिरसः शीवंहोच्छो मृत्तिकाः। शीवकावभम् स ग्रस्तुमयं
   धितीयं मंडलामम्।—Say. Kram. Rv. II, 1.
4 स च गूढःमार्गस्रकुञ्जी शुचिप्रचं एव; सन् ग्रामविक्षुःसुरमेदं हीतं दैव भोक्तिः।—
5 Br. Dv. IV, 66-69.
6 Br. Dv. IV, 78.
7 Samkh. Bra. XXII, 4.
From the Rgveda we collect the following points about Gṛtsamada:

(i) Gṛtsamada was the son of Śunahōtra (II, 41, 14; 17.);

(ii) he mentions Śambara as having been found in the mountains after a long search of forty years (II, 12, 11);

(iii) he speaks of Śambara’s hundred very old cities as having been rent by Indra (II, 14, 6);

(iv) he says that Indra rent the ninety-nine cities of Śambara in favour of Divōdāsa (II, 19, 6);

(v) he says that the two Asuras, Cumuri and Dhuni, were killed by Indra in favour of the royal seer Dabhitī and that even the door keeper of Dabhitī obtained the enemies’ gold (II, 15, 9).

The Puranas say¹ that Gṛtsamada was the third son of Śunahōtra, the latter being the son of Nahuṣa’s brother Kṣattravṛddha; and that Gṛtsamada’s son was Śunaka; and that his grandson Saunaka inaugurated the division of the Aryan race into four principal groups on the basis of the nature of their work. Thus the Puranas take Gṛtsamada to a very early age.

From all these, the following conclusions may be drawn:

(1) The two Gṛtsamadas, Gṛtsamada Śunahōtra and Gṛtsamada Vaitahavya were probably one and the same person.

(2) Gṛtsamada Vaitahavya must be either a contemporary of or later than Divōdāsa who killed Śambara.

(3) Gṛtsamada Vaitahavya entered the Saunaka order of Bhārgava teachers and hence was called Saunaka Gṛtsamada. The Bhārgavas were divided into seven orders among which the Saunaka was one (Va. 65, 96).

(4) Cumuri and Dhuni were killed by the King Dabhitī and his soldiers, and belonged to a very early age, and hence Ānāgrīra Gṛtsamada i.e. the son of Śunahōtra who was

¹ Brm. 11, 32; 33. Vs. IV, 8, 1. Va. 92, 2; 3; 4.
oppressed by the same two Daityas, was a contemporary of King Dabhiti.

(5) The same Gr̄tsamada was adopted by Bhārgava Vitahavya as stated in the Mahābhārata and became known as Bhārgava Gr̄tsamada.

(6) Vitahavya the Haihaya, was enlisted in the general order of Bhārgava teachers.

(7) The Śaunaka order of Bhārgava teachers did not exist before the time of Vitahavya the Haihaya, and Śāyana is probably wrong in calling Gr̄tsamada a Śaunaka.

(8) The statement in the Sarvānikrāmaṇī quoted by Śāyana seems to be based on the custom of adoption which was prevalent even in the Vedic age as we shall show later on.

The line that sprang from Vitahavya Bhārgava as stated in the Mahābhārata is entered on the genealogical table which goes to show that Gr̄tsamada Vaitahavya ranks only two steps below Atithīgva Divōdāsa whose exploits he must have therefore heard of, and hence may very well mention Divōdāsa in his compositions. This shows that Gr̄tsamada Vaitahavya was later than Atithīgva Divōdāsa and hence the Mahābhārata seems to be perfectly right in identifying him.

Now in the Rāmāyaṇa we find¹ that Pratardana is also called the brave Kauśeya, and that he returned to his own capital Vārānasī with the permission of Rāma Dāśarathī, after the coronation of the latter was over. The word ‘Kauśeya’ there, suggests amendment to ‘Kāśeya’ which means ‘the descendant of Kāśi.’ His son Kṣattraśri, whom Vājineya Bharadvāja speaks of, was probably another name or a surname of the Puranic Vatsa. Or it may be the name of some other son of Pratardana Daivōdāsi. For we know that Partardana had many sons amongst

¹ N. Ram. VII, 38, 19, 20.
whom Vatsa and Bharga were famous,¹ and we have already seen that Pratardana had his son named Kṣattrasrī² as evidenced by the Rgveda.

Thus we see that the Aikśvāka King Daśaratha, the father of Rāma, the northern Pāñcāla King Atithigva Divōdāsa, the brother of Ahalyā, Senajit, the southern Pāñcāla King, Sārvabhauma and Rkṣa II, the sons of Viduratha of the Hastināpura line, Kṛta, the father of Uparicara whose descendant Bṛhadratha I founded the kingdom of Magadha, Rōmapāda-Daśaratha of the dynasty of Aṅga, Śrīadhvaja Janaka, the father of Sītā, King Satvant of the Yadu dynasty, and the father of Vītahavya the Haihaya,—all these ten kings belonged to the same age, namely the age of Divōdāsa.

¹ Va. 92, 65; Brm. 11, 50; Hv. I, 29, 73. ² R. VI, 26, 8.
CHAPTER III.

THE DESCENDANTS OF THE KING SATVANT OF THE YADUS.

We shall now try to reconcile the various conflicting descriptions in the Purāṇas of the dynasty that sprang from the king Satvant of the Yadus. The Vāyu (95, 45-47), calls him Sattva and represents him to have been the son of Purudvant by Aikśvākī. This Purudvant was, according to the Vāyu, the son of Puruvaśa (or Mahāpuruvaśa) and the latter was one of the four sons of Madhu, so that according to the Vāyu, Sattva (the correct name is Satvant, vide Sat. Bra. XIII, 5, 4, 21; vide also Ait. Bra. VIII, 14) was the third in descent from Madhu. Sattva’s son is named Sattvata in the Vāyu (95, 47). According to the Vāyu (96, 1-2) Sattvata’s wife Kauśalyā was the mother of Bhajamāna, Devāydhā, Andhaka and Vṛṣṇi.

The Matsya (44, 44-46,) says that Puravasa, the son of Madhu, was the father of Purudvant and that Jantu was born to Purudvant by Vaidarvī Bhadraseni, while Jantu had by Aikśvākī his famous son Sātvata. Hence according to the Matsya, as ac-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madhu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Puruvaśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Purudvant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Sattva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Sātvata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bhajamāna Andhaka Devāydhā Vṛṣṇi
cording to the Vāyu, Sāttvata was the fourth in descent from Madhu. It is clear that Sattva of the Vāyu is the same as Jantu of the Matsya. According to the Matsya (44, 47) Bhajamāna, Devāvṛdha, Andhaka, and Vṛṣṇi were the Sāttvatas (Sāttvān) and were born to Kauśalyā. The Matsya evidently means that these four were the sons of Sāttvata. The Brahmanda (II, 3, 70, 46-48) says that Madhu’s son was Puruvasu; Puruvasu’s son was Purudvant; Purudvant’s son by Bhadra-vatī was Purūdvaha, but by Aikṣvākī was born Sattva; and from him (i.e. from the last named Sattva) was born the famous Sāttvata. Thus according to the Brahmanda which closely agrees with Bhajamāna Devāvṛdha Vṛṣṇi Andhaka the Vāyu, Sāttvata was the fourth in descent from Madhu. The Brahmanda (II, 3, 71, 1) adds that Sāttvata had his sons named Bhajamāna Devāvṛdha, Andhaka, Vṛṣṇi &c. by Kauśalyā. The Hariavmśa (I, 36, 28) says that Madhu had, by Vaidarbhī, a son named Maruvasas. It is evident that this Maruvasas of the Hariavmśa is the same as Puruvaśa of the Vāyu, Puravasa of the Matsya and Puruvasu of the Brahmanda. The son of Maruvasas was, according to the Harivamśa (I, 36, 29a,) the excellent Purudvant. After finishing with Purudvant, the son of Maruvasas, the Harivamśa I, 36, 29b states “मधुजलेख्य वैद्रभा मद्रवसा कुरुद्वहः” which literally means “Kurūdvaha Madhu was born then to Bhadrawatī of the house of Vaidarbha”. The commentator Nilakanṭha clears this by stating that Purudvant’s wife was Bhadrawatī Vaidarbha and Madhu was born to her. After this the Harivamśa (I, 36, 30a) says that
Aikṣvākī too was the wife, and Satvant was born to her. The Harivaṃśa really means that in addition to Vaidarbhi Bhadra-vatī (the mother of Madhu Kurudvaha), Purudvant had Aikṣvākī too as his wife, and that Satvant was born to Aikṣvākī. Thus according to the Harivaṃśa, the genealogy stands as represented here. The Harivaṃśa I, 36, 30b finishes with Satvant by remarking that Satvant was possessed of all good qualities and was, amongst the Sātvatas, a spreader of fame. (Satvān Sarvagunōpeṭah sātvatām kīrtivardhanah). The corresponding line in the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa runs as

“Sattvāt Sattvagunōpeṭah Sattvataḥ Kīrtivardhanah”

and means

“From Sattva (was born) Sattvataḥ, the possessor of Sattva qualities and the increaser of fame”. The corresponding line in the Matsya runs as

“Sātvataḥ Sattvasaṃyuktaḥ Sattvataṁ Kīrtivardhanah”

and means

“Sattvata (who was born to Jantu) was possessed of Sattva qualities (and was) amongst the Sātvatas an increaser of the fame or an increaser of the fame of the Sātvatas” (taking Sāpeksatvepi gamakatvāt Samāsah). Now the Harivaṃśa after calling the son of Purudvant by the name Satvant, next chooses (I, 37, 1) to call him Satvata.

The Harivaṃśa gives another account of the ancestry of Satvata whom it has also called Satvant as we have seen just now. It says (Hv II, 37, 12-13) that there was a king named Haryaśva who belonged to the dynasty of Ikṣvāku, the son of Manu, and that he (i.e. Haryaśva) married Madhumatī the daughter of Madhu—a Daitya. Haryaśva’s son was Yadu (Hv. II, 37, 44); one of Yadu’s five sons was named Mādhava (Hv. II, 38, 1-2); Mādhava’s son was Satvata (Hv. II, 38, 36-37). Hence according to his second account of the Harivaṃśa, the ancestry of Satvata stands as re-
presented in the adjoining tree. Now the Harivamśa has said before (I, 37, 1-2) that Andhaka was one of the many sons of Satvata, while it now says that Satvata’s son was Bhīma (Hv. II, 38, 38) and that Bhīma’s son was Andhaka (Hv. II, 38, 43). Hence according to this second statement of the Harivamśa, Bhīma may be patronymically called Sātvata whose existence is a certainty on the strength of the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, and the Matsya.

The genealogy according to the Kūrma (I, 24, 30-34) is represented by the adjoining tree. It says that Sattvata, the son of Aṁśu made a scripture for the Kūndas and the Gōlas on the advice of a certain Rāsi Nārada and that Sattvata’s son Sātvata circulated the scripture (Km. I, 24, 30-35). The Kūrma adds (I, 24, 35-36) that the Sātvatas [Sātvatān] named Andhaka, Vṛṣṇi, Devāvṛdhā, and Bhajamāna &c., were born to Kauśalyā. The Kūrma evidently means that these were the sons of Sātvata by Kauśalyā. The Viṣṇu says (IV, 12, 16) that Aṁśu’s son was Satvata and that Satvata’s sons were Bhajina, Bhajamāna, Andhaka, Devāvṛdhā, Vṛṣṇi &c. (Vs. IV, 13, 1). Thus according to the Viṣṇu, the sons of the Satvata were known
as the Śātvtatas. The Viśṇu omits Śātvata, the son of Satvant and the father of Andhaka, Devāvṛḍha, Bhajamāna &c. Aṁśu of the Viśṇu stands for Satvant, and Śātvata for Sātvata. According to the Bhāgavata (IX, 24, 6) Āyu’s son was Sātvata and Sātvata’s sons were Bhajamāna, Bhaji, Viśṇi, Devāvṛḍha, Andhaka &c. It is easy to infer that Āyu of the Bhāgavata stands for Sattva of the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa, Jantu of the Matsya, Aṁśu of the Viśṇu and the Kūrma, Satvant of the Harivamśa.

According to the Agni 275, 22-24 Madhu’s son Dravarasa was the father of Puruhuta, and Puruhuta’s son Jantu was the father of Sāttvata and Sāttvata was the father of Bhajamāna, Viśṇi, Andhaka and Devāvṛḍha. The genealogy is represented in adjoined tree. It is evident that Jantu of the Agni stands for Jantu of the Matsya and therefore for Sattva of the Vāyu.

The Brahma simply says (15, 28-31) that Madhu’s son was Satvant and Satvant’s sons were Bhajamāna, Viśṇi, Andhaka and Devāvṛḍha. It is clear that the Brahma omits steps and especially the king Sātvata.

From all these evidences of the Purāṇas, it is clear that the father of Bhajamāna, Viśṇi, Andhaka and Devāvṛḍha, was a king whom the Vāyu, the Matsya, the Brahmāṇḍa,
the Kûrma, the Bhāgavata, the Agni have called Sāttvata or Sātvata. This same king has been called Bhîma, the son of Satvata by the Harivaṁśa (in its second account). It is clear that the Vāyu, the Matsya, the Brahmāṇḍa &c. have used the patronymic, while the Harivaṁśa, in its second account, gives the personal name. Hence we shall call him Bhîma Sātvata (i.e. the son of Satvant): The Viṣṇu has corrupted the name of his father (i.e. Satvant) into Aṁśu and the name of the son into Satvata which should have been Sātvata. Lastly the Kûrma which is much later separates the same name into Aṁśu and Satvata.

Now we shall determine the dynasty of Bhîma Sāvata. This famous king Bhîma Sātvata was according to the Harivaṁśa ruling at the same time when Râma Dâśarathî was ruling his kingdom and that when they were thus simultaneously reigning, Satrughna killed Lavaṇa, the son of Madhu, and cut down the forest of Madhu and established the town of Mathurā.\(^1\) The Harivaṁśa further says, that Andhaka, the son of Bhîma (\(=\) Sātvata) was ruling in Mathurā at the same time when Râma’s son Kuśa was ruling his own kingdom.\(^2\) The Râmâyana says that Satrughna installed his son Subâhu in Mathurâ,\(^3\) and the Harivaṁśa improves on this by informing us that Bhîma re-occupied Mathurâ and even resided there for a time.\(^4\) It is certain then that

\[1\] सल्तनत सुती राजा बीमो नाम मद्यानभूतो।
वेन बेमा, युक्तर्था, सल्तनत सालिता, कृता।।
राजसे राजावे तामनु राजसे राजार विवासतो।
श्रवणे नववा हुलवा विचक्षे द स मधोवनम्।।
तामनु मद्यवे फारे फरीच मद्यरामाम्।
भिवदायामास विवृतु, सुभिवदनवस्व कु।।
H.V. II, 38, 38—40.

\[2\] तत्, कुमे खिलु राजाके कने तु सुपराजनि।
भृकुठी नाम भृमक्ष सुती राजाधारवस्व।।
H.V. II, 38, 43.


\[4\] H.V. II, 38, 41—42.
Śatrughna's son Subāhu was ousted by Bhīma Sātvata. Every one will admit that a detailed information like this can only come out of a well-informed source and accordingly we hold that this synchronism supplied by the Harivaṃśa is based on truth. Yet there are Vedic evidences to prove the same contemporaneity between Rāma Dāśarathi and Bhīma Sātvata. We have already seen that the Purāṇas are completely unanimous in holding that Bhajamāna, Devāvṛḍha, Andhaka and Vṛṣṇi were brothers. Of these Devāvṛḍha performed austerities on the bank of the river Parnāsa and got an excellent son named Babhrum.  

In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa it is found that the Rṣis Parvata and Nārada spoke about the edibles of a Kṣattriya to Sōmaka Sahadevya (=the son of Sahadeva); Sōmaka again spoke about it to Sahadeva Sārṇijaya (=the son of Sṛṇjaya), that is, Sōmaka really spoke about it to his father Sahadeva; Sahadeva again spoke about it to Babhrum Daivāvṛḍha (=the son of Devāvṛḍha). This shows that Babhrum, the son of Devāvṛḍha, was a contemporary, to a certain extent, of Sōmaka, the son of Sahadeva, as well as of Sahadeva, the son of Sṛṇjaya. We have already established from the Rgveda that Atithigya Divōdāsa, the son of Vadhrayaśva, and Prastōka, the son of Sṛṇjaya, were contemporaries, as Garga, the son of Vājineya Bharadvāja, accepted gifts both from Atithigya Divōdāsa as well as from Prastōka. We have also established that this Divōdāsa, the son of Vadhrayaśva, was no other than the very Divōdāsa who was the brother of Ahalyā. Remembering now that Ahalyā was accepted back by Śravantī Gautama after Rāma Dāśarathi paid her a visit, it cannot but be inferred that Bhīma Sātvata, the grand-father of Babhrum Daivāvṛḍha,

1 Va. 96, 6-16; Mt. 44, 51-60; Bd. II, 3, 71, 6-16; Hv. I, 37, 6-15; Km. 1, 24, 37-38; Vs. IV, 13, 3-5; Bh. IX, 24, 9-11; Ag. 275, 25-26; Brm. 15, 33-44.  
2 Ait. Bra. VII, 34.  
3 Rv. VI, 47, 21-25.  
4 Rv. VI, 61, 1.  
5 Va. 99, 100-201.
was a contemporary, to a certain extent, of Rāma Dāśarathi. The contemporaneity is best illustrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Srūjaya</th>
<th>Vadhrayāva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satvant Sahadeva</td>
<td>Prastōka, Nārada Dīvōdasa Ahalyā Daśaratha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīma</td>
<td>Parucepepa Rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sōmaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devāvṛdha</td>
<td>Anānata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhaka</td>
<td>Kuśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babhrū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we proceed with the successive lineal descendants of Andhaka the son of Sātvata (=Bhīma). The Vāyu at the very start when it proposes to give us the lineal descendants of Andhaka, corrupts the name ‘Andhaka,’ into ‘Satyaka and ‘Kukura’ into ‘Kakuda’ and says that the daughter of the king of Kāśi gave birth to Kakuda Bhajamāna, Śuci and Kambalabarhis from Satyaka.¹ The Vāyu afterwards corrects the name Kukuda into Kukura.² It may be that Satyaka was another name of Andhaka. The Matsya corrupts³ ‘Andhakāt Kāśyaaduhīta’ into ‘Atha Kanka-sya duhitā’ and then proceeds with the lineal descendants as does the Vāyu. The Brahmānda says⁴ that Kukura, Bhajamāna, Śuci and Kambalabarhis were born to Satyaka by the daughter of the Kāśi king. The reading in the Harivamśa is satisfactory as it says⁵ that the daughter of the king of the dynasty of Kāśi had four sons namely Kukura, Bhajamāna, Śami and Kambalabarhis from Andhaka. The Harivamśa in its second account says⁶ that Andhaka’s son (Suta) was Raivata. It will be realised afterwards as we proceed that the word ‘Suta’ here means a distant descendant and not the son, and that the name Raivata is a corrupt form of the correct name Revata. The Kurma says⁷ that

¹ Va. 96, 115. ² Va. 96, 134. ³ Mt. 44, 61. ⁴ Hv. I, 37, 17. ⁵ Hv. II, 38, 44. ⁶ Km. I, 24, 48-49.
the daughter of the king of the dynasty of Kāśi had, from Andhaka, four sons namely Kukura, Bhajamāna, Šamīka and Kambalabarhis, so that the reading in the Kūrma too is satisfactory. The Viṣṇu says that Andhaka’s four sons were Kukura, Bhajamāna, Śuci and Kambalabarhis so that the Viṣṇu is all right. The Bhāgavata mentions only the names of the four brothers Kukura, Bhajamāna, Śuci, and Kambalabarhis but omits the name of their father i.e. it omits Andhaka. The commentator however clears this by quoting from the Viṣṇu that these four are to be understood to have been the sons of Andhaka. The Agni says that Kukura, Bhajamāna, Śini and Kambalabarhiṣa were the four sons of Babhrū Daivāvṛdha. But this is a mistake as can be inferred from the combined testimony of the Kūrma, the Viṣṇu and the Harivamśa as well as from the evidences of the Vāyu the Matsya, and the Brahmāṇḍa although the readings in the latter three are corrupt. The same is evidenced by the Brahma which says that from Andhaka the daughter of the Kāśya king had four sons namely Kukura, Bhajamāna, Šāsaka and Balabarhis [Śaśakam Balabarhiṣam]. It is evident that ‘Śaśakam Balabarhiṣam’ is the scribes error for Śucim Kambalabarhiṣam, ‘kam’ having been separated from ‘bālarniṣam’ and added on to the corrupt form ‘Śaśa’ which should have been ‘Śucim’ as sanctioned by the Vāyu, the Viṣṇu, the Brahmāṇḍa, and the Bhāgavata. This Śuci has been called Śāsi in the Matsya, Śini in the Agni, Sami in the Harivamśa and Šamika in the Kūrma as we have seen before.

The Purāṇas now deal with the lineal descendants of Kukura, the son of Andhaka. Kukura’s son has been called Brṣṭi (in some manuscripts Brṣṇi) in the Vāyu, Brṣṇi in the Matsya, Brṣṇi in the Brahmāṇḍa, Dhrṣṇu in the Hari-

1 Vs. IV, 14, 3.  
2 Bh. IX, 24, 19a.  
3 Ag. 275, 27.  
4 Brm. 15, 45-46.  
5 Va 96, 116a.  
6 Mt. 44, 62a.  
7 Bd. II, 3, 71, 117a.
vanśa,¹ Bršni in the Kūrma,² Dhṛṣṭa in the Viṣṇu,³ Vahni in the Bhāgavata,⁴ Dhṛṣṇu in the Agni,⁵ and Bršṭi in the Brahma.⁶ The correct form of the name is Viṣṇi. After Viṣṇi whom we shall call Viṣṇi II, there is a divergence of opinion amongst the Purāṇas as regards his lineal descendants. The Vāyu says⁷ that Bršni (or Bršṭi) had a son named Kapōtarōman and Kapōtarōman’s son was Revata and Revata had a learned son Bhava [Bhavat in the line ‘Tasyasīttumburusakhā Vidvān Putro ‘bhavat kila’ is a corrupt reading for the personal name ‘Bhava’ because after the verb ‘āsit’ has been used, there is no need of using ‘abhavat’ again]. He was the friend of Tumburu and was well-known by his (i.e. Tumburu’s) name as Candanōdakadundubhi; they were namesake and were friends. Thus according to the Vāyu, the genealogy would stand as represented above.

The Brāhmaṇḍa gives⁸ the same number of steps from Viṣṇi II to Candanōdakadundu bhi but it changes Revata of the Vāyu into Vilōman and gives the name of the son of Vilōman as Andhaka and adds that this Andhaka’s another name was Candanōdakadundubhi. It is evident then Revata of the Vāyu is the same as Vilōman of the Brahmaṇḍa. The Viṣṇu says⁹ that Dhṛṣṭa’s son was Kapōtarōman, Kapōtarōman’s son was Vilōman, and Vilōman’s son Bhava was surnamed as Candanōdakadundubhi. Thus Bhava of the Viṣṇu is the same as Andhaka of the Brahmaṇḍa and Bhava

¹ Hv. I, 37, 18a.  ² Km. I, 24, 49b.  ³ Vs. IV, 14, 4.  ⁴ Bh. IX, 24, 19.  ⁵ Ag. 175, 28.  ⁶ Brm. 15, 46.  ⁷ Va. 96, 116-117.  ⁸ Bd. II, 3, 71, 117-118.  ⁹ Vs. IV, 14, 4.
of the Vāyu. According to the Viṣṇu, the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa that gentleman’s surname was Candanōdakadundubhi. The Kūrma says¹ that Brṣṇī’s son Kapōtarōman was the father of Vilōmaka and Vilōmaka’s son Tama was the friend of Tumburu and Tama’s son was Anakadundubhi. It is evident that the Kūrma corrupts Candanōdakadundubhi into Anakadundubhi and commits a mistake by separating its Tama (=Andhaka of the Brahmāṇḍa= Bhava of the Viṣṇu) from Candanōdakadundubhi. This mistake has certainly been due to corrupt readings. The Kūrma partially corrects itself by calling its Anakadundubhi by Candanōdakadundubhi later on.² The Bhāgavata says³ that Vahni (=Vṛṣṇi II) had his son named Vilōman and Vilōman’s son was Kapōtarōman and Kapōtarōman’s son was Anu and his friend was Tumburu. Thus the Bhāgavata reverses the order by making Kapōtarōman the son of Vilōman and gives the name Anu for Bhava, the friend of Tumburu. It is evident that this Anu of the Bhāgavata is the same as Andhaka of the Brahmāṇḍa, Bhava of the Viṣṇu and the Vāyu, and Tama of the Kūrma.

¹ Km. I, 24, 49-50. ² Km. I, 24, 63a. ³ Bh. IX, 24, 19-20a.
The Matsya says\(^1\) that Brṣṇi’s son was Dhṛti and his son was Kapōṭarōman and Kapōṭarōman’s son was Taittance and his learned son was Nala who was surnamed Nandanōdara-dundubhi. It is certain that Dhṛti mentioned in the Matsya as the son of Vṛṣṇi II is spurious and has sprung into existence owing to misunderstanding of the relation between the following two lines:

कुकुरः सुतो व्रश्नष्णोस्तु तनवोभवत्।
कपोतरोमाव प्रसायः रावनोभवदालः॥

It is evident that the word Kapōṭarōman of the second line has its ‘anyaya’ with the first line. It is also probable that ‘Dhṛti’ is a corrupt form for ‘abhavat’ in the first line. Secondly the Matsya gives the name Taittance for Revata-Vilōman. Thirdly the Matsya has corrupted Candanōdaka-dundubhi into ‘Nandanōdaradundubhi,’ while the appellation ‘Tanuja Sarpa’ given by the Matsya to its Nala (= Andhaka = Bhava = Tama) the learned son of its Taittance (= Vilōman = Revata) is a corruption for ‘Tumburu Sakhā.’ Mark how curiously corrupted are the readings of the Matsya.

The Agni which almost copies from the Matsya says\(^2\) that Dhṛṣṇu (= Vṛṣṇi II) had Dhṛti, the latter had Kapōṭarōman, Tittiri was born to Kapōṭarōman, Tittiri’s son was Nara and his was Candanadundubhi. We have already given reasons why Dhṛti should be considered as spurious so we need not further dilate on it. Similarly Nara was the same as Nala of the Matsya, Tama of the Kūrma, Andhaka of the

\(^1\) Mt. 44, 62-63.
\(^2\) Ag. 275, 28-29.
Brahmāṇḍa, Bhava of the Viṣṇu and the Vāyu and hence was the same as Candanōdakadundubhi; and not his father as indicated in the Agni which apparently distorts the identity owing to its corrupt readings.

The Brahma says¹ that Bṛṣṭi's son was Kapōtarōman and Kapōtarōman's son was Tiliri and Tiliri's son was Punarvasu. Tiliri is evidently a corruption for Tittiri whom we have seen before to have been the successor of Kapōtarōman and hence he was no other than Revata of the Vāyu and Vilōman of the Brahmāṇḍa, the Viṣṇu, the Bhāgavata and the Kūrma &c. The Brahma omits steps between this Revata-Vilōman-Tittiri and Punarvasu who is a bit below in the list.

At last, we turn to the Harivamśa where we find² Dhrṣṇu, Kapōtarōman, Taittiri, Punarvasu as the lineal descendants after Kukura. Thus the Harivamśa omits steps between Tittiri-Vilōman-Revata and Punarvasu. We shall see presently that Punarvasu belongs to a lower step on the genealogical table.

Now we shall determine the successive lineal descendants of Bhava who was surnamed Candanōdakadundubhi. To do this let us try to understand the following lines quoted from the Vāyu 96, 118-119

¹ Brm. 15, 46-47.
² Hv. I, 37, 18-19.
Mark the words 'Abhijitāḥ' and 'Atirātrasya' in the first and the third lines respectively of the verses quoted above from the Vāyu.

Now turn to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. There we find that Aṭṭāra's son, the Kaushalya Para Hairanyanābha sacrificed with an Abhijit Atirātra. The Vedic scholar knows it well that Jyōtis Atirātra, Āyus Atirātra, Viśvajit Atirātra Abhijit Atirātra, Gō Atiratra &c. were famous forms of Atirātra sacrifices. The Abhijit and the Viśvajit may also be performed as Agniṣṭōma sacrifices and in that case they form part of the Gavam-Ayana. The Abhijit as an Atirātra when performed as a part of a sacrificial session like the Aśvamedha, as in the present case, consists of chanting twelve Stōtras in four different Stōmas. Now try to understand the two verses quoted from the Vāyu Purāṇa. They really mean that the Yādava king Bhava who was surnamed Candanōdakadundubhi instituted an Aśvamedha sacrifice for a son to be born to him, and during the session of the Aśvamedha when Stōtras were being chanted in the Abhijit Atirātra sacrifice of that session, Punarvasu rose from the centre of the enclosure of the Vedi [Sadōmadhyāt]. It may be taken to be established then that Bhava-Candanōdakadundubhi, by virtue of an Abhijit Atirātra performed in the sacrificial session of the Aśvamedha, got his famous son Punarvasu. Thus the information supplied by the Vāyu about the whole affair is of absorbing interest.

Now turn to the other Purāṇas. The Brahmāṇḍ (II, 3, 71, 119), the Viṣṇu (IV, 14, 4), the Kūrma (I, 24, 63) (or rather the pandits who wrote them during the early Gupta period) have not been able to understand the true meaning of the interesting tradition handed down to them; and accordingly an imaginary Abhijit between Bhava-Candanōdakadundubhi and his son Punarvasu has been set

1 Sat. Bra. XIII, 5, 4, 4.
up in them. The Harivamśa (I, 37, 18-19) is in serious error in omitting Bhava-Candanaḥdakadundubhi from between its Taittiri (=Vilōman=Revata) and Punarvasu. So also has been the Brahma (15, 47). The Agni (2 5, 29) is all right, although it corrupts names. Now we turn to the Matsya which gives the corresponding lines as follow:

न क्षमन प्रवितते यज्ञे धम्मार्यत्: युनवंसः:
ब्रह्ममेच तु युवार्थमाजहार नरोत्तमः:
तथा मध्येवितरंच्य सहामुढात् समुयस्वितः:
भास्मु विद्यानु नम्ब्रो यज्ञा दाता युनवंसः:

It will be noticed that the Matsya words ‘Abhijātaḥ’ ‘Sabhā-madhyāt’ and ‘Karmajño’ stand for the corresponding Vāyu words ‘Abhijitaḥ,’ ‘Sadō-madhyāt’ and ‘Dharmajño.’ The superiority of the Vāyu over the Matsya is clearly felt when it is perceived that ‘Abhijitaḥ’ is the word in this particular case and means ‘by virtue of the Abhijit sacrifice’ and that ‘Sadō-madhyāt’ is the only word appropriate in connection with the sacrificial altar (cf. Vedisadas) ; and that Dharma is the proper word which means a Yajña, a sacrifice (Rv. III, 17, 1, 5 ; Rv. I, 134, 5 ; Kumb. M. Bh. XII, 58, 21, &c.). As against these, the Matsya word ‘Abhijātaḥ’ means ‘born’ and cannot stand as an historical evidence. The Matsya word ‘Sabhā-madhyāt’ means very little, while the Vāyu form ‘Sadō-madhyat’ is the exact word which was used in those days in connection with sacrifices, [compare Vediṣadas, Yajnāsadasa, Yajnāsadana, Sadas (Sat. Bra. V, 4, 3, 6) Sadasya &c.]

To give an idea of the Sadas we observe that the Iṣtis were performed in the Prācinavamśa. To the east of the Prācinavamśa, lay the Mahā-Vedi. On the eastern part of this Mahāvedi or Saumika Vedi was erected the Sadas or a shed. The Sōma was used to be brought from the Prācinavamśa to the Sadas. Six long parallel fire-pits
[Dhiṣṇyas] stretched from the North to the South inside the Sadas. Near the centre of the series of Dhiṣṇyas was placed the Audumbarī.

Similarly Karma being derived from the root Kṛ originally meant any action (Rv. I, 62, 6); but of course it afterwards came to mean a sacrifice. After all, the priority of the Vāyu over the other Purāṇas for these and many other reasons, is indisputable.

Now who was the son of Punarvasu? The Vāyu says that Punarvasu had a twin i.e. Āhuka and Āhukī. Of these Āhuka was unconquered [Bāhu-Vāṇajitah] [compare 'Yamāhurajitam Kṛṣṇam' Kumb. MBh. III, 273, 74]¹. The Matsya also says that the twin [Putra-mithunam] was conquered (Babhūvāvijitam).² The Brahmāṇḍa (Veṅkatesvara Press edition) however without understanding the word ‘Babhūvāṇṇajitah’ has tried to correct it by substituting Babhūvābhijitah for it.³ The Harivaṃśa⁴ the Brahma,⁵ have been misled by the Brahmāṇḍa in thinking that Punarvasu’s son was Ābhijit and Ābhijit’s twin son and daughter were Āhuka and Āhukī. This confusion of the Harivaṃśa and Brahma is checked by the Viṣṇu,⁶ the Kūrma,⁷ the Bhāgavata⁸ and the Agni⁹ all of which clearly state that Āhuka and Āhukī were respectively the son and daughter.

---

¹ Va. 96, 120. ² Mt. 44, 66. ³ Bd. II, 3, 71, 121. ⁴ Hv. I, 37, 19. ⁵ Brm. 15, 47-48. ⁶ Vs. IV, 14, 4. ⁷ Km. I, 24, 63. ⁸ Bh. IX, 24, 21. ⁹ Ag. 275, 29.
of Punarvasu. Accordingly it is settled that the unconquered Āhuka was the son of Punarvasu. It may as well be held in defence of the Brahmāṇḍa i.e. against the Vāyu and the Matsya that Punarvasu had his twin son and daughter i.e. Āhuka and Āhukī by virtue of an Abhijit sacriifice but even in that case the setting up of an imaginary Abhijit as the son of Punarvasu, as as been done in the Harivaṃśa and the Brahma, is out of question. Consequently the Harivaṃśa and the Brahma are wrong in this respect.

Āhuka, according to the Vāyu,\(^1\) gave his sister Āhukī in marriage to Āhukāndha and Āhukāndha had a daughter and two sons named Devaka and Ugrasena. As the verses are important we quote them here

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ब्राह्मकथाकाव्याय सम्बन्ध लाइकी यदिः } \\
\text{ब्राह्मकथाय सम्बन्ध ही पुनः सम्भवः } \\
\text{देवकाकपयवेञ्च देवगर्भसमातुभो।}
\end{align*}
\]

In some manuscripts of the Vāyu the second line runs as “Āhukātkāśyadhuhīta &c.” and means “From Āhuka; the daughter of the Kāśi king became two sons namely Devaka and Ugrasena.” This means very little and there is no way other than the conclusion that some reading in the Vāyu has become corrupt. The corresponding lines in the Brahmāṇḍa (II, 3, 71, 128-129a) run as follow:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ब्राह्मकथायवेञ्च खमार्क लाइकी यदिः } \\
\text{ब्राह्मकात् काश्यधुहीतां पुनः सम्भवः } \\
\text{देवकाकपयवेञ्च देवगर्भसमातुभो।}
\end{align*}
\]

These readings in the Brahmāṇḍa yield something concrete and mean that Āhuka gave his sister in marriage to the Avantis (perhaps to the royal family) and two sons namely Devaka and Ugrasena were born to the daughter of the Kāśi King from Āhuka. The readings in the Matsya (44, 70-71a) support the Brahmāṇḍa. The Harivaṃśa,\(^2\) the

\(^1\) Va. 96, 127-128.  
\(^2\) Hv. I, 37, 26-27a.
Brahma\(^1\) too support the readings of the Matsya and the Brāhmaṇḍa. The Viśṇu,\(^2\) the Bhāgavata,\(^3\) and the Kūrma,\(^4\) agree in stating that Devaka and Ugrasena were the sons of Āhuka. The Agni\(^5\) is confused when it states that Ugrasena was the son of Devaka. This confusion is evidently due to corrupt readings. Thus we see that all the Purāṇas together with some manuscripts of the Vāyu converge towards proving that Devaka and Ugrasena were the sons of Āhuka. Yet something may be said in favour of the reading in the Vāyu. Āhukāndha to whom according to the Vāyu, Āhukī was given Daśaratha Satvant in marriage, may be inferred to have been Rāma (1) Bhīma Sātvanta the King of Avanti, if we combine all the Kuśa (2) Andhaka evidences of the Purāṇas. Ugrasena’s son was Kamsa and Devaka’s daughter’s son was Śrīkṛṣṇa. Thus Śrīkṛṣṇa belongs just one step below Kamsa. Thus we see that Śrīkṛṣṇa was the 12th in descent from Satvant who was a contemporary of Divōdāsa or Daśaratha.

We have seen that Kapōtarōman’s son has been named Revata in the Vāyu, Vilōman in Śrīkṛṣṇa the Brahmaṇḍa and the Viśṇu, and Tittiri in the Matsya,

\(^1\) Brm. 15, 55. \(^2\) Vś. IV, 4, 5. \(^3\) Bh. IX, 24.
\(^4\) Km. I, 24. \(^5\) Ag. 275, 30a.
Agni, &c. Nevertheless the Purāṇas are unanimous in calling the son of this variously named son of Kapōtarōman by the surname Candanōdakadundubhi. This king has been named Bhava in the Viṣṇu. The Vāyu means to call him Bhava but corrupts the word into 'abhavat.' However, Bhava being the son of Revata may very well be patronymically called Raivata. If this is accepted then the second account given in the Harivamśa II, 37 Ch. about the ancestry of Śrīkṛṣṇa may be explained. Mr. Pargiter thinks that the second account given in the Harivamśa is an old calumniation. The account gives us the adjoined genealogy downwards from Raivata who belongs to the seventh degree below Satvant. The commentator Nila-kaṇṭha says that Vasu, the father of Vasudeva in this account was no other than Śūra who is represented as the father of Vasudeva in all the Purāṇas. We notice that Śrīkṛṣṇa in this table derived from the second Harivamśa account belongs to the 12th step below Satvant. Now let us turn to the general Purānic account about the ancestry of Śrīkṛṣṇa.

The Viṣṇu says (IV, 14, 8-10) that Divamīḍhuṣa had his son named Śūra and Śūra had his wife named Māriṣā and she became the mother of Vasudeva, the father of Śrīkṛṣṇa. Hence according to the Viṣṇu, the genealogy of this portion only stands thus: The Hari-


Devamīḍhuṣa

Śūra + Māriṣā

Vasudeva + Devaki

Śrīkṛṣṇa
Aśmakī (=the daughter of the Aśmaka Raj family), and changing the name Māriśā of the Viṣṇu into Mahiśā Bhōjā. The Vāyu says (96, 143-144) that Śūra begat Devamīḍhūsa on Aśmakī, Devamāhuṣa on Māsyā, and Vasudeva &c on Bhāsyā Bhōjā (=the daughter of Bhōja). This reversal in the order is due to a corrupt reading in the Vāyu, as will appear afterwards.

The Brahmāṇḍa says (II, 3, 71, 145-146) "begat Śūra Devamīḍhūsa on Aśmakī and Śūra begat Vasudeva &c. on Māriśyā Bhōjā. The Brahmāṇḍa also corrupts just one reading by applying the second case-ending to Devamīḍhūsa. Thus corruption is evident as the Brahmāṇḍa cannot say who the father of Śūra Devamīḍhūsa was.

The Matsya says (Mt 46, 1-2) that Aikṣvākī (=the daughter of the Ikṣvāku family) produced Śūra surnamed Adbhūtamīḍhūsa, and Vasudeva &c. were born to Śūra by Pauruṣā Bhōjā. It is evident that the Matsya corrupts Māriśā into Pauruṣā. It should be noticed here that the Mother of Śūra is named Aikṣvākī in the Matsya while the Brahmāṇḍa and the Harivamsa call her Aśmakī. It follows then that she was the daughter of the family established by the Aikṣvāka King Aśmaka.

The Bhāgavata (IX, 24, 27-28) says that Devamīḍhā Śūra's wife was Māriśā the mother of Vasudeva &c. The commentator Śṛidhara clears this by stating that Deva mīḍha's son was Śūra and
Sūra’s son was Vasudeva. The Brahma says (14, 14-15) ‘‘begat Sūra Devamiḍhūśa on Asiknī and heroes (Sūrah) Vasudeva &c. were born to Mahiṣī Bhōjyā. The Brahma also corruptions Sūram vai Devamiḍhūṣah’ into ‘Sūra vai Devamiḍhūṣam’ like the Brahmāṇḍa. This is evident as it cannot tell us who the father of Sūra was. It further corruptions ‘Aśmaki’ into ‘Asiknī’ and Mārisā Bhōjā into ‘Mahiṣī Bhōjyā,’ and “Sūrāt” into “Sūrāḥ.” The Agni simply says (275, 47) that Sūra’s son was Vasudeva and daughter was Prthā, the wife of Pāṇḍu.

The Kūrma (I, 24, 69) says Devala’s son was Sūra and Sūra’s son was Vasudeva, the father of Śrīkṛṣṇa. It is evident that the Kūrma has changed Devamiḍhūsa or Devamiḍha into Devala. In the Mahābhārata VII, 14 2, 6-7, Gauḍa recension we find that Devamiḍha’s son was Sūra and Sūra’s son was Vasudeva, the father of Śrīkṛṣṇa. The confusion in some of the Purāṇas is due to the corruptions in the correct line:

चश्मकाणां जनयामास शूरेः वै देवमीदुष्यः।

The Vāyu corruptions this line into

चश्मकाणां जनयामास शूरोऽ वै देवमीदुष्यम्।

In the Brahmāṇḍa this line runs as

चश्मकाणां जनयामास शूरं वै देवमीदुष्यम्।

Thus the Brahmāṇḍa corrects ‘Śūro’ of the Vāyu into ‘Śūram’ but keeps ‘Devamiḍhūṣam’ as it is in the Vāyu. The Matsya says that Sūra was surnamed Adbhūtamiḍhūsa. The line is correctly given only in the Harivaṃśa. The Viṣṇu is all right so far as the relation between Devamiḍhūsha and Sūra
is concerned. The relation between the two accounts of this portion of the genealogy is shown below:

```
Satvant
(1) Bhīma Sātvata
(2) Andhaka
(3) Kukura
(4) Vṛṣṇi II
(5) Kapōtatōman
(6) Revata-Vilōman—Tittiri
(7) Bhava Raivata-Candanaḍakadundubhi
(8) Punarvasu (8) Rkṣa Raivata
(9) Āhuka (9) Viśvagarbha (9) Devamiḍhūṣa
(10) Devaka (10) Ugrasena (10) Vasu (10) Śūra
(11) Devakī (11) Kamsa (11) Vasudeva (11) Vasudeva
(12 Śrīkrṣṇa (12) Śrīkrṣṇa
```

The commentator while commenting on this second account of the Harivamaṣṭa about the genealogy of the Sātvatas finds no other way of reconciling the two conflicting accounts than to assume that Vasu who is represented here as the father of Vasudeva was the same as Śūra whom all the Purāṇas as well as the Mahabhārata point out as the father of Vasudeva. If this is granted then Viśvagarbha of the second Harivamaṣṭa account may also be identified with Devamiḍhūṣa of the general Purānic account.

To determine the ancestry of Devamiḍhūṣa, the father
of Śūra, we observe that the Viṣṇu is confounded in supposing Devamiḍṭhūṣa to have been the son of Kṛtavarma Hārdikya (Vs. IV, 14, 7-8). A similar mistake of the Viṣṇu is its tacking the line of Dvimīḍha (the brother of Ajamiḍha) to Bhallāta, the descendant of Brahmadatta, the Pīṇcālya (Vide Vs. IV, 19, 13). We know that Kṛtavarma Hārdikya took part in the Mahābhārata war and Śatadhanus or Śata-
dhanvan, the son of Kṛtavarma, took the Syamantaka jewel by killing Satrājīt, the father of Satyabhāmā. Hence Kṛtavarma Hārdikya could not have been the father of Devamiḍṭḥūṣa, the great grand-father of Śrīkṛṣṇa. This mistake in the Viṣṇu has been faithfully copied by the Bhā-
gavata and the Kūrma. Let us turn to the other Purāṇas for the ancestry of Devamiḍṭḥūṣa.

The Vāyu says (96, 17-18 that Vṛṣṇi had two wives Gāndhārī and Mādrī. By Gāndhārī, Vṛṣṇi had Sumitra as his son, while Mādrī gave birth to Yudhājīt; but she [Sā tu] (produced) Devamiḍṭḥūṣa, Anamitra and Suta.

The Matsya (45, 1-2) says

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|}
\text{Vṛṣṇi} & & & \\
\hline
\text{Sumitra} & \text{Yudhājīt} & \text{Anamitra} & \text{Śīni} & \text{Devamiḍṭḥūṣa}
\end{array}
\]

that Vṛṣṇi had Sumitra by Gāndhārī, and Mādrī produced Yudhājīt; and then [tato] Devamiḍṭḥūṣa, Anamitra, Śīvi and Kṛtalakṣaṇa. Hence the Matsya seems to support the Vāyu about the ancestry of Devamiḍṭḥūṣa. The Harivamśa (I, 38, 10-11) corrupts Vṛṣṇi into Krōṣṭr, but afterwards it is all right and supports the Vāyu and the Matsya.

The Brahmāṇḍa (II, 3, 71, 18-19) supports the Vāyu and the Matsya but changes Vṛṣṇi into Dhṛṣṭi and Deva-
miḍṭḥūṣa into Midvāṃsa.
The ancestry of Śrīkrṣṇa according to these authoritative Purāṇas would then stand as represented:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
| & Vṛṣṇi & \\
| Sumitra & Anamitra & Devamīḍhuṣa & Yudhājit & \\
| Nighna & Śni & Śūra & Prṣṇi & \\
| Prasena & Satrājit & Satyaka & Vasudeva & Svaphalka & \\
| Satyabhāmā & Sātyaki & Śrīkrṣṇa & & Akrura & \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus Śrīkrṣṇa falls at the 4th step below Vṛṣṇi who, according to the Purāṇas, was the son of Bhīma Sātvata as we have seen before.

Now we have already found before that Śrīkrṣṇa Devakī-putra really was 12 generations below Satvant, and hence 10 generations below Andhaka, the brother of Vṛṣṇi. Now we find by counting lineally downwards from Vṛṣṇi that Śrīkrṣṇa's place is at the 4th step below Vṛṣṇi. What does it show? It shows that either this Vṛṣṇi is a different Vṛṣṇi or steps have been omitted between Vṛṣṇi and Devamīḍhuṣa, and his brothers. The probability is on the side of the latter, as we have it in the Mahābhārata (Gauḍa recension VII, 142, 6-7) that Devamīḍha was the father of Śūra, the grandfather of Śrīkrṣṇa Vāsudeva. As Śrīkrṣṇa is repeatedly called Vārṣṇeya in the Mahābhārata, we may conclude that he belonged to the line of Vṛṣṇi the son of Bhīma Sātvata and that steps have been omitted between Vṛṣṇi and Devamīḍhuṣa.
CHAPTER IV

THE LINEAL DESCENDANTS OF BHĀRGAVA VĪTAHAVYA.

We shall now determine the lineal descendants of Vītahavya the Haihaya. He was defeated by Pratardana, the king of Kaśi, and took up the profession teaching, as we have seen before. This Kaśi king Pratardana was a bit earlier than of Rāma Dāsarathī. The Rāmāyaṇa has really over-shot the mark a little bit by saying that he was of the same age as Rāma.¹ Bharadvāja the Purūhita of Vadhrasva’s² son Divōdāsa, gave Pratardana Daivōdāsi his kingdom and officiated as a priest of Kṣattraśrī, the son of Pratardana.³ Bharadvāja Vājineya was thus the contemporary of all these three kings. This could only be possible had Pratardana been directly the son of Divōdāsa, and this was actually so for we know that Divōdāsa had his heroic son Pratardana by Dṛṣadvati-Mādhavī;⁴ the Vedic Index is unhappily ill-reasoned about it. Gr̄tsamada Saunahōtra, the adopted son of Vītahavya Bhārgava mentions the name of Divōdāsa saying that Indra rent the ninety-nine cities of Šambara for Divōdāsa.⁵ He also mentions that Šambara’s hundred cities were rent and Varci’s many sons were killed.⁶ Garga, the son of Vājineya Bharadvāja, refers to the killing of the two covetous Dāsa chiefs named Varci and Šambara in the country of Udabrajā (Rv. VI, 47, 21) while receiving presents from Divōdāsa and from Prastōka, the son of Sṛṣṭhīya (Rv. VI, 47, 22 ; 23 ; 25 ;). Sāyana on Rv. VI, 47, 22 says that Prastōka Sṛṣṭhīya was the same.

as Atithigva Divōdāsa and Aśvatha. But Vedic and Purānic evidences converge towards proving that Divōdāsa the son of Vadhrayāśva was different from Prastōka, the son of Sṛujaya. Vadhrayāśva’s father Mudgala was the son-in-law of the Naśadha king Nala; while Sṛujaya was the son of Devavāta. Thus we notice that both Gṛtsamada and Garga mention the killing of Varci and Śambara by Divōdāsa. This is exactly what we should expect for Gṛtsamada was the grandson of Bharadvāja and therefore was probably a younger contemporary of Divōdāsa. This will also be confirmed when we proceed with his lineal descendants and mark other synchronisms.

Now the son of Gṛtsamada Vaitahavya is named Sāvainasa in the Kumbakonam edition of the Mahābhārata (XIII, 8, 61). The Gauḍa Mahābhārata edited by the Vaṅgavasi Press (XIII, 3, 61a) has the form Sucetas for his name. Now none of these forms can be accepted. In the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra (II, 6, 10) we find that Bhārgava, Vaitahavya and Sāvetasa were the famous Pravaras of some sections of the Bhṛgu, namely, of the Yāskas, Badhaujas, Mauṇas, Maukas &c. As the patronymic forms are always used in the Pravaras, it is evident that the correct name of the son of Gṛtsamada Vaitahavya is Savetas, and not Sucetes of the of the Gauḍa recension, neither the corrupt patronymic of the Kumbakonam recension. The name of the son of Savetas Gārtṣamada may of course be patronymically called Sāvetasa. Vartcas Sāvetasa.

The Kumbakonam Mahābhārata has corrupted this patronymic Sāvetasa into Sāvainasa. Savetas whose name has been corrupted into Sucetas in the Gauḍa recension of the Mahābhārata, had a son named Vartcas\(^1\) who may very

\(^1\) Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 61.
well have the patronymic Śāvetasa. Thus it is evident that the Kumbakonam Mahābhārata has omitted the intermediate name Savetas (= Sucetas of the Gaṇḍa recension) and has attempted to call Varcas by the patronymic Śāvetasa but even in this attempt it has corrupted the correct patronymic Śāvestasa into Śāvainasa. The Kumbakonam Mahābhārata says¹ that Śāvainasa’s son had a son named Vitastya. Thus the Kumbakonam Mahābhārata admits that it omits the name of the son of Varcas-Śāvetasa and father of Vitastya. The Gaṇḍa Mahābhārata says² that Varcas had a son named Vihavya and Vihavya’s son was Vitatya. It is evident that Vitastya of the Kumbakonam Mahābhārata is the same as Vitatya of the Gaṇḍa Mahābhārata, and that the Gaṇḍa Mahābhārata has given us the exact name Vihavya for the son of Varcas-Śāvetasa. This Vihavya was the author of the 128th hymn of Maṇḍala X of the Rgveda³. After this the Kumbakonam Mahābhārata says⁴ that Vitastya’s son had a son named Śivasta. Thus the Kumbakonam recension admittedly omits the name of the son of Vitastya. The Gaṇḍa recension says⁵ that Vitatya’s son was Satya and Satya’s son was Santas. Thus it is evident that the Kumbakonam Mahābhārata omits Satya and chooses to call Satya’s son by the name Śivasta whom the Gaṇḍa Mahābhārata calls Santas. The son of Śivasta (= Santas) is

¹ Kumb. MBh. XIII, 8, 62. ² Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 61-62. ³ Sarv. Kram. Rv. X, 128. ⁴ Kumb. MBh. XIII, 30, 61. ⁵ Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 61. ⁶ Kumb. MBh. XIII, 8, 63; Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 63.
called Sravas in both the recensions. After Sravas both the recensions of the Mahābhārata are agreed in naming the successive lineal descendants who were Tamās, Prakāśa, Vāgindra, Pramiti, Ruru and Šunaka and Saunaka.

After adjusting thus the successive lineal descendants of Vitahavya Bhārgava, we shall now point out the synchronisms which will confirm the synchronisms adduced heretofore. We notice that Ugraśravas Sauti while relating the history of the Mahābhārata to Kulapati Šaunaka in the Naimiṣa forest says that Pramati, the distant descendant of Cyavana Bhārgava, was the father of Ruru and that Ruru’s son, by Pramadvarā, was Šunaka and that this Šunaka was the great grand-father [Pūrvapitāmaha = Prapitāmaha] of Kulapati Šaunaka, his audience. There need not be any quarrel over the term ‘Pūrvapitāmaha’ which simply means ‘great grand-father.’ Everytime Janamejaya Pārīkṣita asks Vaiśampāyana the question—“what did my Pūrvapitāmahas do after that?” It cannot but be admitted then that Arjuna

1 Kumb. MBh. XIII, 8, 63-65; Gd. MBh. XIII, 30, 63-65.
2 Kumb. MBh. I, 5, 9-10; Gd. MBh. I, 5, 9-10.
was the contemporary of Ruru, as is illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruru</th>
<th>Arjuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śunaka</td>
<td>Abhimanyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaunaka Vaiśampāyana</td>
<td>Parikṣit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaunaka Rōmaharṣaṇa</td>
<td>Janamejāya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kulapati Śaunaka Urgaśravas  Satānīka I

A table showing the relations between the different accounts given in the Kumbakonam and the Gauḍa recensions of the Mahābhārata about the dynasty of Grūtsamada Vaitahavya is given in the next page.
MBh.  Gd. MBh.  Asval.
Kumb.  Vīṭahavya  Śrauta Sūtra.  Accepted.
Vīṭahavya  Vīṭahavya  Vīṭahavya  Vīṭahavya
Grīṣamāda  Grīṣamāda  Grīṣamāda
Svātainasa  Varcas  Savetas  Savetas
Vihāvya  Vihāvya  Vihāvya (The
The son  (unnamed)  author of Rv.
Vitastya  Vitatyāa  Vīṭastyāa-Vīṭatyāa
The son (unnamed)  Satya  Satya
Sivasta  Santas  Sivasta-Santas
Sravas  Śravas  Śravas
Tamas  Tamas  Tamas
Prakāśa  Prakāśa  Prakāśa
Vāgindra  Vāgindra  Vāgindra
Pramiti  Pramati  Pramiti
Ruru  Ruru  Arjuna  Ruru
Sūnaka  S'ūnaka  Abhimanuyu  Sūnaka
Saunaka  S'āunaka  Parikṣit  Saunaka
Saunaka  S'āunaka  Janamejaya  Saunaka
Kulapati  Kulapati  Kulapati
Saunaka  S'āunaka  Saunaka

With Vīṭahavya as one down to Ruru, the number of
generations is fourteen only.
CHAPTER V.

THE MĀGADHA DYNASTY.

We shall now determine the dynasty that sprang from Kṛta whom we have already seen to have been the contemporary of Daśaratha Ājeya or Divodāsa Vādhryaśva. This contemporaneity which we deduced from genealogical considerations is admirably confirmed by the Mahābhārata. It says that when Rāma Jāmadagnya, after being exhorted in an assembly of Brāhmaṇas by Parāvasu, the son Raibhya and grandson of Viśvāmitra, began to kill the Kṣattriyas a second time, then, Vatsa, the son of Pratardana Daivodāsi, Sārvabhauma or Rkṣa, the son of the Paurava king Viduratha, and Dadhivāhana’s grandson i.e., Divirtha’s son of the dynasty of Aṅga Vāleya, were saved from death. This king is called Kṛta in the Vāyu² Kṛmi in the Matsya³, Kṛtaka in the Viṣṇu⁴, Kṛtayajña in the Brahma⁵, Kṛtayajña in the Harivamśa⁶, Kṛtin in the Bhāgavata⁷. It is related in the Purāṇas that he had to perform many sacrifices before he got a son. The name of this son was Vasu. He was known as Uparicara because people believed that he had an airship [Vimāna] on which he used to ride and travel through the air⁸. He was also known as Caidya which may mean that he belonged to the dynasty of Cedi or that he occupied the country of Cedi. The latter meaning is supported by the Mahābhārata which explicitly calls him a king belonging to the dynasty founded by Puru Paurava stock i.e. belonging to the dynasty founded by Puru Vāyāta. [Paurava nandana] and says that he took [Jagrāha] the country of Cedi on the advice of

1 Gd. MBh XII 49 ; Kumb. MBh XII 48.  
² Vs. 99, 219.  
³ Mt. 50, 25.  
⁴ Vs. 19, 19.  
⁵ Brm. 13, 108-2.  
⁶ Hv. I, 32, 90.  
⁷ Bh. IX, 22, 5.  
⁸ Kumb. MBh. I, 64, 19—47.
the Vedic God Indra. This means that he was an ardent worshipper of Indra. Mr. Pargiter suggests that Vasu conquered the Vidarbhas in Cedi and started a new line. Mr. Jainath Pati does not accept this theory of Mr. Pargiter and says that Vasu entered a virgin country and founded the Cedi dynasty. Now this supposition of Mr. Jainath Pati cannot be accepted, as the Rgveda supplies the important information that Brāhmātithi, the son of the Rṣi Kaṇva, accepted presents from the Cedi king Kaśu. We shall prove when we will take up the early Vedic Age that Brāhmātithi, Devātithi, Nīpātithi, Medhyātithi, Medhātithi were all directly the sons of Kaṇva; the son of Ghūra. It was in the hermitage of this Kaṇva (i.e. in Nāḍapit, Śat. Brā. XIII, 5, 4, 13) that Śakuntalā, the mother of Bharata Dauśmanti, was brought up. Besides it should be noticed that Kaṇva Medhātithi, the brother of Brāhmātithi, and Priyamedha Āṅgirasa were the joint authors of Rv. VIII, 2, and the sons of Priyamedha Āṅgirasa officiated in the sacrifice of Aṅga, the son of Vali, of the dynasty of Anu Yāyāta. The king Vali, the father of Aṅga, was believed to be Vali Vairōcana of the early Vedic Age, reborn; and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which like the Purāṇas could not rise above the belief in an after-birth, calls Aṅga, the descendant of Vīrōcana. We indicate here the way in which we shall prove when we will take up the early Vedic Age that being the contemporary of Kaṇva Brāhmātithi, the Cedi king Kaśu belonged to the early Vedic Age, and consequently the Cedi dynasty was established at the foot of the Vindhyas long before Uparicara Vasu, and that the view of the Purāṇas that the Cedis were a branch of the Vidarbhas cannot at present be doubted. Consequently

1 Kumb. MBh. I, 64, 2.
4 Rv. VIII, 5, 37; 38.
5 Ait. Bra. VIII, 22.
we hold that Mr. Pargiter’s theory about the conquest of Cedi by Vasu is not unreasonable. In fact, even before coming across this controversy we took “Jagrāha” of the Mahābhārata to mean “forcibly occupied”. The Jaina Harivamśa which is a very late work, written in imitation of the Brahminical Harivamśa, and which contains indelible signs of manufactured names, to prove the great antiquity of the Jaina religion, inserts this famous king Vasu as the descendent of Mithilānātha, the king of Videha. The description in the Jaina Harivamśa XV, 67 that the king Vasu died because he sacrificed animals, is also enjoyable. The Cetiya-Jātaka mentions this famous king by the name Upacara or Apacara which is really a corruption or a vulgar form of the correct name Uparicara preserved in the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata. The Cetiya Jātaka connects this king Upacara with his ancestor Mahāsammata through the successive lineal ancestors Cara, Varamandhātā, Mandhātā, Uposatha Varakalyāna, Kalyana, Vararōja, and Rōja. Thus the Cetiya Jātaka seems to consider Uparicara as a king belonging to the Ikṣvāku family, for the inclusion of the names Mandhātā &c. raises such a presumption. But this may be pronounced to be a confusion in that Jātaka on the strength of the Mahābhārata which calls him Paurava-Nandana and the Purāṇas follow it up. The Cetiya Jātaka however describes in detail how this king Upacara (= Uparicara) sank down into the earth for persisting to tell a lie to his family priest Kapila, the brother of Kōrakalambaka, and how the five sons of Upacara on the orders of Kapila became the kings of Hatthipura, Assapura, Sihapura, Uttara-Paṅcāla, and Daddarapura respectively. The Mahābhārata also says that the king Uparicara had five sons and that they were installed by their father as kings in five different countries.

1 Cetiya Jataka. No. 422, Book VIII. Cowell’s edition Vol. III.
2 Kumb. MBh. I, 64, 42-43.
According to the Mahābhārata these five sons of Uparicara Vasu were Bṛhadhrātha the king of the Māgadhas, Pratya- 
grahā, Kuśāmba surnamed Maṇivāhana, Matsīla-Māvella 
and Yadu. The Mahābhārata finishes by declaring that 
these famous five sons of Vasu were the founders of five 
famous dynasties. After this the Mahābhārata introduces 
a ludicrous myth and tries to represent that the mother of 
Vedavyāṣa was the daughter of Uparicara Vasu but this 
cannot be. In fact, it is admitted in the myth that she 
remembered that she was the daughter of Vasu in her 
former birth, as indicated by the as word “Jātismaraṇatā” 
in the Mahābhārata. This is also proved by the number 
of lineal descendants of Bṛhadhrātha Vāsava down to 
Jarāsandha. In fact this attempt has been made in later 
times to ascribe high connections to Vedavyāṣa on the 
mother’s side. After all, the mother of Vedavyāṣa was 
Satyavatī the daughter of a fisherman, and the Mahā- 
bhārata in another place (XIII, 53 Ch.) while giving us a 
list of ancient Ṛṣis who were born in Vaiśyayōni and Śūdra- 
yōni explicitly mentions that Vyāsa was born to Satyavatī, 
the daughter of a Dāsa (i.e. a Śūdra). The Purāṇas which 
which were later than the time of adding this mythological 
portion about the mother of Vedavyāṣa, have been confused 
in stating that Vasu had seven sons. In reality, Vasu 
had five sons as described in the first portion of the 
Mahābhārata account as well as in the Cetiya Jātaka. The 
Cetiya Jātaka however has forgotten their real names and the 
places where they settled. The Mahābhārata admirably 
supports the Cetiya Jātaka in stating that Vasu sank down 
into the Rasātala [=the Netherlands] by telling a lie 
although he performed many sacrifices.

Now we propose to adjust the dynasty that sprang from

1 Kumb. MBh. I, 64, 43-44. 2 Kumb. MBh. I, 64, 45-46.
3 Kumb. MBh. I, 64, 114. 4 Kumb. MBh. XIII, 53, 19.
5 Kumb. MBh. XIII, 9, 36, XII, 344-345 Chh.
Bṛhadṛatha, the son of Uparicara Vasu. Bṛhadṛtha's son was Kuśāgra;¹ Kuśāgra's son was Rṣabha;² Rṣabha's son was Puṣpavant;³ some manuscripts of Matsya corrupt the name of Puṣpavant into Puṇyavant but the other manuscripts of Matsya spell it as Puṣpavant. Puṣpavant's son was Satyahita or Satyadhṛta or Satyadhṛti.⁴ Some manuscripts of the Matsya appear to state that Puṣpavant's son was Puṇya and his son was Satyadhṛti.[पुष्क्र: पुष्क्रवत्थे व] but the other manuscripts of the Matsya put “Putra” instead of ‘Puṇya’ at the beginning of the line quoted inside the bracket, so that these manuscripts mean that Puṣpavant’s son was Satyadhṛti and this is in agreement with all the other Purāṇas. Hence it may be pronounced that ‘Puṇya’ there, is a corruption for the correct reading ‘Putra’. The Bhāgavata reverses the order and says⁵ that Satyahita’s son was Puṣpavant, but this is a mistake as it is opposed by all the other Purāṇas. Satyahita’s son is named Sudhanvan in the Vāyu,⁶ the Viṣṇu⁷ and the Agni;⁸ the Matsya calls him Dhanuṣa.⁹ The Harivaṃśa first corrupts ‘Sudhanvāca’ into ‘Sadharmātmā’ and then separates it into “Sa” and “Dharmātmā.”¹⁰ The Bhāgavata omits him. Sudhanvan’s

¹ Va. 99, 223; Mt. 50, 28; Hv. I, 32, 93; Brm. 13, 109-5; Bh. IX, 22, 7; Vs. IV, 19, 19; Ag. 278, 29.
² Va. 99, 223; Mt. 50, 29; Hv. I, 32, 94; Brm. 13, 109-6; Bh. IX, 22, 7; Vs. IV, 19,19; Ag. 278, 29.
³ Va. 99, 224; Mt. 50, 29; Hv. I, 32,95; Brm. 13,109-6; Vs. IV, 19, 19; Ag. 278, 29.
⁴ Va. 99, 224; Mt. 50, 30; Vs. IV, 19, 19; Hv. I, 32, 95; Ag. 278, 29.
⁵ Bh. IX, 22, 7. ⁶ Va. 99, 225. ⁷ Vs. IV, 19,19.
⁸ Ag. 278, 3. ⁹ Mt. 50, 30. ¹⁰ Hv. I, 32, 96.
son is called Urja in the Vāyu,¹ the the Harivamśa² and the Agni.³ He is Jantu in the Viṣṇu,⁴ Jahu in the Bhāgavata,⁵ and Sarva in the Matsya.⁶ Urja’s son is called Nabhaśa in the Vāyu,⁷ Sambhava in the Matsya,⁸ the Harivamśa,⁹ and the Agni.¹⁰ The Vāyu says¹¹ that Nabhaśa’s (=Sambhava) son was Jarāsandha. The same is the opinion of the Harivamśa¹² and the Agni¹³. Nilakaṇṭha while commenting on this verse of the Harivamśa, says that as Bṛhadraṭha has been mentioned before (i.e. in the Book II of the Mahābhārata) as the father of Jarāsandha, this means that this Sambhava was a surname Bṛhadraṭha, and thus he was a second Bṛhadraṭha, or that it may be explained on the ground of Kramabheda due to Kalpabheda. The Matsya says¹⁴ that Sambhava’s son was Bṛhadraṭha, the two pieces of whose body was jointed by Jarā and hence he was named Jarāsandha. (It seems that the writer of this portion of the Matsya consulted the Mahābhārata which calls the father of Jarāsandha by the name Bṛhadraṭha in the Sabhāparva). The Viṣṇu puts a full stop after Jantu (=Urja) and says¹⁵ that from Bṛhadraṭha was born another who was named Jarāsandha as the parts of his body were joined by Jarā. It is evident that the Viṣṇu has consulted the Mahābhārata story of the king Uparicara,

one of whose sons was named Bhadratha as well as the story of the origin of Jarasandha in Book II of the Mahabharata. The Bhagavata which closely follows the Visnu has risen a step above the Visnu and says\(^1\) that Bhadratha, the son of Uparicara Vasu, had Jarasandha by another wife; that is, it means to say that Bhadratha had Kuśagra by one wife and Jarasandha by another. But all the Purāṇas are against the Visnu and the Bhagavata in this respect and accordingly they may be considered wrong. The exigencies of the genealogical tables in those two Purāṇas also point to the same fact. For in that case how does it stand that while from Kuru through Sudhanvan to Jarasandha there are only seven steps, from Kuru through Jahnu to Pāṇḍu the father of Arjuna there are 17 or 18 steps? It is tentatively assumed at present then that the Visnu and the Bhagavata have been confused about Bhadratha, the son of Uparicara Vasu, and Jarasandha’s father whom the Mahābhārata calls by the name Bhadratha. To explain the statement of the Mahābhārata, note that Drupada-Yajñasena a distant descendant of Sōmaka Sāhadeva, is repeatedly called Sōmaka.\(^2\) Similarly the father of Jarasandha who was a distant descendant of Bhadratha Vāsava has been called Bhadratha in the Mahābhārata. Similarly any descendant of Janaka has been called simply Janaka and any descendant of Ikṣvaku Mānava has been called simply Ikṣvāka in the Purāṇas. There is probably a fourth reason for considering the Visnu and the Bhagavata wrong here. Note particularly the Purānic statement that there were 32 kings from Bhadratha to Ripuñjaya both inclusive and that they reigned for roughly about 1,000 years, and by counting the names given in the Purāṇas we find the number to be actually 32. Had it been otherwise as represented in the Visnu and the Bhagavata the

\(^1\) Bh. IX, 22, 8.  
\(^2\) Kumb. MBh. I, 110, 4; 11.
number would have been 25. There is a fifth reason for which the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata may be considered wrong. Had Jarāsandha and Kuśāgra been the two sons of the first Bṛhadratha (i.e. the son of Vasu Uparicara), then we could naturally except Rṣabha, the son of Kuśāgra Bārhadratha, or Puspavant, the son of Rṣabha Kauśāgri, to be engaged in the Mahābhārata war like Sahadeva Jarāsandhi. But as a matter of fact, we don’t find any mention of them in any connection in the Mahābhārata which relates details about Jarāsadha, Sahadeva, Jayatsena, Daṇḍadhāra, and Meghasandhi (=Somādhi). This shows that Kuśāgra, Rṣabha &c. were the distant ancestors of Jarāsandha. Accordingly we hold with Nilakaṇṭha that Nabhasa-Sambhava was the father of Jarāsandha on the strength of the majority of the Purāṇas. Sahadeva thus belongs to the 13th step below Kṛta whom we have seen to have been the contemporary of Divodāsa or Ahalyā or Daśaratha, because Kṛta had to perform many sacrifices before he got Vasu as his son, and because Jarāsandha was born to the Bṛhadratha king. 

Nabhaṣa-Sambhava when the latter was quite advanced in years.
CHAPTER VI.

THE HASTINĀPUR LINE.

Viduratha’s sons Sārvabhauma and Rksa were, to some extents, contemporary of Divodāsa or Daśaratha. The Vāyu, the Matsya, the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata state that Sārvabhauma’s son was Jayatsena. The Mahābhārata which as in its later list (Kumb. MBh. I, 63 ch) represents Sārvabhauma the son of Ahañyāti and which thus transfers Sārvabhauma and his lineal descendants down to Rksa towards the earlier period that is beyond our present scope, informs us that Sārvabhauma took away Sundarā, the daughter of the king of Kekaya, by conquest and had, by her, a son named Jayatsena. This detailed information of the Mahābhārata is true but the carrying up of Sārvabhuma and his lineal descendants down to Rksa, is probably defective. We indicate why. Notice that according to this later list of the Mahābhārata, Antyanāra or Rantināra or Matināra (for this man is variously named) is the 10th in descent from Sārvabhauma i.e. the 15th descent from Puru Yāyāta. Rantirāra’s daughter Gaurī was the mother of Māndhātā Yauvanāśva. This Māndhātā married Vindumāti, the daughter of Śaśavindu Craitarathi and Śaśavindu is only the 6th in descent from Yādu Yāyāta. Being descended from the same ancestor Yayāti Nāhuṣa, these positions of Rantināra and Śaśavindu are incompatible. Note again that Bharata Dauśmanti was crowned with the Aindra-mahābhiṣeka ceremony by Dīrghatamas Māmateya (Ait. Brā. VIII, 23) and this Dīrghatamas begat on the wife of Vali, five sons who were Aṅga.
Vāṅga, Kaliṅga &c. Thus Bharata Dauśmanti and Vali of the dynasty of Anu Yāyāta were contemporaries to a certain extent. Now Vali was the 12th in descent from Anu according to the unanimous testimony of all the authoritative Purāṇas, while according to this later list of the Māhābhārata, Bharata Dauśmanti becomes the 19th in descent from Puru Yāyāta. But this is objectionable for if Vali was the 12th, Bharata could not have been the 19th. Notice thirdly again that Viśvāmitra, the son of Gathin, was the 12th in descent from Amāvasu, the brother of Āyuś Pauruvāvāsa, and his daughter’s (=Śakuntalā’s) son Bharata should have been the 14th in descent from Āyuś; but this later list of the Māhābhārata, places Bharata at the 22nd step below Āyuś. Similarly by taking every other dynasty of the early Vedic age it can be proved that this later list of the Mahābhārata is defective. To say that all the other dynasties are incomplete and that this later list of the Mahābhārata is complete is against all reason. In fact, this later of the list Mahābhārata has become lengthened owing to the mixing up of the various Paurava lines. This fact will be clearer when we shall take up the early Vedic age in future. We may indicate in this connection however that the earlier list of the Mahābhārata (Kumb. MBh I, 8 ch.) is very satisfactory in this respect.

The son of Jayatsena is called Ārādhi in the Vāyu,1 Ārāvin in the Viśnu,2 Rucira in the Matsya3 and Rādhika in the Bhāgavata.4 The Kumbakonam Mahābhārata says5 that Jayatsena had, by Suśravā Vaidarbhī, a son named Aparācīna. The Gaṇḍa Mahābhārata calls him Avācīna6. But both the recensions of the Mahābhārata are agreed in naming the son of Aparācīna-Avācīna as Ariha. It is evident that Ariha of the Mahābhārata is the same as Ārādhi-Ārāvin-

Rādhika-Rucira of the Purāṇas. His son and successor is called Mahābhāuma in the Mahābhārata, Māhasattva in the Vāyu, Tatōbhauma in the Matsya. The Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata omit Mahābhāuma. But he must be introduced on on the strength of the Vāyu, the Matsyā and the Mahābhārata. Mahābhāuma's son is called Ayutāyus in the Vāyu, (Aritāyus in the Matsya,) the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata. The Mahābhārata says that because the son of Mahābhāuma performed no less than ten thousand human sacrifices therefore he was called Ayutānāyin. This explodes the objection of R. C. Datta and Rosen who used to think that human sacrifices were not in vogue in the Vedic age, although Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitra cited the single but glaring instance of Śunahṣepea at the Rājasūya Vāruna sacrifice of Hariścandra Traiśāṅkava. Not only does the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa give the full account of the attempted sacrifice of Śunahṣepea but it also mentions the particular Rk or Rks with which Śunahṣepea prayed for his life to Indra, Aśvins, Varuna, Viśvedevāḥ, &c respectively. R. C. Datta is perfectly on the wrong track in doubting the history of Śunahṣepea recorded in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. We shall see afterwards that it can be proved from the Rgveda itself that Śunahṣepea was actually going to be killed in a sacrifice.

There is yet a third instance of human sacrifice performed by an ancient Indo-Aryan King, namely the sacrifice of Pāriksita Janamejaya who attempted to exterminate the Non-Aryan race of Nāgas by burning them in a sacrifice. In

1 Kumb. MBh. I, 63, 18; Gd. MBh. I, 95, 19.
3 Mt. 50, 36.
4 Va. 99, 232; Mt. 50, 36; Vs. IV, 20, 3; Bh. IX, 22, 10.
5 ॐ: इन्द्रवंदे इन्द्रजवाणार्जुनामयेऽपि तस्मि भविष्यतासाहिष्ठि। Kumb. MBh. I, 63, 20.
later times, the Nāga tribe has been confused with snakes and ludicrous myth has sprung into existence. The fourth instance of human sacrifice having been current in ancient India is mentioned during the reign of Caṇḍa Pradyōta who flourished about twenty-one generations after Pārīkṣita Janamejaya. His brother Kumārasena tried to put to stop to the vicious practice which was still in vogue in Ujjain on the occasion of the feast of Mahākāla. The buying and selling of human flesh was current even during the time of Harṣavardhana.

Ayutānāyin married Kāmā, the daughter of Prthuśravas and has a son named Akrūdhana by her. Akrūdhana married Karambhā, the daughter of the king of Kaliṅga, and Devātithi was born to him. The son of Devātithi is Rcā in the Kumbakonam recessiou of the Mahābhārata, and Ariha in the Gauḍa recension. The Purāṇas omit Rcā-Ariha. His son was Rkṣa who is mentioned in the Purāṇas. The Matsya calls him Dakṣa. After Rkṣa we have Bhīmasena, Dīlīpa and Pratipa successively in the Purāṇas, while the Mahābhārata confuses this Rkṣa with Rantināra’s father. Dīlīpa of the Purāṇas is probably the same as Pratisutvan, (indicated in the patronymic Prātisutvana) of the Atharvaveda XX. 129, 2 or Pratiśravas of the later list of the Mahābhārata. Pratipa had, by Sunandā Saivyā, three sons, Devāpi, Santanu and Bahlīka. The eldest Devāpi being affected with leprosy, King Pratipa was not allowed to install him as king because of the opposition of the council of Brāhmaṇas, old men, citizens.

---

1 Vide my paper on Harṣacarita - Sir A. T. Moorkerjee commemoration Volume (Orientalia); cf. Harṣacarita ch. VI.  
2 Harṣacarita ch. V.  
3 Gd. MBh. I, 95, 21; Va. 99, 232; Mt. 50, 37.  
4 Gd. MBh. I, 95, 22; Va. 99, 232; Mt. 50, 37.  
5 K. MBh. I, 63, 23.  
6 Gd. MBh. I, 95, 23.  
7 Va. 99, 233; Mt. 50, 37.  
8 Va. 99, 233; 234. Mt. 50, 38.  
9 Gd. MBh. I, 95, 44.  
10 Gd. MBh. V, 149, 14-16.  
11 Gd. MBh. V, 149, 17.  
12 Gd. MBh. V, 149, 22.
and villagers. The king became so very sorry that he actually wept¹ for his eldest son. Seeing that his father was powerless in the matter, Devāpi went away² to a forest. The second Bāhlīka abandoned all claim to his paternal kingdom and inherited his maternal³ uncle's property i.e. the kingdom of the Śivis, and the youngest Santanu became the king of Hastināpara with the permission of Bāhlīka⁴.

In the Mahābhārata we find⁵ that Valadeva in his travels throughout Uttarāpatha visited the hermitage of Ruṣāṅgu where in former times Ārṣṭiṣena had applied himself to austerity, and the great sage Viśvāmitra attained Brāhmaṇahood. This hermitage of Ruṣāṅgu was situated close by the northern bank of the river Sarasvatī, where Ruṣāṅgu was transferred by Brāhmaṇas and breathed his last⁶. At this famous Sarasvatī Tirtha, the great Rṣi Ārṣṭiṣena, Rājarṣi Sindhudvīpa, austere Devāpi and the sage Viśvāmitra attained Brāhmaṇahood⁷.

We have it from the Purāṇas that Ārṣtiṣena was the son of Sala who was the second son of Sunahōtra, the ancestor of the Kāsi line⁸, so that Ārṣtiṣena belonged to a very early time - which the Mahābhārata confirms by declaring that Ārṣtiṣena belonged to the Kṛta age⁹. He applied himself to austerity at the famous Sarasvatī Tirtha¹⁰, and after

¹ Gd. MBh. V, 149, 23. ⁴ Gd. MBh. V, 149, 26.
² Gd. MBh. V, 149, 27. ⁵ Gd. MBh. V, 149, 28.
³ Gd. MBh. IX, 39, 24. ⁶ Gd. MBh. IX, 39, 29; 32.
⁷ यवांने च चरणम् कौँ च वान्तर्वं कतिपयः।
   तपस्या भवता राजनुः प्रायात्वहतिवदासम्।।
    भिभ्य दृष्टयु राजायमः विनायािवः मद्धतः।।
    बाल्यं कवचवं यथा विवाहायुततः सुनाधिता।।
    Gd. MBh. IX, 59, 35.
⁸ Va. 92, 3; 5.
⁹ तत्र कल्यं गच्छा राजन व्यापजितेऽविजयस्ये।।
   वस्त्रं रहस्तृधि नियमं विधायमध्यमे।।
    Gd. MBh. IX, 40, 3.
¹⁰ Gd. MBh. IX, 40, 6.
attaining spiritual success, blessed the place of his success with the following three good wishes:

(i) Any man who would thenceforth bathe in that great river would receive the merit of a horse-sacrifice.

(ii) There would thenceforth be no trouble due to snakes and reptiles.

(iii) A man would receive a large measure of success with a very little effort at that sacred place.

Thus wishing for that Sarasvatī Tīrtha, the sage Ārṣṭiśena departed to heaven. After him, at the same sacred place Sindhudvīpa (the son of Ambarīṣa Nābhāgi) and Devāpi attained Brāhmaṇa-hood. Men who entered the Gōtra or Order of teachers established by Ārṣṭiśena were generally known as the Ārṣṭiśenas. Devāpi, the son of Pratipa, because he entered the order of teachers established by the great sage Ārṣṭiśena, has been called Ārṣṭiśena Devāpi. In the Rgveda we find Devāpi offering up prayers to Brhaspati so that the great godhead might be pleased to make clouds rain for King Šantanu. After the hymns were over, Ārṣṭiśena Devāpi offered oblations to fire, and profuse rains were brought down from the upper regions in the sky. Devāpi on this occasion acted as the priest of Šantanu and called himself Ārṣṭiśena Devāpi, the descendant of Manu. Thus from the joint evidence of the Mahābhārata and the Rgveda we conclude that Devāpi and Šantanu were the sons of Pratipa of the dynasty of Kuru; and that being a leper, Devāpi was debarred from inheritance by the subjects and went away to a forest and entered the Ārṣṭiśena order of

1 Gd. MBh. IX, 40, 7; 8.
2 ताथिश्च न तदा तीव्रं सिद्धु-डौ, प्रतापार्थ।
   देवायिविश्ववर्गम ग्राम्यम् प्रापतुरीस्व। Gd. MBh. IX, 40, 10.
3 ग्रीष्णार्थद्विपद्यमण्यम् ग्राम्यम् धिजातः। Va. 92, 6.
4 Rv. X, 98, 1; 3.
5 Rv. X, 98, 5; 6.
7 Rv. X, 98, 8.
teachers. Kauravya Devāpi thus became well-known as Ārṣṭiśeṇa Devāpi. In the Vedic age anybody born in a particular Gōtra or family could enter a different Gōtra at his own sweet will. Grātsamada Āṅgirasa, we know, entered the Bhārgava order.

The Bṛhaddevatā supports the main portion of this ancient history but introduces noticeable modifications. There we find¹ in agreement with the Mahābhārata that Ārṣṭiśeṇa Devāpi and Kauravya Santanu were brothers belonging to the Kuru family and were the sons of a king. Devāpi was the elder and Santanu the younger. But the modified Bṛhaddevatā account is that Devāpi being a leper became the son of Rṣṭiśeṇa [चन्द्रिकेयास्वतीभवत्] while the Mahābhārata says that Devāpi performed austerities at the hermitage of Ārṣṭiśeṇa. This necessarily involves us into a controversy between Dr. Sieg and Dr. Macdonell about the priority between the Bṛhaddevatā and the Mahābhārata.

We have seen that the account in the Mahābhārata in in full agreement with the Purāṇas which declare that Ārṣṭiśeṇa was the son of Śala, the second son of Śunahōtra of the Kāśi line. Thus Ārṣṭiśeṇa belonged to a very early time and the Mahābhārata in agreement with this Purānic account says that Ārṣṭiśeṇa belonged to the Kṛta age. His descendants and followers were generally known as the Ārṣṭiśeṇas, according to the Purāṇas. Thus several series of Ārṣṭiśeṇa teachers continued to flourish to the age of the Mahābhārata. Pratipa’s leper son entered this order and became known as Ārṣṭiśeṇa Devāpi. In compact with the Purāṇas, the Mahābhārata further informs us that Devāpi had another brother named Bāhlika in addition to Santanu. Besides the Mahābhārata improves on the brief treatment of

¹ śaṭi'वेश्वर देवापीः कोरवलश्व घनम्।
भातरी दुधम् लेती राजप्रभो वशम्।
कार्वालिपी देवापीः कायियंश्व घनम्। | Br. Dv. VII, 155-156.
the Purāṇas by informing us that their mother’s name was Sunandā and that she belonged to the Śivi family.¹ Thus it will be found that there is a general agreement between the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas except in so far as the former supplies us at times with details about the Kuru family which is its special subject to deal with.

Now there is absolutely nothing to impeach the Purānic statement that a compendium of Purāṇa or ancient history was, for the first time, culled from various sources by PārāśaryaVyāsa² and that he entrusted this original collection of ancient history to his Sūta disciple named Lomaharṣaṇa. This history of past events began to be related to assemblies of Rṣis from Satra to Satra and thus the propagation of Purānic knowledge went on throughout the country. Out of that original collection which comprised of descriptions of various dynasties, have been evolved the different Purāṇas such as the Vāyu, the Matsya, the Viṣṇu, &c. which we now possess. The explicit statement³ in the Purāṇas that descriptions of various dynasties were listened to by an assembly of Rṣis while they were holding, for two years, a long, difficult, three-year Satra at Kurukṣetra on the bank of the river Drṣadvatī at a time when the Paurava King Adhisīmakṛṣṇa, the Bārhadratha King Senajit and the Aikṣvāka King Divākara were simultaneously ruling their own kingdoms, proves beyond doubt that the dynastic lists existed eighteen generations before the time of Caṇḍa Pradyōta of Ujjain or Bimbi-

¹ Gd-MBh. I, 95, 44.
² भाख्यानेवचा पाख्यानेवाण गांवापावार्णिः कलभिचिचिभि।
   प्रारम्भाद्विदं च सर्वप्राण स्मास्तंः सम्बन्धवत॥
   भ्रमरस्वाते वामीविषयास्वत करणो वे रोपहस्तः॥
   प्रारम्भाद्विदं तथ॥ देवी वायी महासुमिभि॥
   Vs. III, 6, 16-17; Va. 60, 21; Va. 1, 24-25; Bh. I, 1,7.
³ Va. 99, 258; 259; Mt. 50, 66; 67; Cf. also Va. 1, 11-29; Va. 99, 282; Va. 99, 299-300; Mt. 271, 23.
sāra of Magadha. Besides, it is sufficiently realisable on general grounds that the dynastic lists, as we now possess them in the Purāṇas, cannot be built up off-hand at a particular point of time in a later period had they not been begun to be collected from a very early time. It will thus be abundantly clear that the dynastic lists in the Purāṇas are more ancient than the time of composition of the Brhaddevatā which according to Prof. Macdonell himself, cannot go earlier than 500 B. C. There is yet another ground for driving at the same point. We know that the famous Gāthās preserved in Brāhmaṇas like the Aitareya and the Satapatha about famous kings and Rṣis of old, are older than the Brāhmaṇas themselves. The Anuvāma Ślokas preserved in the dynastic lists of the Mahābhārata as well as the Purāṇas, being of the same nature as the Gāthās of the Brāhmaṇas and having been composed by the Sūtas and Purāṇajīnas of old, are older than the Brāhmaṇas and the Aranyakas and therefore certainly older than the Brhaddevatā. Accordingly the author of the Brhaddevatā really means by the remark "ऋषिीणसूतोऽभवत्" that Santanu's brother Devāpi became the adopted descendant of Rṣṭiśena i.e. was enlisted in the order of teachers established by Arṣṭiśena. 'Arṣtiśena' was Devāpi's Gōtra title and not directly patronymic. It will be found that in the Paurava genealogy, none of Devāpi's ancestors had the name Rṣtiśena whose existence would have justified the name Arṣtiśena for Devāpi. Professor Macdonell's contention that because the Brhaddevatā mentions only two brothers and because the Mahābhārata introduces Bāhlika as the third brother therefore the latter has borrowed from the former, has no reason to stand upon. Why should the Brhaddevatā bother itself about the third brother Bāhlika? It has got to deal with only those persons who are mentioned in the hymns of the Rgveda and the authors of these hymns and the circumstances under which these hymns have been composed.
Bāhlika is neither mentioned in any hymn nor has he composed any hymn. Ballhika is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XII, 9, 3, 3,) as a Kauravya King and as the son of Pratipa. The form 'Pratipiya' is neither 'curious' nor 'remarkable' as we have the epithet 'Pārikṣitīyas [= sons of Parikṣit] applied to Janamejaya and his brothers Srutasena, Bhīmasena and Ugrasena in the same Brāhmaṇa (XIII, 5, 4, 3.) Neither has any harm been done by the Brāhmaṇa in its spelling it as 'Pratipiya' instead of as 'Pratipiya' for both the forms 'Pratipa' and 'Pratipa' were in vogue. The Professor's third contention that because the Mahābhārata form is Sāntanu instead of Sāntanu therefore priority should be conceded to the Brhaddevatā, is also ill-founded. Variant forms of the names of persons are very common in the Purāṇas. These are due to the Sūtas who related the Purāṇas and the scribes who re-wrote them time after time. It should be recognized however that Sāntanu is the correct form being sanctioned by the Rgveda and followed up by the Vāyu, and almost always the Kumbakonam recension of the Mahābhārata, while the Gauḍa Mahābhārata form Sāntanu must be ascribed to those Sūtas and scribes whose special province was to deal with that particular recension. Accordingly we conclude that (i) the Mahābhārata although certainly increased in volume by later contributions, has its description of the Paurava dynasty more ancient than the date of the Brhaddevatā; and that (ii) the Mahābhārata⁴ form 'Āroṣṭi-śeṇa' being sanctioned by the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas⁵ and supported by the Rgveda⁶ is the original one; and that (iii) the form Rṣṭi-śeṇa, from which has been derived the word 'Āroṣṭi-śeṇa' patronymically by Sanskrit grammar, was the real name of Sala. Thus Āroṣṭi-śeṇa was a Gōtra title exactly like Kausīka, Vasiṣṭha, Saunaka, Rāthītara,

¹ Gd. MBh. IX, 39, 24; 35; 40, 3; III, 158; 159; 160; 161.
² Va. 92, 3; 5.
³ Rv. X, 98, 5; 6; 8.
Bhārgava, and that Gōtra was established by Arṣīśena the son of Śala, (=Rṣīśena) in the Kṛta age.

The latter part of the story in the Brhaddevata runs thus: After the death of their father, the subjects approached Devāpi and requested him to become their king, but he said that he did not deserve the kingdom and that Santanu should be their king. On this, the subjects installed Santanu as their king and Devāpi went to the forest.

Thus according to both the Brhaddevata¹ and the Mahābhārata², Santanu became the king after the death of Pratīpā, but the Brhaddevata supplies the important information that at the death of their father, the subjects were in favour of Devāpi’s installation. Santanu however, became the king with the permission of Devāpi as well as Balhika. Then there was the twelve-year drought during the reign of Santanu who, thereupon with his subjects, approached Devāpi again and requested him to take charge of his kingdom. Devāpi again refused but performed sacrifices to remove the drought³. The same account is supplied by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa⁴ and as we have seen, the same is supported by the Ṛgveda which informs us that Devāpi performed sacrifices for Santanu. Let us turn back to our point.

Santanu Pratīpā was a skilled physician, and was, for this reason, surnamed ‘the great Bhiṣak’⁵ (=Mahābhiṣak). His reputation as a Bhiṣak or physician was so very great that people believed whoever was touched by him, be he a

² ब्रह्मवेदव सदिवेदव; भद्रसविनिधिव; गद। MBh. V, 149, 28.
³ Br. Dv. VIII, 2-6.
⁴ Bh. IX, 22, 14-17.
⁵ ब्रह्मवेदव विहान्तम् व वचा सवविनिधिव॥
वदेवब्रह्मवेदव सदिवेदव प्रत भद्रसविनिधिव॥
म् वं करामम् च श्रीति जौष; रोगविनिः च।
इत्यधृति च महति त्यसतुः तं भद्रसविनिः॥
Mt. 50, 42-43; Va. 99, 237-38.
chronic sufferer, was re-established in the health of a young man. It has escaped the notice of all the previous enquirers including even Šaunaka the author of the Brhaddevatā that the Ṛgveda contains the compositions of Šantanu. The great Bhiṣak composed the 97th hymn of Maṇḍala X, and this composition of him has been inserted just before that of Devāpi. Sūktas composed by members of the same family were intentionally placed together by the great Vyāsa. Šantanu’s sons, by Dāseyi Satyavatī, were Citrāṅgada and Vicitravirya and it is well known that on the latter’s wives Ambikā and Ambālikā, Pārāśarya Vyāsa begat Dhiṭtarāstra and Pāṇḍu respectively. Pāṇḍu’s Kṣetraja sons were the heroes of the Mahābhārata. Now counting up the number of steps from Sārvabhauma Vaidurathī to Arjuna Pāṇḍava, we get the number sixteen.

It may be thought necessary to speak a few words on the attitude of the Brahma the Harivaṃśa and the Agni. They say1 that Vidurathā’s son was Rkṣa. It is quite probable that this Rkṣa, the son of Vidurathā became the king under the name Sārvabhauma, or it may as well be that Rkṣa was the brother of Sārvabhauma. In fact, these statements of these Purāṇas cannot be explained away by saying that

1. Hv. I, 32, 103; Brm. 13, 111; Ag. 278, 33.
Rksa was a distant descendant of Viduratha in as much as this fact is attested in a reliable place of the Mahabhara, which says that the son of Viduratha was brought up by the Rksas in the Rksavant mountain and the implication is that he was named Rksa. The probability is that this Rksa, the son of Viduratha, was different from Sarvabhauma. Now it is stated in the Harivamsa the Brahma and the Agni that this Rksa's son was Bhimasena and that Bhimasena's son was Pratipa, but the exigencies of the genealogical table show that there is a gap between Bhimasena and Pratipa.

It is important to consider the informations supplied by the Mahabhara in this respect. The Mahabhara gives us two conflicting lists of kings of the Paurava dynasty. The earlier or rather the older of the two lists is admittedly the one given in the 94th chapter of the First Book of the Gauda recension. This chapter has been separated into two, namely the 88th and the 101st chapters in the Kumbakonam recension. The later list of the Paurava kings is given in the 63rd chapter of Book I in the Kumbakonam recension. The same is given in the 95th chapter of Book I of the Gauda recension. The later list is definite (whether correct or not) about the kings intermediate between Kuru and Pratipa. According to this later list, these intermediate kings were Viduratha, Anasvant, Pariksit and Bhimasena, successively. The older list is not fully clear about these intermediate kings, and we have taken the verses concerned to mean the intermediate kings as Asvavant-Awiksit, Pariksit, Janamejaya and Dhrtarastra. However combining the evidences of the Harivamsa, the Brahma and the Agni with those derived from the two lists of the Mahabhara the Kuru genealogy would stand thus:

1. Kumb. MBh. XII, 48, 82; Gd. MBh. XII, 49, 76.
2. Hv. I, 32, 105-106; Brm. 13, 113-114; Ag. 278, 33.
Thus according to these Mahābhārata lists, Arjuna becomes the 11th with Saṁvaraṇa as the 1st. Now if we suppose that the Pāncālya king who invaded Hastināpura and defeated Saṁvaraṇa was no other than Sudās Paijavana even then the contention of our thesis is supported. For in that case taking Saṁvaraṇa to be a younger contemporary of Sudās Paijavana and remembering that Santanu or Pāṇḍu became fathers when they were advanced in years, it may be conceded that Arjuna belonged to the 11th step below Sudās Paijavana i.e. to the 12th step below Pijavana or Daśaratha or Divodāsa. If according to the Mahābhārata, there were only four steps between Kuru and Pratīpa, then and only then, the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata would be held as correct when they state that Vasu’s daughter Kāli was married to Santanu and that Jarāsandha’s father was the first Bṛhadṛatha, the son of Vasu. This is illustrated in the above table. However this hinges on the correctness of the Mahābhārata account regarding the succession between Kuru and Pratīpa. The account of the succession however is obscure, still we have added this alternative adjustment as it is not opposed to the contention of our thesis.
CHAPTER VII.

THE NORTHERN PĀNCĀLAS.

The dynasty that sprang from Divodāsa, the son of Vadhryaśva, as given in the Purāṇas is defective and incomplete. The Purāṇas inform\(^1\) us that the successor (=Dāyāda) of Divodāsa was Mitrayu. The Vāyu says\(^2\) that Maitreya was born after Mitrayu, and that they entered the Bhārgava order. It should be noticed that the use of the plural “they” here is unwarranted as there is no plural noun before it for which it may stand. The Harivamśa says\(^3\) that after Mitrayu, Sōma Maitrāyana was the king and his sons were the Maitreyas, and they entered the Bhārgava order. Now it may be inferred that the Vāyu has omitted one step rightly filled up by the Harivamśa. The same inference is confirmed by the statement in the Matsya which says\(^4\) that after Mitrayu, that Maitrāyana-vara became the king. The Matsya after this, corrupts the reading by using the singular number in ‘Maitreya.’ Accordingly we adjust the dynasty up to this as represented. After finishing with the Maitreyas who entered the Bhārgava order of teachers, the Vāyu says that Cyavana comes after Maitreya and Cyavana’s son was Sudāsa\(^5\). In the Rgveda we find that Sudāsa’s father was Pijavana.\(^6\) The historian of ancient

---

\(^1\) Va 99, 206; Mt 50, 13; Vs IV, 19, 18; Bh IX, 22, 1; Hv I, 32, 35.

\(^2\) Va 99, 206.

\(^3\) Hv. I, 32, 36.

\(^4\) Mt. 50, 15.


\(^6\) हे नमु स्वस्वते, बने गौरिणि रात्रा बपुर्ण्यात्रा सुदासः।

रहिण्य एसवास्स दान जीतित उवा पविभृच्छ रेभम् II —Rv. VII, 18, 22.
India can at once catch that the line beginning with 'राजापिचवन' in the Vāyu 99, 207b was been corrupted as such by the copyists; and that the correct form originally ran as 'राजापिजवन'. The word 'पिजवन' was corrupted into पिचवन at an intermediate stage, the confusion having been between च and ज. At this stage, it was supposed that चवन was the real name and that therefore 'पि', was erroneously supposed to be remnant of the indeclinable 'चपि', and was tacked on to 'राजा' by vowel combination. Similarly the line below beginning with 'चव वै चवनाहीमान' should run as 'चव पिजवनाहीमान'. When this fact is fully realised, it will be easy to understand how this name Pijavana has been corrupted in the other Purāṇas. The Matsya says¹ that Sudāsa was the son of Caidyavara. It is easy to recognise that 'Pijavana' has been corrupted into 'Caidyavara' in the Matsya. Mark how curiously corrupted is this reading of the Matsya. We have just seen before that the Vāyu after finishing with the Maitreyas starts with Pi-Cyavana (=Pijavana) saying that then the unrivalled Pi-cyvana became the king' [Rājā Picyavanō Vidvān tatō pratirathō bhavat]. It will be admitted that the Vāyu after finishing with the Maitreyas begins with another branch and starts with Pijavana saying 'tatō'. The writers of the Matsya without understanding this attitude of the Vāyu erroneously suppose² that Caidyavara (=Pijavana) was the son of Maitraya. The error of the Matsya is corrected by the Harivamśa, the Brahma, and the Agni although the readings in the latter are corrupt. The Harivamśa after finishing with the Maitreyas as do the Vāyu and the Matsya, starts with 'Pañcajana' saying that Pañcajana was the son of Srnijaya³. It may be easily inferred that this 'Pañcajana' of the Harivamśa stands for 'Picyavana' of the Vāyu and 'Caidyavara' of the Matsya. Thus the

¹ Mt. 50, 15. ² Mt. 50, 14. ³ Hv. I, 32, 77.
Harivamśa supplies the important information that Pijavana was the son of Śrīnjaya. After this the Harivamśa says that Sōmadatta was the son of Pañcajana. This ‘Sōmadatta’ is nothing but a corrupt substitute for ‘Sudāsa’ of the Vāyu and the Matsya, for his successor was Sahadeva according to both the Vayu¹ and the Harivamśa²; and his father Pijavana has been evidently called ‘Pi-cyavana’ in the Vāyu and ‘Pañcajana’ in the Harivamśa. The same remarks which apply to the Harivamśa apply to the Brahma also, for the Brahma agrees word for word with the Harivamśa. The Agni which is a very late Purāṇa further corrupts the name and substitutes³ Pañcadhanusā for Pañcajana of the Harivamśa and the Brahma (=Pi-cyavana of the Vāyu= Pijavana of the Rgveda). The Bhāgavata⁴ and the Viṣṇu⁵ make him Cyavana for the separation of ‘Pi’ and ‘Cyavana’ in the Vāyu. The genealogy of the portion described so far is represented thus:

```
| Anūpa-Mudgala | Devavāta |
| Vadhrayaśva | Sṛnjaya |
| Divōdāsa | Suplan-Sahadeva | Pijavana | Prastōka |
| Mitrayu | | Sudās |
| Sōma Maitrāyaṇa | | | |
| The Maitreyas |
```

Pijavana, the father of Sudās, was according to the Harivamśa, the Brahma and the Agni the son of Śrīnjaya. In the Rgveda we find Vasiṣṭha, the priest of Sudās Pajavana, speaking of Divōdāsa as the father [Pita-
ram] of Sudās. We have already found that Sudās in the Rgveda is spoken of as the son of Pijavana. Combining these two Śāyana states that Pijavana was another name of Divōdāsa. But this attitude of Śāyana does not seem reasonable, for we have already seen that Divōdāsa was the son of Vadhrayaśva as affirmed by Bharadvāja Vājineya and as evidenced by the Purāṇas; and Vadhrayaśva again was the son of Mudgala Bhārmyaśva (=Anūpa) by Indrasena Nālāyanī; while Śṛṇijaya, the son of Devavāta, was the father of Prastōka and Suplan (=Sahadeva); and according to the Harivaṁśa, the Brahma and the Agni, of Pijavana. If according to Śāyana we identify Pijavana with Divōdāsa and Prastōka with Divōdāsa (Rv. VI, 47, 22) then Divōdāsa’s father Vadhrayaśva, will have to be identified with Śṛṇijaya, the father of Prastōka and Pijavana, and Śṛṇijaya’s father Devavāta will have to be identified with Vadhrayaśva’s father Mudgala-Anūpa and Mudgala’s father Bhārmyaśva will have to be identified with Devavāta’s father Bharata. But all these identifications would be preposterous.

Trkṣa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhārmyaśva</th>
<th>Bharata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mudgala-Anūpa</td>
<td>Devavāta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadhryaśva</td>
<td>Śṛṇijaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahalyā</td>
<td>Divōdāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrayu</td>
<td>Prastōka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pijavana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudās</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 इन्ह नहीं मनात; सचतानु दियोदाम म नितरें सुदाम; 
2 प्रविद्या पेतवभस्म कैत इत्याम चब्रमर दियोदु ||—Rv. VII, 18, 25.
3 हे नाम देवलं; मरे गोहारे रथ वर्तमन्त सुदाम; 
4 प्रविद्या पेतवभस्म दारं होतं हार पथों रथों ||—Rv. VII, 18, 22.
5 दियोदाम दृष्टि पिजवभस्म व नामावजारपु !—Say. on Rv. VII, 18, 25.
The Purāṇas too, treat them as different persons. But then Rv. VII, 18, 25 requires to be explained. We notice that Divōdāsa, the brother of Ahalyā, was the uncle (Pitravya) of Sudāś as indicated in the genealogical table. In many places in our ancient literature, the uncle [Pitravya] is called the father [Pitar]. For example, Bhīṣma Sāntanava speaks of his uncle Bāhlika as his father. Hence the word ‘Pitaram’ in the Rgveda VII, 18, 25 may be taken in the sense of ‘Pitrvyam’. In addition to Prastōka and Pijavana there were sons born to Sṛṇjaya. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa we find that Nārada and Parvata spoke about the edibles of a fighter to Sōmaka Sahadevyā (= the son of Sahadeva); Sōmaka spoke about it to Sahadeva Sārṇjaya (= the son of Sṛṇjaya i.e. to his father Sahadeva spoke about it to Babhru Daivāvṛdha (= the son of Devāvṛdha) and so on. As ‘Daivāvṛdha’ and ‘Sahadevyā’ mean the son of Devāvṛdha and ‘the son of Sahadeva’ respectively Sārṇjaya here means by analogy directly ‘the son of Sṛṇjaya’. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa we find that Suplan Sārṇjaya went to Pratidāra Adbhāvāta (= the son of Ibhhāvāta) and learnt from him the method of performing the Dākṣāyaṇa and Sautrāmaṇi sacrifices. When Suplan came back to his country i.e. the country of the Sṛṇjayas, the people became very glad to have their king back and used to say that Suplan had come back with the Devas Accordingly Suplan was surnamed Sahadeva. He instituted a grand sacrifice on the bank of the Sarasvatī at the famous Agniśiras Tīrtha where he had a spacious altar constructed for it. The spot where Sahadeva performed more sacrifices lay close by the Yamunā. He was probably different from Sahadeva Vārṣāgira who Subdued the Simyus and Dasyus.

1 Gd. MBh. XIII, 44, 22. 2 Ait. Bra. VII, 34.
3 Sat. Bra. II, 4, 4, 3; 4. 4 Sat. Bra. XII, 8, 2, 3.
5 Gd. MBh. III, 90, 5; Kumb. MBh. III, 88, 5.
6 Kumb. MBh. II, 88, 7; Gd. MBh. III, 90, 7. 7 Rv. I, 100, 17.
The Purānas mention Sahadeva after the variously named Sudās Paijavana,¹ and the Vāyu and the Viṣṇu even use the patronymic Saudāsa for 'Sahadeva',² but the patronymic here, as in many other cases, is used in the sense of 'a successor of'. After all, Sahadeva was directly the son of Śrūnjaya and Sudās was the son of Pijavana Sārṇijaya Suplan-Sahadeva was thus the uncle of Sudās Paijavana. After the downfall of Sudās,³ his uncle Sahadeva became the ruler of the Northern Pāṇcālas.

It was in February 1918, that I informed my learned colleague Professor Vanamali Vedāntatīrtha, M. A. that the Pāṇcāla Sudāsa, the son of Pi-cyavana of the Vāyu could be no other than the Rgvedic Sudās, the son of Pijavana. In July 1920, I requested the Registrar of the Calcutta University to help me with the library copy of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1910, where, I was told, Mr. Pargiter had contributed an article on Indian Antiquities. I find there to my agreeable surprise that Mr. Pargiter has also identified the Pāṇcāla Sudāsa with the Vedic Sudās, although he has said nothing about 'Picyavana' of the Vāyu and although his Pāṇcāla genealogy is faulty in character for many reasons. Thus our independent findings mutually supporting each other prove beyond doubt that the Rgvedic king Sudās Paijavana was the Pāṇcāla king in the Purānic list, and that the stray attempt of Dr. Surenārāṇā Sen to identify the Vedic Sudāsa with the Aikṣvāka Sudāsa, the father of Kalmāsapāda,⁴ is clearly a failure. Similarly, the attempt of Babu Suvināla Chandra Sarkar to identify Sudās Paijavana with Raghu, the great grand-father of Rāma Dāśarathi², is a guess pure and simple, which can claim no serious attention of scholars.

¹ Va. 99, 208; Vs. IV, 19, 18; Bh. IX, 22, I; &c.
² Va. 99, 208; Vs. IV, 19, 18, &c.
³ Manu VII, 41; cf. also VIII, 110.
⁴ Dacca Review May 1915. ⁵ Dacca Review June 1912.
To fix the position of Sudās Paijavana on the genealogical table we note the following points:

(i) He was the son of Pijavana (=Picyavana of the Vāyu =Pañcajana of the Harivamśa, the Brahma &c.) whom the Harivamśa and the Brahma represent as the son of Śrīnjaya.

(ii) The Rgveda\(^1\) mentions Divōdasa as the father [Pitaram] of Sudās. Here Pitar may mean the father, the uncle, or any forefather.

(iii) The Rgveda\(^2\) mentions Sudās as the grandson of a Devavant (=attended with the gods) king and as the son of Pijavana. Here Devavant is probably a surname of Śrīnjaya. Compare Aśvavant, Harivant, Gōmant &c., in the Rgveda.

(iv) Combining the latter two, Sāyana says that Divōdāsa was another name of Pijavana. But in this respect we have differed from him giving reasons. But if it is maintained in defence of Sāyana that Śrīnjaya adopted Divōdāsa as his son, then we have no objection, for adoption was prevalent during the Rgvedic period. But this is not the attitude of Sāyana. For he says while commenting on Rv. VI, 47, 22, that Prastōka Śrīnjaya (=the son of Śrīnjaya) had all the three different names Divōdāsa, Aśvatha, and Atithigva. But the Rgveda (VI, 61, 1) and all the Purāṇas are unanimous in stating that Divōdāsa was the son of Vadhryaśva. The Purāṇas add that the famous Ahalyā was the sister of Divōdāsa, and her father Vadhryaśva, according to the joint evidence of the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata, was the son of Mudgala Bhārmyaśva by Indrasena, the daughter of Naiṣadha Naḍa. The Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa calls him Vadhryaśva Ānūpa\(^3\) (i.e. the son or a descendant

\(^1\) Rv. VII, 18, 25.  
\(^2\) Rv. VII, 18, 22.  
\(^3\) एते नेव्रणा ग्रामद्रुप: पम्प्लां भूतमानस्मात्॥—Panc Bra. XIII, 3, 17.
of Anūpa). It is very probable that Anūpa was a surname of Mudgala or an ancestor of his. Accordingly we suggest that Prastōka, Divōdāsa and Pijavana should be considered as different persons, as indicated by the Purāṇas. Whatever may be the truth about the whole affair, this much is certain that Sudās belongs to a step below Divōdāsa or Prastōka or Pijavana. That is, Sudās belongs to the second step below Śrūjaya.

(v) We have already seen that Abhyāvartik Cāyamāna (=the son of Cāyamāna) and Prastōka Sārñjaya (=the son of Śrūjaya) being defeated by the Vāraśikhas in fight, approached Bharadvāja Vājineya. Now we find that Kavi Cāyamāna (=the son of Cāyamāna) was killed in the battle of Paruṣiṇī, where Sudās, the son of Pijavana Sārñjaya, defeated ten kings arrayed against him. It is evident then Kavi was the brother of the Emperor Abhyāvartik and that he was against Sudās in this battle. Accordingly the position of Sudās on the genealogical table cannot but be the first step below Divōdāsa or Ahalyā or Daśaratha Aikṣvāka.

(vi) Sixthly for the position of Sudās Pāijavana, we observe that Nārada, Parvata and Arundhatī were descended from a certain Kaśyapa who, we may assure our readers at this stage, was not the same as the son-in-law of Dakṣa Prācetasa. This Kaśyapa, we shall prove when we will take up the early Vedic Age, was a second Kaśyapa, the father of Avatsāra. This Nārada who belonged to the Kaśyapa family gave Arundhatī in the marriage to Vasiṣṭha. Vasiṣṭha got his famous son Sakti by Arundhatī and Sakti had his son Parāśara by Adṛśyantī. We know that young Parāśara, hearing from his mother Adṛśyantī that his father

---

1 Rv. VII, 18, 8.  
2 Va. 70, 79.  
3 Va. 70, 80.  
4 Va. 70, 83.  
5 Va. 70, 83.
Sakti had been killed by a Rākṣasa set on by Viśvāmitra, arranged for a Satra to exterminate all Rākṣasas1 and was ultimately dissuaded from doing it by his grand-father Vasiṣṭha. This Rākṣasa was no other than the Ikṣvāku king Kalmāṣapāda who had been rendered as such when a Rākṣasa named Kiṅkara entered his body at the bidding of Viśvāmitra, the enemy of Vasiṣṭha.2 This Kalmāṣapāda was, according to the Purāṇas 3 the third in descent from Rtu parṇa, the friend of Mudgala’s father-in-law Nala. Now mark in the Rgveda that Vasiṣṭha, the priest of Sudās, was, out of contempt, called a Yātudhāna by his enemy Viśvāmitra,4 and that in retaliatory reply to it Vasiṣṭha called the followers of Viśvāmitra contemptible Rākṣasas and prayed to Indra and the Maruts to kill these Rākṣasas5 and wished for the death of his enemy Viśvāmitra.6 The truth now dawns on the historian that Kalmāṣapāda, the Ikṣvāku king, because he was the follower of Viśvāmitra and killed Sakti at the bidding of the latter, has been depicted as a great Rākṣasa in the Mahābhārata, a work originally performed by a descendant of Vasiṣṭha, the enemy of Viśvāmitra. The strong presumption is then inevitable that Vasiṣṭha, the priest of Sudās, was the same Vasiṣṭha whose son Sakti was killed by the Ikṣvāku king Kalmāṣapāda; because the follower of Viśvāmitra has been called a Yātudhāna or Rākṣasa both in the Rgveda and the Mahābhārata.

1 Gd. MBh. I, 181 ch; Vs. I, 1, 17 &c.
2 Gd. MBh. I, 176, 21.
3 Va. 88, 174-176.
6 Rv. VII, 104, 16.
Now, we learn from the Vāyu that Viśvamitra tried to harm the young Parāśara, the grandson of Vasiṣṭha. In the Rgveda we find that Vasiṣṭha, the priest of Sudās, mentions that his enemies (i.e. Viśvamitra and his followers) wished to harm Parāśara who prayed to the Vedic war-god Indra. Thus the Rgveda remarkably supports the Vāyu and the inevitable conclusion is Parāśara’s grand-father was the priest of Sudās. This fact is further established by referring to the genealogical table above. For it will be found that Sudās, the son Pijavana Sārṇjaya, belongs to third step below Mudgala who was the son-in-law of Naḍa and who was for this reason a younger contemporary of Rītuparna. Hence the Ikṣvāku king Kalmāśapāda, the third in descent from Rītuparna, was a contemporary of Sudās Pijavana whose priest Vasiṣṭha was. It cannot but be admitted then Śakti who was killed by Kalmāśapāda, was the son of that very Vasiṣṭha who was the priest of Sudās Pijavana. The same Vasiṣṭha begat Āṣmaka on Madayanti, the wife of Kalmāśapāda, and the same Vasiṣṭha’s grandson Parāśara was a contemporary of Sarvakarman, the son of Kalmāśapāda; for the Mahābhārata states that Saudāsa’s

1 Va. I, 177.
2 प्र ति रघुदासमधुक्लया परामर्श वत्सालोपसिधि।

भ ते भोजस सध्व महंताय दुर्मिभा, कुदेन य नाग् न—Rv. VII, 18, 21.
son was named Sarvakarman because Parāśara like a servant did all his work.

Seventhly, for the position of Sudās Paijavana on the genealogical table we turn to the poetical compositions of Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha. He defeated ten kings in a battle which took place near the river Paruṣṇi in the Punjab. Viśvāmitra was his former Purūhita and led him and his forces over the Vipāś and the Sutudrī. He had a queen named Sudevī by worshipping the Āsvins. He was a contemporary of the famous Ikavāku king Trasadasyu, the son of Purukutsa. Consequently it follows that Sudās was to certain extent a contemporary of Tryaruna Traivṛṣṇa (=Traidhātva) of the Iksvāku race.

The position of Sudās Paijavana has been determined. Some of the kings arrayed against him in the battle of

---

1 Gd. MBh. XII, 49, 77-78.
2 Rv. VII, 18; VII, 20, 2; 25, 3; 32, 10; 33, 3; 64, 3; 83, 1; 33, 2, 5; 83, 8; Av. X, 128, 12.
3 मृदुया क्षितिजव्यदेश्योत्सर्यमृतिकारणमे मिन्तु मघें नुङ्चताच। निविन्योऽदद्धस्य सूदासस्मप्रियःयत कृषिकंभिरेऽदर्पं ||—Rv. III, 53, 9; Cf. Rv. III, 53, 11.
4 सायो; प्रवीणवेंद्र्य ना दयु राजचाचारिषर्वीररिसवतम्।
5 अस्ति; सूदास जहू सुदेवं तारिषृह, जविताभविना गतम् इल—Rv. I, 112, 19.
6 अर्धं च घोषतं बीमलवं ताम्रक ताम्रकाचति; सूदास।
Paruṣṇī were the distant descendants respectively of Anu,1 Druhyu,2 &c. the sons of Yayāti Nāhuṣa.

We now proceed to indicate why they should be considered as the distant descendants of Yayāti Nāhuṣa. Vasiṣṭha, the priest of Sudās in his prayers to Indra says3 “Oh owner of wealth, being your friends and be’oved, and leaders of your sacrifice, we shall enjoy at home. Make Turvaśa and Yādva submit, thereby making Atithigva happy. By the word Atithigva here, Vasiṣṭha means his Yajamāna Sudās who was ever mindful towards guests; and by Turvaśa and Yādva, he evidently means the distant descendants respectively of Turvasu and Yadu, for the word Yādva is admittedly a Vedic patronymic derived from Yadu, and the word Turvaśa is a derivative of the Vedic word Turvas, [Turvas being the Vedic form which stands for the Purānic form Turvasu; the form Turvasu also is sometimes used in the Rgveda]. Lines other than those preserved in the Purāṇas existed, as each king was the father, not of one son only, but of many sons; and in this way the Yadus and the Turvasus multiplied into tribes. The chiefs of these two tribes were titled as Yādva and Turvaśa respectively. Similar were the cases with the descendants of Druhyu and Anu. Druhyu and Anu became the titles of the chiefs of the tribes into which the descendants of the primitive ancestors multiplied. Compare Janaka, Ikṣvāku, Sṛṇjaya, Bṛhadratha &c. Any descendant of Janaka could be called a Janaka, and descendant of Bṛhadratha could be called a Bṛhadratha, any descendant of Sṛṇjaya could be called a Sṛṇjaya, and so forth. Particularly notice in this connection the statements of Vasiṣṭha. He says “sixty hundred and six thousand six hundred sixty-six Anus and Druhyus (=i. e. the des-

1 Rv. VII, 18, 14.
2 Vv. VII, 18, 14; Rv. VII, 18, 12.
3 Rv. VII, 19, 8.
cendants of Anu and Druhyu) lay down on the battle field for Sudās; these acts attest the might of Indra.” The huge number of the Anus and Druhyus who opposed Sudās, the son of Pijavana Sārṇjaya, proves that they were the distant descendants of the primitive ancestors, and were formed into tribes in course of time. The chief titled as Druhyu opposed Sudās at the battle of the Paruṣṇī and was drowned, while Yādva and Turvaśa, as we have seen, submitted 2; and of these, the chief titled as Turvaśa (personal name unknown) came to Sudās and was killed by him. 3 Mark in this connection that Sāyana makes the word ‘Yakṣu’ here (Rv. VII, 18, 6) mean expert in sacrifices’ (Yajñakusāla). Notice also that ‘Yakṣu’ was the name of a tract of land (Janapada) famous for its horses. 4 The Mahābhārata says 5 “It has been remembered that the Yavanas were the descendants of Turvasu, the son of Yayāti Nāhuṣa.” The philologists declare that the ‘Y’ in ‘Yavana’ may be replaced by ‘J’; that is, both the forms ‘Yavana’ and ‘Javana’ are permissible and therefore interchangeable. Javana even in later Sanskrit literature means “one who possesses speed” (Compare Yāśka’s derivation of Pijavana (Nir. II, 24. Roth’s edition, Göttingen). Now the word Turvas also means “one who runs fast”; so that both the words Turvas and Javana mean the same. Just as the Sṛṇjayas (Sat. Brā. x, 8 9, 3, 1; 2; &c.) mean the descendants of Sṛṇijana, the Jamadagnis (Jamadagnayāḥ Rv. III 53 16) mean the descendants of Jamadagni Ārāṇaka, the Bharatas (Bharatāḥ Rv. III, 33, 11; 12;) mean the descendants of Bharata, so the Yavanas (=the Javanas) mean the descendants of Yavana (= Turvasu). In Hebrew literature the son of Nweos or Nwexos (=Noah in English) is called Yepheth or Yapht

1 Rv. VII, 18, 12.
2 Rv. VII, 19, 8.
3 Rv. VII, 18, 6.
4 Sayana on Rv. VII, 18, 19.
5 Kumb. MBh. I, 79, 42.
and his son is called Javana. The similarity of names makes the following equations very remarkable.

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Nahuṣa} = \text{Nweos} \\
& \text{Yayāti} = \text{Yapht} \\
& \text{Turvasu} = \text{Yavana} = \text{Javana}
\end{align*}
\]

Did the Hebrews borrow the names of famous ancient Indo Aryan kings? We suspect that the Yavanas who have been established to have been the same as the ancient Greeks, were, after all, the descendants of Turvasu (=Yavana), the son of Yayāti Nahuṣa. In the Rgveda we find that Yayāti Nahuṣa performed sacrifices on the bank of the Sarasvati. The Mahābhārata informs us that Valadeva in his travels throughout Uttarapatha visited that sacred spot where Yayāti Nahuṣa performed his sacrifices. It was then called the Yayāta Tīrtha. Thus the most ancient literary records of the world are in favour of the supposition that the Indo-Aryans were already settled in India at the time of Yayāti Nahuṣa. We have seen before that the Mahābhārata declares: ‘It has been remembered that the Yavanas were the descendants of Turvasu’. It is very difficult then to resist the conclusion that the Yavanas, who were the descendants of Turvasu (=Yavana), migrated out of India towards the North west. It this is permitted, then the approximate time of separation of an Indo-Greek branch from the main body of Indo-Aryans can be determined from genealogical considerations.

We have seen before that Turvaśa (=Turvasu) was the title of a king to whom the appellation ‘Yakṣu’ has been given in the Rgveda. Sāyana renders ‘Yakṣu’ here by ‘Yajñakuśala but he also recognizes that Yakṣu was the

---

1 Rv. VII, 95, 2.  
Kumb. b.MB. I 7 79 42.  
2 Kumb. MBh. IX, 42, 33.  
4 Rv. VII, 18, 6.
name of a Janapada or country. It is very probable then that Turvaśa was the title of the Yavana king of the Janapada named Yakṣu. Being the inhabitants of the Janapada named Yakṣu, the followers of the Turvaśa king were known as the Yakṣus. Thus we arrive at the probability that the Pāṇcāla king Sudās, the son of Pijavana, Sārṇjaya killed the Turvaśa king (or the Yavana king) who was settled in the Janapada named Yakṣu, and that the Turvasas or the Yavanas were also known as the Yakṣus.

Druhyu, Turvaśa, Yādva &c. were the titles of the distant descendants of the primitive ancestors, just as Iksvāku, Satvant, Sivi, Janaka Jamadagni, Bharata, Sṛṇyaja, Sōmaka &c. became respectively the titles of the descendants of the famous ancestors bearing those names. That was a peculiar custom of the Vedic Age. The same practice has been followed even in the historical age. The Śisunāgas, the Pradyōtās, the Nandas, the Śungas, the Mauryas (the very word Maurya means Chandragupta, the son of Murā) &c. and the typical examples.

After thus fixing the position of Sudās, the son of Pijavana Sārṇjaya, on the genealogical table we observe that Ajamiḍha, the great ancestor of the Pāṇcālas and the Kauravas, was the descendant of a certain Bharata different from Bharata, the son of Duṣmanta. Now from the Rgveda we learn that Sudās Pijavana fought the Bharatas. It comes to this then that a Pāṇcāla king fought the Bharatas. Now there is a description in Mahābhārata of the invasion of Hastināpura by a Pāṇcālya king when Sambaraṇa, the descendant ofṚkṣa Ajamiḍha, was ruling. For this reason Mr. Pargiter has suggested that Sambaraṇa was the Bharata king whom Sudās fought. The genealogical tables are against it; but there is a great confusion in the Purānic genealogy of the Bharatas.

1 Sayana on Rv. VII, 18, 19.
Sudās Paijavana having attained a victory over ten rival kings became very haughty, and this haughtiness of his became the cause of his downfall. The battle of ten kings which took place at a remote corner of India, was an insignificant battle, as compared with those described in the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, and as such, could not form the subject of a historical epic, although Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra who were directly concerned with it, have preserved it in their poetical compositions. The battles of Kurukṣetra and Laṅkā were very momentous events with which the whole of Aryan India was concerned, and as such, at once formed the subject of great historical epics.

From Divōdāsa, the son of Vadhrayaśva, there sprang another line of descendants whom the Purāṇas have completely forgotten. In the Sarvānukramāṇi to the Rgveda we find that Divōdāsa had a son named Parucchepa who composed from the 127th to the 129th hymn of Maṇḍala I of the Rgveda. Parucchepa Daivōdāsi mentions the feat of his father, namely the killing of Šambara by Atithigya Divōdāsa. Parucchepa's son was Anānata. Anānata Pārucchepi composed Rv. IX, 111. No descendant of Anānata Pārucchepi can be collected from the Rgveda.

The Vāyu uses the patronymic Saudāsa for Sahadeva and apparently means that Sahadeva was the son of Sudās. But this is a mistake in the Vāyu, as we have already learnt from the Satapatha and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇas that Suplan-Sahadeva was the son of Śrūjaya. Accordingly the other Purāṇas which have followed the Vāyu, have fallen into error. Sahadeva was the successor of Sudās and the Purāṇas have in many places, confused the successor with the son.

Sahadeva’s son was Sōmaka who, like his father, performed sacrifices on the Yamunā. He received instructions on the edibles of a Kṣattriya from Nārada and Parvata, and spoke about it to his father Sahadeva Sārṇjaya. Sōmaka Sāhadevya made a gift of two horses to the famous Rṣi Vāmadeva who officiated as his priest in a sacrifice in which the Rṣi Vāmadeva offered oblations to the fire lighted for the well-being of the soul of the king’s departed grand-father Sṛṇjaya Daivavāta. In sacrifices, Somaka Sāhadevya in common with many other Vedic kings had an absolute faith. Being desirous of many sons he actually burnt his only little son Jantu in a fire lighted up for the purpose, and allowed his weeping wives to inhale the foul-smelling fumes that were evolved by the burning of the poor child. India is in need of such steel-hearted fathers who would not hesitate to sacrifice their sons for the liberation of their noblest possession on earth. The Mahābhārata says that as a result of this Puruṣa-medha sacrifice, hundred (=many) sons were born to Sōmaka by his hundred (=many) wives, and amongst these sons, the youngest was Jantu reborn. The Mahābhārata does not evidently name this youngest son by the term Jantu but simply believes that he was Jantu in his former birth or that Jantu was reborn as the youngest son of Sōmaka in consequence of the Puruṣa-medha sacrifice. The Purāṇas state that this son of Sōmaka Sāhadevya was Prṣata. But this cannot be accepted. In fact, the very description that Sōmaka had a hundred sons and amongst them Prṣata was the youngest, mean that Prṣata was a distant descendant of Sōmaka. That is the way of the Purāṇas to imply the gap between Sōmaka and Prṣata. The question as to who was the famous son of Sōmaka in consequence of the Puruṣa-medha sacrifice is answered

1 Gd. MBh. III, 125, 25-26.
2 Ait. Bra. VII, 34.
3 Rv. IV. 15, 7-8.
4 Rv. IV, 15, 4.
5 Gd. MBh. III, 127-128.
6 Kumb. MBh. III, 129, 7-8.
7 Va. 99, 210; Vs. IV, 19, 18, &c.
by the Mahābhārata where we find that the famous Rājarṣi Arkadanta was the son of Sōmaka. Sōmaka Sāhadevyā became so very famous by performing sacrifices that people believed that Ajamīḍha, the great ancestor of the Kauravas and Pāñcālas, was reborn as Sōmaka. This mythology represents the mental back-ground of the people of the later Rgvedic Age. Accordingly we hold that strong faith in a rebirth originated in the later Rgvedic Age, and the Purāṇas have recorded that belief. Now the names of the lineal descendants of Arkadanta, the son of Sōmaka, have been forgotten with the exception of a certain king named Nila whom the Vāyu speaks of as the grand-father of Prṣata. The Harivamśa calls him Nīpa. The Matsya calls him Nīla but represents him as the father Prthuka. The Matsya reading Prthuka evidently stands for Prṣata and may be pronounced to be a corrupt reading for Prṣata. The Brahma calls Nīpa as the grand father of Prṣata. This Nīla-Nīpa was killed by Ugrāyudha who belonged to the line of Dvimīḍha. Ugrāyudha in his turn was killed by Bhiṣma Śāntanava as is attested by the Mahābhārata and the Harivamśa. We side with the majority of the Purāṇas in holding that Nīla-Nīpa was the grand-father, (and not the father) of Prṣata. Thus we tap every available source of Purānic information but cannot complete the Northern Pāñcālas who were also called the Śrṇijayas inasmuch as it sprang from the famous ancestor Śrṇijaya. Curiously however help comes from unexpected quarters which calculates the number of lineal descendants of Śrṇijaya, the father of Sahadeva down to a known later period. In the Satapathāṇa Brāhmaṇa we find that the king Duṣṭarītu Paumśāyana was expelled from the kingdom of the Śrṇijayas who also expelled Revottaras Pāṭava Cākra

1 Kumb. MBh. XIII, 53, 28.  
2 Va. 99, 192.  
3 Hv. I, 20, 45.  
4 Mt. 49, 77-78.  
5 Kumb. MBh. XII, 25, 10; Gd. MBh. XII, 27, 10; Hv. I, 20, 35.  
6 Sat. Bra. XII, 9, 3, 3-13; cf. XII, 8, 1, 17.
Sthapati. This kingdom came down to Duṣṭarītu Paunṣāyana (=the descendant of Puṃsa) through ten generations. Here it is to be observed that the founder of the dynasty was Srñjaya. His son Prastōka, as we have seen, was the contemporary of Divōdāsa, as Garga, the son of Bharadvāja, Vājineya received presents from both Divōdāsa and Prastōka. In India the descendants and followers of a famous king have often been generally known by the name of the king. This has been particularly the case with the famous founders of dynasties. The descendants of Bharata were known as the Bharatas, those of Kuru were known as the Kuruś, those Ikṣvāku were known as the Ikṣvākus. The Brhadhrathas, the Janakas, the Yadus, the Anus, the Śivas, the Uśināras the Haihayas, the Tālajāṅghas, the Āṅgas, the Cedis, the Vidarbhas, the Aśmakas, are the other examples. The same practice has been followed down even to the historical age. The Siśunāgas, the Pradyōtatas, the Mauryas, the Sungas, are the typical examples. Hence it will be admitted that by the kingdom of the Srñjayas is meant the kingdom founded by Srñjaya, just as by the kingdom of the Brhadhrathas is meant the kingdom founded by Brhadhratha (i.e. the kingdom of Magadha). There are many other instances. The kingdom of the Śivas was founded by the king Śivi Anśinara, the kingdom of the Videhas was founded by the king Videha (=Mithi-Janaka), the kingdom of the Āṅgas was found by the king Āṅga Vāleya, and so on.

Now it will be perceived that Duṣṭarītu Paunṣāyana (=the descendant of Puṃsa, the word being derived in the same way as Nālāyana or Nālāyanī from Nala,) the king of the Srñjayas, was holding the kingdom founded by Srñjaya, at a time when ten lineal ancestors before him had already ruled there. Hence it cannot but be inferred that Duṣṭarītu was the tenth in descent from Srñjaya, the founder of the kingdom. Hence Duṣṭarītu was the ninth in descent
or at the ninth step below Prastōka Sārñjaya whom we have already seen to have been a contemporary of Divōdāsa. Now this Duṣṭaritū Paumsāyana was opposed by his

1. Sārñjaya

2. Prastōka

3. (2) Prastōka Sahādeva Divōdāsa Daśaratha

4. (3) Sōmaka

5. (4) Arkaḍanta

6. (5) Sāarjunā

7. (6) Bhīma

8. (7) Arjuna

9. (8) Nila

10. Pumṣa

Duṣṭaritū (9) — Šantanu Balhika

Prṣata. (10) Vicitravīrya

Drupada (11) Pāṇḍu

Dhrṣṭadyumna (12) Arjuna

contemporary, the Kauravya king Balhika, the son of Pratīpa. This Balhika is well known to us. He was the brother of Devāpi and Šantanu. Now as Ajuna Pāṇḍava was the third in descent from Šantanu, the brother of Balhika, Arjuna thus belonged to the third generation below Duṣṭaritū Paumsāyana, the king of the Sṛujayasa. Thus the evidence of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa proves that Arjuna Pāṇḍava belonged to the 12th step below Prastōka Sārñjaya or Divōdāsa.

1 Sat. Bra. XII, 9, 3, 3-13.
CHAPTER VIII.
THE SOUTHERN PĀNCĀLA LINE.

The first few kings of the Southern Pāncāla dynasty that sprang from Ahamīḍha are variously named and their order of succession is variously given in the different Purāṇas. Hence it is necessary that we should review these points in greater detail here. As the dynasty is dealt with by the Vāyu the Viṣṇu the Bhāgavata and the Matsya only, we draw up the following table illustrating how they differ as to their names and orders of succession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vā. 99 170-171</th>
<th>Vṛ. IV. 19, 11</th>
<th>Bh. IX, 21,</th>
<th>Mt. 49. 47 49.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhadvasu</td>
<td>Bṛhadivasu</td>
<td>Bṛhaddhanu</td>
<td>Bṛhadanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—dhanu)</td>
<td>Bṛhadīṣu</td>
<td>Bṛhaddhanu</td>
<td>Bṛhanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhadvisṇu</td>
<td>Bṛhaddhanu</td>
<td>Bṛhanmanas</td>
<td>Bṛhanmanas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhatkarman</td>
<td>Bṛhatkarman</td>
<td>Bṛhatkāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhadratha</td>
<td>Jayadratha</td>
<td>Jayadratha</td>
<td>Jayad-(Bṛhad) ratha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvajīt</td>
<td>Viśvajīt</td>
<td>Viśada</td>
<td>Āśvajīt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senajīt</td>
<td>Senajīt</td>
<td>Senajīt</td>
<td>Senajīt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vāyu places Bṛhadvasu as the first king of this dynasty. Some manuscripts of the Vāyu have the reading Bṛhadhdhanu instead of Bṛhadvasu. The Viṣṇu reads Bṛhadvasu for his name but places him the second in the series after Bṛhadiṣu. The Bhāgavata reads Bṛhaddhanu for his name and places him the second in the lineal succession as does the Viṣṇu. The Matsya calls him Bṛhaddhanu, as do the Bhāgavata and some manuscripts of Vāyu, but places him the fourth in the lineal succession.

The second king in the Vāyu is Bṛhadvisṇu. He is not mentioned in the Viṣṇu and its follower the Bhāgavata, but the Matsya probably calls the same king by the name Bṛhadiṣu.
The third king in the Vāyu list is called Brhatkarman. It is evident that he is the same as Brhatkāya of the Bhāgavata. The Viṣṇu agrees with the Vāyu in calling him Brhatkarman while the Matsya omits him.

The fourth king in the Vāyu list is called Brhadhratha. The Matsya calls him Jayadratha but some manuscripts of the Matsya read Brhadhratha. The Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata call him Jayadratha.

The fifth king in the Vāyu list is Viśvajit. He is Viśvajit in the Viṣṇu, Viṣada in the Bhāgavata and Aśvajit in the Matsya.

The sixth king in the Vāyu list is Senajit. He is Senajit in all these Purāṇas.

Now after the first king Brhadvasu = Brhadhanu of the Vāyu, the Viṣṇu and its follower the Bhāgavata mention only one king and name him Brhadiṣu. We suspect that this king Brhadiṣu of the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata is the same as Brhadiṣu of the Matsya and Brhadviṣṇu of the Vāyu and should therefore be placed below Brhadvasu = Brhadhanu in the former two Purāṇas. There is no harm in securing thus an agreement amongst all the Purāṇas, as the number of kings in them (i.e. in the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata) remain the same which is essential for our purpose. This being granted, the case becomes very simplified as is represented in the following modified table:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Va</th>
<th>Va (modified)</th>
<th>Bh (modified)</th>
<th>Mt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brhadvasu (-dhanu)</td>
<td>Brhadvasu</td>
<td>Brhadhanu</td>
<td>Brhadhanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhad-виṣṇu</td>
<td>Brhadiṣu</td>
<td>Brhadiṣu</td>
<td>Brhadiṣu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhatkarman</td>
<td>Brhatkarman</td>
<td>Brhata</td>
<td>Brhanmanas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhadhratha</td>
<td>Jayadratha</td>
<td>Jayadratha</td>
<td>Brhad-виṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvajit</td>
<td>Viśvajit</td>
<td>Viṣada</td>
<td>Aśvajit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senajit</td>
<td>Senajit</td>
<td>Senajit</td>
<td>Senajit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it is clear that there is a wonderful agreement amongst all these Purāṇas if Brhadiṣu of the Viṣṇu
and the Bhāgavata is thus transferred be’ow Bṛhadvasu (= Bṛhaddhanu). Now the Matsya mentions no less than three lineal ancestors above Bṛhaddhanu (=Bṛhadvasu) unknown to the other Purāṇas. There is a reason for this unless it is supposed that these three names have been manufactured by the Matsya. We are of opinion that the Matsya Purāṇa was compiled in the Matsya country by the Matsya people¹ and was probably better informed about them. According’y we adjust this portion of the dynasty thus:

1. Bṛhadanu
2. Bṛhanta
3. Bṛhanmanas
4. Bṛhaddhanu—Bṛhadvasu
5. Bṛhaziṣu—Bṛhadviṣṇu
6. Bṛhatkarman—Bṛhatkāya
7. Bṛhadratha—Jayadratha
8. Viśvajit—Aśvajit—Viśada
9. Senajit

Thus Senajit belongs to the ninth step below Ajamīḍha as do Divoḍaśa and his sister Ahalyā. Now it may be admitted that Senajit was to a certain extent contemporary of Divoḍaśa younger or older.

We consult the Vāyu (99, 172-182), the Viṣṇu (IV, 19, 11-13, the Viṣṇu is confused after Bahlāṭa, as it omits Janamejaya and ticks the line of Dvimīḍha after Bahlāṭa,) the Bhāgavata (IX, 21, 23-6, the Bhāgavata omits from Samara to Anuha, and afterwards, Janamejaya, the son of Bhallāṭa it further places Prthusena below Pāra), and the Matsya (49, 49-59,) and

have on the combined evidence of the Purāṇas Ruclidāśva, Prthhusena, Paura, Nīpa Samara, Pāra, Prthu, Sukṛti, Vibhrāja, Aṇuha, Brahmadatta, Viśvaksena, Udaksena, Bhallāta, Janamejaya, one after another in lineal succession. The Matsya says that the 12th Viśvaksena-Yugadatta was the 9th Vibhrāja reborn. The Vāyu corrupts the line in which this sentiment is expressed. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says that Brahmadatta wrote a work on the science of Yēga on the advice of Jaigīsavaya.

Now there are conflicting synchronisms in the Purāṇas about the kings Aṇuha, Brahmadatta, Bhallāta and Janamejaya. It is stated in the Harivāṁśa¹ that Brahmadatta of the Southern Pāṇcāla dynasty was the contemporary of Pratipa, the grand-father of Bhīṣma Śāntanava. It is also, stated there that Bhallāta, the great grandson of Brahmadatta, was killed in a fight by Rādhaya². The Vāyu puts 'राजा वेन' in the place of 'राजविन' of the Harivāṁśa. It is further stated in the Vāyu, the Matsya, and the Harivāṁśa that for Janamejaya, the son of Bhallāta, the king Ugrāyuḍha

¹ Hv. I, 20, 11-12.
² Hv. I, 20, 32.
who belonged to the line of Dvimiḍha exterminated all the Nipas.

The Viṣṇu mentions the extermination of the Nipas by Ugrāyudha but does not state that it was done him on behalf of Janamejaya. It is related in detail in the Hari-vaṁśa that this king Ugrāyudha who exterminated the Nipas for Janamejaya, the son of Bhallāṭa, was killed in a fight by Bhīṣma Śāntanava. After the death of Śantanu, the king Ugrāyudha sent a messenger to Bhīṣma asking him to hand over his (=Bhīṣma’s) mother Gandhakālī (=Satyavatī to him (Ugrāyudha). Enraged at this insult, Bhīṣma proceeded to the Pañcāla country and killed the king Ugrāyudha. In agreement with this information of the Harivaṁśa, the Mahābhārata informs us that the mighty Cakravartin king Ugrāyudha was killed by Bhīṣma Śāntanava.

If this line of argument is followed, then the following table would indicate the synchronisms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aṇuha</th>
<th>Pratipa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmadatta</td>
<td>Śantanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visvaksena</td>
<td>Bhīṣma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udakṣeua</td>
<td>Pāṇḍu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhallāṭa</td>
<td>Arjuna Karna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janamejaya</td>
<td>(Rādhaya)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But there are arguments against this arrangement. For it is stated in the Purāṇas that Aṇuha, the father of Brahmadatta, married Kṛtvī (or Rei), the daughter of Śuka, the son

---

1 Va. 99, 182; Hv. I, 20, 34; Mt. 49, 49.
2 Vs. IV, 19, 14.
3 Hv. I, 20, 34-35.
5 Kumb. MBh. XII, 26, 10; Gd. MBh. XII, 27, 10.
6 Va. 99, 179; 73, 23-31; Hv. I, 20, 4; I, 18, 50-53; Mt. 15, 8-10; &c.
of Vedavyāsa. We also find it stated in the Purāṇas¹ that Brahmadatta married Sannati, the daughter of Devala. We further find it stated in a famous saying in the Mahābhārata that the Pāṇcālīya king Brahmadatta made valuable gifts to the Rṣi Śaūkha². This Śaūkha we know was the son of Jaigīśavya, the brother-in-law of Asita³. These would tend to lower a bit the position of Brahmadatta on the genealogical table. For if Aṇuha is supposed to have married, the daughter of Śuka, the son of Vedavyāsa, then Aṇuha could, at best, have been the contemporary of Yudhiṣṭhira Pāṇḍava, as is represented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vedavyāsa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍu</td>
<td>Śuka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yudhiṣṭhira</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>Aṇuha</td>
<td>Dhaumya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sannati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Śaūkha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These positions of Aṇuha and Brahmadatta are strengthened by the Purānic statement that Brahmadatta married Devala’s daughter Sannati; for as Devala’s brother Dhaumya was the priest of the Pāṇḍavas, Devala was, to a certain extent, a contemporary of Yudhiṣṭhira, and Brahmadatta can very well marry the daughter of Devala, as represented in the table. There is again a third consideration which fixes the above positions of Aṇuha and Brahmadatta. We know that Devala’s father was Asita, and Asita’s brother in-law was Jaigīśavya, the son of Śataśilāka. Asita married Ekaparna and had his son Devala by her, while Jaigīśavya married Ekāpatala (the sister of Ekaparna) and had, by her, his famous sons named Śaūkha and Likhita⁴. Thus Śaūkha and Devala were the sons of two sisters and therefore were cousins [Matṛṣvasriyau Bhrātarau]. Now it will be realised how the Māhabhārata information that Brahmadatta made

¹ Mt. 20, 23-26 Hv. I, 23, 25-26; &c.
² Kumb. MBh. XIII, 200, 17.
³ Va. 72, 17-19.
⁴ Va. 72, 17-19.
gifts to Śaṅkha fixes the position of Brahmadatta on the genealogical table as represented:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Vedavyāsa} & & & & & \\
\text{Pāṇdu} & \text{Śūkṣ} & & & & \\
\text{Yudhiṣṭhira} & \text{Kr̥tvī} & \text{Aṇuha} & \text{Dhaumya} & \text{Devala} & \text{Śaṅkha} \\
\text{Brahmadatta} & & & & & \\
\text{Sannati} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus one line of traditions would make Brahmadatta a contemporary of Pratipa, the father of Śantanu, while the other would place him a step below Yudhiṣṭhira. It is impossible to reconcile these two conflicting series. That Brahmadatta’s father Aṇuha married Kr̥tvī, the daughter of Śuka,—the son of Vedavyāsa, is attested by all the authoritative Purāṇas including the Vāyu and the Matsya as well as the Harivaṃśa; that Brahmadatta married Devala’s daughter Sannati is also attested by many of the Purāṇas including the Harivaṃśa; that Brahmadatta made gifts to the Rṣi Śaṅkha is also accepted as truth; while the account that he was a contemporary of Pratipa is held by the Harivaṃśa alone; no other Purāṇa gives any direct support to it. The statement in the Harivaṃśa that Brahmadatta’s great grandson Bhallāṭa was killed in a fight by Rādheya due to the reading ‘राविवेन हत: पुरा’ is opposed by the Vāyu reading ‘राजा वैन हत: पुरा’ which would mean that Bhallāṭa murdered his father. However, if the Harivaṃśa account of the contemporaneity of Brahmadatta and Pratipa is credited, then Senajit, the contemporary of Divōdāsa becomes 15 generations earlier than the Mahābhārata episode, while if the latter account is held to be correct, Senajit becomes earlier than the time of the Mahābhārata by 11 generations.
CHAPTER IX.

THE ANGA DYNASTY

Now we shall adjust the dynasty that sprang from Rōmapāda, the friend and contemporary of Daśaratha Aikṣvāka. Rōmapāda’s son was Caturāṅga, as is attested by all the Purāṇas. Caturāṅga’s son is named variously in the Purāṇas. The Vāyu calls him Prthulākṣa. The Matsya calls him Prthulākṣa. The Viṣṇu, the Bhāgavata, the Harivaṇaśa, the Brahma, the Agni agree with the Matsya in naming him Prthulākṣa. Accordingly it may be admitted that the reading in the Vāyu is corrupt and we adopt the name Prthulākṣa. Prthulākṣa’s son was Campa, the father of Haryaṅga. Both Campa and Haryaṅga have been omitted in the Bhāgavata. After Haryaṅga the Purāṇas differ as to his lineal descendants. The difference amongst the Purāṇas is best illustrated by the following table:

1 Va. 99, 104; Mt. 48, 95; Mt. I, 31, 47; Brm. 13, 41; Vs. IV, 18, 4; Bh. IX, 23, 10; Ag. 277, 13.
2 Va. 99, 905.
3 Mt. 48, 96.
4 Vs. IV, 18, 4; Bh, IX. 23, 10; Hv. I, 31, 48; Brm. 13, 42; Ag. 277, 13.
5 Va. 99, 105, 107; Mt. 48, 96-98; Vs. IV, 18, 4-5; &c.
From the above table, it is clear that Mahātmavant of the Matsya is the same as Bṛḥātmavant of the Agni and Bṛhanmanas of the Vāyu, the Viṣṇu, the Harivaṃśa, the Brahma and the Bhāgavata. We shall call him Bṛhanmanas as sanctioned by the majority. Who was the father of this Bṛhanmanas? The Vāyu says at first that Bṛhanmanas was the son of Bṛhadhratha but it revises its opinion by declaring that Bṛhanmanas was the son of Bṛhadbhānu. The Matsya says that Mahātmavant (=Bṛhanmanas) was the son of Bṛhadbhānu, so that the Matsya supports the latter account of the Vāyu. The Viṣṇu supports the latter account of the Vāyu, by declaring that Bṛhanmanas was descended from Bṛhadbhānu. The Agni supports the latter account of the Vāyu by stating that Bṛḥātmavant was the son of Bṛhadbhānu. The Brahma and the Harivaṃśa call the father of Bṛhanmanas by the name Bṛhad-darbha. The Bhāgavata however supports the former account of the Vāyu by saying that Bṛhadhratha, Bṛhat-Karman and Bṛhadbhānu were brothers and Bṛhanmanas was the son of Bṛhadhratha; but the Bhāgavata has omitted the names of Campa, Haryaṅga and Bhadraratha. The Viṣṇu describes Bṛhat-karman Bṛhadbhānu and Bṛhanmanas as lineal descendants. The Viṣṇu however describes Bhadraratha, Bṛhadhratha and Bṛhatkarman as the sons of Haryaṅga; but here the Viṣṇu is opposed by the Vāyu, the Matsya, the Agni, the Harivaṃśa and the Brahma, all of which state that Bhadraratha was the father of Bṛhadhratha. The correct genealogy of this portion of the dynasty which would satisfy most of the Purāṇas may be thus stated:

(4) Haryaṅga
    (5) Bhadraratha
        (6) Bṛhatkarman (6) Bṛhadhratha (6) Bṛhadbhānu
            (7) Bṛhanmanas
For our purpose the above table will do as it shows that Bṛhanmanas was a step below both Bṛhadratha and Bṛhadbhānu, thus both the accounts of the Vāyu are reconciled. The Bhāgavata also is satisfied because according to it Bṛhanmanas was the successor of Bṛhadratha. The Viṣṇu is satisfied so far as it describes that Bṛhatkarman and Bṛhadratha were brothers. The corrected genealogy from Rōmapada to Bṛhanmanas may then stand thus:

Rōmapāda

| (1) Caturaṅga
| (2) Prthulākṣa
| (3) Campa
| (4) Haryaṅga
| (5) Bhradraratha

(6) Bṛhatkarman  (6) Bṛhadratha  (6) Bṛhadbhānu

| (7) Bṛhanmanas

After finishing with Bṛhanmanas, the Purāṇas differ again as to the lineal descendants of Bṛhanmanas. The difference amongst them is illustrated by the following tables:
It is evident that Brhadbhānu in the first Matsya list is a scribe’s error. The correct form is Brhanmanas as is stated in all the Purāṇas, as well as in the alternative list of the Matsya itself. Again Brhat and Brhadratha of the alternative Matsya list stand for Dhrti and Dhrtavrata of the second lists of the Vāyu, the Harivamśa and the Brahma, as well as of the lists of the Viṣṇu and the Bhāga-vata. Then Brhadratha of the Agni and the first Matsya lists is the same as Dṛḍharatha of the first lists in the Vāyu the Harivamśa and the Brahma. We shall call him Dṛḍharatha according to the Vāyu. The Vāyu, the Matsya, the Harivamśa and the Brahma relate in interesting detail how the dynasty branched off into two lines from Brhanmanas through his two wives Yasodevi and Satyā. According to these Purāṇas Yasodevi’s son was Jayadratha, and Vijaya was the son of Satyā. This detailed account is more to be credited and the other account of the Viṣṇu followed up by the Bhāgavata that Vijaya was the son of Jayadratha, should be rejected. The Paurāṇika Sūta being asked on that special point by the audience Rsis, specifies the point at which the dynasty branched off into two lines. Accordingly the correct genealogy of this portion of the dynasty stands thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Yasodevi} + (7) \text{Brhanmanas} + \text{Satyā} \\
\mid \\
(8) \text{Jayadratha} \\ (9) \text{Dṛḍharatha} \\ (10) \text{Viṣvajit-Janamejaya} \\ (11) \text{Aṅga} \\ (13) \text{Karna} \\
\mid \\
(8) \text{Vijaya} \\ (9) \text{Dhrti} \\ (10) \text{Dhrtavrata} \\ (11) \text{Satyakarman} \\ (12) \text{Adhiratha} \\
\end{array}
\]
The last i. e. Karna was the illegitimate son of Kunti and was brought up by Adhiratha, the Suta, and he inherited the property of Anga, the fourth in descent from Brhanmanas. He was a famous hero and was killed in an unfair fight in the Mahabharata war by Arjuna PANDAVA. Thus Karna naturally belongs to the 13th step below Romapada-Dasaratha.
CHAPTER X,
THE DESCENDANTS OF DASARATHA AIKVĀKA.

We shall examine critically the branch Ikṣvāku dynasty that sprang from Daśaratha Ājeyā, the father of Rāma. Purāṇas are unanimous, in stating the names of the successive lineal descendants of Daśaratha⁴. They

Daśaratha were: Rāma, Kuṣa, Atithi, Niṣadha, Nala Nabha, Pundarīka, Kṣemadhanvan, Devānīka and Ahīnagū. Noticing here that the Paurānic Kṣemadhanvan, the son of Pundarīka, is the same as Kṣemadhrītvan Pundarīka of the

Niṣadha Pañcāvīṇa Brāhmaṇa², who sacrificed on the north bank of the river Sudāman, we proceed with the main Purānic

Nala account.

Nabha

According to the Matsya,

Pundarīka Kūrma, Agni, Liṅga, Siva, Ahīnagū’s son was Sahasrāśva², Kṣemadhanvan (= Kṣemadhrītvan)

Devānīka

Ahīnagū

Pāripātra Sahasrāśva

while the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, and the Bhāgavata say that Ahīnagū’s son was Pāripātra, or Pāriyātra⁴, but the Viṣṇu introduces Rupa or Ruru between Ahīnagū and Pāripātra⁵;

¹ Va. 88, 184-203; Vs. IV, 4, 47-48; Mt. 12, 49-54; Hv. I, 15; 26-29; Brm. 8, 87-90; Bh. IX, 10, 2; 12, 21-12; Ag. 73, 34-38.
² यदा व च चेमद्वी दोष्करणिः द्राक्ष दुधायश्च उत्तरे॥ Panc. Bra. XXII, 18, 7.
³ Mt. 12, 51; Km. 21, 60; Ag. 273, 38; Sv. VI, 61, 71.
⁴ Va. 88, 204; Bh. IX, 12, 2; Bd. III, 64, 204.
⁵ Vs. IV, 4, 47.
The Harivaiśa and the Brahma say that Ahīnagu’s son was Sudhanvan. Following the list of successive lineal descendants of Ahīnagu according to the Matsya, the Kūrma, the Agni &c., we reach Śrutāyus about whom it is remarked in the Matsya that he was killed at the Bhārata war. These lineal descendants of Ahīnagu were, according to these Purāṇas, Sahasrāśva, Candrāvalāka, Tārāpiḍā, Candragiri, Bhānuścandra, and Śrutāyus successively, i.e., we have sixteen generations between Daśaratha and Śrutāyus. Now because the Ikṣvaku king Bṛhadvala king killed at the Mahābhārata war by Abhimanyu Arjuni, Mr. Pargiter has assumed that Śrutāyus and Bṛhadvala mean the same person whom he has called Śrutāyu-Bṛhadvala. But this he has no right to assume. Śrutāyus’s father was Bhānuścandra, whereas the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, which supplies us with the immediate ancestors of Bṛhadvala explicitly states that his father's name was Takṣaka. Now we find that there were killed less than three Śrutāyuses in the Mahābhārata battle. The first Śrutāyus was the king of Kaliṅga, who was killed by Bhīma. The second Śrutāyus (belonging to a high family) with his brother Acyutāyus and two sons Niyutāyus and Dirghāyus were killed by Arjuna. The third Śrutāyus was the king of the Ambaṭṭhas and was killed by Arjuna.

The second Śrutāyus with his brother Acyutāyus was employed in defending the right side of the Krauñc-Vyūha arranged by Bhīma. The third Śrutāyus is mentioned as the King of the Ambaṭṭhas who were as much allied to the Kōsālas as the Kṣudrakas were to the Mālavas. These Kṣudrakas and Mālavas were the Oxydrakai and the Malloi of the Greeks. They have also been mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. These Mālavas were the descendants of Sāvitra’s father Aśvapati, the king of Kekaya, by his wife Mālavi. It is not certain as to which of these above three Śrutāyuses was the Aikṣvāka king killed.

---

1 Hr. I, 15, 30; B. m. 8, 91. 2 Gd. MBh. VI, 54 ch. 3 Gd. MBh. VII, 91 ch. 4 Gd. MBd. VII, 91 ch. 5 G1. MBh. VI, 51, 18. 6 Gd. MBh. VI, 51, 15-16. 7 Me Crindle 115. 8 MBhs. IV, 1, 168. 9 Kumb. MBh. III, 298, 61.
in the Bhārata war. But it is probable that he was the Ambaśṭha King Srutaśvya who was killed by Arjuna. These Ambaśṭhas are explicitly mentioned in the Mahābhārata as Daśaratha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daśaratha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Kuśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Atithī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Niṣadha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Nala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Nabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Puṇḍarīka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Kṣemadhanvan-Kṣemadhīrtvan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Devānīka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Ahīnagu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rūpa Ruru Pāripātra (11) Sahasrāśva

| (12) Candrāvalōka |
| (13) Tārāpiḍa |
| (14) Candragiri |
| (15) Bhānūscandra |
| (16) Srutaśvya |

Kṣatriyas. Srutaśvya thus according to the Purāṇas belonged to the 16th step below Daśaratha. Thus he was a contemporary of Bṛhadvala. His father Bhānūscandra was then the contemporary of Arjuna or Śrīkṛṣṇa. Bhānūscandra thus appears to belong to the 15th step below Daśaratha.
Thus the Ikṣvāku line that sprang from Daśaratha through Ahīnagu and his son Sahasrāśva indicates that the age of Daśaratha or Divōdāsa or Ahalyā was removed from the Mahābhārata episode by approximately about 15 generations.

Now let us turn to the other branch which is described in the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Viśṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa as well as in the Harivamsa and the Brahma. Pāripātra (or Pāriyātra), the son of Ahīnagu, had, according to the Vāyu, a son named Dala, the father of Bala1. The Brahmāṇḍa says the same, namely that Pāriyātra’s son Dala was the father of Bala2. The Viśṇu after introducing Rūpa and Ruru between Ahīnagu and Pāripātra says3 that Pāripātra’s successor was Dala and Dala’s successor was Chala. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says4 that after Bala, the son of Pāriyātra, was the king Sthala. The Harivamsa says5 that Ahīnagu’s Dāyāda was Sudhanvan and that Sudhanvan’s son was the father of Anala. It is evident that the Harivamsa chooses to call Pāripātra-Pāriyātra by the name Sudhanvan and that its Anala is the same as Bala of the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa, Chala of the Viśṇu, and Sthala of the Bhāgavata. The Brahma says6 that Sudhanvan, the son of Ahīnagu, had a son who was the father of Sala. Now turn to the Mahābhārata and notice that the Ikṣvāku king Parīkṣit who had his capital at Ayōdhya in the Aryāvarta, married Susōbhana the daughter of a Maṇḍuka king (evidently the totem name for the non-Aryan tribe) named Āyus and had three sons named Sala, Dala and Bala by her7. It is at once easy to detect that the king Parīkṣit of the Mahābhārata is no other than the king Pāriyātra or Pāripātra of the Purāṇas and that Sala, Dala and Bala were brothers and succeeded to the

1 Va. 88, 204. 2 Bd. III, 64, 204. 3 Vs. IV, 4, 48. 4 Bh. IX, 12, 2. 5 Hv. I, 15, 30. 6 Brm. 8, 90. 7 Kumb. MBh. III, 195 ch; Gd. MBh. III, 192 ch.
throne of Ayōdhya one after another. The hopeless confusion amongst the Purāṇas about the relationships of these kings to one another is thus removed by the Mahābhārata. Particularly notice here that although the succession here was collateral, yet the Purāṇas go on erroneously representing it as lineal. Similarly Rūpa and Ruru of the Viṣṇu were the elder brothers of Pāripātra and ruled at Ayōdyā only for short time, and as such, have been excluded from the lists in the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Bhāgavata, the Harivamśa and the Brāhma. Bala's son is called Auṅka in the Vāyu¹, Uluka in the Brahmāṇḍa², Uktha in the Viṣṇu and the Harivamśa³; the Brāhma calls him Ukya but erroneously represents him as the son of Sala⁴. The

Ahīmagu

Rūpa    |    Ruru    |    Pāripātra

Sala    |    Dala    |    Bala

Uktha

Bhāgavata calls his Arka⁵. The correct name however is Uktha as stated in the Viṣṇu and the Harivamśa. The addition of the consonant य in the Brahma is the scribes corruption for य. The word 'Uktha' primarily means a 'Stōtra' performed with unrecited Mantras (Apṛagīta-Mantra-Sādhya Stōtra, Rv. 1, 84, 5). But secondarily it means the famous Ukthya-Yāga or Ukthya-sacrifice. (Vācaspatya Abhidhāna.) The method of performing the Ukthya-Yāga is given in the Tāṇḍya. Brāhmaṇa (IV, 3.) Consult also the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VI, 13) to have a knowledge of the discussion regarding the different status of the

¹ Va. 88, 205. ² Bd. III, 64, 205. ³ Vs. IV, 4, 48; Hv. 1, 15, 31. ⁴ Brm. 8, 92. ⁵ Bh. IX, 12, 2.
Hōtrakas (=Assistants to the Hotṛ) who have Ukthas of their own, and those who have not. In the introduction to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (Part III, p. xiv to p. xvi), Dr. Julius Eggeling discusses the method of performing the Ukthya-sacrifice. Then it will be realised that ‘Uktha’ means the celebrated Yāga, or sacrifice performed with ‘Ukthas’ or unrecited hymns.

Now after knowing the meaning of the name of this Aikśvāka king we take a due note of the appellation given to him by the Purāṇas. He is unanimously called Dharmātman (=devoted to Dharma) in the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Harivamśa and the Brahma¹. The word “Dharmātman” in its oldest sense means ‘one whose whole self was in Yajña or Sacrifice.’ Thus both the appellation Dharmātman and the name Uktha prove that this Aikśvāka King was really devoted to and expert in sacrificial matters or ‘Yajñās’. We shall see afterwards that this king Uktha (=Yajña) is mentioned in the Mahābhārata. He was defeated by Bhūma previous to the Rājasūya. Uktha’s son Vajrānābha was the father of Saṅkhana.² Saṅkhana’s son Dhyuṣitāśva or Vyūṣitāśva was the father of Viśvasaha³. The last mentioned king Viśvasaha was the father of the famous Hiranyanābha Kauśalya.⁴ This famous king Hiranyanābha was the contemporary of Janamejaya, Pārikṣita, the grandson of Ābhimanyu, Arjuni, as we now proceed to show.

First it is remarked of Hiranyanābha that Yājñavalkya learnt the science of Yōga from him.⁵ Śrīdhara, the commentator of the Bhāgavata, has been mistaken by apply-

¹ Va. 88, 205; Bd III, 64, 205; Hv. I, 15, 31; Brm. 8, 92.
² Nilakanṭha on Kumb. MBh. XII, 58, 21.
³ Va. 88, 205; Bd III, 64, 205; Hv I, 15, 31.
⁴ Va. 88, 206; Bd III, 64, 206.
⁵ Va 88, 207; Bd III, 64, 207.
⁶ तथाद्भिषित भीमो बालिकान्त्वति न चौमता। Va. 88, 208; Bd. III, 64, 208; cf. also Bh. IX, 12, 3; Hv. I, 15, 31.
ing the epithet Kauśalya to Yājñavalkya; his "यत: यत्
सकाश्चत् कौशल्या याज्ञवल्क्यः: \&c." should be "यत: यत्
सकाश्चत् कौशल्या याज्ञवल्क्यः: \&c." Kālidāsa, in his Raghuvāṃśa has erroneously taken the term Kauśalya, to be
the name of the son of Hiraṇyanaḥha. Now Yājñavalkya
was the disciple\(^1\) and the nephew\(^2\) of Vaiśampāyana with whom he quarrelled and compiled the Ṣukla Yajurveda\(^3\). Vaiśampāyana (=the descendant of Viśampāyana) was a contemporary of the king Janamejaya,
(the grandson of Abhimanyu), to whom he related the story of the Mahābhārata at his court. Then it fol-
lows that Hiraṇyanaḥha Kauśalya and Janamejaya were contemporaries because Yājñavalkya learnt both from
Hiraṇyanaḥha as well as from Vaiśampāyana. The
same fact is supported by the statement in the Purāṇas\(^4\) that Satānīka I, the son of Janamejaya Pārīkṣita
(=the grandson of Abhimanyu Ārjuni) learnt the three Vedas from Yājñavalkya who, as we have seen just now, was the pupil of Hiraṇyanaḥha Kauśalya. Now the

\(^1\) भाष्यानाम समानीयो समस्रमाथिवानीवेषाह। Va. 61, 13.
\(^2\) एवमुस्खतः कः की मात्रानकालस्वाबितः। Va. 61, 13.
\(^3\) एव सुमुखतः कः की मात्रानकालस्व जनतु। Bd. II, 35, 18.
\(^4\) यज्ञवल्क्याः तथा सुभो वेगवर्त्तितो दिवजाः।
शिवः परमस्थायी सुधासिद्धम्। वदा। Vs III, 5, 1,—2.
Cf. also Bh, XII, 6, 61,—62.
\(^5\) क्षलोक्याः कार्तिकाः धीरस्व वेगवर्त्तित।
प्रभुवल्लामर्यादि वार्लिक विन्ति न तद्वपेक्ष। Vs. III, 5, 27; cf. also Madh.
Brd. Ar. VI, 5, 3.
\(^6\) तत्तता तात्वाय नावाय न यज्ञावल्लक्तः।
ताति तत्र तत् तत्र तद्न तत्त् सुवृत्त वै ब्रह्मारत्त।
वै जात्रायाय मात्रायणीया याज्ञवल्क्याय चैव तत्त्त। Va. 61, 21.
\(^7\) ततः प्रयत्। भावानीको याज्ञवल्क्यात् वै कथा पदम्।
भाष्यां महाष्यां मात्र विन्यासम्। परमविविखः। Bh. IX, 22, 38.
तस्मात्। भावानीको भविङ्गति। चेती याज्ञवल्क्यात्
वेदतीथिः \&c. \&c. \&c. Vs. IV, 21, 2.
Vāyu in one place says\(^1\) that the self-controlled king Hiranyanābha Kauśalya was the disciple of the grandson [धौत्र] of Jaimini. But in another place the Vāyu relates\(^2\) in detail that Jaimini taught his son Sumantu the Vedas, and these Sumantu taught his son Sutvan, and Sutvan again handed them down to his son Sukarman, and Sukarman got two very intelligent disciples, the one having been Pausyaṇji and the other, the king Hiranyanābha Kauśalya. This detailed information in the Vāyu seems to be founded on truth as a detailed information can only come out of a well-informed source. Accordingly there should be प्रीत्रव in the second line of the verse in the Vāyu (88, 207). Most probably the prefix ‘प्र’ has been omitted for the sake of the metre. The Bhāgavata in one place says\(^3\) that Hiranyanābha Kauśalya was the disciple of Jaimini, remarking however that Yājñavalkya learnt the science of Adhyātma Yōga of Hiranyanābha. But the Bhāgavata in another and more reliable place definitely states\(^4\) that Sumantu learnt the Vedas of his father Jaimini, and handed them down to his son Sutvan; and Sukarman, the disciple of

\[ \text{Vyāsa} \]
\[ \text{Jaimini} \]
\[ \text{Sumantu} \]
\[ \text{Sutvan} \]
\[ \text{Sukarman} \]

Pausyaṇji Hiranyanābha

\(^1\) ब्हरयत्रामः किंचल्लो चिन्हेत्राय तूतो भवत्।
प्रीत्रव जैमिनः भिन्यः कृतः सनम्भु र्यामसु।।
Va 88, 207.

\(^2\) उपथापायायामसु मृगन्तुषुषु जैमिनः।
सृंगन्तुषुपायायामसु गहिस्येऽसु।।
सूक्त्यां सूर्यदेव सूत्यायामसु यामसु।।
तूतो हिमालयान्ते सुभवं सूर्यं बनं भव।।
तस्य ग्यायीवहर्ष्यदानी पीथविण्डी विज्ञानसं।।
हृदयामः किंचल्लो हितीयोभृंगराजः।।
Va 61, 27-34.

\(^3\) Bh. IX, 12, 3.

\(^4\) Bh. XII, 6, 75-77. This has escaped the notice of Wilson.
Sutvan, had Pausyañjī and Hiraṇyanābha Kauśalya as his disciples. Thus according to the detailed informations of the Vāyu and the Bhāgavata, the relation may illustrated as in the adjoined tree: Hence when the Bhāgavata in one place calls Hiraṇyanābha, the pupil of Jaimini, it really means to say that Hiraṇyanābha was the distant disciple of that great teacher Jaimini.

The Viṣṇu in one place calls Hiraṇyanābha the disciple of Jaimini, but in another place relates that Sumantu was the son of Jaimini, the disciple of Vyāsa; and Sumantu's son [सुत: ] Sukarman had two disciples, Hiraṇyanābha Kauśalya and Pausyañjī. It is evident that the Viṣṇu, in its second account, has omitted Sutvan between Sumantu and Sukarman, or that the word सुत: may be taken in the sense of a descendant. Thus the first account of the Viṣṇu really means that Hiraṇyanābha Kauśalya was the distant disciple of Jaimini.

The Brahmāṇḍa in one place says that Hiraṇyanābha Kauśalya was the disciple of Pausyañjī and was remembered in the Eastern Sāman-works; and that he read no less than five hundred Samhitās with his teacher and that it was from him that Yaśnavalkya got the science of Yōga. The Brahmāṇḍa in another place says that Jaimini taught his son Sumantu (the Sāmaveda), Sumantu taught his son Sutvan, Sunvān [evidently a corruption for Sutvā] again taught his son Sukarman, and the last-named Sukarman had his two famous disciples Pausyañjī and Hiraṇyanābha Kauśalya. Thus according to the second account of the Brahmāṇḍa, as according to all the other Purāṇās, Hiraṇyanābha was the disciple, not of Pausyañjī, but of Sukarman, the great grand son of Jaimini. Hence in its first account the Brahmāṇḍa has corrupted प्राचीनत्वः बेमिरि: गिरषः into पौष्पिकः स वे गिरषः: It should be noticed in this

1 Vs. IV, 4, 48. 2 Vs. III, 6, 1-4. 3 Bd. iii, 64, 207. 4 Bd. iii, 64, 208. 5 Bd. ii, 35, 31-38.
connection however that the Brähmaṇa disciple of Sukarman has been named Pauṣyaṇji in the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa and the Bhāgavata, Pauṣpiṇji in the Viṣṇu, and Pauṣpiṇḍya in the editions of the Śāmavidhāna Brähmaṇa which omits steps between Jaimini and Pauṣpiṇḍya in shortly indicating the line of teachers.

Accordingly we have the third ground for holding that Hiranyanābhā Kausalya was the contemporary of Janamejaya Pārikaśīta, the grandson of Abhinyu Arjuni. For Jaimini being the disciple of Vyāsa was a contemporary of Pāṇḍu Hiranyanābhā Janamejaya and Jaimini’s son Sumantu was therefore the contemporary of Arjuna Pāṇḍava. Sumantu’s son Sutvan may therefore be equated to Abhimanyu, and Sutvan’s son Sukarman was therefore a contemporary of Parikṣīt. Hiranyanābhā Kausalya, the disciple of Sukarman, therefore, must belong to the same step with Janamejaya.

Fourthly again this synchronism is supported in a most interesting way by the Mahābhārata where we find that Bhīma defeated Brhadvala, the king of Kōśala, as well as Dīrghayajña, the virtuous king of Ayōdhyā, on the occasion of the Rājasūya sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira. This information is extremely interesting, as it proves the existence of two branch lines of the Ikṣvākus at the age of the events of the Mahābhārata. Brhadvala was the king of Uttara Kōśala,

---

1 Sam. Vidh. Bra. III, 9, 8.
2 Gd. MBh. II, 30, 1—2.
shortly called Kósala, whose capital was Śrāvasti, whereas Dirghayajña belonged to the Ayōdhyā line. Can Dirghayajña be identified with any of the kings intermediate between Pāripātra and Hiranyanābha? Yes, he is at once recognized to be the same as Uktha, the son of Bala in the Purānic list. Uktha, is the kind of Yajña or sacrifice. Dirghayajña means a long Yajña or sacrifice so that both mean the same.

This practice of changing the name of a king but keeping the meaning of the name the same, is common with the Purāṇas. For example, the name of the last Bāhradratha king who was murdered by his minister Punika in favour of the latter's son Pradyōta is given as Ripuṅjaya in the Matsya² and the Viṣṇu³, but the Vāyu⁴ calls him Ariṅjaya and the two names mean the same. Again the name of the son of Khaninetra of the line of Nābhānедiṣṭa is given as Atibibhuti in the Viṣṇu³, but the Mahābhārata⁶ chooses to call him Suvarcas; and two names mean the same. Again the father-in-law of Sikhaṅḍin, the son of Drupada, has been called both Hiraṅyavarman⁷ and Hemavarman in the Mahābhārata and the two names mean the same. Again the grandfather of Śruttāyus Aikśvāka has been named Candragirī⁸ in many Purāṇas but the Agni chooses to call him Candraparvata⁹ and the two names have the same meaning. There are other instances. Thus it will be admitted that Paurāṇikas, according to their convenience, used to change the name of any person keeping the sense unaltered by the change.

Similarly, Uktha of the Purāṇas has been changed into Yajña “the Tall” in the Mahābhārata, Uktha and Yajña

¹ “The capital of Kosala was Sravasti on the upper course of the Rapti” Smith’s Oxford Students’ History of India, 8th edition. Page 57; Kat-Sar-sag. 106, 43 ; 44.
⁵ Vs. IV, 1, 16. ⁶ Gd. MBh. XIV, 4, 9. Gd. MBh. V, 191, 10.
⁷ Gd. MBh. V, 195, 7. ⁸ Mt. 12, 55. ⁹ Ag. 273, 39.
having the same meaning. The identity of Uktha and Yajña can also be inferred from the fact that virtually the same appellation (i.e. धर्म and धर्मिन्य) has been used both in the Mahābhārata and the Vāyu.

When young Brhadvala was ruling at Śrāvasti, old and pious Uktha (=Yajña) was then still ruling at Ayōdhyā, and it is for the reason that he was old and religious that we do not find him involved in the Mahābhārata battle in which both Śrutāyus and Brhadvala took part. Now, the fact that Brhadvala was the king of Kōsala whose capital was Śrāvasti, coupled with the fact that Prasenajit, the king of Kōsala, who was a lineal descendant of Brhadvala in the twenty-third decree, had his capital at Śrāvasti as well as the third fact that it was Śrāvasti which Śrīrāmacandra wished his son Lava to inherit, prove that Brhadvala was descended from Lava and as such belonged to the Śrāvasti line; and it is really very striking that when we proceed upwards with his lineal ancestors, side by side with Śrutāyus’s ancestors in the Matsya school of Purāṇas, we find that Puṣya stands at the same step with Atithi, the son of Kuśa. It is at once evident then that Puṣya cannot be the son of Lava. Had Puṣya been the son of Hiranyanābha, and thus, had Brhadvala been the fourteenth in descent from Hiranyanābha, how could it be possible for Brhadvala to fight with a man (i.e. Abhimanyu) who was the grandfather of Janamejaya Pārikṣita, the contemporary of Hiranyanābha? The conclusion therefore becomes inevitable that Puṣya was the son of Lava. So that in the Śrāvasti line we have Lava, Puṣya, Dhruvasandhi, Sudarśana, Agnivarna, Śīghra,

2 Kat-sar-sag. 106, 43; 44.

"The capital of Kōsala was ‘Śrāvasti on the upper course of the Rapti’"—V. A. Smith’s Oxford Students’ History of India, 8th edition, page 57.
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Maru, Praśuśruta, Susandhi, Amarṣa, and Viśrutavant. After Viśrutavant, we have on the authority of the Bhāgavata, Viśvavāhu, Prasenajit and Takṣaka. Then we have Brhadvala, the son of Takṣaka. The first line of the 209th verse of the 88th chapter of the Vāyu originally ran as “पर्यस्त् लब्धता विद्वान् &c.” An an intermediate stage it stood as “पर्यस्त्तु लब्धता विद्वान् &c.” At this stage the copyist was naturally tempted to show off his scholarship by converting it into “पर्यस्त्त्द्य लब्धता विद्वान् &c” and thus a mistake is being carried on through hundreds of years.

There is yet another way of looking at the question. We know it as certain that the last Kāṇva King Susarmaṇa was ousted by the seventh or the eighth king of the Andhras

1 Bh. IX, 12, 7; 8.
and yet the Purāṇas begin with the first Andhra king Śipraka as the successor of Suśarman. The same has happened here. The real history is that Hiranyanābha Kausalya became a great Yōgīn, so much so that the famous Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyā, the disciple and nephew of Vaiśampāyana, learnt of him the science of Yōga. He was a great Vedic scholar and devoted his whole life to Vedic teaching. His disciples were well-known as the Eastern Saman-singers in contradistinction to the disciples of Pausyaṇīji, who were known as the Northern Saman-Singers. Vedavyāsa, after compiling the Vedas, handed them to his four famous disciples who, in their turn, taught their disciples and thus the propagation of Vedic teaching was carried on by several successions of teachers, and the position of Hiranyanābha Kausalya was the fifth in the series below Vedavyāsa as represented.

It will be established afterwards that Vedavyāsa compiled and grouped the Vedas after the forest of Khāṇḍavaprastha was burnt down by this youthful grandson Arjuna Pāṇḍava, and that therefore the famous king Hiranyanābha Kausalya flourished considerably after the events of the Mahābhārata.

There is a fifth round for holding that Hiranyanābha kauśalya was contemporary of Janamejaya Pārikṣita. We have already seen that Pausyaṇīji and Hiranyanābha were class friends as both of them were the pupils of Sukarman, the great grandson of Jaimini, the disciple of Vedavyāsa. The Viṣṇu informs us that Hiranyanābha's disciple was Kṛti and that this Kṛti taught his disciples twenty-four Saṃhitās. The Vāyu says that Hiranyanābha's disciple Kṛta who was the son of a king, was the author of

1 Va. 61, 34-35.  2 Va. 61, 27—34.  3 Vs. III, 6, 7.
twenty-four Saṁhitās. The spelling Kṛta here is the scribe's error for Kṛti as the Vāyu corrects the spelling Kṛta into Kṛti afterwards by remarking that Pauṣyaṇī and Kṛti were the authors of Saṁhitās. In the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat we find that Yājñavalkya and a certain Janaka were great friends and that this Janaka learnt much from Yājñavalkya. We also find there that this Janaka performed a sacrifice on the occasion of which there is great debate in Mithilā. In that debate scholars like Aśvala, Yājñavalkya, Artabhāga—the son of Jaratkāru, Kahōla—the son of Kuṣītaka, Uṣasta Čākrāyaṇa, Vidagdhā Sākalya, Uddālaka Āruṇī—the preceptor of Yājñavalkya, &c. took part. The point to be noticed here is this that Yājñavalkya and Kṛti were the disciples of Hiranyanābha Kausalya; and we have just now seen that Yājñavalkya and a certain Janaka were great friends. Can there be any doubt then that this Kṛti was any other than Kṛti, the son of Vahulāśva, of the Janaka dynasty? It will be remembered that Uddālaka Āruṇī, Upamanyn, and Veda were the disciples of Ayōda Dhaumya and that Veda was approached by Janamejaya Pāriksita to become his priest. Thus it follows that Uddālaka Āruṇī Veda, Janamejaya Pāriksita, Hiranyanābha Kausalya were contemporaries. This is also strengthened by the fact that Yājñavalkya learnt not only of Vaiśampāyana and Hiranyanābha Kausalya but also of Uddālaka Āruṇī. This contemporaneity of Hiranyanābha and Janamejaya Pāriksita is further strengthened by the fact that Vahulāśva was reigning at Mithilā when Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra went there to see his Brāhmaṇa friend Srutadeva.}

1 Va. 61, 44. 2 Va. 61, 48. 3 Brd. Ar. IV, 1–4. 4 Brd. Ar. III, 1–9. 5 Gd. MBh. I, 3, 21–22. 6 Gd. MBh. I, 3, 82. 7 Va. 61, 13–18; Bd. II, 25, 18–21; Vs. III, 5, 1–2; Bh. XII, 6, 61–62. 8 Va. 88, 208; Bh. IX, 12, 3; Bd. III, 64, 208. 9 Brd. Ar. VI, 3, 15; 4, 33. 10 Bh. X, 86, 13–17.
genealogical table shows that Kṛti was born at an advanced age of his father Vahulāśva.

There is a sixth ground for holding that Hiranyanābha was a contemporary of Janamejaya younger or older. In the Harivamśa¹ we find that the infant great grandson of Janamejaya Pārikṣita was taken care of by by the sage Pippalāda. In the Praśna Upaniṣat we find that the same sage Pippalāda was approached by Sukeśā Bhāradvāja who asked him (Pippalāda) a question put to him (i.e. Sukeśā) by Prince Hiranyanābha Kausalya before.² Pippalāda seems to have been very old, when he took care of Janamejaya’s great grandson Ajapārśva.

There is a seventh reason for the same contemporaneity, for we know that Āstika, the son of Jaratkāru, attended the great sacrifice in which Janamejaya almost exterminated the non-Aryan race of the Nāgas,³ and we have just now seen that Ārtabhāga, the son of Jaratkāru, was a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇī, Yājñavalkya, Kṛti Janaka &c. Ārtabhāga and Āstika most probably mean the same person.

The eighth ground for accepting the same contemporaneity as true is derived thus: We shall see in a subsequent chapter that Indrōta Daivāpa Saunaka performed sacrifices for Janamejaya Pārikṣita.⁴ This Indrōta Daivāpa Saunaka taught his son Dṛti Aindrōta Saunaka,⁵ and Dṛti Aindrōta again taught his disciple Puluṣa Prācinayogya.⁶ Puluṣa’s pupil was his son Satyayajaṇa Pauluṣi.⁷ Satyayajaṇa Pauluṣi, Prācināsāla Aupamanyava and Buḍila Āsvatarāśvi &c. approached Uddālaka Āruṇī for knowledge

³ Kumb MBh. I, 54, 23.
of Ātman,\(^1\) and Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi learnt from and therefore was a contemporary of Janaka Vaideha,\(^2\) the disciple of Hiranyanābha. The relation is illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indrōta Dāivāpa</th>
<th>Dṛti Aindrōta</th>
<th>Janamejaya</th>
<th>Hiranyanābha</th>
<th>Upamanyu, Uddālaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prulṣa Prācīnasāla</td>
<td>Kṛti Janaka, Yajnavalikya</td>
<td>Prācīnasāla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyayajña Paulusi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above relation accords well with the account of the Mahābhārata where we already found that Upamanyu, Veda and Uddālaka Āruṇi were the pupils of Āyōda Dhaumya and of these, Veda officiated as the priest of Janamejaya; It is quite natural that Prācīnasāla, the son of Upamanyu, should be a younger contemporary of Kṛti Janaka, the disciple of Hiranyanābha.

Who was the son and successor of Hiranyanābha Kausalya? In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^3\) we find that Aṭṭāra’s son Para Kausalya who performed an Abhijit Atirātra, was well-known as Hairanyanābha Kausalya. It appears from this that Hiranyanābha’s son was Aṭṭāra and Aṭṭāra’s son was Para. The use of two successive patronyms indicates the name of the father as well as of the grand-father. The Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra says that the Vaideha king Para, the son of Ahṇāra, performed the Viśvajit Atirātra and that thus Hiranyanābha Kausalya bound his sacrificial horse and gave away plentiful regions in charity.\(^4\) Professors Macdonell and Keith evidently make a mistake in reading the spelling of the patronymic. The spelling here is

\(^1\) Chand. Up. XI, 1.
\(^2\) Brd Ar. Up. V, 14, 8.
\(^3\) एतत्तेऽपि पूर्वः इत्याचरणात् प्रिये न दृश्य च दृश्य परिप्रसन्नाति हि कौशल राजा तदेवतः गायत्रिभविभोतम्।
\(^4\) विविध्यति ह्यं पर चार्कर इति मेध्यविभवत्। चित्यानामः कौशल दिति, पूण्यं श्रमितहत्। सत. ब्रा. XIII, 5, 4, 4.

\(^5\) निरितितन तः पर चाश्च इति कौशल दिति, तत्रैव प्रमत्यापि यज्ञगाढ़ा मोदते। सन्ध. स्राव XVI, 9, 11-13.
Āhnāra' (आन्धर) and not Ahlāra (आल्लर) as they have supposed (Vedic Index Vol. I, p. 491). The Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (XXV, 16 3) agrees with the Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra in calling him Para Āhnāra. Macdonell and Keith are again wrong in stating that the reading here (i.e. in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa) is Āṭnāra (Vedic Index Vol I, p. 491). The Jaiminiya Upaniṣat Brāhmaṇa (II, 6, 11) and the Taittirīya Samhitā (V, 6, 5, 3) agree with the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa in calling him Para Āṭnāra. The correct form seems to be ‘Āṭnāra’ instead of ‘Āhnāra’ and the reading ‘Hiranyanābha’ of the Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra is a corrupt one for the patronymic Hairanyanābha. The genealogy may then stand thus: Hiranyanābha, Āṭnāra, Para.

Thus this is certain that Puṣya was the son of Lava and not of Hiranyanābha, as erroneously represented in the Purāṇas owing to the corrupt reading ‘पुष्यस्य भुतो विहान’ which should have been पुष्यस्य लव्यो विहान. &c. Most probably the Kausalya king Para Āṭnāra Hairñayanābha conquered Videha, while Divākara, a descendant of Brhadvala of the Śrāvastī line, occupied Ayōdhyā, but the Purāṇas begin, not with the intermediate Divākara but from the top with Puṣya, the son of Lava of the Śrāvastī line. Hence Divākara, the king of the Śrāvastī line has been mentioned as having his seat at Ayōdhyā1. Divākara’s descendant continued to rule with their capitals both at Śrāvastī as well as at Ayōdhyā, because we have the explicit mention in the Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara of the existence of the Ayōdhyā king named Kṛtavarman who had, by Kalāvatī, a daughter named Mrgāvatī2. According to the Kalpā-Sūtra of the Jainas, Mrgāvatī was the queen of the King Śatānīka II of Kausāmbī; Sugupta was the minister and Sugupta’s wife Nandā was the lady companion of the queen Mrgāvatī.

1 Va. 99, 282.
2 Kat. Sar. 9, 29 ; 39 ; 69 ; 71.
Th number of lineal descendants of Kuśa down to Saṅkhana as well as the number of lineal descendants of Lava down to Takṣaka, the father of Brhadr- vala, indicate that the age of Daśaratha or Divādāsa was earlier than the events of the Mahābhārata by fifteen generations.

Rūpa Ruru (11) Pāripātra Sahasrāśva (11) Amarsā

Śala Dala Bala Candrāvalōka (12) Viśrutavant
(13) Uktha Tārāpiḍa (13) Viśvavāhu
(14) Vajranābha Candragiri (14) Prasenajit
(15) Saṅkhana Bhānuśandra (15) Takṣaka
(16) Vyusitāśva Srutāyus (16) Brhadravala
(17) Viśvasaha (17) Brhadraṇa
(18) Hiranayanābha (18) Uruksaya
(19) Atṇāra (19) Vatsavyyuha
(20) Para (20) Prati-vyūha
(21) Divākara
We have particularly noticed the important point that while the Vāyu School of Purāṇas gives only one line of descendants of Ahīnagu and appears to add the Śrāvastī line of kings after Hiranyanābha Kausalya owing to a corrupt reading, the Matsya school gives just the other branch. Both the Vāyu school up to Hiranyanābha Kausalya and the Matsya school up to Srutāyus are right. With this idea in our head, we proceed to examine the Janaka dynasty from Siradhvaja Janaka, the contemporary of Daśaratha and Atithigya Divodāsa.
CHAPTER XI.

THE JANAKA DYNASTY.

It is related in detail in the Rāmāyāna how Sudhanvan, the king of Sānkāśyā, invested Mithilā, the capital of Siradhvaja Janaka who thereupon fought and killed the king Sudhavanan, and placed his own brother Kuṣadhvaja on the throne of Sānkāśyā. The Viṣṇu also says that Kuṣadhvaja, the king of Sānkāśyā, was the brother of Siradhvaja. The Vāyu too attests the same fact. Hence the wrong statement in the Bhāgavata that Kuṣadhvaja was the son of Siradhavaja is rejected. Dharmadhavaja was the son of Kuṣadhvaja. Dharmadhvaja had two sons named Kīta-dhvaja and Mitadhvaja. Keśidhvaja, the son of Kṛtadhvaja, fought Khāṇḍikya, the son of Mitadhvaja. It is tempting to identify this Khāṇḍikya, the enemy of Keśidhvaja, with Khāṇḍika, the enemy of Keśin of the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra. But there are arguments against that. Particularly notice in this connection that ‘Khāṇḍikya’ or Khāṇḍika is a patronymic derived from Khāṇḍika. Keśin (Bārbhya or Bālbhya) was the king of the Pāṇcālas, and learnt from Khāṇḍika, the son of Udbhāra, the method of atoning for a bad omen at a sacrifice; he was the author of a Śāman, and was taught by a golden bird. The Maitrāyaṇi Samhitā has corrupted ‘Khāṇḍika’ into ‘Ṣaṇḍika’. However, with Keśidhvaja and Khāṇḍikya

1 N. Ram. I.  
2 Vs. IV, 5, 12.  
3 Bh. IX, 13, 19.  
4 Bh. IX, 13, 19.  
5 Vs. VI, 6, 7; Bhv. IX, 13, 19.  
6 Bh. IX, 13, 21; Vs. VI, 6, 10.  
7 Baudh. Srau. XVII, 54.  
9 Sat. Bra. XI, 8, 4, 6.  
12 Maitra. Sam. I, 4, 12.
the two descendants of Kuśadāvaja, the Purāṇas finish
the kings of Śāṅkāśyā. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa wrongly
prolongs the Janaka dynasty by interweaving this
Śāṅkāśyā line into the Mithilā line between Śiradhvaja
and his son Bhānumant. Bhānumant was really the son of
Śiradhvaja Janaka.¹ Bhānumant’s son was Śatadyumna²
whom the Vāyu corrupts into Pradyumna.³ Śatadyumna’s
son was Suci⁴ who is named Muni⁵ in the Vāyu. This
Suci-Muni had a son named Urjavaha.⁶ After Urjavaha
we have Sutadvāja⁷ who is named Satvaradhvaja⁸ in
the Viṣṇu. The Bhāgavata calls him Sanadvāja⁹ but
reverses the order of succession by making Urjaketu
(evidently a variant for Urjavaha) the son of Sanadvāja,
but we reject this order on the authority of the Vāyu and
the Viṣṇu. Sanadvāja-Sutadvāja-Satvaradhvaja had a son
who is named Śakuni in the Vāyu but Kuni in the Viṣṇu.¹⁰
The Bhāgavata omits him altogether. From Kuni, the
Janaka dynasty branched off into two lines one of which
is preserved in the Vāyu and the other in the Viṣṇu.
The Viṣṇu however after finishing the list it has taken
up to describe, comes round and describes the Vāyu list,
and introduces minor modifications.

Now let us take up the line that sprang from Kuni
and has been described in the Vāyu. We have successively¹¹
Svāgata-Sāśvata, Suvarcas-Sudhanvan, Śruta, Suśruta, Jaya,
Vijaya, Ṛta, Sunaya, Viṭahavya, Dhṛti, Vahulāśva and
Kṛti. We check this Vāyu list with the Viṣṇu and the
Bhāgavata lists and find Subhāsa between Sudhanvan-
Suvarcas and Su-Śruta in the Viṣṇu, but the Bhāgavata
mentions Śruta after Subhāsa and omits Suśruta; so that

¹ Va. 89, 18 ; Vs. IV, 5, 12.
² Vs. IV, 5, 13; Bh. IX, 13, 21.
³ Va. 89, 19.
⁴ Bh. IX, 13, 22; Vs. IV, 5, 13.
⁵ Va. 89, 19; Vs. IV, 5, 13.
⁶ Vs. IV, 5, 13.
⁷ Vs. IV, 5, 13; Va. 89, 20.
⁸ Va. 89, 20-23.
in all the Purāṇas, the number of kings intermediate between Sudhanvan-Suvarcas and Jaya is only two.

It is probable that Śubhāsa and Śrāuta were the two sons of Suvarcas-Sudhanvan and Śubhāsa died after a very short reign leaving his brother Śrāuta to succeed to the throne of Mithilā, and as such, has been omitted from the Vāyu list.

Now let us turn to the Viṣṇu list. There we have the following successors\(^1\) of Kuni:—Aṇijana, Ṛtuji, Ariṣṭanemi, Śrutāyus, Sūryāśva, Sañjaya, Kṣemāri, Anenas, Minaratha, and Satyarahtha. Aṇijana of the Viṣṇu list is Aja in the Bhāgavata, while Ṛtuji is Purujit. It is tempting to identify this Ṛtuji with Krataji Jānaki, the priest of Raṇa Kauṇeyya (Taitt. Sam. II, 3, 8, 1; Panc. Bra. XIII, 4, 11. Was Aṇijana, the son of Kuni, the same as Raṇa, the son of Kuni mentioned in the Vedic literature? After Satyarahtha, the Viṣṇu practically confesses that it does not know the name of his son but that Satyarahtha’s grandson was Upagur\(^2\). The latter has been named Upaguru in the Bhāgavata\(^3\). After Upagur, we have Śrūta and Upagupta in the Viṣṇu,\(^4\) but the Bhāgavata introudces Agni between Upaguru and Upagupta.\(^5\) This shows that Śrūta and Agni were one and the same person. Accordingly after Satyarahtha, we take Sātyarahtha, Upagur, Agni, and Upagupta successively, and Vasu is included after Upagupta according to the Bhāgavata.\(^6\) Then Ananta of the Bhāgavata is recognized to be the same as Śaśvata of the Viṣṇu i.e., Svāgata of the Vāyu. The Viṣṇu after finishing this line with Upagupta comes round to describe the Vāyu list. The greatest probability is that the kingdom of the last king Vasu of this line passed into the hands of some descendant of Kṛti Janaka, and the same old Purānic trickery is exhibited by the Viṣṇu which mentions not the name of the intermediate king but

\(^1\) Vs. IV, 5, 13.
\(^2\) Vs. IV, 5, 13.
\(^3\) Bh. IX, 13, 24.
\(^4\) Vs. IV, 5, 13.
\(^5\) Bh. IX, 13, 24.
\(^6\) Bh. IX, 13, 25.
begins from the top with the first king Śāśvata—Śvāgata of the other branch dynasty.

Thus on the genealogical table, Kṛti naturally falls at the same step with Yājñavalkya, the disciple of Hiranyanābha Kausalya. We have already seen that Pausyañjī and Hiranyanābha Kausalya were class-friends, as both of them were the pupils of Sukarman, the great grandson of Vyāsa’s disciple Jaimini. 1 We also have it from Viṣṇu that a certain Kṛti was the disciple of Hiranyanābha and taught his disciples twenty-four Saṁhitās. 2 The Vāyu also says that Hiranyanābha’s disciple Kṛta who was the son of a king, was the author of twenty-four Saṁhitās, and delivered them to his disciples. 3 Afterwards the Vāyu corrects the spelling Kṛta into Kṛti by remarking that Pausyañjī and Kṛti were the authors of Saṁhitās. 4 In the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat we find that Yājñavalkya and a certain Janaka were great friends and that both learnt from each other. 5 We also find there that this Janaka performed a Vahudakṣiṇa sacrifice on the occasion of which there was a great debate in Mithilā. 6 In that debate Yājñavalkya came off to be the greatest philosopher, all others assembled having been non-plussed by him. The famous Pāncāla scholar Uddālaka, the son of Aruṇi, took part in that debate. 7 It will be remembered that Uddālaka Aruṇi, and Veda were class friends 8 and that the latter was approached by Janamejaya Pārīkṣita, the grandson of Abhimanyu,
to become his priest. Thus Uddālaka, Veda, Janamejaya, Hiranyanaabhā were contemporaries. This is also proved by the fact that Yājñavalkya learnt not only from Hiranyanaabhā and Vaiśampāyana, but also from Uddālaka Āruṇī.

Now we have found just now that Kṛti was the disciple of Hiranyanaabhā and we have also seen before that Yājñavalkya too was the disciple of Hiranyanaabhā. Can there be any doubt then that Kṛti was any other Kṛti Janaka and that in his Vahudakṣīna sacrifice he invited the old Pāncāla scholar Uddālaka Āruṇī and his own class-friend Yājñavalkya? The corrupt spelling Kṛta for the correct name Kṛti of the Janaka dynasty has been responsible for the misplacement of a synchronistic remark in the Purāṇas. It will be remembered that Ugrāyudha who belonged to the line of Dvimiḍha and who was killed in a fight by Bhīṣma Sāntanava was the son of a king named Kṛta. The Purāṇists remembered that some king Kṛta (Kṛti was the correct name) was the disciple of Hiranyanaabhā Kausalya and finding no other king bearing the name they pounced on Ugrāyudha’s father to have been that disciple. The mistake is evident on the very face of it. To determine the position of Kṛta, we have it that his son Ugrāyudha killed Prṣata’s grand-uncle Nīla and was anxious to marry Satyavatī after the death of Śantanu. For this reason, Ugrāyudha belongs to the same rank with Nīla or Śantanu. Accordingly Kṛta, Pratipa etc., belong to the same step on the genealogical table. Thus Kṛta having been no less that seven generations above Hiranyanaabhā could not have been the disciple of the latter. Kṛti was certainly born at an advanced age of his father Vahulāśva whom Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva

1 Gd. MBh. I, 3, 82.
2 Va. 88, 208; Bh. IX, 12, 3; Bd. III, 64, 208.
3 Va. 61, 13-18; Bd. II, 35, 18-21; Vs. III, 5, 1-2; Bh. XII, 6, 61-62.
5 Hv. I, 20, 35.
7 Hv. I, 20, 42; 43; Va. 99, 189, 190.
8 Mt. 49, 77; 78.
found reigning at Mithilā, when he went there to see his Brāhmaṇa friend Śrutadeva. The genealogical table indicates that Vahulāśva was then a young man and that his father Dhṛti died at an early age when Śrīkrśna went to Mithilā.

Now in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat we find that Śvetaketu, the son of Uddālaka Āruṇi, as well as Kahōḍa, the son of Kuśitaka, took part in the debate with Yājñavalkya, on the occasion of the Vahudaksīna sacrifice, held by Janaka who, as we have seen, was no other than Kṛti Janaka. In the Mahābhārata we get the very interesting tant information that Kahōḍa was the pupil of Uddālaka, the father of Śvetaketu, and that Uddālaka gave his daughter Sujātā in marriage to his obedient disciple Kahōḍa. By Sujātā, Kahōḍa had his son named Aṣṭāvakra. Being desirous of money, Kahōḍa approached a certain Janaka, the king of Videha. The court-pandit Vandin discomfited him in a debate. Kahōḍa was kept in a confinement and was relieved after twelve years by his son Aṣṭāvakra who defeated the Śūta scholar Vandin in a disputation. This Janaka has been addressed as Ugrasena and as Aindradyumni i.e., the son of Indradyumna. The probability is that Upagupta (or Uragupta) and Ugrasena were one and the same person and that he was ruling at one of the two principalities into which Videha was divided between the two branch dynasties that issued from Kuni. In the same way Sāmkāśyā was divided between Keśīdhvaṇa and Khāṇḍikya. The Janaka dynasty wrongly-prolonged in the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa thus seems to be complete in the Vāyu, so far as one branch line is concerned.

1 Bh. X, 86, 13-17.  2 Gd. MBh. III, 132 ch.  3 The writer of this portion of the Mahābhārata evidently forgets that Vandin was the name of the caste of the court-pandit. The son begotten on a Kṣattriya mother by a Vaiśya father is a Vandin (vidé Kumb. MBh. XII 83, 12) while a Śūta is the son of a Brāhmaṇa mother by a Kṣattriya father (vide Kumb MBh. XIII, 83, 10; Manu X, 11).
The number from Bhānumant to Vitahavya, the grand-father of Vahulāśva goes to show that Siradhvaja who was a contemporary of Divōdāsa was earlier by 15 generations only than the Mahābhārata episode.

(1) Bhānumant
(2) Satadyumna Kṛtadhvaja Mitadhvaja
(3) Śuci Keśidhvaja Khāṇḍikya
(4) Urjavaha
(5) Sanadvāja
(6) Kuni
(7) Śvāgata Kratujit Rajana
(8) Suvarcas Ariṣṭanemi
(9) Śruta Śrutāyus
(10) Suśruta Suprāśva
(11) Jaya Saṅjāya
(12) Vijaya Kṣemāri
(13) Rta Anenas
(14) Sunaya Mīnaratha
(15) Vitahavya Satyaratha Arjuna

Dhṛti Sātyarathi Abhimanyu
Vahulāśva Upagu Parikṣit

Hiraṇyanābha Sruta-Agni Janamejaya
Yājnvalkya Kṛti Upagupta Satānika

Vasu
CHAPTER XII.

THE SOUTHERN KÖŚALA LINE.

We shall now take up to describe a branch Ikṣvāku dynasty which, during the Rgvedic period, ruled Southern Köśala situated just to the south of the Vindhyaas. Sindhu dvipa’s son Ayutāyus was, according to all the Purāṇas, the father of R̄tuparṇa; but in the Gauḍa recension of the Mahābhārata we find the patronymic “Bhaṅgāsuri” applied to R̄tuparṇa. In the Kumbakonam recension we have the form “Bhāgasvari.” Bhaṅgāsura or Bhagasvara then was the name of the father of R̄tuparna. It is easy to infer that the Purāṇas have finished some branch Ikṣvāku line with Ayutāyus, and have tacked on the Southern Köśalas or the Ṣaphālas to that line. The Mahābhārata forms Bhaṅgāsura and Bhagasvara of the personal name of the father of R̄tuparna seem to be corrupt. In the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sutra¹, his name is Bhaṅgāsvina. In the Āpastamba Śrauta Śūtra² R̄tuparna and Kayōvadhi are spoken of as Bhaṅgyāsvināu. R̄tuparna was the friend of Nala, the father-in-law of the Rgvedic R̄ṣi Mudgala Bhārmyaśva. The important question as to where the capital of R̄tuparna was, is admirably answered by the Mahābhārata. R̄tuparna was the king, not of Ayōdhyā in the Āryāvarta, but of Southern Köśala or Ṣaphāla in the Deccan. His friend Nala, the king of Niṣadha³, being ousted by his brother Puṣkara, waited three nights outside the town with his wife Damayanti⁴ and showed her the different roads to

¹ बाहुदाय्यानाय प्राचीनं स्मृति तत्त वै चेत नित्यं पर्यायं भागकुसूर इतये पश्चिमकाली राजय। Baudh. Srau. XVIII,13
² यदा भार्तिभिः वदत करतपृष्ठ कथीयति। Apast. Srau XXI, 20, 3.
³ The reading in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (II, 3, 2, 1, 2) is Naiṣadha. The St. Petersburg Dictionary suggests that the original form was Naiṣidiha (Vedic Index Vol I, p. 461.) But the reading Naiṣadha clearly suggests amendment to Naiṣadha.
⁴ Gd. MBh. III, 61, 10.
the Dakśināpatha beyond Avanti and the Rkṣvant mountain. The great mountain Vindhya stood just in
front of his kingdom and the river Payśphi flowed by his
capital. The king pointed out to his wife the roads to the
kingdoms of Vidarbha and Kōśala, and beyond these
principalities at the foot of the Vindhya mountain, lay
the Deccan proper. Nala related all this to his wife with
the intention of leaving her alone in the forest without
anybody to protect the helpless queen.

After being separated from her husband, Damayanti
wandered through a big forest. She crossed many streamlets
and mounds, and at last saw a man named Śuci who was the
leader of caravan of the king Subāhu of Cedi. After
Damayanti reached the capital of Cedi, and got shelter in
the royal family, it gradually transpired in their conversa-
tions that the Cedi queen Sunandā and Damayanti’s mother
were sisters, and that they were daughters of Sudāman, the
king of Daśārṇa.

The king of Niśadha, leaving his wife in the forest to take
care of herself, travelled through the forest and came across
the Nāga king Karkōṭaka in the latter’s principality. The
king of the Nāgas, a non-Aryan tribe, advised Nala to go to
the adjacent kingdom of Kōśala where Rṣuparna was then
reigning. Nala reached Rṣuparna’s town on the tenth day
after his banishment. Thus it follows that Niśadha, Vidarbha, Kōśala, Cedi, Daśārṇa were contiguous states at

1 एति गच्छन्ति नाहें; पन्यामी द्विविधायःपथम्
वृक्षेषुचन्द्रं च समातःकय्य पन्य तःम् || २२ ||

2 एष्य विन्दु महाभादैः; पन्यायं च सत्तेः
चार्माशं सत्वाणि बृहस्पतिधर्मित्ता; || २२ ||

3 एष्य; पन्या विद्योधायेऽस्य गच्छति कौशलाः
चतुः परं देवोऽपि द्विविधे द्विविधायेः; || २२ || Gd. MBh. III, 61, 21-23.

4 Gd. MBh. III, 63, 18.
5 Gd. MBh. III, 64, 127
6 Gd. MBh. III, 67, 1.
this time, situated at the foot of the Vindhya and that the river Payośī flew past the capital of Niṣadha. We further find that Sahadeva Pāṇḍava during his conquest of the South, defeated Bhishmaka, the king of Vidarbha, and then the ruler of the adjacent kingdom of Kōśala.

Now we perceive that this kingdom of Kōśala was the Southern Kōśala.¹ We also find that Nala, as the charioteer of Rtuparna, drove from the capital of Kōśala to the capital of Vidarbha in approximately 11 hours with four choicest horses². Thus it will be seen that Kōśala and Vidarbha were neighbouring states and as such, this Kōśala of Rtuparna³ was at the South of the Vindhya. Rtuparna or an ancestor of his migrated to the South, and established a settlement in Kōśala as the word “Niveśana.” indicates. In the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra⁴ Rtuparna is spoken of as the king of Śaphāla. From this we infer that Śaphāla was the Southern Kōśala. We are not now in a position to state when this settlement was made but this much is certain that it existed before the time of the famous Rgvedic king Divodāsa because his grandfather Mudgala was the son-in-law of Rtuparna’s friend Nala. The Purāṇas differ regarding the succession after Rtuparna. The difference amongst the Purāṇas is best illustrated by the following table:

¹ Gd. MBh. II, 31, 12.
² Gd. MBh. III, 71, 10; 19; 73, 1.
³ Gd. MBh. III, 67, 1.
⁴ Baudh. Srau. XVIII, 13.
Chronology of Ancient India
In the above table it will be seen that Urakāma mentioned in the Vāyu between Asmaka and Mūlaka has been omitted in the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata, while the corrupt Brahmāṇḍa reading tend to make Mūlaka the son (=Uraśa) of Asmaka. The Brahmāṇḍa represents here the intermediate stage in the process of leaving Urakāma out of account. Vālika of the Bhāgavata is the corrupt form of the correct name Mūlaka. The Harivāṃśa has forgotten Sarvakāma, the son of its Rtuparna, but has tried to fill up the gap with the patronymic Ārtaṇarī. The Matsya has evidently omitted Sarvakāma and his son Sudāsa between Rtuparna and Kalmāṣapāda. The Mahābhārata¹ says that Vasiṣṭha begat Asmaka on Madayantī, the wife of Kalmāṣapāda, and this is followed up by the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata. But the Mahābhārata also says that Saudāsa’s son was Sarvakarman, so named, because Parāśāra¹, the son of Sakti, like a servant did all his work.² This is followed up by the Harivāṃśa, the Matsya and the others. Accordingly we hold that Kalmāṣapāda Saudāsa had two sons Sarvakarman and Asmaka and adjust the genealogy thus:

```
Rtuparna
| Savakāma
| Sudāsa
| Kalmāṣapāda
```

```
| Sarvakarman
| Anarāṇya
| Nighna
| Anamitra
```

```
| Aśmaka
| Urakāma
| Mūlaka
```

```
| Raghu
```

¹ Gd. MBh. I, 177 Ch.
² Gd. MBh. XII, 49, 77-78.
This adjustment satisfies all the Purāṇas and admirably explains the very important information of the Mahābhārata that Kalmāṣapāda’s son Aśmaka founded a town named Paudanya.

Now mark here that the Prakrit form of Paudanya is Pōdana. This Pōdana has, in time, been softened into Pōtanna and then into Pōtana. Compare here how ‘Cedi’ has been softened into ‘Ceti’ in the Pali Buddhist Canon particularly in the Cetiya Jātaka. We know that Pōtana was the capital of the Assakas (=Aśmakas) already settled on the bank of the Gōdāvari during the Buddhist Period.

It is almost certain then that Sarvakarman, the first son of Kalmāṣapāda, having inherited his father’s kingdom of Southern Kōśala, the second son Aśmaka migrated and was settled on the bank of the Gōdāvari, just a bit south of the Southern Kōśala kingdom and had his capital named Paudanya (= Pōdana = Pōtanna = Pōtana).

Now there was a small colony of the Aśmakas to the North-west of Avanti and Varāhamihira speaks of the Aśmaka district lying to the north-west. This Aśmaka of Varāhamihira is probably the same as Ptolemy’s Auxomis (Mc Crindle’s Ptolemy). Saint Martin identifies Auxomis with the modern Sumi. These informations indicate that the Aśmakas in later times migrated towards the north-west from the original Aśmaka country situated on the bank of the Gōdāvari.

This migration towards the north-west seems to be an exception to the view generally held that the Aryan migration always took place towards the South. But as there are other evidences of this kind of northward migration we cannot but usefully cite them here.

We know that Jyāmagha, the son of Rukmakavaca Yādava, was settled first in the city of Mṛttikāvatī situate

---

1 Gd. MBh. I, 177, 47.  
2 Rhys Davids Buddhist India p. 27.  
3 Rhys Davids Buddhist India p. 27.  
4 Br. Samhitā XIV, 22.
on the bank of the Nerbuda. Then conquering the regions of the Rķsavant mountain, he lived in the town of Suktimatī. Saivyā (i.e. the wife of Jyāmagha) in her advanced years, gave birth to a son named Vidarbha. This famous king Vidarbha was the founder of the kingdom of Vidarbha, situated on the South of the Vindhayas. Now we have already seen that Bhīma Sātvata and Andhaka, the son of Bhīma Sātvata, who were the descendants of Vidarbha, the son of Jyāmagha, were in possession of Mathurā in latter times by ousting Subāhu, the son of Śatrughna. It comes to this then that a scion of the royal family of Vidarbha in the Deccan occupied and ruled Mathurā in the Āryāvarta. The lineal descendants of Andhaka down to Kāmsa Augrasenya ruled in Mathurā and it is well-known that Kṛṣṇa and the Yādavas were compelled to migrate South-west to Dvārakā owning to the repeated invasion of Mathurā by the mighty Māgadha King Jarāsandha. There is yet a third instance of this movement towards the north. We know that Vidarbha’s son Kaiśika—Kauśika—Kuṣa(I suspect that this variously named king was the same as the king Kaśu of the Rķveda.) was the father of Cedi, the founder of Cedideśa (=Cedi’s country). We also know that this Cedideśa is the region comprising the modern Bundelkhand and Bāgellkhand, situated just on the north of the Vindhayas. It comes to this then that the grandson of the founder of the kingdom of Vidarbha which was situated on the south of the Vindhayas, was the founder of the kingdom of Cedi situated on the north of the Vindhayas—a third instance of a movement towards

1 Hv. I, 36, 14-15. 2 Hv. I, 36, 19. 3 विभक्त दशेश पथें विदभ्रां जो नववेधाद् | Hv. II, 60, 10. 4 Hv. I, 36, 22 ; Vs’ IV, 12 Ch.

Places are being named after men to the present day; Mymensingh (founded by Momen Singh), Bhairava (founded by Bhairava people still remember that the former name Bhairavabāzār was due to the founder Bhairava) Pareshnātha, Candranatha are the other examples.
the north. Again we know that Magadha was occupied by Brhadhratha, the son of the Cedi king Uparicara Vasu who belonged to the Paurava family (Paurava-Nandana, MBh). Hence this fact supplies us with the fourth instance of northward movement of the Aryans.

Accordingly we have evidences to hold that the Aryan migration did not necessarily take place always towards the south. There were movements in various directions, and it is not at all surprising that the Aśmakaś should, for some reason or other, be pressed to migrate towards the northwest where they have been noticed by Varāhamihira in later times.

Aśmaka's son Urakāma was, according to the Vāyu, the father of Mūlaka. We know that Mūlaka was the name of the capital of the Assakas in later times. It is clear that the capital was named after the name of the famous king Mūlaka of the Rgvedic Period.

From Kalmāsapāda sprang another line of descendants as evidenced by the Matsya, the Śiva, the Harivamśa and the Mahābhārata. They were Sarvakarman, Anarānya and Nighna successively. Nighna was the father of Anamitra and Raghu. The elder Anamitra, according to the Matsya, went to the forest, and Raghu became the king. But according to the Harivamśa and the Śiva, Anamitra and his son Duldudha were rulers. Duldudha (=Munḍidruha of the Śiva) according to the Harivamśa, was succeeded by Dilipa. But the Matsya says that Raghu, the brother of Anamitra was succeeded by Dilipa. The exigencies of the genealogical table shows that this southern Kōśala line has been interwoven in the Northern Kōśala line and the confusion has been due to the names Dilipa and Raghu occurring in the Southern Kōśala line.
CHAPTER XIII.

THE KĀŚI DYNASTY.

The line that sprang from Divodāsa by his wife Drṣad-
vati ruled the kingdom of Kāśi and the kings of that line are
mentioned in the Purāṇas which usually differ from each
other as to their names and order of succession in a few
cases. The account of the dynasty as described in the
Vāyu, the Viṣṇu the Bhāgavata, the Harivaṃśa, the Brahma
and the Agni is shown in the following scheme:
The Harivamśa and the Brahma in their first account introduce Kṣemya (or Kṣema) and Ketumant between Sunītha and Suketu, while in their second account, Varṣa-ketu appears as the predecessor of Bibhu. The Brahma omits Ketumant in its second account. The Bhāgavata places Dhrṣṭaketu above Sukumāra making him contemporary of Drupada (X, 82, 24). Ānarta (of Hv., Brm. and Ag.) was the same as Subibhu (of Va. and Vs.). Now this Subibhu is named as Abibhu in the Gauḍa recension of the Mahā-bhārata, while the Kum-bakanom recension spells his name as Abhibhū.¹ He took part in the Mahā-bhārata war and was killed by the son of Vasudāna.² His son Sukumāra also took part in the Mahā-bhārata war.³ The most famous king of this line was Pratārdana Daivōdāsi who, as we have already seen, was, a contemporary of Rāma Dāśarathi. We have also seen before that he crushed the power of the Haihayas and compelled their king Vītahavya to take up teaching, and fought

¹ Gd. MBh. V, 151, 62; Kumb. MBh. V, 151, 63; Kumb. & Gd. MBh. VI, 51, 20. ² Gd. MBh. VIII, 6, 23; Kumb. MBh. VIII, 3, 23. ³ Gd. MBh. VII, 22, 27; Kumb. MBh. VII, 23, 27; Kumb. MBh. V, 171, 15.
a Maithila king¹ (the Purānic title of Bhānumant the son of Siradhvaja is Maithila although a Maithila generally means an inhabitant or a king of Mithilā)² and thus he was believed to have attained Indra’s world by fighting and strength.³ Pratardana was not only a very brave soldier but also a curious student of rituals.⁴ During his reign, Rāma Jāmadagnya exterminated the Kṣattriyas a second time and his young son Vatsa Pratardāṇi somehow or other, escaped his terrible vengeance⁵ His grandson Alarka who was the king of Kāśi and Karuṣa,⁶ was blessed by Agastya’s wife Lōpāmudrā,⁷ the daughter of the king of Vidarbha.⁸ Young Agastya approached Vradhnaśva (= Vadhryaśva = Divodāsa’s father) Trasadasyu Paurukutsa, the Aikṣvāka king, and the king Śrutarvan for money.⁹ This king Śrutarvan is clearly the same Śrutarvan who is mentioned in the Rgveda by his priest Gōpavana Ātreya as the son of Rkṣa and as a great sacrificer.¹⁰ Śrutarvan subjugated a Dāsa chief named Mrgaya.¹¹ Rāma Dāśarathi met Agastya in Daṇḍaka and Agastya saw Rāma in Lāṅkā.¹² Hence Rāma Dāśarathi was, to a certain extent, a contemporary of Alarka. Vatsabhūmi and Bhargabhūmi were the lands of the descendants of Vatsa and Bharga, the sons of Pratardana, and almost all the Purāṇas have been confused in expressing this sentiment. The number of descendants from Divodāsa to Sukumāra indicates that Divodāsa was earlier by thirteen generations than the events of the Mahābhārata.

CHAPTER XIV.

We propose to add yet another Brâhmanic evidence in support of our thesis. In the Vaµ̄sa Brâhmaña of the Sâmaveda we find a series of teachers the earlier ones of whom are well-known to us and belong to the Vedic period while the latter were post-vedic The adjoining list is collected from the Vaµ̄sa Brâhmaña.

Vibhâṅḍaka Kâśyapa

Ṛṣyaśṛṅga Kâśyapa

(1) Mitrâbhu Kâśyapa

(2) Indrâbhu Kâśyapa

(3) Agnibhu Kâśyapa

(4) Śavas

(5) Devataras Śāvasāyana

(6) Pratithi Devataratha

(7) Nikōthaka Bhāyajātya

(8) Vṛṣaṇuṣma Vātāvata

(9) Indrōta Śaunaka

Some of these teachers are known to us. A detailed account of Vibhâṅḍaka Kâśyapa is supplied by the Mahābhārata. There we find that Vibhâṅḍaka Kâśyapa who had his hermitage on the bank of the river Kauśikī (=the modern Kuśi in the district of Purnea) had his son named Ṛṣyaśṛṅga by a Mr̥gī (evidently a non-Aryan maid). Lōmapāda-Daśaratha of the dynasty of Anga Vā'eya employed Ṛṣyaśṛṅga Vaibhâṅḍaki to officiate in a sacrifice instituted by him (i. e. Lōmapāda) to remove draught. The same incident is evidenced by the Rāmāyaṇa. Lōmapāda gave his daugh-

1 Kumb. MBh. III, 111 ch.

2 N. Ram. I., 9 & 10 chh.
ter Śántā in marriage to Rṣyaśrīṅga. It was by virtue of Rṣyaśrīṅga’s officiating in a Putreṣṭi sacrifice that Lōmapāda got his son Caturaṅga. Rṣyaśrīṅga also officiated in the Putreṣṭi sacrifice instituted by Daśaratha Ājeya of the Ikṣvāku dynasty and as a result, Rāma, Laksmaṇa, Bharata and Satrughna were born. Accordingly Vibhāṅdaka Kāśyapa and his son Rṣyaśrīṅga Kāśyapa are thoroughly known to us. The Vamśa Brāhmaṇa is just wrong in placing Rṣyaśrīṅga Kāśyapa above Vibhāṅdaka Kāśyapa. The eighth in the order of disciples downwards from Vibhāṅdaka is Vṛṣaśūṣma Vatāvata. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa we find that Vṛṣaśūṣma Vatāvata Jātukarnya (i.e. the son of Vatāvata and grandson of Jatukarna) gave sacrificial instructions to the Agnihotris. It is easy to recognise that the same Vṛṣaśūṣma Vatāvata is mentioned in both the Aitareya and the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa. The Puraṇas call him simply Jātukarnya and state that he was an older contemporary Vedavyāsa. The disciple of Vṛṣaśūṣma (=strong like a bull) Vatāvata (=the son of Vatāvata) Jātukarnya was, according to the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa, Indrōta Śaunaika (vide the table). This Indrōta Śaunaika is also thoroughly known to us. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa we find that Indrōta Daivāpa Śaunaika performed sacrifices for Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣit. We also find that Janamejaya Pārikaṣita performed this sacrifice in Āsan-divant. We further find that the Rṣis performed a Jyōtis Atirātra for Bhīmasena, a Gō Atirātha for Ugrasena and an Āyus Atirattra for Srutasena. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa further informs us that Bhīmasena, Ugrasena, and Srutasena were the brothers of Janamejaya and the sons of Parikṣit.
(Note particularly the Gāthā and the commentary of Hari-
svāmin.) In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa we come across a
certain Janamejaya Pārikṣita who was crowned with the
Aindra Mahābhīṣeka ceremony by a Rṣi named Tura Kā-
vaṣeya.¹ The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa preserves the same
gāthā about this Janamejaya Pārikṣita as does the Sata-
patha Brāhmaṇa and says that 'in Āsandivant Jan-
amejaya Pārikṣita bound for the gods a black-spotted grain-
eating horse adorned with a golden ornament and yellow
garlands.' As the same gāthā is preserved in both the
Brāhmaṇas and as Janamejaya Pārikṣita is mentioned in both
of them, it will be admitted that these two Brāhmaṇas
mean the same Janamejaya Pārikṣita. Now turning to the
Māhābhārata we find that Janamejaya Pārikṣita, (i.e. the
grandson of Abhimanyu Ārjuni) had his brothers named
Srutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena and that these four
Pārikṣitas (i.e. the sons of Pārikṣit) instituted a long sacri-
ifice in Kurukṣetra.² It is decided that Indrōta Daivāpa
Śaunaka, the disciple of Jātukarṇya, performed sacrifices
for Janamejaya Pārikṣita, the grandson of Abhimanyu,
and that the same Janamejaya Pārikṣita was crowned
with the Aindra Mahābhīṣeka ceremony by Tura Kāvaṣeya.
This fact is further confirmed by the evidence of the
Bhāgavata Purāṇa³ where we find that Janamejaya
Pārikṣita, the grandson of Abhimanyu Ārjuni, employed
Tura Kālaseya as his priest. Kālaseya here is an evident
corruption for Kāvaṣeya. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa also
informs us that Janamejaya Pārikṣita had Śrutasena,
Ugrasena and Bhīmasena as his brothers.⁴ Now Indrōta
Daivāpa Śaunaka has also been mentioned simply as Indrōta
Śaunaka in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.⁵ After all this, we
conclude that Indrōta Daivāpa Śaunaka or Indrōta Śaunaka,

² Kumb. MBh. I, 3, 1.
³ Bh. IX, 22, 37.
⁴ Bh. IX. 22, 35.
⁵ Sat. Bra. XIII, 5, 3, 5.
the disciple of Vṛṣaśūṣma Vatāvata Jātukarnya, performed sacrifices for Janamejaya Pārīkṣita, and that the same Jana-
mejaya Pārīkṣita was crowned with the Aindra Mahābhīṣeka
ceremony by Tura Kāvaśeya. Accordingly Tura Kāva-
šeeya was, to a certain extent, a contemporary of Indrōtā
Saunaka. Now in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa we find that

Vibhāṇḍaka
1. Mitrābhu
2. Indrābhu
3. Agnibhu
4. Savas
5. Devataras Śāvasāyana
6. Pratithi Devataratha
7. Nikōthaka Bhāyajātya
8. Vṛṣaśūṣma Vatāvata Jātukarnya
9. Indrōtā Saunaka, Tura Kāvaśeya

Yajñavacas Rājastambhāyana
Kuśri.

Tura Kāvaśeya’s disciple was Yajñavacas Rājastamb-
bhāyana and the latter’s pupil was Kuśri. 1 Elsewhere in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa we find that Kuśri who was the son of Vājaśravas had Upaveśi as his disciple; Upaveśi’s son and disciple was Aruṇa; Aruṇa’s son and disciple was the famous Uddālaka Aruṇi; Uddālaka Aruṇi’s disciple was the famous Yājñavalkya
Vājasaneyā. Thus we have the following table:—

Vedavyāsa (9) Tura Kāvaśeya
Pāṇḍu (10) Yajñavacas Rājastambhāyana
Arjuna (11) Kuśri Vājaśravasa
Abhimanyu (22) Upaveśi
Parīkṣit (13) Aruṇa
Janamejaya (14) Uddālaka Aruṇi
Satānīka 1 (15) Yājñavalkya.

Yājñavalkya Vājasaneya, the disciple of Uddālaka Āruṇi thus naturally belongs to the 15th step below Vibhāṇḍaka in order of discipleship. The table indicates that Tura Kāvaśeya lived to a great age. But there is no reason to be surprised at this, as we have numerous evidences to show that Rṣis in those times had very long lives. Thus Vedavyāsa attended Janamejaya’s court. Again Indrōta Saunaka’s pupil was his son Dṛti Aindrōta Saunaka, and Dṛti’s disciple was Puluṣa Prācinayōgya. Puluṣa’s pupil was his son Satyayajña Pauluṣi. Satyayajña Pauluṣi, Prācināśāla the son of Upamanyu, and Buḍila Aśvatarāśvi &c. approached Uddālaka Āruṇi for knowledge of Ātman, and Buḍila Aśvatarāśvi, learnt from and therefore was a contemporary of Janaka Vaideha who, as we have already seen, was no other than Kṛti Janaka, the class friend of Yājñavalkya. The relation is best illustrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Indrōta Dāivāpa</th>
<th>Aruṇa</th>
<th>Parikṣit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dṛti Aindrōta</td>
<td>Saunaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Puluṣa Prācin-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiraṇyanābha Upamanyu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Satyayajña</td>
<td>Kṛti Janaka, Prācināśāla Buḍila Yājñavalkya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pauluṣi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the line of teachers from Vibhāṇḍaka Kāśyapa through Indrōta to Satyayajña Pauluṣi, the contemporay of Kṛti Janaka and Yājñavalkya indicates that Indrōta Saunaka became the pupil of Vṛṣaṣuṣma Vātāvata Jātukarnya when the latter was very old, and that Vibhāṇḍaka Kāśyupa was earlier than Puluṣa Prācinayōgya by a series of 11 teachers. But the combined evidences of the Vamsa, the Aitareya and the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa prove that the age of Vibhāṇḍaka Kāśyapa or Daśaratha or Divōdāsa was removed from the age of Kuṣri Vājaśravasa by approximately about 11 generations or discipleships.

4 Chan 1. Up. XI. 1.
5 Brd. Ar. Up, V, 14, 8
CHAPTER XV.

DISTINGUISHED RŠIS BELONGING TO THE PERIOD.

The first and the most famous Vedic poet of this period was Bharadvāja Vājineya. He was a contemporary of Divōdāsa, Prastōka Sārṇjaya and Abhyāvarttin Cāyamāna and consequently of Daśaratha. His sons were Garga and Pāyu. Rāma Daśarathī repaired to his hermitage on his way back from Laṅkā.¹ He was the Purōhita of Divōdāsa², gave Pratardana Daivōdāsi his kingdom³ and Kṣattrōsrī Prātardani was his Yajamāna⁴. He was one of the Rśis of the Vedic age, who prohibited the slaughter of cows in sacrifices⁵ simply out of gratitude to the bovine race which showers on mankind, kindness in the form of milk.⁶ Bharadvāja loved the cows so very deeply that he did not heistate to identify them with Indra, his deity.⁷

Then comes Rkṣa, the son of Valmīka Bhārgava. He was the author of the original Rāmāyaṇa. An absurd legend has probably developed round his patronymic ‘Valmīki.’ It was in his hermitage that Kuśa and Lava, the sons of Rāma Daśarathī, were brought up. These two disciples of his, first sang the poetry of Rāmāyaṇa composed by him at the court of their father. The heroes of a drama are still called Kuśi-Lavas in Sanskrit. The present Rāmāyaṇa has evolved out of the practice of singing the original Rāmāyaṇa which was undoubtedly in Vedic dialect and in Anustubh metre. Hence the present Rāmāyaṇa is the Sanskritredaction (with later contributions added) of the original Vedic Rāmāyaṇa which contained verses of the type: “मा नियाद प्रतिष्ठां लम्बगमः गाभलीः समाः।”

¹ Va. 45, 114.
² Panc. Bra. XV, 3, 7; Kumb. MBh. XIII, 8, 25.
³ Kat. Sam. XXI, 10; Gd. MBh. XIII, 30 Ch.
⁴ Rv. VI, 26, 8.
⁵ Rv. VI, 28, 4.
⁶ Rv. VI, 28, 1.
⁷ Rv. VI, 28, 5.
Its style need not be suspected as belonging to a later age because it is composed in Anustubh, Dirghatamash Mā-mateya who crowned Bharata Dauśmantī and who thus belonged to the same period composed \"Deckānta: मामतियो चलूर्वान् दशमे बुधि।\" The Hindus who had the extraordinary memory to carry the Vedas in their brain for thousands of years to deliver up to modern scholars, cannot be expected to have forgotten the very simple fact that Rkṣa Bhārgava composed the first verse that was an effusion of pity. Tradition has it that Rkṣa Vālmīki also tried to compile the Vedas existing at his time after the Rṣi Trṇavindu, and after him (i.e. Vālmīki) Sakti, the son of Vasiṣṭha, tried to compile the Vedas.  

(7) Ambhrṇa  
(8) Vāk  
(9) Kaśyapa Naidhrũvi  
(10) Silpa Kaśyapa  
(11) Harita Kaśyapa  
(12) Asita Vārṣagana  
(13) Jihvāvant Vādhyoga  
(14) Vājaśravas  
(15) Kuṣṛi Vājaśravasa  
(16) Upaveśa  
(17) Aruṇa  

The third mentionable Rṣi of the period is Vāk, the famous daughter of Ambhrṇa. She belongs to the eighth step on the genealogical table and was the author of the famous Devi Sūkta, namely the 125th hymn of Manḍala X of the Rgveda. In her composition we come across the Doctrine of Logos imported into Europe by the Essenes of Palestine or the Therapeutæ of Egypt. The fourth in the series of disciples from Vāk was Asita who had by Ekaparnā his famous son Devala; hence Asita belongs to the twelfth and Devala to the thirteenth step on the genealogical table. Devala thus was the contemporary of Yudhiṣṭhira. Devla's younger brother Dhaumya, was the priest of Yudhiṣṭhira.

1 Rv. I, 158, 6.  
2 Vs. III, 3, 17; 18.  
3 अभं बचस भवार्द्रिति वाश्वाचर्य वाणिज्यां वास्तवमयति Rv. Suk. Kr. X, 125.  
4 R. S. Trivedi, Vicitra Prasanga.  
5 Brhadāranyaka IV, 2, 5, 3.  
6 Va. 72, 17.  
7 Gd. MBh. I, 183, 2.
Asita's brother-in-law was Jaigīsavya who married Ekapāṭalā, the sister of Ekaparṇā. Jaigīsavya who was the son of Śataśilāka, got, by Ekapāṭalā, two sons named Śaṅkha and Likhita who became reputed law-givers. The second in the line of disciples from Asita was Vājaśravas. The third in the line of disciples from Vājaśravas was Aruṇa, the father of the famous Pāñcaḷya Uddālaka, and the latter's pupil was Yājñavalkya (=the son of Yajñavalka-Brahmarāta).

(17) Aruṇa         Patañcalā Kāpya
Kuṣītaka       (18) Uddālaka
Kahōda, Svētaketu (19) Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyā
Āsurī
Āsurāyana
Praśīnī-putra Āsurivāsin
Kārśakeyī-putra.
Śaṅjīvī-putra.

Then we pass on to speak about a seer who was the father of the idea of the Eternal Universal Self pervading the Universe and yet remaining emmanent in it. He is the famous Rṣī Nārāyaṇa, the author of the Puruṣa Sūka, namely, the 90th hymn of Maṇḍala X of the Ṛgveda. He used to live in his famous hermitage at Badarī which is still visited by pilgrims as one of the most sacred places of India. The name Nārāyaṇa indicates that he was the son of a seer named Nara. Nara and his son Nārāyaṇa lived austere lives at Badrikāśrama and their fame as pious Rṣis spread far and wide. A wicked king named Dambhōdbhava who was always anxious to fight could not brook the idea that the austere sages Nara and Nārāyaṇa could be his rivals. Accordingly the king proceeded to harm the austere Rṣis at their hermitage but was humbled down by Nara. In

1 Va. 72, 18.  
2 Va. 72, 19.  
3 Gd. MBh. III, 90, 25.  
4 Gd. MBh. V, 96, 14.  
5 Gd. MBh. V, 96, 23.  
6 Gd. MBh. V, 96, 30; Gd. MBh. V, 96, 31.
his old age Nārāyaṇa who was of the saintliest character, propounded his highest philosophy of One Birāṭ Puruṣa pervading the Universe; and piety’s self he was worshipped even by the devout heads of his age. The unique message of Universal Brahman proclaimed by Nārāyaṇa attracted the devout Nārada who actually repaired to Badarī to visit the sage.\(^1\) The Mahābhārata makes the Rṣi Nārāyaṇa speak as follows; “That Universal Puruṣa is destitute of the three qualifications;\(^2\) that Brahman is supposed to possess all attributes and yet is really without attribute and can be realised only through knowledge and we two (Nara and Nārāyaṇa) also have been created out of that Eternal Atman. Knowing Him thus we two worship that Eternal Self.\(^3\) Followers of the Vedas, Āśramas, and various other tenets of religion worship Him with devotion, and He bestows on them the proper courses earned by their actions.\(^4\) But those solely devoted to the One, who surrender themselves up to that Eternal Self with all their heart, with all their soul, with all their understanding, verily enter that Universal Brahman.\(^5\)” Hearing all this, Nārada became anxious to see the original nature of the God Nārāyaṇa and the sage Nārāyaṇa bade good bye to him. Nārada then went to a country named the White Country which lay to the north-west from the hill Gandhamādana and just to the north of the Milk Sea.\(^6\) He saw men of that blessed land as white as the full moon\(^7\) and sang prayers in honour of the Universe-Self of attributes yet really devoid of all attributes.\(^8\) The Universe-God became pleased with Nārada and appeared before him in his real form. Nārada saw that the Universe-God was possessed of thousand eyes thousand heads thousand bellies, thousand arms\(^9\) &c. Compare this with

\(^1\) Gd. MBh. XII, 334, 14.  
\(^2\) Gd. MBh. XII, 334, 30.  
\(^3\) Gd. MBh. XII, 334, 41; 42.  
\(^4\) Gd. MBh. XII, 334, 43.  
\(^5\) Gd. MBh. XII, 334, 44.  
\(^6\) Gd. MBh. XII, 335, 8.  
\(^7\) Gd. MBh. XII, 338, 1.  
\(^8\) Gd. MBh. XII, 338, 3.  
\(^9\) Gd. MBh. XII, 339, 6; 7.
the idea contained in the first Rk of the Puruṣa Sūkta composed by the Ṛṣi Nārāyaṇa.

Nārada conversed with the Puruṣa and came back to Badarikāśrama again, and listened to the sage Nārāyaṇa who gave him the spirit of ideas afterwards developed in all the Upaniṣats, the Vedas, the Sāṃkhya-yoga and the Pāncarātra religions. It really means the Ṛṣi Nārāyaṇa communicated to Nārada, his unique philosophy of Universe-God contained in his composition Puruṣa Sūkta; and this idea of Puruṣa Sūkta was communicated by Nārada to Vedavyāsa in Naimiśāraṇya and Vyāsa spoke about this to Yudhiṣṭhira, Śrīkṛṣṇa and Bhīma listening. The same tradition is embodied in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa where we find that Nārada who was very fond of travels throughout India went once to visit the Ṛṣi Nārāyaṇa who lived a long life of austerity softened with piety, knowledge and self-control, for the highest good of the people of India. Nārada listened to his highest philosophy and bowed to the primitive Ṛṣi in deep reverence and after coming back to Naimiśāraṇya, related to Dvai-pāyana Vyāsa all that was uttered from the mouth of Nārāyaṇa. This record of the Bhāgavata and Mahābhārata is extremely important, as it will supply us with the approximate time of composition of the Puruṣa-Sūkta. In later times, the son of Nara has been raised to the status of a God exactly in the same way as Śrī Rāmachandra, Śrīkṛṣṇa, Valadeva, Subhadrā, and Gautama Buddha, and has begun to receive regular worship in public temples and is represented by a small piece of stone.

The Hindus of modern times have completely forgotten that these pieces of stones representing Nārāyaṇa were

1 Rv. X, 90, 1.  
2 Gd. MBh. XII, 339, 110.  
3 Gd. MBh. XII, 339, 111; 112.  
4 Gd. MBh. XII, 346, 16; 17.  
5 Gd. MBh. XII, 348, 64; 65 cf. also Gd. MBh. XII, 348, 85; 86.  
6 Bh. X, 87, 5; 6.  
7 Bh. X, 87, 47-48.
originally collected from his hermitage at Badarī the very soil of which became sacred in the eyes of all Hindus of early times, and that the deity Nārāyaṇa whom they now worship was, after all, an austere philosopher belonging to an ancient age. In later times some of the philosophers have identified the Rṣi with water from the analogy that water is a universal purifier like the product of Nārāyaṇa’s thinking i. e. the Puruṣa-Sūkta; but they did not altogether forget that he was the son of Nara, as is evident from the quarterverse,” चायो वे नरसृवन. Impartial scholars, unprejudiced by sectarian bias, will determine whether or not, the idea of ‘the son of man’ which is an exact equivalent of ‘Nārāyaṇa’ travelled to the west through the Essenes or the Therapeutes; in the meantime, it has become an article of strong conviction with us that the idea of the Universe-God contained in the Puruṣa-Sūkta composed by Nārāyaṇa is responsible for the origin of the idea of the Avalokiteśvara of the Buddhists, as well as of the Viśvarūpa described in the 11th chapter of the Bhagavadgītā. It is perfectly natural that in a country like India where the belief in an afterbirth originated in the Vedic age, the holy Rṣis Nara and Nārāyaṇa should be believed to be reborn as Arjuna and Śrīkṛṣṇa.¹

Nārāyaṇa belongs to the ninth step on the genealogical table, as Nārada, went to Badarī and became his disciple. Then we pass on to note just one important point in the compositions of Vasiṣṭha about whom we have already learnt much. We find that he prays to Śambhu, the presiding deity over fields.² Thus offering prayers to Śambhu as the presiding deity over fields, began in the later Vedic Age.

Krśna Dvaipāyana Vedavyāsa was born to Parāśara II by Satyavatī Dāseyī. He was the putative father of Pāṇḍu and Dhṛtarāṣṭra and hence his position on the genealogical

¹ Gd. MBh. III, 12, 46.
² Rv. VII, 35, 10.
table is fixed. We try here to indicate the time about which Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana compiled the Vedas.

It will be found in the Mahābhārata (Kumb. MBh. XIII, 53, 21-22) that a Brāhmaṇa named Mandapāla, had, by a Śūdra woman named Sārṅgi, four sons who were Brahmacārvādins (=the authors of Vedic hymns) and that they prayed to Agni, the carrier of 'havya'. Their names were Drōṇa, Stambamitra, Sārisṛkka and Jaritāri. The Mahābhārata is here admirably corroborated by the Rgveda. There we find that the 142nd hymn of Maṅḍala X of the Rgveda was actually composed by the Sārṅgas who were Jaritṛ, Drōṇa, Sārisṛktā and Stambamitra (Sarvānukramaṇī to Rv. X, 142). Śaḍguruśiṣya, while commenting on this says that they were Sārṅgas by birth (जातितः). We know that this is one of the many totem names of the several non-Aryan tribes. There were also other people namely the Matsyas, the Ajas, the Markaṭas, the Sarpas, the Nāgas, the Mṛgas, &c. There is no doubt that they were the old ethnic names suggesting totemism. Mandapāla, however, married a Sārṅgī woman and got four sons who were the authors of Vedic hymns, as is evidenced by the Rgveda and the Mahābhārata.

When did these four compose that particular hymn? The exquisite Mahābhārata answers that as well. Elsewhere in that work we find (Kumb. MBh. I, 254, 47) that when Arjuna Paṇḍava burnt down the Khāṇḍava forest these four Sārṅgas namely Jaritāri, Sārisṛkka, Stambamitra and Drōṇa escaped from being burnt (Kumb. MBh. I, 255-257 chh). The Khāṇḍava forest is mentioned in the Taittirīya Aranyaka (V, I, 1) the Paṇcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (XXV, 3, 6) and the Sātyāyanaka cited by Sāyana on the Rgveda IV, 101. It was the southern boundary of Kuru-kṣetra according to the Taittirīya Aranyaka. The Mahābhārata describes in detail (in Chapter 258th of book I) how these four Sārṅgas prayed to Agni Vaiśvānara in order
that that Vedic God might be pleased to spare them that time; how Mandapāla, their father, became very anxious for his sons; how leaving his second wife Lapitā, he came to his first wife Sarngi and her sons Jaritāri, Drōṇa, Stam-bamitra and Sarisrka; how the sons blamed their father for leaving them at their distress (Ch. 159); how they left that place for elsewhere to live (Ch. 260).

This is a most momentous event which will have an important bearing upon the chronology of Vedic literature, as it shows that Vyāsa Pārāśarya compiled and grouped the Vedas after the Khāṇḍava forest was burnt down by Arjuna Pāṇḍava, for the hymns composed by the Sarṅgas on this occasion, have been incorporated by Veda-vyāsa in the 10th Maṇḍala of the Rgveda. Accordingly it may be admitted that the Rgvedic Age extends right up to some of the events of the Mahābhārata. Remembering in this connection that Santanu (=Bhiṣak) and Deväpi were the authors of the Rgvedic hymns it may be safely concluded that we have reached almost the terminus ad quem of Rgvedic literature in which all Vedic scholars are profoundly interested.
CHAPTER XV.

CHRONOLOGY.

We shall now deduce the chronology of the later Vedic Period from genealogical considerations. We have seen that the later Vedic Period i. e. the period between the time of Divōdāsa and the Mahābhārata episode was one of 12 generations of the Satvant dynasty, but one or two kings of this dynasty had to perform sacrifices in order to become fathers in their advanced years. The Anga dynasty from Rōmapāda downwards gives us 13 generations covering the same period. The Māgadhā dynasty gives us 13 steps, as Vasu and Jarāsandha were born at an advanced age of their fathers. Similarly, the Northern Pāñcāla dynasty gives us 12, while the Kaśi dynasty and the Vaiśā Brāhmaṇa tend to give us 13, although the Ikṣvāku and the Janaka dynasties would give us the number 15. Thus from the combined evidence of more than a dozen dynasties we infer that the later Vedic Period covered twelve to fifteen generations. The small discrepancies are natural. As we have already said, the eldest children born in some cases were daughters. Allowances must also be made for the first few children having been daughters in a particular case. In some cases, the eldest brothers died for their younger to succeed. Besides different dynasties might naturally have characteristic adolescence, puberty and longevity. In others, a particular king might become a father in his advanced years, and so on. The reasons for the small divergence are very various. We are inclined to think that 13 would most approximately express the number of generations covering the same period. We have determined the date of the Mahābhārata war to be circa. 1150 B. C. From this date as our fixed point we shall calculate the approximate dates of even earlier events of the later Vedic Period. We have got to determine
the most reasonable number of years that should be assigned to each member of a series of successive lineal descendants of a reigning dynasty, and then calculate from genealogical considerations.

The question is: by how many years is the father generally removed from his eldest son who according to the Indo-Aryan Law is the successor to the throne of his father? We have got to remember that in some cases the eldest children born were daughters, and in a few others the eldest sons died for their youngers to succeed. Let us take a few typical cases; (i) Babur was at the forty-eighth year of his age in 1530 when he died.\(^1\) Aurangzeb his descendant in the fifth degree was 40 years of age when he assumed the full honours of the imperial dignity under the title of Alamgir in 1659.\(^2\) Hence the period from Babur at 25 to Aurangzeb at 25 was one of \(1644 - 1507 = 137\) years; and this period is occupied by 5 steps. Accordingly each steps occupies in average period of \(\frac{137}{5} = 27.4\) years.

(2) Now we take an English line of kings.

Henry III, the son of John Lackland of the House of Anjou was only nine years old in 1216.\(^3\) His son Edward I was at 33 when he became the king in 1272.\(^4\) His son Edward II was 23 years old when he became the king in 1307.\(^5\) The next king Edward III, the son and successor of Edward II, was at 14 in 1327.\(^6\) The Black Prince, the son of Edward III was 16 years old in 1346 when he fought at Crecy.\(^7\) Richard II, the son of the Black Prince was at 10 in 1377 when he succeeded to the throne of his grand-father.\(^8\) Hence from

---

\(^1\) The Oxford Students' History of India by V. A. Smith. Page 154 Revised 8th edition.

\(^2\) Smith's Oxford Student' History Page 207 Revised edition

\(^3\) Tout's Advanced History of Great Britain Page 159.

\(^4\) Tout's Advanced History of Great Britain Page 178

\(^5\) Tout's Advanced History of Great Britain Page 198.

\(^6\) Tout's Advanced History of Great Britain Page 205.

\(^7\) Tout's Advanced History of Great Britain Page 214.

\(^8\) Tout's Advanced History of Great Britain Page 228.
Henry III at 10 to Richard II at 10 we have a period of 1377—1217 = 160 years and the number of steps between them is only 5. Hence the average period of each step is $\frac{160}{5} = 32$ years.

(3) Thirdly, take the Hanoverian dynasty:

George I (more than 50 years in 1714 A. D.)

George II

Frederick the Prince of Wales

George III

George IV

William IV.

Victoria

Edward VII

George V

Prince of Wales (at 27 in 1921, being born on the 23rd June, 1899).

Hence from George I at 27 to the present Prince of Wales at 27 we have a period of 231 years (=1921—1690) for 8 steps. The average = 28·875.

(4) Take the case of the Gupta kings. Chandragupta I became king on the 26th February 320 B. C. Narasingha Gupta Baladitya, the descendant of Chandragupta I in the fifth degree, acceded to the throne in 469 A. C. Hence for five steps we have a period of 149 years; each step thus covers an average of $\frac{149}{5} = 29.8$ years.

(5) Then turn to the First Lohara dynasty of Kasmira. Samgrāmarāja ascended to the throne of Srinagar in 1003 A. C. His son and successor Ananta became king at 1028 A. C. Kalasa, the son of Ananta, began his reign from 1063 A. G. Harṣa, the son of Kalasa became king at 1089 A. C.

1 Tout's Advanced History, p. 536.
Thus from the accession of Sauṃgrāmarājā to the accession of Harṣa, we have a period of 1089—1003 = 86 years, and this period was occupied by 3 steps each step thus covers $\frac{86}{3} = 28.6$ years.

(6) Then let us take the old English kings of the house of Cedric.

Egbert 802 A. C.—839 A. C.  
Ethelwolf 839—858 A. C.  
Alfred 871—899 A. C.  
Edward the Elder 899—914 A. C.  
Edmund 940—946 A. C.  
Edgar 959—975 A. C.  
Etherred the Unready 978—1016 A C.  
Edmund Ironside 1016 A. C.  
Edward  
St. Margaret  
Matilda 1100—1135 A. C.  
Thus from the accession of Egbert to the accession of Matilda we have a period of 1100—802 = 298 years and this period is covered by 10 steps each step thus covering a period of 29.8 years.

(7) Then we take the genealogy of the French kings of the direct Capetian line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Capet</td>
<td></td>
<td>987—1996 A. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>996—1031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1031—1060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Philip I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1060—1108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Louis VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>1108—1137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Louis VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>1137—1180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Philip II Augustus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1180—1222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Louis VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>1222—1226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lois IX</td>
<td></td>
<td>1226—1270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Philip III</td>
<td></td>
<td>1270—1285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Philip IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>1285—1314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the accession of Hugh Capet to the accession of
Philip IV we have a period of $1285 - 987 = 298$ years for 10 steps. Each step thus covers an average period of 29.8 years.

(8) In the Kṣitīśa-Vaṃśāvali-Carita we find that Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa commenced his career in Bengal from 1077 A. D. Viśvanātha, the 12th in descent from Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, began his life in 1399 A. D. The generalalogical tree is given below:

1. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa...1077 A. D.
2. Nipu
3. Halāyudha
4. Harihara
5. Kandarpa
6. Viśvambhara
7. Narahari
8. Nārāyaṇa
9. Priyamkara
10. Dharmāṅgada
11. Tārāpati
12. Kāmadeva
13. Viśvanātha 1399 A. D.

Thus for 12 steps we have 322 years yielding an average of $\frac{322}{12} = 26.83$ years.

(9) In the same book we find that from the commencement of the career of Viśvanātha (1399 A. D.) to the beginning of Rāma Samaddāra’s life (1597 A. D.), 198 years elapsed and this period is covered by 7 steps, as indicated below:

1 Kṣit. Vams. P. 70.
1. Viśvanātha...1399 A. D.
2. Rāmachandra
3. Subuddhi
4. Kānsāri
5. Trilōchana
6. Saṭṭhīdāsa
7. Kāsinātha
8. Rāma Samāddāra—1597 A. D.

This gives us an average period of \( \frac{109}{7} = 28.8 \) years.

(10) Again, Kṛṣṇachandra was installed as the king of Nadia in 1728 A. D.¹ Satiśachandra, his descendant in the fifth degree became the king in 1858 A. D. We have thus a period of 130 years for the five steps given below:

1. Kṛṣṇachandra...1728 A. D.
2. Sivachandra
3. Iśvaracandra
4. Giriścandra
5. Śrīśacandra
6. Satiśacandra...1859 A. D.

This gives us an average of \( \frac{109}{7} = 26 \) years.

Now let us take the mean of all the averages we have obtained from the ten dynasties we have considered.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>28.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total \( 287.385 \) Mean \( \frac{287.385}{10} = 28.738 \) years.

 Rejecting the decimal portion, we take 28 years to be the most reasonable period that should be allowed per step or generation. We are now in a position to determine the approximate dates of important events of the later Vedic Period.

Divodasa was earlier by 13 average generations than the Mahabharata episode. Calculating backwards we get the date 1544 B.C. (=1150 +13 × 28) for the battle of Udabraja in which Samvara and Varci were killed by Divodasa with his ally Dakatāna Aiksvāka. We should not be far wrong if we date this battle at about 1500 B.C. Hence according to this estimate the later Vedic Period becomes roughly one of 350 years.

Sudās belongs to a step below Divodasa Hence the battle of ten kings may be dated at about 1470 B.C.

Rāma who was born in his father’s advanced years, was 42 years of age when he killed Rāvana Vaiśravana at Lanka. Hence the battle of Lanka may be dated about 1450 B.C. Thus the battle of Lanka took place roughly about 300 years before the battle of Kurukṣetra.

The emperor Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna and Prastōka. Sāriṇjaya fought the Vāraśikhas about 1500 B.C.

Nārāyaṇa composed his famous Puruṣa Sukta when he was quite mature in intellect and published it thorough Nārada who communicated it to Vedavyāsa in Naimiśāraṇya where Vyāsa was engaged in teaching. Vyāsa again communicated it to Yudhiṣṭhira, Śrīkrṣṇa and Bhīṣma listening. Consequently the Puruṣa Sukta may be dated at about 1150 B.C.

The composition of Jaritṛ, Droṇa, Stambamitra and and Sārisṛkta may be dated about 1170 B.C. i.e. about the time of the burning of the forest of Khāṇḍava.

Bṛhadraṭha I really belongs to the 3rd step below Kṛṣṇa. Hence the origin of the Bṛhadraṭha dynasty may be dated approximately about 1425 B.C.

Vāk, the daughter of Ambhrṇa belongs to the 7th setp
CHAPTER XVII.

CHRONOLOGY DEVELOPED IN ‘RIGVEDIC INDIA’ UNTENABLE.

We shall here examine the chronological system of Dr. Abinashchandra Das. The learned author quotes the second Rk of the 95th hymn of Maṇḍala VII of the Rgveda in order to prove its hoary antiquity and renders it into

“Of the rivers, the Sarvasvati alone knows (this), the sacred stream that flows from the mountains into the sea.”

Now there is nothing to find fault with this rendering except the use of the present tense in the verb ‘to know.’ It should have been in the past tense and the correct rendering should have been

“Of the rivers, the Sarvasvati alone knew (this) &c.”

For it should be noticed in this connection that the author of this hymn is Vasistha who was the priest of Sudás Paijavana. The Rṣi has already related the feats of his Yajamāna Sudás in the preceding hymns. Vasistha is here alluding to a fact which was long past before his time namely that the great king Yayāti Nāhuṣa performed sacrifices on the banks of the Sarvasvati, and that the river Sarvasvati at that time listened to and therefore came to know Nāhuṣa’s (=Yayāti’s) supplications. Sāyana is perfectly right when he paraphrases ‘acetat’ by ‘prārthanāmajñāśīt.’ Thus it is clear that Dr. Das has been mistaken about the tense employed in the Rk. To say that by the past tense employed (in ‘acetat’) the present is meant would not do, because Vasistha again uses another past tense alluding to an event long past before his time namely that the Sarvasvati milked ghee and milk for Nāhuṣa (=Yayāti) and Sāyana is perfectly right when he paraphrases ‘duduhe’ by ‘dugdhave’i, ‘dattavati’. The place where Yayāti Nāhuṣa
performed sacrifices was known as the Yāyāta Tirtha and Valadeva in his travels throughout the Uttarāpatha visited that Tirtha (Kumb. MBh. IX, 42, 33).

Now because in this Rk the Sarasvati is spoken of as going to the sea, Dr. Das posits the existence of a great sea extending from the Punjab to the confines of Assam at the time of the composition of this Rk. But this interpretation of his is very far-fetched. A look at the map of India will convince any unprejudiced observer that the modern Surasati (=the ancient Sarasvatī) after taking a westerly course from Thaneswar (=sthānviśvara=the ancient Kurukṣetra) joins the Mārkaṇḍa river near Pehoa, and Mr. Nundo Lal Dey in his Geographical Dictionary of Ancient India informs us that the united stream still bears the name Sarasvatī. Running in a south-westerly direction with the small towns Mandwi, Fatahabad and Sirsa situated on its banks, the Sarasvatī is lost into the dry bed of the Ghaggar (=the ancient Drṣadvatī) at Bhatnair near Dabhli Tibi. The dry bed of the Ghaggar (=the ancient Drṣadvatī) from Dabhli Tibi to Kandera still exists and the distance from Kandera to the small lake near Kasabjal which Indus has formed while passing, is just about 25 miles. Although there is much accumulation of sand here, the dry bed can still be traced to the Indus. The truth really is that the Sarasvatī, being joined with the Drṣadvatī, reached the lake-formation near Kasabjal, and thus reached the sea after union with the Indus like the Vipāsā and the Śutudrī both of which although they join the Indus, have been spoken of as going towards the sea (Rv. III, 33, 1-3). In fact, everywhere in India’s ancient literature, rivers in general have been spoken of as going to the sea (compare: Yathā Nādīnām Vahavombuvegāḥ Samudramevābhīmukhā dravanti Kumb. MBh. VI, 35, 28) Samudragā is a synonym of Nadi or river (see Hemachandra) Sāgaramāmini is a name of all rivers (Bharata, Trikāṇḍāśeṣa). Even
the smaller rivers which do not directly fall into the sea are spoken of as reaching the sea after union with bigger ones¹ (cf. Māgha, Siśupālabadha, II, 100; 104;). Cossider also the case of Yamunā which although joins the Ganges near Allahabad is spoken of as going to the sea (Kumb MBh. III, 88, 3). Particularly notice in this connection the statement of Gṛtsamada (Rv. II, 35, 3) as interpreted by Dr. Macdonell. Gṛtsamada says that all the rivers reach the sea and please the god Apāṁ Napāt. In fact, all the rivers are represented in Sanskrit literature as going to the sea. This is evidently the general idea meant by the Vedic poet Vasiṣṭha. It should also be kept in mind in this connection that whenever a Vedic poet begins to glorify a particular deity, he ascribes to that deity all greatness, all power, all benevolence, and what not. For this plain sentiment expressed by the Vedic poet, it is neither rational nor necessary to carry the composition of the Rk ‘a million and a half’ or even ‘hundreds of thousands’ of years back, and to posit the existence of a sea from the Punjab to the confines of Assam.

Dr. Das’s second reason for the geological antiquity of the Rgvedic Period that during that period the provinces of Pañcāla, Kosala, Maghadha, Anga, Videha &c. were not in existence have been fully discussed in Chapter XIX under the heading “Aryan Settlement of India during the Rgvedic Period,” and it has been proved that in addition to these provinces in Northern India, even a portion of Southern India too was occupied by the Aryans during that period.

The third argument adduced by him for carrying the Rgvedic times to millions of years back seems to be founded on no reason. He says that because the God Keśin or Agni is mentioned as living in the eastern and western seas there-

¹ The view of Mr. Hara Prasad Shastri M.A. that in Vedic times, the Sarasvati independently reached the sea at Sōmanātha in Guzrat is clearly absurd on the very face of it.
fore the R̥gvedic Aryans did not know of the existence of any land to the east of their country. The writer of the Mānava Dharma Shastra speaks of the eastern and the western seas. Does it follow from this that the Rajputana sea of the geologists existed at the time of writing the Mānava Dharma Shāstra? Even in modern times one may speak of the eastern and the western seas and say that Vāḍavānala exists in the eastern and western seas. Does it follow that just to the east and the west of the place in which the speaker lives, two vast seas exist? Even Kālidāsa speaks of the eastern and the western seas in a similar expressive manner (Pūrvaparau Tōyanidhi Vagāhya &c—Kumar. I, 1). By the eastern and the western seas are clearly meant the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea respectively and Hopkins is perfectly right in this identification. Dr. Das has fallen into a serious error by supposing that the R̥gvedic Aryans were confined in the Punhab which he erroneously identifies with the Sapta-Sindhu.

Lastly Dr. Das thinks that the climates and seasons that prevailed in Sapta-Sindhu as mentioned in the R̥gveda and the Āvesta would support him in carrying the R̥gvedic Period to geological ages. But we find that the R̥ks (VII, 66, 15), (VI, 48, 8), (II, 1, 11) quoted by Dr. Das. as supporting him in this matter would just go against him. The use of the words Sharad, and Hima respectively in the above R̥ks to designate the year, does not prove the predominance of the seasons during a greater part of the year in particular areas of the small tract called Sapta-Sindhu as Dr. Das has supposed. When Śaṃyu the son of Bṛhaspati Āṅgirasa, says (Rv. VI, 48, 8) that he was igniting the fire for hundred Himas, Śaṃyu really confesses that he was engaged in composing the above R̥k during the Hima season. When Gṛtsamada says (Rv. II, 1, 11) that the fire ignited before him was verily that Ilā of hundred Himas he really confesses that he was engaged in composing that particular hymn
during the Hima. When Vasiṣṭha is describing (Rv. VII, 66, 16) the splendid rise of the sun and hopes to enjoy that beautiful sight for the next hundred autumns, Vasiṣṭha is really confessing that he was composing that particular humn during an autumn. For it is well known that the Indian sky after the rains are over i. e. during the autumn becomes clear and it is a favourite topic of the poets to describe the splendid autumn sun-rise in the most glowing terms. It was on account of the frequent indentification of the rainy season with the year in later times in the way suggested in the above Rks that the year is generally designated as Varṣa now a days.

Dr. Das citing the Ṛṣitec evidence of the climate of Sapta-Sindhu says (Rigvedic India, p. 13) “The Ṛṣitec says that the Sapta-Sindhu possessed a delightfully cold climate in ancient times which was changed into a hot climate by Angra Mainyu.” To understand the truth about this the original word of which the translation is “in ancient times” requires to be seen. It is quite possible that the primitive Aryan thinker during a terribly hot summer recalls in his mind delightful cold of just the previous winder and thinks (in his crude way of thinking) that the unbearable heat was caused by the evil spirit Angra Mainyu. Or it may as well be that the primitive Aryan in his childhood did not feel so much heat and praises his land saying “It was delightfully cold before, but not it has been changed into a hot one by Angra Mainyu”. In fact, the true mentality of the speaker of this portion of the Ṛṣitec requires to be fully known. It is useless to expect to determine the chronology of Vedic India from vague passages like these.

Dr. Das next quotes Mr. Medlicott to prove that low temperature prevailed in Indian area in ancient epochs; but may not one ask what connection has this low temperature of ancient geological epochs got to do with the Aryans of India? The evidences of Blanford, of the Encyclopædia
Britanica, for the prevalence of a cold climate in low latitudes are granted, but these evidences have not been proved to bear any bit of relation to India of the Vedic Age.

Dr. Das says (Rigvedic India, p. 14) again that there is evidence in the Rgveda of heavy showers of rain falling in Sapta-Sindhu during the rainy season which lasted for three or four months &c. but we see that there is not an iota of evidence in the whole of the Rgveda to show that heavy continued rains prevailed in Sapta-Sindhu, while it may be observed that these phenomena may have been true of the sacred spot named Vrtraghna situated on the bank of the Ganges the valley of which has been proved to have been occupied by the Indo-Aryans during the Rgvedic period in Chapter XIX under the heading "Aryan Settlement of India."

In Chapter II of his Rigvedic India Dr. Das goes on quoting from Sir Sidney Burdard, R. D. Oldham, Medlicott, Blanford, Ragozin, Coggin Brown, &c. in order to put down the antiquity of man in India to be a million of years, but unfortunately he adduces no evidence, absolutely none, to prove that these Pliocene or Miocene men were the Aryans of India. Dr. Das next goes on quoting from the Encyclopaedia Britannica to show that at early geological epochs such and such were the distributions of land and sea in Asia, but we find he establishes no relation between these early geological distributions with India of the Vedic Age. Dr. Das next quotes from Lassen an extract which says "It appears very probable that at the dawn of history, East Turkistan was inhabited by an Aryan population, the ancestors of the present Slavonic and Teutonic races &c." Here Dr. Das seems to have been confused about the term "the dawn of history" spoken of by Lassen and the geological epochs of the geologists. Dr. Das says that recent geological times saw the early dawn of history, but as to how could it see, he has given us no proof. Thus throughout the second chapter Dr. Das talks of matters quite irrelevant to his point. It
may be pointed out that Dr. Das at the very beginning, took his start with the preconceived notion that the Rgvedic Aryans were confined in the Punjab (1st Chapter p. 8), while at the end of the second chapter (Rigvedic India, p. 30) he confuses these Rgvedic Aryans with the ancient Aryans of Lassen.

The third chapter of his Rigvedic India is devoted to proving the vast antiquity of the Aryans of Sapta-Sindhu In doing this Dr. Das has reasoned that because the region between the Sarasvatī and the Sindhu was called the ‘God-fashioned region’, that because the two rivers Bipās and Šutudri have been made to say that they are advancing towards the God-fashioned region, that because Manu speaks of the region between the Sarasvarī and the Drṣadvatī as the God-fashioned country, that because in the Rgveda II, 41, 16, the Sarasvatī has been described as the best of mothers, the best of rivers and the best of Goddesses, and that because in the Rgveda II, 41, 17, the Sarasvatī has been described as the support of all, therefore the geological fact of the Punjab having been the most ancient life-producing region in India would certainly accord with it. Thus Dr. Das unfortunately makes a confusion between the production of life in India and the sacredness of the Sarasvatī Tirtha where some of the Rgvedic poets used to assemble and perform sacrifices. We have proved in the next section that the Gangetic valley was occupied by the Aryans during the Rgvedic period, and that the famous king Bharata Daṇṣmantī who belonged to the mediaval Rgvedic period performed no less than 55 horse sacrifices at a sacred spot named Vṛtraghna on the bank of the Ganges. Can any one hold on grounds like this that this sacredness of the Ganges was due to its producing life in the most ancient epochs of the geologists, or can any one guarantee that this life produced there, means the life of the Indo-Aryans and not the life of birds and beasts?
Dr. Das. next continues saying that because the gerat deluge is not mentioned in the Rgveda, therefore the flood did not happen during the Rgvedic period. This is *argumentum ex silentio*. The flood is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (I, 8, 1, 6) the Mahābhārata (Kumb. MBh. III, 190 Ch) and the Purāṇas (Mt. I, 10-33 ḍīc.) as having happened at the time of Manu Vaivāsvatā. Dr. Das does not seem to have recognised that the Purānic genealogics were originally meant for the various dynasties of kings who parcell out and ruled India of the Rgvedic period, that the Rgvedic Period extends right up to the time of the events of the Mahābhārata, that the Brāhmaṇas give us at times the accounts of kings and Rṣis of the Rgvedic Period. It will be excessively daring to discredit these evidences particularly in the face of the fact that Mahābhārata (Kumb. MBh. III, 190, 49) identifies the place where the boat was bound and even remembers its name as Nauvandhana, and that the old accounts of other nations preserve the reminiscences of the flood.¹

Dr. Das thinks that in the Rgveda II, 12, 2, seismic disturbances have been referred to, but this is going too far. As we have already said whenever a particular deity is glorified, the Vedic poet ascribes to that deity all greatness, all power, all benevolence and what not. It is henotheism pure and simple. To find in passages like these, a reference to the seismic disturbances of geological epochs is straining one’s imagination too much. Accordingly his conclusion that the Rgvedic Aryans lived in Sapta- Sindhu in Pliocene times rests on purely fanciful grounds.

Dr. Das devotes the 4th chapter of his Rgvedic India in proving the geological antiquity of the Rgveda. He

¹ The flood is not mentioned in the Atharvaveda (XIX, 39, 8). Weber (notes to Die Fluthsage, Ind. Streifen I, 11) and others (cf. Griffith’s note). The accepted reading *na)vamśa vāna* has been separated in the Padapāṭha into ‘न’ and ‘वानम्स वान’ and Sāyana explains it with the remark ‘वर्ष मोक्ष का तत्त्वाति स्वातंत्र्याद्वाकुक्ष्मप्रस्व शिष्या नान्ति’. 
begins by referring to the Orion of Tilak, but does not try to prove the untenability of the rival system, built up by the great Marhatta thinker. Dr. Das argues that because Professor Bloomfield has observed that the *real beginnings of Aryan life* reach back several thousands of years more than the language and literature of the Vedas, therefore that observation suggests the hoary antiquity of Aryan civilisation. Dr. Das thereby means to say that this carrying the Rgvedic times to millions of years back is also suggested by Bloomfield. Dr. Das thus makes a confusion between the time of the *real beginnings of Aryan life* and the *Rgvedic Period of the Indo-Aryans*; it is also unfortunate that he takes ‘several thousands’ in the sense of ‘millions’.

After this Dr. Das quotes the Rgveda III, 39, 2 in support of his theory. The author of this hymn is Viśvāmitra. Viśvāmitra says “Oh Indra, the prayer which, being pronounced in sacrifices before the rise of the sun (or better, before day-break, ‘दिवः पूर्वं’) awakes you, is come to us in white clothes from our fathers and is old.” It is evident that Viśmāmitra is here alluding to the fact that his father Gāthin or his grand-father Kuśika or his great grand-father Isīratha were in the habit of praying to Indra. It does not mean that Viśvāmitra is repeating the compositions of his father or of his grand-father. It is for this reason that Viśvāmitra speaks of the prayer, apparelled in white, *i. e.*, clothed in new language. It means that Viśvāmitra was the independent author of many hymns of the Rgveda and did not borrow the language of anybody else. He only alludes to the fact that the custom of praying to Indra is old, and that his fathers were in the habit of offering prayers in early dawn to the Vedic God Indra. The Rgveda confirms this by preserving the compositions of Gāthin and Kuśika. Accordingly Dr. Das has fallen into a serious error by thinking that this would support him in carrying the Rgvedic times to a lac of years back.
After this Dr. Das again repeats his confusion between 'the real beginning of Aryan life' and the time of composition of Rgvedic hymns and cites the authority of Professor Hopkins. Dr. Das should have noted that by the term "Aryan life" Hopkins means the life of Aryans consisting of the Germanic, the Slavonic, the Keltic, the Greek, the Latin, the Iranian, the Indo-Aryan all taken together before their separation. Even admitting for the sake of argument that Hopkins means by the term 'Aryan' the ancestors of the Indo-Aryan section only, it is clear that he means to keep a distance of several thousands of years' time between the beginning of that early Indo-Aryan life and the commencement of the time of composition of the Rgvedic hymns. But Dr. Das without understanding this attitude of Hopkins has tried to find in the Rgvedic hymns references to the very beginning of Aryan life.

Proceeding to enumerate other evidences of the antiquity of the Rgveda and the Saptā-Sindhu, Dr. Das mentions the Rk (IV, 26, 2). It is to be particularly observed here how Dr. Das has been confused as to the real facts stated in the Rk.\(^1\) The poet Vāmadeva posing himself as Indra says "I have given the earth to the Aryan (=Manu)" &c. Dr. Das interprets it as (Rigvedic India, p. 48) "Indra is said to have given lands to the Aryans in Saptā-Sindhu to live in." Thus one can perceive it at once that Dr. Das inserts 'Saptā-Sindhu' in order that it may fit in with his preconceived idea of Saptā-Sindhu having been the original Aryan home. The original word is 'Bhūmi', and Sāyana is perfectly right when he renders 'Bhūmi' by 'Prthvī'. None has any right to insert 'Saptā-Sindhu' here.

Dr. Das says next (p. 52) "The antiquity of the river Sarasvati is proved by the fact that it was in her region that the first born Vṛtra was seen by the early Aryan Rishis

\(^1\) प्रथम भूमिमन्दायां थ त...
to be killed by Indra which fact earned for her the name of Vṛtraghnī &c." Now this interpretation of Dr. Das is far-fetched. The Sarasvatī was called Vṛtraghnī not for the fact that the first born Vṛtra was killed in her region, but for the fact the Rṣis and the kings of the Indo-Aryan race believed that they could kill their enemies by virtue of sacrifices performed on her banks. Śāyana is perfectly right when he says while commenting on the Rgveda VI, 61, 7, that 'Vṛtras' means the enemies in general, and no one will admit that all the enemies of the Indo-Aryan race were confined in the region of the Sarasvatī. Fights took place and enemies were killed in various parts of the Northern India and because the Rṣis believed that they or their Yajamānas were successful in killing their enemies by performing sacrifices on the Sarasvatī, therefore the river has been applauded as Vṛtraghnī i.e., the killer of enemies by Bharadvāja Vājineya. Remember in this connection that Abhyāvartin Cāyamana and Prastōka Sārṇijaya defeated the Vāraśikhas after performing their sacrifices by Pāyu Bhāradvāja. Secondly, no one can comprehend how the sacredness of a particular place can be brought forward as an argument for its early colonisation. Particular places in Northern India were considered sacred or regarded as Tīrthas for particular events happening at them. Thus the Vedic seer Viśvāmitra who belonged to the dynasty of Kānyakubja performed sacrifices at Utpalāvat in the Paṅcāla country. Hence Utpalāvat in Kānyakubja became considered as sacred. To commemorate this Rāma Jāmadagnya a Rgvedic poet (Rv. X, 110) composed an Anuvanśa verse\(^1\). Naiṣadha Nala, the father-in-law of the Rgvedic poet Mudgala, after having been banished from his kingdom by his brother Puṇkara—drank water on the hill named Kuṇḍūḍa. In memory of this, that hill became considered as sacred\(^2\). Kubera, the son Viśravas, mentioned

\(^1\) Kumb. MBh. III, 85, 16-17.
\(^2\) Kumb MBh. III, 85, 25.
in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII, 4, 3, 10) was born in the hermitage of Viśravas situated on the Narmadā and for this and other reasons the river Narmadā was considered sacred.¹ This Kubera Vaiśravaṇa belonged to the Vedic Age as his brother Rāvana Vaiśravana was a contemporary of Daśaratha or Atithigva Divodāsa. The famous Rgvedic king Sahadeva Sārūjaya performed sacrifices at a spot on the bank of the Yamunā, and in memory of this that spot was considered as a Tīrtha and called Agniśiras. In commemoration of this, a famous Gāthā has been composed by Vedic teachers.²

The famous Rgvedic king Bharata Dauśmanti (RV. VI, 16, 4) performed seventy-eight horse-sacrifices on the Yamunā at the same sacred spot.³ The famous Pāncāla poet Dālbhya (=Keśīn) had his hermitage on the Drśadvati⁴ which was accordingly considered sacred. The famous Rgvedic poet Jamadagni had his hermitage at Palāśaka which was at the confluence of the several principal rivers.⁵ Accordingly Palāśaka was considered sacred. Many Vedic seers used to live at Kanakhala across Hardwar near which the river Gaṅgā issues out of mountains.⁶ Accordingly Kanakhala was considered sacred. It was on a hill named Puru situated close to Kanakhala that the famous Rgvedic king Aīḍa Pururavas was born.⁷ This famous king of the Rgvedic Age was the ancestor of a section of Indo-Aryans and has been commemorated as a hero in hymn (X, 95) and as a votary of the fire cult in Rgveda I, 34, 4. and in many places in Vedic literature.⁸ The Rgvedic Rṣi Nārāyaṇa, the author of the famous Puruṣa Sūkta, had his hermitage at Badarī, and for this the Badarikāśrama has been considered as a sacred Tīrtha, and many sages used to live there.⁹

famous king Kuru who belonged to the Rgvedic Age performed grand sacrifices at a spot on the Sarasvatī. This spot which was called Kurukṣetra after the name of the king, was considered as a Dharmakṣetra or a Tirtha. Dirghatamas used to live in Anga, Vibhāṇḍaka on the banks of the Kauśikī in modern Purnē and Agastya in the Deccan. Thus it will be realised that there were Tirthas in many places in Northern India during the Vedic Period and it is a very pernicious theory that the Sarasvatī was the only Tirtha where all the Rgvedic poetry was composed. Rṣis used to live in various places in Northern India and Vedic poems were naturally composed by them in all those places. The Sarasvatī was one of the most famous and ancient Tirthas no doubt, having been especially glorified by Vājinēya Bharadvāja who informs us that many earlier sages had their hermitages on her banks.1 But the kings and their men used to live in other parts of Northern India. They used to approach the seers and had their sacrifices performed by them. The Sarasvatī thus was a very ancient Tirtha, but it cannot be held that all members of the Indo-Aryan race were confined there during the Rgvedic period as has been held by Dr. Das. (Vide the chapter on the Aryan Settlement of India during the Rgvedic period).

The Vedic poets used to get intoxicated during the time of sacrifices by drinking the Sōma juice. This drink gave them energy, exhilaration, joy &c. They have for this reason applauded the Sōma plant as ‘Pratnamit’ (Rg. IX, 42, 4) ‘Yajñasya Pūrvyam’ (Rv. IX, 2, 10) ‘Yajñasya Ātmā’ (Rv. IX, 2, 10) Divah Piyuṣam’ (Rv. IX, 110, 8) &c. Dr. Das quotes all these appellations of Sōma to prove the geological antiquity of the Rgvedic civilization. Thus it will be realised that on the whole Dr. Das has arrived at nothing definite about the chronology of the Rgvedic Period.

1 Rv. VI, 61.
In conclusion, we draw the attention of scholars to a book entitled "The Aryavartic Home and the Aryan Cradle in Sapta-Sindhu" written by Mr. N. B. Pavjee and published in 1915. This writer has drawn from the Manual of the Geology of India by Messrs. Medlicott and Blanford to prove the antiquity of man in India, as has been done by Dr. Das, without being able to establish any connection between this primitive man and the Indo-Aryan (Aryavartic Home p. 18).

This writer, long before Dr. Das, has argued (Aryavartic Home p. 20) exactly like Dr. Das (Rigvedic India p. 36) that the tract lying between the Indus and the Sarasvatī has been designated as the God-fashioned region (Yōnim Devakṛtaṃ III, 33, 4). Long before Dr. Das (Rigvedic India, p. 49) he has argued (Aryavartic Home p. 21) that it was in this region of the Sarasvatī and the Indus that the first the oldest and the greatest of serpents was killed (Prathamajāmahināṃ Rv. I, 32, 3 Ahammadanā, Prathamajāmahināṃ Rv. I, 32, 3; Ahammadini, Rv. IV, 28, 1); that it was here (i.e. in the region of the Sarasvatī and the Indus) that the rising dawn was observed by our primitive ancestors (Aryavartic Home, p. 21); that the sun was seen to rise in that sacred region (Aryavartic Home, p. 21); that the land of seven rivers or lands in Sapta-Sindhu was given to the Aryans by Indra quoting the same famous Rāk of the seer Vāmadeva (Aryavartic Home, 22); that the Sarasvatī is the best of mothers, the best of rivers, the best of goddesses &c. (Aryavartic Home, 22-24); that the origin of life or vitality in the region of the Sarasvatī is a proof of the antiquity of the Indo-Aryan life (Aryavartic Home, 0. 24-29); that because Sōma has been called very old (Pūrvyā), extremely ancient (Pratnamit), older than sacrifice (Yajñasya Pūrvyā) the very soul of sacrifice (Ātma Yajñasya) the very nectar of remotest antiquity received from the heavens (Divāḥ Piyūṣānā Pūrvyāṃ) and so on, therefore the very highest
antiquity of Sōma sacrifice, and for the matter of that, the antiquity of the Rgvedic Period is proved (Aryavartic Home, p. 122-162). In fact, all the materials and arguments embodied in the book of Mr. Pavjee have been utilized by Dr. Das. We have criticised Dr. Das's Rgvedic India because it contains the most recent exposition of the theory originally propounded by Mr. Pavjee. We do not therefore attempt a separate refutation of Mr. Pavjee's arguments as they have already been disposed of in dealing with Dr. Das's book.
CHAPTER XVIII.

CHRONOLOGY DEVELOPED IN "THE ORION" UNTENABLE.

We shall in this section discuss just one point raised by the great scholar the late Bal Gangadhar Tilak in his Orion. At the very outset we are bound to remark that "The Orion" is a splendid astronomical exposition which can serve to check the extravagant chronological guesses of others. It may have or has its faults, but it shows very simply this that the commencement of the Rgvedic period cannot be carried "hundreds of thousands" and millions of years back, and that neither can it be carried down to 800 B. C. It is not the object of our present enquiry to deal with all the points raised in "The Orion" concerning the early Vedic Age. We shall only mention just one point raised in it in connection with the later Vedic Age.

Tilak says (The Orion, 2nd edition Chapter III, p. 36) "It is clear, therefore, that in the days of Varāhamihira, there existed works which placed the winter solstice in the beginning of Dhanisthā and the summer solstice in the middle of Āshleshā. This statement of Varāhamihira is fully corroborated by quotations from Garga and Parāśara which we meet with in the works of later commentators; and it appears that the system of commencing the year with the month of Māgha which corresponds with the above position of the solstices was actually in vogue. The account of the death of Bhīṣma related in the Mahābhārata Anuśāsanaparba 167 ch. shows that the old warrior who possessed the superhuman power of choosing his time of death, was waiting on his death-bed for the return of the sun towards the north from the winter solstice, and that this auspicious event took place in the first half of the month of Māgha. It is evident from this that the winter solstice must have coincided in those
days with the beginning of Dhanishṭhā as described in the Vedanga Jōtisha and other works."

It is abundantly clear from this quotation that Tilak is at one with us in holding that at the time of the death of Bhīṣma Śāntanava, the winter solstice coincided with the beginning of Dhanishṭhā.

In the preface (p. vi) to the Orion, Tilak further defines his chronological attitude by writing "According to this view the Mahābhārata war must be placed in the Kṛttikā period, in as much as we are told that Bhīṣma was waiting for the turning of the sun from the winter solstice in the month of Māgha." The Kṛttikā period according to Tilak "commences with the vernal equinox in the asterism of the Kṛttikas and extends up to the period recorded in the Vedāṅga Jyōtisha i.e. from 2500 B.C. to 1400 B.C." (The Orion 2nd edition p. 207). It is clear from this that Tilak thinks that the period recorded in the Vedāṅga Jyōtiṣa is roughly about 1400 B.C., and we have already seen that this time recorded in the Vedāṅga Jyōtiṣa was, according to Tilak himself, the time about which Bhīṣma died. It follows then that Tilak is of opinion that the Mahābhārata war happened about 1400 B.C.

Tilak holds (Orion, 2nd edition, p. 34) that this astronomical method "based upon old observations" involving "inevitable want of accuracy does not affect" his "conclusions to such an extent as to make them practically useless for chronological purposes." He says "suppose there is a mistake of 5° in observing the position of the sun with reference to a fixed star * * *. This would cause an error of not more than 5 × 72 = 360 years in our calculations, and in the absence of better means there is no reason to be dissatisfied with such a result especially when we are dealing with the remotest period of antiquity." It is clear from this attitude of Tilak that he has no quarrel with the man who holds the Mahābhārata war to have taken place about 1400
+360 = 1760 B.C.; neither would he object to anybody's holding for that war the date of about 1400—360 = 1040 B.C. He has given us the express sanction of 5° or 360 years; and this period due to the inevitable inaccuracy of old observations may be added to or substracted from the dates arrived at by him in his preliminary attempt to gauge the Vedic period by the rough astronomical method. That the latitude of 360 years is passable to Tilak, is further proved by his saying (Orion 2nd Edition p. 38) "From these data (of the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa) astronomers have calculated that the solstitial colure occupied the position above-mentioned between 1269 B.C. to 1181 B.C., according as we take the mean rate of precession of the equinoxes 50" or 48" 6 a year". The sum and substance of Tilak's opinion is that the calculation depends on the rate of precession. It is clear from the above that the time recorded in the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa about which, according to Tilak himself, the great warrior Bhīṣma died, may be 1181 B.C. or 1269 B.C. or 1400 B.C. Tilak according to his own admission has no abjection to these dates, as we have already seen that he has given us a range of 360 years round about his date 1400 B.C.

Now no sane scholar would question the truth of the universally alleged incident that it was Kṛṣṇa Dvai pāyana Vedavyāsa who compiled and grouped the Vedas. It is stated in all the Purāṇas¹ unanimously, in many places in them, in a hundred places in the Mahābhārata² and every student of history has admitted that it is a historical fact.³ This great sage who was probably the greatest intellectual figure of India's ancient history, was the putative father of Pāṇḍu and Dhṛtarāṣṭra. After grouping

¹ Vs. III, 4 Ch.; Bh. XII, 6, 44-48.
² Gd. MBh. I, 60 ch.; XII, 349 ch.
the Vedas into four he entrusted them to his four disciples Paila, Jaimini, Vaiśampāyana and Sumantu and these four in their turn handed them down to their disciples. To Vaiśampāyana was entrusted the teaching of the Yajurveda, and this Vaiśampāyana taught his disciple and sister’s son Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyya (Viṣṇu Purāṇa Book III Chapter V, 1-2. Vā. 61 ch., Bh. XII, 6, 53-54). As a result of a friction between Vaiśampāyana and his sister’s son Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyya, the latter gave up the teaching of the Yajurveda which he received from his preceptor and uncle, and afterwards compiled and composed the Sukla Yajurveda (Vs III, 5ch., Gḍ. MBh. XII, 318 ch) also called the Vājasaneyī Śaṃhitā inasmuch as it was compiled by Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyya. The original Yajurveda which Vaiśampāyana used to teach was named the Taittiriya Śaṃhitā, because the teaching of this was taken up by the Tittira class of Brāhmaṇas—the other disciples of Vaiśam pāyana. It comes to this then that these universally alleged traditions converge towards proving that the Taittiriya Śaṃhitā and the Vājasaneyī Śaṃhitā were compiled round about, or to be more precise, a bit later by a few years than the events of the Mahābhārata, and we are of opinoin that the truth of these statements about the time of compilation of these Śaṃhitās preserved in the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata can never be questioned.

Now let us turn to the attitude of Tilak about the time of compilation of the Taittiriya Śaṃhitā. He says (the Orion, 2nd edition, p. 41) “The vernal equinox coincided with the Krittikas when the Taittiriya Śaṃhitā was compiled.” From this Tilak infers (the Orion 2nd edition p. 57) that “the winter solstice occurred in those days on the full moon of Māgha” “According to the Vedāṅga Jyōti- sha” continues Tilak (Orion p. 57) “it (i.e. the winter solstice) fell a fortnight earlier i.e. on the first day of the bright half of Māgha” From this Tilak calculates the
date of compilation of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā to be 2350 B. C. (pp. 55-59) taking 14°, 10' as the distance between the 10th degree of Bharāṇī and the asterism of Kṛttikā.

We have seen before that the time of compilation of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā, or the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā, and above all, of the compilation of the Vedas themselves by Vedavyāsa can never be prior to the events of the Mahābhārata. Here Tilak asks us to believe that the Taittirīya Saṃhitā was compiled about 2350 B. C., and to believe at the same time that about the time of the death of Bhīṣma Sāntanava the winter solstice coincided with the beginning of Dhanisṭhā as described in the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa; and the coincidence of the winter solstice with the beginning of Dhanisṭhā according to Tilak himself took place about 1181 B. C. or 1269 B. C. or 1400 B. C. To put it more coincisely, Tilak places the death of Bhīṣma Sāntanava about 1181 B. C. or 1269 B. C. or 1400 B. C. and yet he feels no hesitation to place Vaiśampāyana and Yājñavalkya about 2350 B. C. It is abundantly clear from the above that Tilak asks us to believe in an absurdity. He virtually requests us to believe that Vaiśampāyana, the compiler of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā or Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyī, the compiler-author of the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā, lived twelve centuries before the death of Bhīṣma Sāntanava. No one, I hope, will be prepared to accept this absurd conclusion when it is distinctly borne in mind that the Vedas themselves were grouped into four by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vedavyāsa after the forest of Khāṇḍavapraṣṭha was burnt down by his youthful grandson Arjuna Pāṇḍava.

The conclusion therefore is inevitable that the Māghī full moon like the Phālgunī full moon and the Caitrī full moon, was one of the three traditional beginnings of the year, that is, the coincidence of the Kṛttikās with the vernal equinox did not take place actually in the days of the compilation of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā but long before that event. That
particular passage in the Taittiriya Samhitā, as interpreted by Tilak in the light of later commentators, really records a tradition about the Māgha full moon having been once considered as the first day of the year. The very name Samhitā indicates that it is a compilation, although the materials compiled might be clothed in the polished style then prevalent amongst the priests. Besides the very fact that we are given no less than three beginnings of the year shows that they are records of earlier observations, and the priests in the days of the Taittiriya Samhitā and of the Brāhmaṇas were in the habit of not only utilizing these beginnings for annual sacrifices, but also using discretions as to which of them to choose. This shows how very risky it is to build up a system and to base conclusions on a doubtful passage of the Taittiriya Samhitā or of the Brāhmaṇas.

It may be thought necessary to discuss the views of scholars outside India. Professor Max Mu'ller thought that the Vedas were composed about 1200 B. C. (History of ancient Sanskrit literature, p. 572). Afterwards he revised his opinion and named the period from 1500-1200 B. C. (Chips. I, 11). A. Weber placed the migration into the Indus valley bed in the 16th century B. C. (Ind. Skizzen pp. 14, 46 43). M. Haug thought that 2400-1400 B. C. was the period of Vedic hymns (Introduction to the Ait. Bra. I, 47-48); he arrived at this result on the analogy of similar periods in Chinese literature. The period 2000-1500 B. C. is estimated by Whitney (OLST 1, 21; Introduction to Sanskrit Grammar p. xiii). Benfrey thought similarly with Whitney (Gd. SPr. 600). F. Mu'ller thought that the period between 2000 B. C. and 1500 B. C. is probable (Allg. Ethnogr. p. 512).

With regard to these estimates, it may be observed, that they are on the whole unreasonable guesses and it is not surprising therefore that they have diverged widely from one another. But it is to be noticed that Professor Max Mu'ller's estimate with regard to the lower limit of the Rgvedic Period has, nearly coincided with that arrived at in our enquiry, although that late Professor adopted an arbitrary method of calculation.
CHAPTER XIX.
ARYAN SETTLEMENT OF INDIA DURING THE RGVEDIC PERIOD.

Dr. Abinashchandra Das says that (Rigvedic India, p. 8) “the land in which the Vedic Aryans lived is called Sapta-Sindhavah or the Land of the Seven Rivers which included the Indus or the Sindhu with its principal tributaries on the west and the Sarasvati on the east.” “The Ganges and the Yamuna”, the Doctor continues, “have been mentioned only once or twice but they have not been included in the computation of seven rivers which gave the country its name.” Finally he says that because we do not find any mention of Pāñcāla, Kōsala and Magadhā in the Rgveda, therefore they did not exist during the Rgvedic times, and that their place was occupied by a long stretch of sea that extended from the eastern shores of Sapta Sindhu to the confines of Assam. The existence of the hypothetical sea is inferred from the mention, by a certain poet, in the Rgveda, of the eastern and the western seas1. Now these conclusions seem to have been drawn rather hurriedly. It is somethat surprising to find it solemnly stated that because Pāñcāla, Kōsala and Magadhā &c. are not mentioned in the Rgveda therefore they did not exist (Argumentum ex Silentio) during the Rgvedic times. It is really strange that because the sons of the Rṣi Vātaraśana namely Etasa, Rṣyaśṛṣṭa &c. mention the eastern and the western seas, Dr. Das therefore would posit the existence of a sea from the Punjab to Assam. Let us examine closely how far these remarks of his are warranted by evidence.

In the Rgveda2 the poet Viśvāmitra, while invoking the Aśvins, mentions the river Jahnāvī. Sāyana in explaining

1 Rv. X, 136, 5.  
2 Rv. III, 58, 6.
the word “Jahnāvi” says that the river Ganges is meant and renders it by “Jahnukulajā”. Wilson says “it might imply the Ganges Jāhnavī if we had reason to suppose that the legend of her origin from Jahnu was known to the Vedas.” Wilson would not have expressed this sort of hesitancy had he perceived that some of the Purānic legends were Vedic in origin, and that the Purāṇas were primarily meant to represent the history of India of the Vedic Age. It is well known to the Purānist versed in Vedic literature that Jahnu was the distant ancestor of the author of the Rk in question⁴ and belonged to the early Rgvedic Age and that his sacrificial ground was inundated by the waters of the Ganges.⁵ It was in commemoration of this important event that the river became afterwards well known as Jāhnavī. It is well known that rivers, hills, towns, countries were named in this fashion in ancient India. Śrāvasti, Viśālā, Vidarbha, Aṅga, Cedi, Bhāgirathī, Hastināpura are the other examples. Secondly, Gaṅgā has been explicitly mentioned in the Rgveda³ by Śamyu, the son of BrhaspatiII. Śamyu, who was the brother of Bharadvāja⁴ speaks of the high bank of the Ganges in the Rgveda⁵ which shows that he was familiar with the Gangetic valley. Thirdly Sindhuksit, the son of Priyamedha Āṅgirasa, explicitly mentions the river Gaṅgā in the Rgveda⁶. He could not have done this had he not been acquainted with the river. Fourthly, consider the decisive evidence of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa where it will be found that Bharata, the son of Duṣmanta, performed seventy eight Āsvamedha sacrifices on the bank of the Yamunā and fifty-five on the bank of the Gaṅgā.⁷

¹ जय ब्राह्मण राज्य चारित्रिस्मृति स विप्रायमिति आदि राजा एतमप्रश्नस्च राजाभास्यतः पराक्रमिते II Panc. Bra. XXI, 12, 2; Va. 91, 48-93; Hv. I, 32, 42-52.
² Va. 91, 54-58; Hv. I, 32, 42-47.
³ Rv. VI, 45, 31.
⁴ Rv. VI, 48, 7.
⁵ Rv. VI, 45, 31.
⁶ Rv. X, 75, 5.
Fifthly in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa it will be found that Bharata Dauśmanti performed no less than seventy eight horse-sacrifices on the bank of the Yamunā and fifty-five at a sacred spot named Vṛtraghna on the bank of the Gaṅgā.\(^1\)

This most famous king of the Vedic Age, mentioned in the Rgveda\(^2\) was, according to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^3\), crowned with the Aindra-Mahābhiṣeka ceremony by Dīrghatamas Māmateya, the author of the Rgveda I, 140-164. The Rgveda was not meant to chronicle all these details about kings and poets of the Vedic Age. It is only by chance that we happen to meet a few of them here and there in the course of prayers offered in honour of the deities and eulogies offered to the gifts of some kings or Ṛṣis.

The valley of the Yamunā also was colonised during the Rgvedic period, as is attested by the evidence of Sindhuksit, the son of Priyamedha Āngirasa; Sindhuksit notices the river Yamunā in his composition i.e. Rgveda\(^4\) and we have just now seen in the Satapatha and the Aitareya that Bharata performed seventy-eight horse sacrifices on the bank of the Yamunā. The same incident is mentioned in the Bhāgavata and other Purāṇas. Consider fourthly the fact already mentioned that the famous Pāṇcāla king of the Vedic Age, Sahadeva Sārūjaya, (the father of Sōmaka) mentioned in the Rgveda\(^5\) the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^6\) and the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^7\) performed grand sacrifices on the Yamunā at the well known Tirtha named Agniśiras.\(^8\)

Consider fifthly the explicit statement of Śyāvāśva, the son of Arcanānas Ātreya. Śyāvāśva says\(^9\) “May I get famous cows on the bank of the river Yamunā” Śyāvāśva Arcannā nasa could not have declared this, had he not been already

\(^1\) Ait. Bra. VIII, 23, 21.  
\(^2\) Rv. VI, 16, 4; V, 54, 14.  
\(^3\) Ait. Bra. VIII, 23; 21.  
\(^4\) Rv. X, 75, 5.  
\(^5\) Rv. I, 100 17; IV, 15, 4; 7; 8; 90 10.  
\(^7\) Sat. Bra. II, 4, 4, 3; 4.  
\(^8\) Kumb. MBh. III, 88, 5; Gd, MBh. III, 90, 5.  
\(^9\) Rv. V, 52, 17.
acquainted with the valley of the Yamunā. Consider sixtly the evidence of Vasiṣṭha, the priest of Sudās Pajjavana. Vasistha says1 while describing the victory of Sudās over ten kings “In this battle, Indra killed Bheda; Yamunā and the Trātus pleased him.” Sāyana in explaining the Rk makes it quite clear as to how the river Yamunā could please the Vedic God Indra. Men inhabiting the banks of the river Yamunā pleased Indra. This shows how decisively the valley of the Yamunā was colonised by the Aryans. Consider seventhly that the famous Cakravartin king Mandhātr who belonged to the early Vedic Age (mentioned in the Rgveda,2 the Gūpatha Brāhmaṇa3 and all the Purāṇas) performed sacrifices on the bank of the Yamunā where many Rśis used to live4. At the same place on the Yamunā, Sōmaka Sāhadevya also performed sacrifices5. Ninthly the Harivamśa,6 the Viṣṇu Purāṇa7 the Bhāgavata Purāṇa8 and the Mahābhārata9 state in distinct terms that in his childhood, Śrīkṛṣṇa used to play on the bank of the Yamunā; that he compelled a Nāga chieftian Kāliya to submit at that place. These incidents about Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva have been clothed in romantic garb owing to the fact that he was raised to the status of a deity in later times on account of his many achievements, and also owing to the general reason that old accounts often get mixed up with romance. It is extremely unwise to suppose that the acts ascribed to juvenile Śrīkṛṣṇa have been later developments round nothing. There must be a nucleus round which developments may occur. We have already shown that the Ṛygedic period extends right up to some of the events of the Mahābhārata, that Vedavyāsa compiled

1 Rv. VIII, 18, 19.
2 Rv. I, 112, 13; VIII, 39, 8; X, 2, 2.
3 Gop. Bra. II, 10.
4 Kumb. MBh. III, 126, 26.
5 Kumb. MBh. III, 126, 26.
6 Hv. I, 67ch.
7 Vs. V, 7 ch.
8 Bh. X, 15, 47; 16, 4-67 &c.
9 Gd. MBh. I, 222 ch.
and grouped the Vedas after the forest of Khāṇḍava prastha was burnt down by his grandson Arjuna; and because the beginning of the events of the Mahābhārata represents full-fledged Indo-Aryan civilisation spread almost all over the Āryāvarta, it will be admitted that the valleys of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā were inhabited by the Aryans during the Rāgvedic Period. We have seen before that according to Dr. Das (Rigvedic India p. 8) ‘the Vedic Aryans lived in the land of seven rivers which included the Indus or the Sindhu with its principal tributaries on the west and the Sarasvatī on the east.’ He means to say that the Sarasvatī was the eastern boundary of the land of the Rāgvedic Aryans. It is now clear on how slender evidence this view of his rests. Dr. Das has perhaps perceived his weakness afterwards for we find him making the shadowy statement (Rigvedic India Vo. I,) that the valleys of the Ganges and the Yamunā were “not so eagerly sought for” by the Rāgvedic Aryans.

Even the Southern Kōsala, Cedi, Daśārṇa, Niṣadha Vidarbha &c. situated at the foot of the Vindhyas were Aryan settlements during the Rāgvedic period. The mention of the Cedis in the Rāgveda¹ particularly of the Cedi king Kaśu in the Rāgveda², and the interesting description in the Nalotpākhyānam of the Mahābhārata, of the kings of Cedi, Daśārṇa, Niṣadha, Vidarbha, Southern Kōsala &c., and the Purānic mention of the king named Cedi, the son of Kauśīka as the ancestor of the Caidya kings point to the conclusion that the Aryans were settled at the foot of the Vindhyas during the medieval Rāgvedic period. And as the Southern Kōsala and Vidarbha were just to the south of the Vindhyas we may conclude that a portion of the Deccan also was occupied. It has been described in Chapter VII. on the Northern Pāncālas as well as in Chapter I on Divōdāsa and Daśaratha that

¹ Rv. VIII, 5, 37; 38; 39.  
² Rv. VIII, 5, 37.
Trkṣa, Bhṛmyaśva, Mudgala, Vadhryaśva, Divodāsa, Pijavana, Sudās, Sṛṇjaya, Sahadeva, Sōmaka &c. all belonged to the Northern Pāñcāla dynasty. We have also seen that the existence of every one of them is evidenced by the Rgveda, Anukramaṇīs to the Rgveda, the Śrauta Sūtras, the Bṛhaddevatā, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa &c. We have also seen that Indrasena, the wife of Mudgala as mentioned in Rgveda1, was no other than the daughter of Nala by Damayanti as attested by the Mahābhārata2. We also know that the father of Indrasena, i.e. the famous Nala mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa3 was the king of Niṣadha; and this Niṣadha we have established to have been situated at the foot of the Vindhyas. The Śatapatha evidently means that Naiṣidha Nāda was a king of the south. Bhṛmyaśva, the father of the Rgvedic Rṣi Mudgala, was the contemporary of Nala's friend Rūtparṇa Aikṣvāka. We have established in Chapter XII on the southern Kōśala line, that this Kōsala kingdom of Rūtparṇa was the southern Kōsala (=Śaphāla) which was also situated at the south of the Vindhyas, and that in approximately 11 hours Rūtparṇa drove to Vidarbha which was a contiguous state. No sane scholar should expect to find these interesting details in the Rgveda which may very properly be termed a book of versified prayers offered to Indra, Varuṇa, the Aśvins, Rudra, the Maruts, &c. It is in the Purāṇas, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata the Brāhmaṇas, the Āranyakas, the Upaniṣats, the Śrauta-Sūtras, the Bṛhaddevatā and works like them that should be consulted in order that India of the Rgvedic Age may be properly understood.

Turning to Dr. Das's attitude about Kīktā, we find him saying that because there was a sea to the east of the Sapta-Sindhu therefore this Kīktā of the Rgveda4 does not

1 Rv. X, 102, 2.
2 Kumb. MBh. III, 114, 24.
3 Sat. Bra. II, 2, 2, 1 ; 2.
and cannot mean Magadha (Rigvedic India, p. 8, foot note). Sāyana says that Kīkaṭa was the land of the Non-Aryans. A very old authority like Yāska gives evidence to the same effect¹. Wilson says "Kīkaṭa is usually identified with south Behar." Weber says "In the Rik Samhitā where the Kīkaṭas the ancient people of Magadha—and their king Pramaganda are mentioned as hostile, we have probably to think of the aborigines of the country." These statements of Wilson and Weber are founded on solid evidence, but as according to Dr. Das a sea must be supposed to have stretched in the Rgvedic period from the Sapta-Sindhu to Assam, this Kīkaṭa could not but be in the Sapta-Sindhu itself and a hilly tract there (Rgvedic India, p. 8, foot note). Afterwards Dr. Das almost withdraws his statement by saying that the ships of the Rgvedic Aryan merchants in their voyage in the eastern sea over the Gangetic trough probably touched south Behar (Rigvedic India, p. 8, foot note). Dr. Das should have noted the fact that the author of the hymn² in which Kīkaṭa is mentioned was Viśvāmitra, the former priest of Sudāś Pajavana, and that Divodāsa, Pijavana, Sudāś, Sahadeva, Sūmaka &c., all belonged to the Northern Pāñcāla dynasty. As to Kīkaṭa, we invite the attention of scholars to the decisive statement in the Vāyu Purāṇa³ which says that in the province of Kīkaṭa, are situated the sacred Gayā, the sacred forest of Rājagrha, the sacred hermitage of Cyavana, and the sacred river Punaḥpunā. This shows that a forest near the capital was named after it and was considered sacred by the pilgrims and that the hermitage of Cyavana was established there before the time of compilation of this portion of the Vāyu Purāṇa. This time is probably post-Vedic as the sacredness of Kīkaṭa is enjoined. Gayā was also situated in the province of Kīkaṭa. Turning again to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa⁴, we come

across the interesting information that towards the beginning of the Kali Age, the Almighty God came down to this world as Buddha, the descendant of Anjana, in the province of Kikata. Sridhara, commenting on this, says that by Kikata is meant the province of Gayas. The Rgvedic Rsi Kakshivant went, with his father Dirghatamas, to Giribraja and performed austerities there. All these interesting informations prove that there was no sea to the east of Saptasindhu during the Rgvedic Period. We strengthen our position by the following further evidences. In the Rgveda, Medhatithi, the son of Kanva, addresses the king Vibhindu and praises his gift. Both Katyayana and Sayana give evidence to the same fact, namely that Kanva Medhatithi was praising the gift of the King Vibhindu in that Rk. Turning now to the evidence of the Rsi Medhyatithi, the son of Kanva we find that he accepted gifts from the king Pakashman, the son of Kurayana. Medhyatithi Kanva also calls Pakashman, the king of the country of Bhoja. Both Katyayana and Sayana give evidence to the same fact, namely that the 4 Rks from the 21st to the 24 Rk of the 3rd hymn of Maindala VIII was composed by Kanva Medhyatithi on the occasion of his accepting gifts from the king Pakashman, the son of Kurayana. Turning now to the Vedic work, the Brhaddevata we find it stated that Vibhindu was the king of Kashi and Pakashman was the king of Bhoja. This information of Saunaka is extremely interesting as it shows that in the early Rgvedic Age the kingdoms of Kashi and Bhoja were already in existence, and the Puranas are thus admirably supported when they hold that the ancient kingdom of Kashi had already been ruled in the

1 Va. 99, 93; Mt. 48, 84-87. 2 Rv. VIII, 2, 41.
6 Kat. & Say. on Rv. VIII, 3, 21-24. 7 Br. Dv. VI, 42.
early Vedic Age by Dirghatapas and that after him, his descendant Dhanvantari, the founder of the Ayurveda, was the king of Kāśi. After them the kings Bhūmaratha, Divodāsa Pratardana, Alaraka &c., were the kings of Kāśi according to the Purāṇas, and finally in the Sarvanukramaṇi to the Rgveda, it will be found that Pratardana, the son of Divodāsa, the king of Kāśi, was the joint author of the Rgveda X, 179. When we have shown before from the Rāmāyaṇa, that Pratardana the king of Kāśi was of the same age as Rāma Dāsarathī and that he came to Ayodhyā when the coronation of that great Aikṣvāka king was performed; when we further recognize that Bhīṣma Śāntanava, the nephew of the author of Rgveda X, 98 took away the three daughters of the king of Kāśi in order to marry them to his brother Vicitravīrya; when at last we remember the fact that Kāśi was settled by the Rgvedic Aryans long before the Mahābhārata period and therefore long before the burning of the forest of Khāṇḍavaparastha from which the Rgvedic Ṛṣis Jaritr, Drōṇa, Stambamitra and Sārisrka escaped there can be absolutely no room for positing the existence of a sea between the Punjab and the confines of Assam during the Rgvedic period as Dr. Das has done.

We add yet another evidence in favour of Kāśi. We know that Agastya, the descendant of Māna, was the author of the Rgveda I, 165-191 as evidenced by the Sarvanukramaṇi, the Sāyanukramaṇi, the Bṛhaddevatā as well as the very texts of the Ṛks themselves. This famous Ṛṣi’s wife was Lopāmundrā. It was by virtue of Lopāmundrā’s blessings that Alaraka the famous king of Kāśi got a long life. After all, Kāśi is very old having been established by Sunahōtra’s grandson Kāśi in the early Rgvedic Age. Lopāmundrā was the daughter of the king of Vidarbha.

1 Va. 92, 18; 21. 2 N. Ram. VII, 38, 15.
4 Rv. I, 179.
5 Gd. MBh. III, 25, 13; Va. 92, 67.
6 Kumb. MBh. XIII, 200, 11.
The poet Dr̥ḍhacyuta was born to her and Dr̥ḍhacyuta’s son was Iddhavāha. Both Dr̥ḍhacyuta and Iddhavāha were R̥gvedic poets (Śarv. Kr. to Rv. IX, 25 ; 26.) Bhīma Vaidarbha mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII, 34) as a contemporary of the R̥gvedic kings Sahadeva Sārṇījaya, Sōmaka Sāhadevya &c. belonged necessarily to the R̥gvedic Period. It shows that the kingdom of Vidarbha of which the modern name is Berar existed during the Medieval R̥gvedic Period when the poet Māndārya Agastya flourished and composed songs in honour of the Vedic Gods Indra and the Maruts.

Passing on to Dr. Das’s attitude about Kōsala, we find him stating that Kōsala could not have existed during the R̥gvedic Period because there is no mention of it in the R̥gveda. As we have said before it is useless to find the mention of countries settled in a collection of hymns such as the R̥gveda primarily is. Whatever historical information we may get there we get out of sufferance. The R̥gvedic Age can never be properly understood unless we tap other sources of information already mentioned. The famous king Kṣemadhirtvan, the son of Puṇḍarīka, mentioned in the Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa, was a king of Kōsala and belonged to the R̥gvedic Period. Remember also Para Āṭṇāra Hairanyanabhaka Kausalya mentioned in the Samhītās, Brāhmaṇas and Śrauta Sūtras. Daśaratha was the king of Ayōdhya which was a portion of Kōsala and married Kausalyā i. e. the daughter of the king of Kōsala. It was Śrāvasta Yauvanāśva who founded the town Śrāvasti named after him in the early Vedic Age, and this town afterwards became the capital of Northern Kōsala.

1 Panc. Bra. XXII, 18, 7.
2 Taît. Samh V, 6, 5, 3; Kath. Samb. XXII, 3.
4 Samkh. Srau. XVI, 9, 11.
The Ṛgvedic sage Nāmi Sāpya (=Nimi of the Purāṇas), who killed the Dāsa chief Namuci, was the king of Videha. This shows that Videha was an Aryan settlement during the Ṛgvedic Period. Remember also the cases of Rajana Kauneyā, Ugradeva Rājani, Kratujit Jānaki, Kesin, Khāṇḍika, Khāṇḍika Audbhāri all of whom belonged to the Ṛgvedic Period and are mentioned in the Samhitās, Brāhmaṇas and Śrauta Sūtras. The Ṛgvedic Rṣi Gōtama Rāhugana was the priest of Māthava Videgha.

Even Anga was a settlement of the Aryans during the Ṛgvedic Period. In the Mahābhārata (I, 113 ch., Kumba Kōnam recension) it is related in interesting detail that the Ṛgvedic Rṣi Dīrghatamas Māmateya, after being thrown into the Ganges was rescued by the Kṣattriya king Vali who took the Rṣi to his house and, according to the custom of Niyōga then prevalent in the Aryan society, requested the Rṣi to raise progeny on the queen. The queen disliked the old poet, but being afraid of her husband ordered her maid servant to go to the poet. Accordingly the famous Kakṣivant, the author of the Ṛgveda I, 116-126 &c. was born. Being aprised of the fact that the queen did not go to the Rṣi, the king Vali ordered her again to approach him. This time the queen obeyed, and Anga and his brothers were born. The different provinces in which they were installed as kings have, according to the Purāṇas, been named after them. The Mahābhārata finishes by remarking that many Kṣattriyas (=Rulers) of India were

1 Rv. I, 53, 7; VI, 20, 6.
2 Panc. Bra. XXV, 10, 17.
3 Taitt Samh. II, 3, 8, 1; Panc. Bra. XIII, 4, 11.
5 Taitt. Samh. II, 3, 8, 1; Kath. Samh. XI, 1; Ait. Bra. VII, 34.
8 Sat. Bra. XI, 8, 4, 6; Mait. Samh. I, 4, 12.
the sons of Brāhmaṇas (i.e. the authors of Vedic hymns.

There is absolutely nothing to impeach this very interesting information recorded in the Mahābhārata, for we find that the same account of the birth of Kakṣīvant is preserved in the Vedic work Brhaddevatā¹ (IV, 21-24) which gives the additional information that the name of the maid-servant of Vali was Uśik. All the Purāṇas unanimously support the same account of the Mahābhārata, and Sāyana supports it in his introduction to the 116th hymn of Maṇḍala I of the Rgveda. Accordingly we are of opinion that the account in the Mahābhārata is sober history and none is entitled to discredit it.

The whole affair shows that the kingdom of Anga was established towards the medieval Rgvedic period. That the kingdom of Anga existed towards the beginning of the later Rgvedic period is evidenced by the existence of its king Rōmapāda who was a descendant of Anga Vāleya and who was a friend of Daśaratha Aikṣvāka, the contemporary of Atithigya Divōdāsa. This Rōmapāda’s son-in-law was the Vedic Rṣi Rṣyaśṛṅga Vaibhāṇḍaki whose existence is attested not only by the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, but also by the Vaṃśa Brāhmaṇa of the Śāmaveda. Vibhāṇḍaka had his hermitage on the Kauśikī (=the modern Kuṣī in Purnea).²

Finally we must confess that we have not been able to follow up Dr. Das when he identifies Sapta Sindhavaḥ with the Punjab. We consult the Rgveda³ for the word and everywhere the word Sapta-Sindhavaḥ means the famous seven rivers namely, the Gaṅgā, the Yamunā, the Sarasvatī, the Sutudri, the Paruṣni, the Marudvṛdhā with which the Asiknī joins, and the Ārjikīyā with which the Vitastā and the Suṣōmā join. These famous seven rivers

¹ Br. Dv. IV, 21-24. ² Gd. MBh. III, 110, 22-26. ³ Rv. I, 32, 12; VIII, 69, 12; VIII, 96, 1; IX, 66, 6; X, 43, 3.
mentioned by the Rṣi Sindhuksit, the son of Priyamedha Āṅgirasā, in the Rgveda X, 75, 5, are always meant by the word Sapta-Sindhavah. If the word Sapta-Sindhavah, instead of meaning the seven rivers, must mean the land of the seven rivers or the valley of the seven rivers, it is difficult to understand why Dr. Das excludes the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā from the list (Rigvedic India, p. 8) in the face of the fact that the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā are the very first and the second in the series. Thus it is really difficult to understand what Dr. Das means by stating "The Ganges and the Yamunā have not been included in the computation of seven rivers which gave the country its name" (Rigvedic India, p. 8).
CHAPTER XX.

(For of the Date of the Mahâbhârata war.)

FROM BIMBISÂRA TO CHANDRAGUPTA MAURYA.

With great diffience, we now proceed to settle the chronology of this period of Indian history. Three sources are available, the Purânas, the Pâli Canon of the Buddhists and the literature of the Jainas. Scholars have ranged themselves on one side or the other, some attach importance to the Pâli texts, some to the Purânas, while others have been inclined towards the Jain chronology. The task is really difficult, and has puzzled the scholars for a long time. We shall see how far these sources can be reconciled.

It is related in the Mahâvamśa that virtuous Bimbisâra was fifteen years old when he was anointed king by own father.¹ Bimbisâra reigned full 15 years when Siddhârtha paid him his first visit.² After this visit, Bimbisâra reigned for 37 years more³ so that according to the Mahâvamśa the total reign-period of Bimbisâra was one of 52 years. The Vāyu and the Matsya however allot him a reign of 28 years⁴. The period in years in the Brahmana⁵ for Bimbisâra is given as ‘aṣṭatriṃśat’ which is evidently a corruption for ‘aṣṭavimśat’. ‘Vimśat’ in one Purâṇa has often been changed into ‘trimśat’ in another for many kings in the Purânic dynastic lists. It may be admitted then that the Purâṇas allot 28 years to Bimbisâra. The Vāyu and the Brahmana say⁶ that Darśaka succeeded Bimbisâra and that he ruled for 25 years, but the Matsya⁷ allots 24 years to Darśaka corrupting his name into Vamśaka. The

¹ MV. 11, 28. ³ MV. II, 30. ⁵ Bd. iii 74, 131.
² MV. 11, 30. ⁴ Va. 99, 318; Mt. 272, 7.
⁶ Va. 99, 318; Bd. iii 74, 131. ⁷ Mt. 272, 9.
truth seems to be that Darśaka was associated in the government of Bimbisāra for 24 years after which Bimbisāra was succeeded by Ajātaśatru, the son of Bimbisāra, by Cellanā, the daughter of Ceṭaka, the Licchavi chief of Vaiśāli. There is no reason to doubt the tradition handed down to us by Bhāsa\(^1\) that Udayana the king of Kauśāmbi married Padmāvatī, the sister of Darśaka, the king of Magadha. That was the tradition in the third century A.D. to which Bhāsa may belong. The same tradition is preserved in the Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara which however cannot name the Magadha king whose daughter was married to Udayana. We shall see later on that Udayana and Ajātaśatru were contemporaries and belonged to the same generation. Udayana was probably older than Ajātaśatru by a few years. Hence Udayana could not have married the grand-daughter of Ajātaśatru, as rightly shown by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar. Hence Udayan’s brother-in-law could have been Ajātaśatru or Darśaka, the successor of Bimbisāra. The Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa are probably right in placing Darśaka just after Bimbisāra. Darśaka was most probably one Bimbisāra’s many sons and managed the state affairs for 24 years during the life-time of Bimbisāra. This being in agreement with the statement in the Mahāvaṃśa that Bimbisāra reigned for 52 years \((=28+24)\), being reconcilable with the traditions of Bhāsa and Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara, being further strengthened by the order of succession in the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa, seems to be the true history, and the identification of Darśaka with Nāga-Dāsaka stands on a bad philology and therefore

\(^1\) काल जीय—एतव खे सुरभिरभिषितनामपद्यपासांक न दाराजदर्जंक्ष भोगली प्रभावती नाम।

वृषभराजस्—एतव सा मगधराजेक्षी प्रभावती नाम, एते।

Svap, Vāsav. I.
on a wrong ground; for ‘Dāsaka’ is not the softened Pali variant from ‘Darśaka.’ The suffix ‘क’ in ‘दासक’ is diminutive or indicative of contempt. The name is Nāga-Dāsa in one of the Buddhistic literatures. Both the names (Nāga-Dāsaka or Nāga-Dāsa) mean ‘a slave of Nāga.’ It is not a personal name at all, but a nick-name. This king was most certainly so nick-named because he was practically a slave in the hands of Sīṣunāga. His personal name was unknown to the Pali authorities.

Bimbisāra had many sons namely Abhaya1 Silavant,2 Vimala Kōndaṁnā3 (by Ambapali, the public girl), Ajataśatru, (by Cellanā) and probably Darśaka etc. Of these sons, Prince Abhaya once found an infant lying on a heap of dust. It was the child of Sālavati, the public girl. Abhaya brought the child up and named him Jivaka. Jivaka went to Taksāśilā, learned that branch of the Ayurveda which is called Kaumārabhṛtyā, came back an expert Kaumārabhṛtya to Rājagrha, cured Bimbisāra of fistula, was appointed a royal surgeon and served the Buddhist Bhikṣu fraternity at Rājagrha4. The derivation of the name Jivaka Kōmarabhaṅca by the Mahāvagga reminds us of the Purānic derivative legends round about the names Jarāsandha, Māndhatṛ, Drōṇa Bhaṛadvāja, Patañjali, Aksapāda Gautama &c. Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has just slipped it. Bimbisāra married Kōsaladevi, the daughter of Mahākōṣala, the father of Prasenajit, the king of Kōsala. On account of the frequent night attacks on the old capital Kuśāgrapura, and the houses of citizens therein being set on fire at night by the Licchavis, Bimbisāra built the new town of Rājagrha to the north of Giribraja to check their invasions.5 Afterwards he made peace with them by marryng Cellanā, the daughter of Cetaka, the Licchavi chief of Vaiśalī6. She was also named

---
1 Mahāvagga. VIII, 1, 4 et. Seq. 2 Thera-gatha Trans, p. 269.
3 Thera-gatha p. 65. 4 Mahāvagga VIII, 1, 4 et. seq.
5 Vinaya pitaka. 6 Jacobi, Introd. S. B. E. Vol. XXII.
Vāsavi and was the niece of Gōpāla. Thus after making peace by matrimonial alliances with the houses of Kōsala and Vaiśālī, he annexed Anga to his kingdom, the capital of which i.e. Campā was occupied and destroyed by Šatānika II, the king of Kauśāmbī, a few years before Bimbisāra’s annexation. Bimbisāra made over the charge of government to his son Ajātaśatru when the latter was about to stab him with a dagger but was seized upon by the officers. Ajātaśatru, however, starved him to death, and afterwards expressed repentance to Buddha for his sin. Darsaka, Šilavant, Vimala etc. went away as Buddhist monks for fear of Ajātaśatru. Ajātaśatru (=Kūnika) was, according to Hemacandra, overpowered with sorrow at the death of his father, and transferred his capital from Rājagṛha to Campā. When Ajātaśatru starved his father Bimbisāra to death, Kōsaladevi, the step-mother of Ajātaśatru, died from grief at the loss of her husband. Her father Mahākōsala, when he gave her in marriage to Bimbisāra, granted a village in the district of Kāśi as bath-powder money (नहन-चुम्ब-मुल = भानचूम्ब-मुल )

After the death of Bimbisāra and Kōsaladevi, Ajātaśatru was in possession of this village, but Prasenajit, the son of Mahākōsala, thought that the parricide Ajātaśatru should not be allowed to enjoy the village, and so resolved to dispossess him. Thus there was a war between Prasenajit and Ajātaśatru. In three successive campaigns Prasenajit was beaten, but in the fourth campaign on account of his arranging his forces in a caravan-like array (शक्तिमद), Ajātaśatru was defeated and taken a prisoner to Śrāvasti, the capital of Kōsala.

1 Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, p. 63. 2 Kalpasutra (Book VI).
3 Jat. V, 261-2; Dīgh. Nik. 1, 85; Dialogues of the Buddha 1899, p. 94; S. B. B. II, 94; Rockhill, Life of the Buddha p. 95 et. seq.
4 Sthav. Car. VI, 32.
5 नहन-चुम्ब-मुल is best rendered by ‘bath-powder’ and not by ‘bath and perfume’ as Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has done.
Prasenajit had a daughter named Vajirā or Vajiri Kumāri¹, and his son Viḍūḍabha by his wife Vāsava Kṣattryā, was his general². He gave his daughter Vajirā in marriage to Ajātaśatru and dismissed the newly married couple with the village in Kāśi as the dowry of Vajirā. The first minister of Prasenajit was Migāra or Mrgadhara³ who was a sceptic and an adherent of the naked Tirthakas (i.e. Nirgrantha ascetics). A second was Dīgha Kārāyana⁴ (=Dīrga Cārāyanā) who was an authority on established practices of kings.⁵ Prasenajit’s mahāmātra was Sirivaḍḍa and his famous elephant was Ekapūndarika.⁶

Ajātaśatru now turned his attention to attack the confederacy of Vaiśali. This confederacy consisted of nine clans, some of which were the Licchivis (or Līchchavīs), the Vṛjīs (or Vaijīs), the Jñātrikas, and the Videhas. This confederacy of nine clans was known as the confederacy of the Vṛjīs or of the Licchivis, as the Vṛjīs and the Licchivis were the most important of the nine clans. These nine Licchivi clans again federated themselves with the nine Mallaki clans and the eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāśi-Kōśala. Kiki was the king of the Kāśis,⁷ while Cetaka was the king of the Licchivis proper and had his capital at Vaiśāli. Cetaka’s daughter Cellana, as we have seen, was the mother of Ajātaśatru, while Triśalā, sister of Cetaka, was the mother of Mahāvira.

However, Kūnik-Ajātaśatru made protracted war on the confederacy of the Licchivis, the Mallakas and the eighteen

---

² Majjh. Nik. II, 87 ch., p. 110; 90 Ch., p. 130.
³ Hoerule, Uvāsagadasāo, Appendix III, p. 56.
⁴ Majji Nik. II. Majjhimapaññāsam, 89, Robert Chalmers’ edition p. 118.
⁵ Arthasastra 95 ch.
⁷ Majjh. Nik. II, 81 Ch.
Gañarājās of Kāśi-Kōsala for more than sixteen years, and at last was able to effect their ruin which it was his firm resolve to do, although his cause was unrighteous.¹

As a result of this war, Vaiśāli, Videha, Kāśi and probably a small portion of Kōsala also were annexed to the kingdom of Ajātaśatru, but a greater portion of Kōsala over which Prasenajit or his son Viḍūḍabha reigned, continued to maintain its independence till the descendants of the last king Sumitra of the line were uprooted Mahāpadma Nanda. The kingdom of Avantī whose capital was Ujjayinī, now stood as the only great rival of Magadhā and the Majjima Nikāya informs us that powerful Ajātaśatru was busy in fortifying his capital, being afraid of an invasion by the fierce Pradyota (=Pajjota) of Avanti. But the invasion was not probably made, for the eloquent Buddhist Pali Canon or the Jaina literature would have recorded it, had it ever been made. The fame of the descendants of Pradyota was destroyed by Śiśunāga, as we shall see later.

Ajātaśatru reigned for 32 years.² It was at the eighth year of his reign that the great Gautama Buddha died.³ The Vāyu and the Brahmanḍa are wrong in allotting 25 years to Ajātaśatru.⁴

Ajātaśatru was, according to the Mahāvaṃśa, murdered by his son Udayibhadra, but the Sthavirāvali-Carita informs us that Udāyin was overpowered with sorrow at the death of his father Ajātaśatru, and transferred his capital from Campā to Pāṭalîputra.⁵ This agrees with the interesting information supplied by the Vāyu that Udāyin founded the town of Kusumapura (=Pāṭalîputra) on the south bank of the Ganges in the fourth year of his reign.⁶ The order

¹ Uvāsagadasāo, Appendix, II, p. 7.)
² MV. II, 31.
³ MV. II, 30.
⁴ Va. 99, 317; Bd. III, 74, 130.
⁵ Sthav. Car. VI, 22-188.
⁶ Va. 99, 319.
of succession in the Viṣṇu which inserts Darśaka between Ajātaśatru and Udayāśva must be rejected, as we have seen before.

The Sthavirāvalicarita informs us that Udāyin was a very powerful king and defeated and killed the king of a certain country, in battle and the son of that king went to Ujjayini, and to the king there related the story of his distress. The deposed prince got into the favour of the king of Avanti who became very jealous of Udāyin. The king of Avanti helped the deposed prince who having been disguised as a monk, murdered Udāyin while asleep. This is evidently the hint of rivalry existing between Magadha and Avanti to become the one paramount power in Northern India. The annexation of Anga, the rooting out of the Vṛjis (or Vajjis), the Videhas, the conquest of the Kaśis, and the humbling down of Kōsala by Magadha, while the alliance between the houses of Vatsa and Avanti meant that the rivalry had already been begun; for we have already seen that Ajātaśatru was in dread of an attack on his capital by the fierce Pradyōta of Avanti. The contest was finally decided in favour of Magadha under the leadership of Śiśunāga who, according to the Purāṇas, destroyed the prestige and influence of the descendants of Pradyōta, as we shall see later on.

Udāyin according to the Mahāvaṃśa reigned for 16 years, but the Vāyu, the Matsya and the Brahmāṇḍa unanimously allot 33 years to Udāyin. It will appear afterwards that this Purānic figure cannot be accepted as the reign-period of Udāyin.

Hemacandra says that on the death of the Udāyin who left no heirs, the five royal insignia viz., the state elephant, the horse, the parasol, the pitcher and the chowries were

1 Sthav. car. VI, 189-190.  
3 Sthav. Car. VI, 208.  
4 MV. IV, 1-2.  
5 Va. 99, 319; Mt. 272, 10; Bd. III, 74, 132.
anointed by the ministers and led through the streets, and
the procession met the marriage procession of a man named
Nanda, the son of a courtesan by a barber; and the five
royal insignia themselves pointed Nanda out as the king of
Magadha.1 Then the ministers, officials, citizens and inhabi-
tants of villages gladly performed the ‘abhiseka’ ceremony
of Nanda.2 Thus Nanda, the successor of Udāyin become
king 60 years after the death of Mahāvīra.3 Nanda and his
descendants continued to rule Magadha till the last Nanda
king was deposed by Viṣṇugupta Cāṇakya 155 years after
the death of Mahāvīra.4 Thus Hemacandra allot 95 years
(=155—60) to Nanda and his descendants. This agrees
fairly well with the Purānic tradition that the Nandas ruled
for about a hundred years. The Purāṇas probably
borrowed the information from ancient Jain sources

The Mahāvamśa mentions Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and
Nāga-Dāsaka as the lineal descendants of Udāyin, and
gives 8 years to Anuruddha and Muṇḍa, and 24 years to
Nāga-Dāsaka (= The slave of Nāga). The Mahāvamśa is
probably wrong in stating that Muṇḍa was the son of Anu-
ruddha, for it is impossible on genealogical considera-
tions that the joint reign-period of the father and the son should be
only 8 years after the grand-father had died quite a young
man after a short reign of 16 years only. The existence of
Muṇḍa as the king of Magadha and as the descendant of
Udayibhadra is attested by the Divyāvadāna5 while the
Anguttara Nikāya6 describes in detail how Muṇḍa, the

3 चन्दनार वध मानसामिग्रिवा चतुरामरायः ।
   गलायं विद्विन्यामयेऽविव मन्दिरामवपदः पः |  2 Sthav. Car. VI, 243.
4 यदं च श्रीमहानन्देश्वरक्षे वधे गन्ते ।
   पुश्चाद्वियायाधिके चन्दनसौरजवावपदः पः |  Sthav Car. VII, 339.
5 Divyavadana, Cowell’s edition XXVI, 369.
king of Pāṭaliputra, was overpowered with sorrow at the death of his queen Bhadrādevī. Muṇḍa's treasurer was Priyaka.

The statement in the Mahāvamsa (IV, 3-7) that Ajāta-
satru and his lineal descendants Udāyin, Anuruddha, Muṇḍa, and Nāga-Dāsaka were parricides, is not wholly incredible as Kauṭilya likens the ancient Indian princes to crabs, generally branding them as parricides, and discusses the supreme need of guarding over them from their very birth. The names Anuruddha and Śuśunāga of the Mahāvamsa seem to be the corrupt forms of the correct names Aniruddha and Śiśunāga. Further, the Pāli authorities have most probably forgotten the real name of the successor of Muṇḍa. They call him by the name Nāga-Dāsa or Nāga-Dāsaka (=the slave of Nāga). This name indicates that this worthless king was a mere puppet in the hands of Śiśunāga.

The Mahāvamsa states that the thorne of Puṣpapura was offered by the citizens, ministers, officials etc. of Puṣpapura to Śuśunāga. The Sthavirāvalicarita omits the unimportant kings, Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and Nāga-Dāsa and states that after the death of Udāyin, the throne of Pāṭaliputra was offered by the ministers and citizens of Pāṭaliputra to Nanda, the son of a courtesan by a barber.\(^1\) It is difficult to believe how the throne of Magadhā could be offered to a man in the street and of such a low origin, by the ministers officials and citizens of Pāṭaliputra. Hemacandra remembered that the throne of Magadhā was offered to somebody whose name he got from ill-informed sources as Nanda, but whose real name was Nandivaradhanā or Nandavaradhana, and this Nandi(—a—)-vardhana has been confounded with Nanda Mahāpadma whom Hemacandra brands as the son of a courtesan by a barber. The Purāṇas also omit or forget the weaklings Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and Nāga-Dāsa, and

\(^1\) MV. IV, 3-7.  \(^2\) Sthav. Car. VI, 242.
call the successor of Udāyin by the name Nandivardhana. The throne of Magadha was offered to him by the citizens of Pāṭaliputra, after the weak and unimportant successors of Udāyin; and this has been imperfectly remembered by Hemacandra who has, on account of the similarity of names, not only confounded Nandi—(a)-vardhana with Nanda (=Mahāpadma), but has practically supported the wrong tradition that Nanda (= Mahāpadma) ruled for about a hundred years (95 years according to the Sthavirāvalīcarita). Thus it appears that the word Śiśunāga was a title of Nandi-(a)-vardhana, so that his full name was Nandi-(a)-vardhana Śiśunāga.

According to the Mahāvamsa, Śiśunāga reigned for 18 years, but the Purāṇas state that he ruled for 40 years. He may be assumed to have been the governor of Magdha for the previous 22 years (=40—18). He transferred his capital to Vaiśāli. The fact that Śiśunāga had his capital at Vaiśāli and not at Pāṭaliputra, seems to be one of the reasons for which the ill-informed Purāṇists of a far later period have been tempted to carry Śiśunāga and Kākavarna to the top of the list above Bimbisāra, as they knew that Udāyin transferred his capital to Pāṭaliputra.

The Matsya explicitly states that Śiśunāga (=Suśunāga of the Mahāvamsa) destroyed the prestige of the Pradyothas, and occupied Giribraja after placing his son Kākavarna at Vārāṇasi.\(^2\) Now Avanti-(Nandi-)vardhana, the son of Pālaka, and Viśākhayūpa being the last kings of the dynasty, as mentioned in the Purāṇas, it must have been their fame (as well as that of the other members of the family)

---

1. Bigandet, Life or Legend of Buddha, II, 115; Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 37.
2. चला तेषां यथ; कुतुह विषयानांकी भविष्यति | &c,
    वाराणसीं संत्र व्याय अविष्यति गिरिरत्नम् II Mt. 272, 6,
    cf. also Bd. iii, 74, 127-8. and Va. 99, 314; 315.
which was destroyed by Śiśunāga, and the Purāṇās evidently mean to push home this fact by mentioning Śiśunāga after Avantivardhana, the last Pradyōta king. Hence Śiśunāga and Kākavarna cannot be carried to the top of the list as they have been in the Purāṇas. Mr. Jayswal has distorted the real meaning of the first line of the verse quoted below by translating it as “a Śiśunāka having completely destroyed their fame” (J. B. O. R. S. 1915, Sept. p. 108) But why ‘a Śiśunāka’ in the face of the explicit mention of Śiśunāka and then of his son Kākavarna in the next lines. Mr. Jayswal has identified the Magadha king Nandivardhana, the Purānic successor of Udāyin, with Nandivardhana, the successor of Ajaka (=Āryaka, the son of Gōpāla) of the Pradyōta dynasty. He has interpreted ‘Vardhana’ in the name ‘Nandivardhana’ as ‘the Increaser’ i.e. ‘the Increaser of the Empire of Magadha’ and has hazarded the conjecture that Nandivardhana added Avantī to his empire at the 10th year of his reign. (J. B. O. R. S. 1915, Sept. p. 78). Now mark in the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa, the line which runs as 

हृद्ध्रैवेश्वरीतुष्य वैतिन्तिखोल्य 

वनतिसंपुर्ण. The corresponding line in the Matsya runs as 

हृद्ध्रैवेश्वरीतुष्य वैतिन्तिखोल्यवनतिसंपुर्ण It is evident that वनतिसंपुर्ण at the end of the line quoted from the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa is the corrupt form of वनतिसंपुर्ण as preserved in the Matsya. Now mark the Vāyu form (च)-वनतिसंपुर्ण for the name of the successor of Ajaka of the Pradyōta dynasty. It is at once clear that (च)-वनतिसंपुर्ण of the Vāyu is the corruption of the correct name वनतिसंपुर्ण.

Thus it is evident that the Vāyu chooses to call the Pradyōta king, Nandivardhana, by the name Avantivardhana. If ‘Vardhana’ is supposed to mean the Increaser of Empire, as Mr. Jawswal has made it mean, then it may be argued that, this Avantivardhana was the Increaser, not of the Magadhan Empire, but of the Empire of Avanti, and
has, for this reason, been named Avantivardhana in the Vāyu.

The son of Sīsūnāga has been called Kālāśōka in the Mahāvaṃśa. The Divyāvadāna calls him Kākavarṇin. The very names Suśunāga of the Mahāvaṃśa and Kākavarṇin of the Divyāvadāna indicate that they are undoubtedly the Purānic Sīsūnāga and Kākavarṇa; and the Purāṇas are clearly wrong in carrying Sīsūnāga and Kākavarṇa to the top of the list because in that case the fame of the last Pradyōta kings could not have been destroyed by Sīsūnāga, as it actually was, according to the Purāṇas themselves. When this synchronism between Avantivardhana, the successor of Ajaka of the Pradyōta dynasty, and Sīsūnāga of Magadha has been first declared by the Vayu, the Brahmāṇḍa and the Matsya etc., when it is further followed up by the Mahāvaṃśa which relates that the ‘amātya’ Suśunāga was offered the throne of Magadha by the citizens, and when it is further found in the Divyāvadāna that Kākavarṇin was a successor of Muṇḍa, there should be no doubt that Sīsūnāga and Kākavarṇa are there in the list after Nāga-Dāsaka; and that Mr. Jayaswal would have been more sober had he not assumed that the Pradyōta chronology has been thrown in the Sīsūnāga chronology parenthetically (J. B. O. R. S. 1915 Sept. Page 76) and had he not tried to identify Kālāśōka with Nandivardhana on his wrongly assumed synchronism deduced on the confused order of succession in the Purāṇas. It is not necessary to try to identify this Kākavarṇa Sāisūnāgi with Nandivardhana, the successor of Udāyin, as Mr. Jayaswal has done (J. B. O. R. S. 1915, page 77). Because there is an “i” at the end of the name (Kākavarṇi) in the Divyāvadāna, Mr. Jayaswal gratuitously assumes that the original authorities of the Divyāvadāna seem to have called

1 राजस्तृ नगर रिविन्दुरारो राजा राज्य कार्यातिर राजस्तृ रिविन्दुरारो भेकात्मक स्वरूपः || सुभाष्य वाक्यावः || Cowell's Divyavadana XXVI, p. 369.
him Darśaka, the Kākavarni, i.e. a descendant of Kākavarna (J. B. O. R. S. 1915 Sept. page 85) to suit his desperate identification of the Purānic Darśaka with Kākavarni of the Divyāvadāna. (J. B. O. R. S. 1915 Sept. page 85). Thus Mr. Jayaswal proposes that Kālāśōka, was the same as Nandivardhana as well as Darśaka. It comes to this then that one and the same man had the four different names:—Darśaka, Kākavarni, Kālāśōka and Nandivardhana. Is it not too much? Kākavarnin means ‘one who has the colour of a crow’ (काकस्य वर्ण भिन्न प्रथम इव वर्ण भिन्न) and Kākavarna means one whose colour is like that of a crow) वाकस्य वर्ण इव वर्ण भिन्न, and it is only superfluous to state that these two mean the same person. The argument of Mr. Jayaswal that because ‘Kāma’ and ‘Caṇḍāla’ in ‘Kāmā-śōka, and ‘Caṇḍālasōka’ have been used in the moral sense therefore ‘Kāla’ in ‘Kālāśōka’ should also have been used in that sense—need not be taken too seriously. Instances are not rare in history, in which adjectives have also been used in the physical sense. The Black Prince, Richard Crookback, William Rufus, Tamar- lane (=the lame Timur), Ajataśatru Kūnika (=the crookedarmed Ajataśatru) etc. are the typical instances.

According to the Mahāvamsa, at the end of the 10th year of Kālāśōka’s reign, a century passed after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha. The exactness of calculation of the eloquent Mahāvamsa followed up by other Sacred Buddhist Texts can leave little room for doubting the correctness of its history. It was at the end of this year that the second Buddhist congress was held. Now mark here that Tārānāth states that ‘Yasa held a Congress of 700 bhikṣus at the Kusumpuri Vihāra in Vaiśālī under the patronage of the king Nandin.’ Notice also in the Mahāvamsa that the

2 MV. IV, 8.  
3 Schiefner, p. 41. (Mr. Jayaswal’s Paper J. B. O. R. S. 1915 Sept. p. 78n.)
thera Yasa, was one of the chief theras in the Congress held in the Vālikārāma in Veśāli being protected by the king Kālaśāka, and under the leadership of the therā Revata\(^1\) who chose 700 out of that troop of Bhikṣus.\(^2\) The name of Yasa and the number 700 are also attested by the Divyāvadāna.\(^3\) The Cullavagga\(^4\) calls him Yasa Kākaṇḍakaputta. The Mahāvagga\(^5\) calls him Yasa kulapatta. The name Yasa Kākaṇḍakaputta, the therā Revata and the number 700 are mentioned also in the Mahābodīvamsa (p. 96,) in connection with the council held at Vālukārāma in Veśāli.

It is at once evident then that this is the Second Buddhist Congress that was held at Vaiśāli when Mahā-Nandi (=the great Nandi=Nandin of Tārānāth) was reigning at Puṣpapura. The same king has been called Kālaśāka in the Mahāvamsa and Kākavarnīn in the Divyāvadāna. In fact the word ‘Aśōka’ means ‘joy’ or ‘gladness’ and is an equivalent of ‘Nandi.’ He was most probably of dark complexion, and was accordingly surnamed Kāla or Kākavarna, so that his full name was Kāla Aśōka or Kākavarna Mahānandi.

It comes to this then that the great Nandi of Tārānath (=Mahā-Nandi of the Purāṇas) was the same as Kālaśāka or Kākavarna. Bāna informs us that Kākavarna, the son of Siṣunāga, was taken somewhere in an artificial aerial car and was murdered in the vicinity of his city with a dagger thrust into his throat.\(^6\) According to the Mahāvamsa he reigned for 28 years.\(^7\) The figures of the Purāṇas which are ill-informed and mutually contradictory may be safely rejected.

Kākavarna had ten sons who, according to the Mahā-

---

\(^1\) MV. IV, 63.  
\(^2\) MV. IV, 61; 62.  
\(^3\) Div. p. 381; the Divyāvadāna confuses Kālaśāka with Aśōka Maurya.  
\(^4\) Cullavagga XII, 1, 1 et seq.; 2, 1 et seq.  
\(^5\) Mahavagga I, 7, 1-15.  
\(^6\) Harsacarita V.  
\(^7\) Mv. IV, 8.
vaṁśa\(^1\) together ruled for 22 years. Thier names are: Bhadrasena, Koraṇḍavarṇa, Maṅgura, Sarbaṅjaya, Jálika, Ubhaka, Saṅjaya, Korabya, Nandivardhana, and Paṅcamaka—(Mahābōdhīvaṁśa p. 98). Amongst the sons of Kākavarṇa, one was named Nandivardhana, but he need not be identified with the Purānic Nandivardhana as suggested by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar\(^2\). The reason will be clearer as we proceed. After these ten kings, the nine Nandas reigned for 22 years according to the Mahāvaṁśa.\(^3\) Their names, according to the Mahābōdhīvaṁśa, (p. 98,) were: Ugrasena, Paṇḍuka, Paṇḍugati, Bhūtapāla, Rāṣṭrapāla, Gōviśāṇaka, Dasasiddhaka, Kevaṭṭa and Dhana.

The Purāṇas inform us that Mahāpadma who had eight sons, was the son of Mahānandi by a Śūdra woman, and exterminated the Kṣattriyas like a second Paraśurāma.\(^4\) This Mahāpadma and his eight sons, one of whom was, according to the Hindu tradition, known by the name Sumālya (or Sukalpa) were well-known as the nine Nandas, while we have just now seen that the first Nanda is named Ugrasena in the Mahābōdhīvaṁśa. Hence Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar seems to be reasonable in identifying Mahāpadma with Ugrasena. The Sthavirāvalicarita brands him as the son of a courtesan by a barber. But it is difficult to believe how the throne of Magadha could be offered to a man in the street and of such a low origin by the ministers, officials and citizens of Pātaliputra. The mistake has really been due to the similarity of the names Nandivardhana and Nanda. The throne, as we have seen was offered to Nandivardhana (=Śiśunāga), while Mahāpadma Nanda, had he been the son of a courtesan by a barber as Hemacandra describes him to have been, could have the throne if he could usurp it, and this is exactly what the Greek account says of

---

\(^1\) MV. V, 14.  
\(^2\) Car. Lec. p. 83.  
\(^3\) MV. V, 15.  
\(^4\) Va. IV, 24, 4; Va. 99, 323; Mt. 272, 19.
him. The last Nanda who was reigning at the time of Alexander’s invasion was named as nearly Agrammes or Xandrammes as the Greeks could catch the unfamiliar Indian sounds. Curtius says ‘His father (i.e. Agrammes’ or Xandrammes’ father. e. the first Nanda i.e. Mahāpadma Nanda) was, in fact, a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who, from his being not uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was, by her influence, advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards however he treacherously murdered his sovereign; and then under the pretence of acting as the guardian to the royal children, usurped the supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death begot the present king.”

Mahāpadma thus was, according to the contemporary Greek writers, a barber in fact, and according to the Jaina tradition, the son of a courtesan by a barber, while the Purāṇaṣ say that he was the son of Mahānandi (=Kākavarṇa) by a Śūdra woman. The Hindu account fits in well with the Greek account if this Śūdra concubine of Mahānandi-Kākavarṇa be supposed to have been a woman of the barber class, for then also the caste of Mahāpadma would be the barber caste, according to the ancient Indian laws of castes. It is not also improbable that a campaign of calumny was started by the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣattriyas to rouse popular feelings against the Nandas, especially for the reason that Mahāpadma uprooted all the reigning Kṣattriya dynasties with the help of his minister Kalpaka, and the Jaina account of the origin of Mahāpadma Nanda is probably a reminiscence of this calumny.

The sovereign murdered by Agrammes’ father (i.e. by Nanda Mahāpadma) in the Greek account was evidently Kākavarṇa-Mahānandi who, according to Bāna, as we have already seen, was murdered in the vicinity of his city with a dagger thrust into his throat. The chronology of the Vāyu
agrees remarkably with the chronology of the Mahāvaṃśa. The Mahāvaṃśa allots 22 years to the sons of Kālāśoka (=Kākavarṇa-Mahānandi) and 22 years to the nine Nandas, so that according to the Mahāvaṃśa, 44 years elapsed between the death of Kālāśoka-Kākavarṇa-Mahanandi and the accession of Candragupta Maurya. Most manuscripts of the Vāyu state that Mahāpadma ruled for 28 years and Kauṭilya took 16 years to uproot the sons of Mahāpadma, so that according to the Vāyu also, the same period of 44 years elapsed between the same two incidents; and it appears from the nature of the accounts of the various sources at our disposal that Mahāpadma really ruled in the name of the ten sons of Kākavarṇa-Mahānandi and then murdered them.

It is not difficult now to see how the essentially wrong tradition that the Nandas ruled for about a hundred years originated. We have already seen that Kākavarṇa-Mahānandi’s father was Śīsunāga-Nandivardhana. It was the confusion between the personal name Nandivardhana (whose title was Śīsunāga) and the title Nanda (of Mahāpadma) that was responsible for the origin of the wrong tradition. According to the Sthavirāvalicarita which omits or forgets the unimportant weaklings Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and Nāgadāsa, Uḍāya’s successor Nanda (=Nandivardhana Śīsunāga) was offered the throne of Magadha 95 years before the accession of Candragupta, while according to the Mahāvaṃśa, Śuṣunāga (=Śīsunāga-Nandivardhana) was offered the throne 90 years before the accession of Candragupta. Thus the Purāṇists knew that the Nandas were the predecessors of the Mauryas, and that Uḍāya’s successor Nandivardhana, erroneously taken as the first Nanda as in the Sthavirāvalicarita, was offered the throne of Magadha about a hundred years before the accession of Candragupta. Thus the wrong tradition of the Viṣṇu and the Matsya originated out of a confusion between two similar sounding names. That it is substantially wrong is proved by the allotment in the Vāyu
of 28 years to Nanda Mahāpadma and 16 years to his sons, and this is in exact agreement with the chronology of the Mahāvamsa, enlightened with the Greek account that Mahāpadma really ruled as a guardian in the name of the sons of Kākavarna-Mahānandi (=Kālāsoka). Accordingly, as attested by the Vāyu and the Mahāvamsa, it is clear that Mahāpadma Nanda and his sons together ruled for 44 years after which Agrammes or Xandrames or Dhana Nanda, i.e. the last reigning Nanda king was uprooted by Cāṇakya in a war in which Bhadraśāla was the Commander-in-Chief of the Nanda army and in which the carnage was really terrible.¹

The following table shows the chronology of the three available sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purānic figures</th>
<th>Mahāvamsa figures</th>
<th>Figures derived the Śthavirā Valiśarita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bimbisāra 28 years (Vā, Mt)</td>
<td>Bimbisāra 52 years (MV)</td>
<td>Śreṇika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darśaka 24 years (Mt.)</td>
<td>Ajātaśatru 32 years (MV)</td>
<td>Kūnika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajātaśatru 25 years (Vā, Bd.)</td>
<td>Udāyin 16 years (MV)</td>
<td>Udāyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udāyin 33 years (Vā, Mt, Bd.)</td>
<td>Anuruddha } 8 years (MV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandivardhana 40 years (Mt, Bd') 42 years (Vā)</td>
<td>Śuṣunāga 18 years (MV)</td>
<td>Nanda and his descendants 95 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahā-Nandi 43 years (Vā, Mt, Bd.)</td>
<td>Kālāsoka 28 years (MV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahā-Padma 28 years (Vā), 88 years (Mt)</td>
<td>Ten Sons 22 years (MV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumālīya &amp;c. 16 years (Vā), 12 years (Mt)</td>
<td>Nine Nandas 22 years (MV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the contemporary kings of different dynasties of this period. It indicates that the descendants of Kṣemaka and Sumitra were uprooted by Mahāpadma Nanda who also murdered the ten sons of Kākavarna-Mahānandi.
One interesting fact cannot but draw our notice. When we look to the names Bimbisāra Śrenīka (Bimbisāra, the soldier), Ajātaśatru Kūnika (Ajātaśatru, the crooked-armed), Udāyin Ajaya (Udāyin, the Invincible), Nandivardhana Śiśunāga (Nandivardhana, the little Nāga), Mahā-Nandi Kākavarna (Mahā-Nandi, the Black) Mahāpadma Nanda Ugrasena (Mahapadma Nanda, the possessor of a Terrific Army), Caṇḍa Pradyōta Mahāsena (Fierce Pradyōta, the possessor of a Great Army) Nandivardhana Avantivardhana (Nandivardhana, the Increaser of Avanti), we are inclined to think that famous kings in those days usually had surnames.

Mr. Bhandarkar has unfortunately accused the Purāṇas of having made desperate attempts to fill up the gaps of the period by inventing names such as Nandivardhana, Mahā-Nandi etc. Now nowhere, whether in the Vedic age or in the historical age, have the Purāṇas exhibited any tendency to deceive us with invented names. They have faithfully preserved all the traditions they could collect about the dynasties related in them. The copyists and the changes of script were responsible for the corruptions that have crept into them. They erroneously placed Bṛhadvala at the fourteenth step below Hiranyanābha Kausalya, but they have also supplied us with the very important synchronism that Hiranyanābha Kausalya was the disciple of the great grandson of Jaimini, and that Yājñavalkya learnt the science of Yōga from Hiranyanābha. They have wrongly carried up Śiśunāga, Kākavarna and his sons, to the top of the list above Bimbisāra, but they have also supplied us with the most interesting synchronism that Śiśunāga, after destroying the prestige of the last Pradyōtas, occupied Giribraja. The mere mention of the name of a king in the Purāṇas raises a strong presumption for the existence of such a king, and none is entitled the suspect it till the contrary can be proved.
The fact that Śiśunāga had his capital at Vaiśāli seems to be one of the reasons for which the ill-informed Purāṇists of the early Gupta period have carried Śiśunāga, Kāka-varṇa etc. to the top of the list above Bimbisāra, as they knew that Udāyin transferred his capital to Pāṭaliputra in the fourth year of his reign. Or it may as well be that the same old Puranic confusion of tacking the first king of a line intended to be described, on to the last king of the line just described, has taken place. It can not however, mislead us, as we have exposed similar other instances of the confusion with regard to dynasties of the Vedic Age. But the Puranists were sure of this that the fame of the last Pradyōtās was destroyed by Śiśunāga.
CHAPTER XXI.

(For the Date of the Mahābhārata War.)

PRADYOTĀ DYNASTY.

We know that the last Bārhadratha king Ripuṇjaya was murdered by his minister Punika who installed his son Pradyotā as the king of Avanti. Pradyotā ruled for 23 years. His eldest son Gopāla abdicated the throne in favour of his younger brother Pālaka and used to live in Kauśāmbi with his affectionate sister Vāsavadattā. After Udayana's death, Gopāla went to the hermitage of a certain Kāśyapa in Asitāgiri and lived the life of a recluse. Pālaka ruled for 24 years in Ujjain. He imprisoned Ajaka (=Āryaka) the son of his elder brother Gopāla, and was for this reason ousted by Šarvilaka who managed to raise a rebellion and to establish Ajaka on the throne of Avanti. Pālaka was thus succeeded by Ajaka, the son of Gopāla. Ajaka ruled for 21 years according to the Matsya and was succeeded by Nandivardhana (=Avantivardhana.) According to the Vāyu, Ajaka ruled for 31 years and his successor Avantivardhana ruled for 20 years. Be that as it may, the total reign period of Ajaka and his successor was one of 51 years according to both the Vāyu and the Matsya. Now the Purānic statement that Avantivardhana—Nandivardhana was the son of Ajaka cannot be accepted. In the Kathāsaritsāgara we find that once during the reign

1 Mt. 272, 1. 
2 Va. 99, 311; Mt. 272, 3.
3 Kat-sar-sag 111, 62; 63. 
4 Kat-sar-sag. 111, 60; 61.
5 Kat-sar-sag. 111, 93. 
6 Va. 99, 312; Bd. 111, 74, 125.
7 Mrch. X, 51; Mrch. IV, 24. 
8 Mrch. X, 46.
9 Mt. 272, 4. 
10 Va. 99, 313.
11 Va. 99, 313; Mt. 272, 4; 5; Bd. 111, 74, 125.
12 Kat-sar-sag. 112, 62; 63; 64 &c.
of Pālaka, an elephant got out of control and killed many citizens in the streets of Ujjayinī. No one was able to control the furious animal which was afterwards pacified by a beautiful girl to the astonishment of all. This girl was the daughter of a Caṇḍāla named Mataṅga and was named Suratamañjari. Her mother’s name was Asokamañjari.

The Prince Avantivardhana, the son of the king Pālaka, hearing this astonishing news, came out to see the girl and became enamoured of her. King Pālaka and queen Avanti-vati became aprised of their son’s intentions to marry the beautiful girl, but hesitated because of her low caste. The queen was not for such a marriage, as she was naturally desirous of high connections, but the king Pālaka easily induced her to give her consent to such a marriage. Accordingly the Caṇḍāla Mataṅga (also known as Utpalahaña) was sent for and came to the court. King Pālaka asked him to give his daughter in marriage to the Prince Avantivardhana, to which the poor Caṇḍāla readily acceded, but on condition that eighteen thousand Brāhmaṇas were to be sumptuously fed on the occasion at his house. Accordingly the marriage was celebrated with great pomp.

At dead of night on a certain day after the marriage, a man named Ityaka, of mixed caste, stealthily managed to carry Suratamañjari away out of Ujjayinī, while she was asleep. After a time she awoke and saw that she was being stolen away by a man. She began to cry aloud for help, but no one came to her rescue. Now it so happened that Ityaka chose to carry her along the path that led to Asitagiri where Naravāhana (=Vahīnara=Bōdhi), the son of Udayana, the late king of Kauśambī, was passing his time with his maternal uncle Gopāla. The Commander-in-chief of Naravāhana, recognizing the pitiful cry of a woman, at once ran towards them and caught Ityaka. Being asked as to why he was carrying the girl away, Ityaka replied that her hand had been promised to him by her mother, while Suratamañ-
jari told them that she was the wife of the Prince Avantivardhana the son of Pālaka, the king of Ujjayinī. Gōpāla then asked his nephew Naravāhana (=Vahīnara) to send for the Prince Avantivardhana and the minister Bharatarōha of the House of Ujjayinī. A messenger was at once despatched to Ujjayinī where, in the meantime, all were in sadness for the sudden disappearance of the Princess. The messenger related the whole story about the Princess to King Pālaka who was exceedingly glad to have the news of his lost daughter-in-law, but became furious against the claimant Ityaka. The Prince Avantivardhana and the minister Bharatarōha were at once sent with the messenger to Asitagiri (lit. the Black Hill = the Śumśumāra Hill ?) where Naravāhana, (=Vahīnara) the king of Kauśāmbi was present with his maternal uncle Gōpāla to decide the dispute. It afterwards transpired that Ityaka was the brother in-law (wife’s brother) of the king Vahīnara (=Naravāhana) who however with his court-pandits decided that a mother had no right to give her daughter in marriage and that Suratamaṇjarī belonged to Avantivardhana, the son of his (Naravāhana’s) maternal uncle Pālaka. Ityaka was allowed to go away unmolested; and the Prince Avantivardhana and his wife Suratamaṇjarī were sent back to Ujjayinī together with the minister Bharatarōha. These details given in the Kathāsaritsāgara about the Prince Avantivardhana and his wife Suratamaṇjarī seem to be based on a substratum of truth, although it is, like many old accounts, mixed up with romance. The Vāyu is wrong when it calls Avantivardhana the son of Ajaka whose successor he (Avantivardhana) really was. His real name was Avantivardhana as is expressly stated in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, and the Vāyu has used this name, while the Matsya and the Brahmāṇḍa call him Nandivardhana probably wrongly.

1 वाञ्चा दशनिंप्लेन: Kat-sar-sag. 112, 13.
The Pradyōta genealogy stands thus:

Punika

Pradyōta-Mahāsena (23 years)  Kumārasena

Gōpaḷa  Pālaka (24 years)

Ajaka (21 years)  Viśākhayūpa  Avantivardhana (50 years) (30 years)

Viśākhayūpa was another son of Pālaka as expressly implied in the Purāṇas. After his father was deposed, he probably established a principality in some adjacent district, as was the custom in those days, and ruled for 50 years according to the Vāyu. His brother Avantivardhana however succeeded Ajaka to the throne of Avanti and ruled for 30 years after which his fame as well as that of Viśākhayūpa and others was destroyed by Śिसुनāga. Notice here that the reigns of Avantivardhana and Viśākhayūpa close about the same year.

Ajaka 21 years  Avantivardhana 30 years  Total 51 years  Viśākhayūpa 50 years.

Kumārasena was the younger brother of Mahāsena and not his son, as Mr. Jayswal has erroneously supposed him to have been (J. B. O. R. S. 1915, Sept. Page 106). He was killed when he tried to put a stop to the practice of selling human flesh on the occasion of the feast of Mahākāla at Ujjayinī by the human Vampire (=Vetāla) named Tālajangha.1. Kumārasena has been spoken of as

1 शास्त्रीय प्रमाणों के प्रस्तुत निरीक्षणांकनानुसार वेतालवाल अजयान अजन्ताज प्रबोधक नीतिकं कुमारं कुमारादेशम्। Harṣacarita VI ch. Vide also my paper on the Harṣacarita of Bāṇa. Sir A. T. Mookerjee Commemoration Volume.
and also as दौरिन्द. जाध्वप्र is simply means यवरज, चतुर्ज, कानिष्ठ सताता, a younger brother; and दौरिन्द means Punika’s son. Mr. Jayswal has been further misled as to the meaning of गोपाल-दारक by which Ḍryaka has been called in the Mṛchakatika (IV, 24 +). गोपालदारक simply means the son of Gōpāla. But Mr. Jayswal misinterprets it as the ‘boy-Gōpāla.’ How Gōpāla could still remain a boy after his younger brother Pālaka had reigned for 24 years (28 years according to Mr. Jayswal) has not been explained by Mr. Jayswal. Gōpāla, as related in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara (11, 62; 63) abdicated the throne in favour of his younger brother Pālaka, and remained at Kauśāmibhi with his sister Vāsavadattā, and after the death of Udayana, went to Asitagiri and lived the life of a recluse. He did not ascend the throne as Ḍryaka as has been wrongly supposed by Mr. Jayswal. After all, Ajaka (=Āryaka) was the son of Gōpāla. The Puranic traditional total of the reign-periods of these kings has very little value, because they were calculated on a chaotic order of succession of kings, and because no single Purāṇa would agree with another, and thirdly because the details do not agree with the total, and fourthly because they were done at a later time i.e. in the early Gupta period by Puranists who had no sufficient materials with them. Hence credible external evidences must be brought in to correct the Purāṇas which however must be made the basis for settling the chronology.

Now we can get the date of accession of Caṇḍa Pradyōta from the Puranic data. According to the Mahāvamsa, Śīśuṇāga became the ruler of Magadha 80 years after the accession of Ajātaśatru. He destroyed the fame of the last Pradyōta kings Avantivardhana and Viśākhayūpa, most probably in a campaign, and then securely placed his son Kākavarna at Vārānasī and then took over the charge of the government of Magadha. Hence Śīśuṇāga may be reasonably supposed to have ousted the Pradyōtas
80 years after the accession of Ajātaśatru. Avantivardhana was ousted when he was ruling for 30 years. Before Avantivardhana, Ajaka ruled for 21 years and Pālaka for 24 years. Hence Pālaka ascended the throne of Ujjayini 75 years \((=24 + 21 + 30)\) before Avantivardhana was ousted by Śisunāga.

It necessarily follows that the last 5 years of the reign of Caṇḍa Pradyōta coalesced with the first 5 years of the reign of Ajātaśatru. It was probably on account of the death of Caṇḍa Pradyōta towards the earlier parts of the reign of Ajātaśatru that the invasion of Magadha by Caṇḍa Pradyōta referred to in the Majjhima Nikāya could not be made.
CHAPTER XXII.

(For the Date of the Mahābhārata War.)

IMPORTANT DATES

(1) Let us consider the Buddhist traditions.
   (a) The substantially correct* statements in the Dipavamsa¹ and the Mahāvamsa² that Aśoka was formally crowned 218 years after the death of Buddha. This virtually reduces to the fact that Candragupta ascended the throne 162 (=218—24—28—4) years after the death of Buddha.
   (b) The dotted record of Canton gives us 975 dots, the last of which was put in 489 A. D. This gives us 486 B. C. as the first year after the death of Buddha. Hence Buddha died in 487 B. C. according to the dotted record. This gives us 325 B. C. (=487—162) as the accession of Candragupta.
   (c) Epigraphic Evidence:—

In the 13th Rock-Edict, Aśoka speaks of the Yōna King Antiyōka (Antiochos II Theos, King of Syria, 261—246 B. C.), and the four kings beyond his realm, Turamaya (Ptolemaios II of Egypt, d. 247 B. C.), Antikina (Antigonos Gonatas of Macedonia, d. 239 B. C.) Maka (Magas of Cyrene, d. 258 B. C.) and Alikā Sudara (Alexander of Epirus d. about 258 B. C.) as alive. The Rock Edicts, and consequently the Rock Edict XIII, were published on the 12th year after the coronation of Aśoka. Hence was Aśoka was

* I am unable to agree with Dr. Charpentier (Ind. Ant. 1914 Aug.) in discrediting this tradition.

¹ द्वितीय च वसुधारमः चढ़ाः जस्व भाषायते जस्व चस्तुमस्याय च।
² मयो विद्यार्थियो विद्यार्थियो निर्देशयो।| Dip. VI, 1.
³ तस्मात् विद्यार्थियो पत्रे देशमिवदत्ते।
⁴ चन्द्रार्थसः वसुधारायतमेव विज्ञानमिह।| MV. V, 21.
crowned either in 269 B. C. \((=258+11)\) or in 271 B. C. \((=260+11)\). Ašoka was crowned in the fourth year after his accession. Hence Ašoka’s accession may be dated at about 273 B. C. or 275 B. C. Adding to this the reign periods \((28+24)\) of Bindusāra and Candragupta, we arrive at 325 B. C. or 327 B. C. as the date of accession of Candragupta \([(273+28+24=325)\text{ or } (275+28+24=327)]\)

We safely reject the upper limit and adopt 325 B. C. as the more probable date for the accession of Candragupta.

(d) Vijaya reigned for 38 years and died in Udāyin’s 14th year. After an interregnum of 1 year Pāṇḍuvāsa was anointed king in the 16th year of Udāyin’s reign. Pāṇḍu-
vāsa reigned for 30 years and died in Nāgadāsa’s 21st year. After Pāṇḍuvāsa, Abhaya reigned for 20 years. After an interregnum of 17 years, Pakuṇḍaka reigned for 70 years and died in the 14th year of Candragupta. Then Mutāśiva reigned for 60 years and died 17 years after coronation of Ašoka. Thus we have a period of 235 years \((=38+1+30+20+17+70+60)\) between the accession of Vijaya and the 17th year after the coronation of Ašoka. Now the epigraphic evidence deduced from the publication of the 13th Rock Edict on the 12th after the coronation year of Ašoka \(i. e.,\) on about 258 B. C. gives us 269 B. C. as the year of coronation of Ašoka. Hence Mutāśiva who died 17 years after the coronation of Ašoka, did so in 252 B. C. \(=269-17).\)

Accordingly Vijaya landed in Ceylon or Buddha died in 487 B. C. \((=252+235)\). Thus we see that if we take our starting point from the epigraphic date of publication of the 13th Rock Edict of Ašoka and calculate backwards from the date collected from the Mahāvamsa, the Ceylonese Chronicle, we arrive at 487 B. C. for the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, which is exactly the date obtained by counting the number of dots in the dotted record of Canton preserved by the Chinese school of Buddhists.

Now as Mutāśiva reigned for 60 years from the 14th year
of Candragupta to the end of the 17th year after the coronation of Aśoka, the accession of Candragupta is at once dated at 325 B. C. (=252 + 60 + 13).

(2) Now we shall consider the Jaina traditions:—

(a) The 148th Sūtra of Book VI of the Kalpa-Sūtra gives us the period between the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra and the writing &c. of the book¹. Some say that this Sūtra was written by Śrī Devardhiganin for giving us the date of the putting of the Kalpasūtra in writing, and its explanation is that 980 years after the death of Mahāvīra, the Siddhānta as well as the Kalpa were written in books, because there is a verse² pointing to this. Others say that this verse is for giving us the date of the public recitation of the Kalpa-Sūtra before the king Dhruvasena of Ānandapura to console him for the death of his son and that this public recitation took place 980 years after the death of Mahāvīra, because there is a verse³ pointing to this. Scholars belonging to this second group, when asked about the meaning of वायण तरे पुष्य चर्च तेष चए reply that the period is 993 years in another recension. A third set of scholars say that the Kalpa was written in 980 A. V. and that the public recitation took place in 993 A. V. because Śrī-Sundara Sūri has decided thus.⁴ Vinayavijayagananin who finished his Subōdhikā commentary

¹ समस्तसा भगवती महावीरसा आव समस्तसा व्हैलाम्बिक विध्रुः ताहुः

² आवीली पुष्य नि वाहये,

³ नावनत चायीतिर वर्ध—

⁴ तेहः ताभुधसम्बन्ध मुहैचिदी।

Kalpa Sūtra VI, 148.

Navnata chaśīya (८०) नावराधी ||

Prārādhā vāṣṭū 'viṣṇu' viṣṇu' ||

Stōtra-ratna-kōśa.
on the Kalpasūtra in about 1629 A. C.¹ says that a public recitation of the Kalpasūtra was begun in the court of the king Dhruvasena of Ānandapura to console him for the death of his son 980 years or, according to another opinion, 993 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra.² Thus it is evident that the commentators differ as to the meaning of वाचनान्तरे. Some hold that it means 'in another recension' (समतान्तरे), while according to others it has the meaning 'after the public recitation' (वाचनान्तरे). According to the latter, the public recitation took place 13 years after the Siddhānta was written in books, and at this time Dhruvasena was the king of Ānandapura. It is evident then that the latter agrees with the second alternative admitted by the former. Now we have it from Dr. Jarl Charpentier that Dhruvasena I was the king of Ānandapura in 526 A. C. He had no issue, and was succeeded by his brother Guhasena in 540 A. C. As Dr. Charpentier has already shown, 993 years before 526 A. C. places us at 467 B. C. (993—526). This is Jacobi’s date.

The Śvetāmbara Jainas in their Paṭṭavallis and other works place the death of Sambhūtavijaya 156 years after the death of Mahāvīra. It is also in the Jaina traditions that Sambhūtavijaya died in the same year in which Candragupta ascended the throne. We have seen before that Hemachandra has placed the accession of Candragupta 155 years after the Vīra-Nirvāṇa. Hence Hemachandra has followed the traditions which he considered to be the best,

¹ सम्बन्धसर्वभाविन्य स्वेद भागि समुवज्ञे पति।
श्योभिः सम्बन्धं समजति अन्तः हितोपदेशम्॥

It means 1686 Samvat or 1629 A. C. (=1686—57). Dr. Hermann Jacobi is clearly wrong here in putting 1616 Samvat as the date of the Subodhikā.

² यहीर्दिवाशात्मकमहाविकासस्वात्मकतिक्षणं समतान्तरं विषयमित्रस्वात्मकतिक्षणं
कन्ने भूक्कन्नपुष्प प्रवर्धातिकरम् समाभिमाध्यतमानंतरे सहायतवक्ष सम्बन्धः सम्बन्धः
श्रीक्षण्यश्रीमानस्वायमानं॥
in placing Candragupta's accession in 155 A. V. Now the memorial verses which form the basis of Merutuṅga's Vicāraśreni place the accession of Candragupta 255 years (=108 + 30 + 60 + 40 + 13 + 4) before Vikrama. This places the Vīra-Nirvāṇa at about 410 years (255 + 155) before Vikrama. Hence according to these Jaina traditions Candragupta’s accession is dated at 312 B. C. (=255 + 57), and the Vīra-Nirvāṇa at 467 B. C. (=312 + 155). This agrees with the date of the death of Mahāvīra obtained before from considerations of the 148th verse of the sixth book of the Kalpasūtra. It is certain that Devardhiganin Kṣamā-Sramaṇa, the writer of that particular verse, accepted the chronology of the memorial verses according to which Candragupta became king 255 years before Vikrama. There are other Jain traditions which try to determine the Vīra-Nirvāṇa with reference to the Vikrama Samvat.

(1) In the Vicāra-śreni of Merutuṅga who was a Śvetābara, the period between the Vīra-Nirvāṇa and the Vikrama-Samvat is given as 470 years. (2) In the Mahāvīra-carita of Nemicandracārya, the interval between the Vīra-Nirvāṇa and the birth of the Śaka king is stated to be 605 years and 5 months. (3) In the Trilokasūra of Nemicandra, a Digambara, the interval between the Vīra-Nirvāṇa and the coronaition of the Śaka king is 605 years and 5 months. (4) In the Trailokyā-Prajñāpti of Yati-Vṛṣabha, a Digambara, the interval between the Vīra-Nirvāṇa era and the Śaka era is stated once as 605 years and 5 months, and again as 461 years. Except the very last, all the others come from the same source as the Vīra-Nirvāṇa, according to them, falls in 527 B. C. approximately. The little bit of difference that may be made out between the second and any one of the rest is due to the fact that Nemicandrācārya could not express himself properly. Similarly, Dr. Hoernle points out that the 18th gāthā of the Sarasvati gaccha says Vikrama was crowned when he was full 16 years old, and that he was
born 470 years after the death of Mahāvīra. That is, Vikrama was crowned full 486 years after the death of Mahāvīra. Now as Vikrama is held to have been crowned in 57 B.C., the Vira-Nirvāṇa falls in 544 B.C. (=57+487). It will thus be perceived (and it is well-known to scholars) how untrustworthy is the nature of calculations of dates of ancient events which involve references to the Vikrama Samvat, and who can gaurantee the truth of the tradition of Candragupta’s having been king 255 years before Vikrama the tradition eventually followed by Devardhiganin. After all, it seems safer to hold the date 325 B.C. for the accession of Candragupta, a date obtained from considerations of Buddhistic traditions. It may at best be 322 or 321 B.C. which Dr. Kern has tried to get and to which Dr. Geiger has lent his support. But 312 B.C. is almost impossible. Accordingly we hold the date 480 B.C. (=325+155) or 477 B.C. (=322+155) for the death of Mahāvīra, because the calculations in the memorial verses can be shown to be all wrong. Hence we accept Hemcandra which he says that Candragupta became king 155 years after the death of Mahāvīra, but can not combine this with the wrong date of the memorial verses to derive the date of the ‘Vira-Nirvāṇa.

The date of Buddha’s Nirvāṇa has already been shown to fall in 487 B.C. Now Dr. Geiger has shown that there was an era in Ceylone, which was started from 483 B.C. But it has not been settled whether this era had any connection with the date of the death of the Buddha, allhough Dr. Geiger is willing to accept this as the desired date. How are eras generally started? By a king or a very powerful authority to mark any important event in his life or some other event. The Vikrama era, the Maurya era, the Gupta era, the Seluekaedian era, the Sātavāhana era &c. are the typical instances. Hence it seems more plausible that this era that was inaugurated in Ceylone from 483
B. C. marks off Vijaya’s coronation in Ceylon. People however correctly remembered that Vijaya landed in Ceylon about the same time when the Buddha died (i. e. in 487 B. C.).

Caṇḍa Pradyōta thus reigned up to 490 B. C. and ascended the throne in 513 B. C.

The accession of Ajātaśatru falls in 495 B. C. and Bimbisāra who ruled full 52 years ascended the throne in 547 B. C. Thus Bimbisāra could hear religious sermons both from Buddha and Mahāvīra.

The accession of Śiśunāga (=Nandivardhana) according to the Mahāvamśa took place 80 years (=32 + 16 + 8 + 24) after the accession of Ajātaśatru i. e. it falls in 415 B. C. (=495 – 80.) According to the Sthavirāvali-carita, Nanda = Nandivardhana = Śiśunāga was offered the throne of Magadha 5 years before 415 B. C. i.e., 420 B.C.

Vira-Nirvāṇa happened 60 years before this i.e., in 480 B. C. (=420 + 60) according to the Sthavirāvali-carita,

When Avantivardhana ruled for full 30 years (Mt.) the fame of the Pradyōtas was destroyed by Śiśunāga (=Nandivardhana) most probably in a war between the houses of Magadha and Avantī. This event may be dated in 415 B. C. Hence Avantivardhana succeeded to the throne of Avanti at 445 B. C.

The accession of Viśākhayūpa, the son of Pālaka, took place in 466 B. C. (=490 – 24). He reigned for 50 years according to the Vāyu. Hence his reign ended in 416 B. C. (=466 – 50) or 415 B. C. i.e. about the same year of the accession of Nandivardhana (=Śiśunāga).
TABLE (C)

Pradyōta 513 B.C.—490 B.C. (Vā, Mt)

Gopāla

Pālaka 490 B.C.—4'6 B.C. (Va, Bd)

Ajaka 466 B.C.—445 B.C. (Mt)

Avantivardhana

Viśākhayūpa

Bimbisāra 547 B.C.—495 B.C.

Ajātaśatru 495 B.C.—463 B.C.

Udāyin 463 B.C.—447 B.C.

Aniruddha, Muṇḍa 447 B.C.—439 B.C.

Nāga-Dāsa 439 B.C.—415 B.C.

Nandivardhana—Śiśunāga 415 B.C.—397 B.C.

Kākavarna—Mahā-Nandi = 397 B.C.—369 B.C.

Mahā-padma, 369 B.C.—341 B.C.

Sumālīya, &c. 341 B.C.—325 B.C.

(MV)  

(Modified by Sthav. Car. which gives 95 years to the Nandas.)

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)  

(MV)
Now we find the approximate time about which Prasenajit ascended the throne of Śrāvasti. His sister was married to Bimbisāra who ascended the throne in 547 B.C.

After Bimbisāra had reigned for 28 years i.e. in about 519 B.C., his successor Darśaka was associated in the Government of Bimbisāra and conducted the affairs of the state for 24 years after which Bimbisāra was starved to death by Ajātaśatru in 495 B.C. The accession of Prasenajit, the brother-in-law of Bimbisāra, to the throne of Śrāvasti may then be taken to be some date intermediate between 547 B.C. and 519 B.C. That is, it may be taken roughly about 533 B.C., remembering that Ajātaśatru as well as Vahī-Nara (=Naravāhana), the son of Udayana, were the sons-in-law of Prasenajit (Vidē Kat-Sar-sag). Prasenajit seems to have enjoyed a long reign.

Now Udayana married the sister of Darśaka, who began his rule from 519 B.C. Udayana also married the daughter of Candra Pradyōta who ascended the throne of Avanti in 513 B.C. Udayana died in 490 B.C. i.e. the same year in which his father-in-law Pradyōta died. In the Kathāsarit-sāgara we find that when Candra Mahāsena was no more, Udayana his son-in-law asked his elder brother-in-law Gopāla to go to Avanti and take charge of the kingdom. But Gopāla abdicated the throne in favour of his younger brother Pālaka. But Udayana who was overwhelmed with sorrow at the news of the death of his father-in-law resolved to depart from this world full of misery. Accordingly he placed his son Naravāhana (=Vahī-Nara) under the care of Gopāla and proceeded to a certain precipitous hill with his wives Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī. They ascended to the top and killed themselves by falling from the precipice. The ancient Inidian used to end his life by some such means when he thought that this world had no charm for him or that his life has been spoilt with sin and sorrow. We find Bhaṭṭa Kumārila burning himself to death in the 7th
century A. D. There are many other instances of suicide which may be thought superstitious. Even the modern age has not been able to transcend this superstition. We find the Japanese General Nogi killing himself by committing 'hārikiri' on the death of his Emperor. Hence it may be admitted that the important information recorded in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara has nothing which can be discredited. The result is that the date of accession of Naravāhana (=Vahī-Nara), the son of Udayana, falls in 490 B. C. i. e. the year of the death of Caṇḍa Pradyōta and Udayana. The accession of Udayana may be dated roughly about 500 B. C., considering that he was the son-in-law of Caṇḍa Pradyōta and contemporary of Ajātaśatru.
CHAPTER XXIII

THE DATE OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA WAR.

Many have been the attempts to determine the date of this important event of India's history, but few of them can be acceptable. The important Purāṇas have tried to determine a particular period of time, namely, the period between the birth of Parikṣit, the son of Abhimanyu, and the coronation of one and the same king whom the Vāyu and the Matsya call Mahāpadma, the great universal monarch who uprooted all the Kṣattriyas of India like a second Paraśurāma. That is, it is the intention of the Purāṇas to supply us with the length of time that elapsed from the accession of Yudhiṣṭhira, the great universal emperor of ancient India, to the coronation of Mahāpadma, another great universal monarch. These two Purāṇas\(^1\) say that this period was one of 1050 years.

The Viṣṇu calls the latter by the name Nanda which evidently stands for Mahāpadma Nanda, as Mahāpadma and his eight sons were well-known as the nine Nandas. Mr. Jayswal has assumed that the name Nanda stands for Mahā-Nandi, the father of Mahāpadma. He has, by this means, attempted to reconcile the divergent evidence of the Viṣṇu according to which the said period was one of 1015 years.\(^2\) But the truth is that all the Purāṇas try to specify one and the same period i. e. the period between the 'abhiṣeka' ceremony of one and the same person viz., Mahāpadma Nanda, and the birth of Parikṣit, and that in this determination, the Viṣṇu differs from the Vāyu and the Matsya.

The historian here notices that these mutually conflicting Puranic calculations were made after the time of Mahāpadma

\(^1\) Va. 99, 415; Mt. 273, 35. \(^2\) Vs. IV. 24, 32.
Nanda; and the description in the Purāṇas of the Maurya Sunga, Kāṇva, Andhra dynasties and the mention of the Guptas indicate that these divergent calculations were made when the final redactions of the Purāṇas were completed, i.e. when it was wrongly supposed that the first Andhra king Simuka succeeded the last Kāṇva king Suśarman; when Śiśunāga, and Kākavarna were wrongly carried up to the top of the list above Bimbisāra; when Ajaka of the Pradyōta dynasty was wrongly supposed to be the successor of Viśākhayāpa, the son of Pālaka; when Śākya, Suđhōdana, and Rāhula &c. were wrongly interwoven in the Kōsala line between Sañjaya and Prasenajit; when Ajātaśatru was placed two steps above Bimbisāra in the Vāyu and three steps below Bimbisara in the Matsya. The calculation of Varāhamihira followed up by Kalhana that Yudhīṣṭhira ruled the earth 653 years after the Kali era\(^1\) is absurd on the very face of it because it rests on a fanciful interpretation of the nonsensical data that the constellation Great Bear stood on the Regulus at the time when Yudhīṣṭhira ruled the earth\(^2\) Even admitting that the interpretation is correct, it cannot be accepted in the absence of corroborative evidence. Hence it is necessary to reject all these calculations and to determine afresh the date in the light of genealogical considerations.

We have shown 28 years to be the most reasonable period that should be assigned to each member of a reigning series (vidē p. 176). Now three dynasties have been handed down to us in a more or less perfect order, all of them starting from the time of the Mahābhārata war to the age of Gautama Buddha: (1) the Kōsala line of the descendants of Brhadvala, (2) the Māgadha line of the descendants of Sahadeva,

\(^1\) श्रीमत प्रतस्त श्रीहतु वंशं वचविकलये च भूते।
कलित्वादं काव्यं भूमिन्तु कृष्णपद्वृतो। Br. Samh.

\(^2\) चासनुण्यम्बतु सुनयु भालित प्रवें दुर्दिश्वः नुप्ततो।
बद्विविश्वाण्डितुः प्रकारानात्सख रावय। Br. Samh, 13, 3; Raj. Tar. 1, 56.
and (3) the Paurava line of the descendants of Abhimanyu Arjuni. We adjust these lines one by one.

THE KŌSAŁA LINE.

We adjust the lineal descendants of Bṛhavala, the descendant of Lava of the Śravastī line thus:—

(1) Bṛhadvala
(2) Bṛhatkṣaṇa-Bṛhadrāṇa-Bṛhatkṣaya.
(3) Uruksaya-Tatakṣaya-Gurukṣepa.
(4) Vatsavyūha
(5) Prativyūha
(6) Divākara Here the Purāṇa was narrated.
(7) Sahadeva
(8) Bṛhadaśva
(9) Bhānuratha
(10) Pratītāśva
(11) Supratīka
(12) Marudeva
(13) Sunakṣattra
(14) Kinnara-Puṣkara.
(15) Antarikṣa
(16) Suṣeṇa-Suvarṇa-Suparṇa-Sutapas
(17) Amitrajit-Sumitra
(18) Bṛhadṛaja-Bharadvāja
(19) Dharmin-Varhis
(20) Kṛtaṁjaya

(21) Brāta (21) Raṇaṁjaya
(22) Saṅjaya
(23) Mahākōsala
(24) Prasenajit
(25) Viḍūḍabha-Kṣudraka
(26) Kṣulika
(27) Suratha
(28) Sumitra
The Puranic statement that Śākyya was the son of Sañjaya and that Sudhdhodana was descended from Śākyya cannot be accepted. In the Mahāvamsa we find that Sakka (=Śākyya?) used to reign at Devadaha and was for this reason known as Devadaha-Sakka (=Śākyya of Devadaha). Śākyya’s daughter Kaccānā was given in marriage to Sihamanu (=Siṁhahanu), whereas Śākyya’s son Añjana married Yasōdharā the sister of Siṁhahanu. Simhahanu’s son Sudhdhodana, by Kaccānā, married Māyā and Prajāvati, the two daughters of Añjana. Sudhdhodana’s son Siddhārtha by Māyā married Bhaddakaccānā the daughter of Añjana’s son Suppabuddha. Bhaddakaccānā’s mother Amitā was the daughter of Siṁhahanu. The relation is best illustrated by the genealogical tree below:

```
          Jayasena
              |                Sakya
          тем           тем
              |                |
 Siṁhahanu  Yasōdharā  Añjana  Kaccānā (married to Siṁhahanu)
              |                |
 Sudhdhodana  Amitā  Suppabuddha  Māyā (married to Sudhdhodana)
            |                |
 Siddhārtha  Bhaddakaccānā (married to Siddhārtha)
```

Siddhārtha was thus connected on the mother’s side by many bonds of union with Śākyya of Devadaha.

Thus the relation can be shortly expressed by saying that Śākyya and Jayasena interchanged their daughters in marriage. Añjana, the son of Śākyya, and Siṁhahanu, the son of Jayasena, did similarly interchange their daughters in marriage, and Siddhārtha was born into Sudhdhodana by Māyā, the daughter of Añjana. Siddhārtha was thus descended on the mother’s side from Śākyya of Devadaha, and was best known as Śākyamuni (= a Muni of the Śākya

1 Va. 99, 288.  
2 MV. II, 17.  
3 MV. II, 18.  
4 MV. II, 18.  
5 MV. II, 22.  
6 MV. II, 24.  
7 MV. II, 22; 19.  
8 MV. II, 20; 21; 22.
clan) and as Śākyasimha (=a lion amongst the Śākyas) because he was supposed to have been descended from Śākya and married a Śākya Princess.

In reality Siddhārtha was descended from Sivisaṅjaya, and belonged to the Ikṣvākus of Kōsala.

We have, Makhadeva

Kalārajanaka

Okkāka (=Ikṣvāku)

Okkāmukha

Sivisaṅjaya

Simhassāra

Jayasena

Śākya (of Devadaha) Śākya of Devadaha himself seems to have been a descendant of Siva-Saṅjaya. The names Okkāka (=Ikṣvāku ?); Mandhātar etc. of the ancestors of Sivisaṅjaya indicate that the kings of Kapilavastu belonged to the Ikṣvāku family that ruled at Śrāvastī, and that some scion of the family migrated to the adjacent territory of Kapilavastu to establish a principality there. The Puranists of the Guptan period remembered that Śākya was a descendant of some Saṅjaya and that the Śākyas were a branch of the Ikṣvākus. Accordingly they have been naturally enfolded between Sivisaṅjaya, the ancestor of Śākya, and Saṅjaya the son of Raṅaṅjaya of the Śrāvastī line. The theory that the Śākyas belonged to the Saka tribe cannot deserve any credence because all the traditions are in favour of their Kōsala Ikṣvāku origin.

Raṅaṅjaya, the 22nd king in the list has been mentioned as the son and successor of Kṛtaṅjaya placed at the 20th step in the Viṣṇu,¹ the Matsya², the Brahmāṇḍa and the

¹ Vs. IV, 22, 3. ² Mt. 271, 11.
Bhāgavata, but the Vāyu¹ introduces Brāta between them; and the truth seems to be on genealogical considerations that Brāta was the elder brother of Rāṇaṁjaya and died without issue, and after his short reign, his younger brother Rāṇaṁjaya succeeded him.

The exigencies of the genealogical table show that Mahā-kōsala was the successor of Saṅjaya, the son of Rāṇaṁjaya. Thus from the accession of Brhatkṣaya on the death of his father Brhadvala at the Bhārata war, to the accession of Prasenajit 22 generations or 616 years (=22×28) passed away.

The accession of Prasenajit has been dated in circa. 533 B. C.

This places the date of the Bhārata war about 1149 B. C. (=616+533).

THE MĀGADHA LINE

After Sahadeva Jārāsandhi we place the following kings of the Māgadha line, one after another in succession.

(1) Sōmadhi-Sōmāpi-Mārjāri.
(2) Śrutāśravas.
(3) Ayutāyus-Apratīpi.
(4) Niramitra.
(5) Sukṣatttra-Sukṛtta
(6) Brhatkarman.
(7) Senajit Here the Purāṇa was narrated.
(8) Śruteṇaṁjaya
(9) Mahāvāhu-Bibhu-Vipra.
(10) Śuci
(11) Kṣema
(12) Bhubata-Anubrata-Subrata
(13) Dharmanetra-Sunetra
(14) Nivr̄ti-Nṛpati.
(15) Subrata-Suśrama-Sama-Trinetra.

¹ Va. 99, 287.
(16) Dr̥dhasena-Dyumatsena
(17) Mahīnetra-Sumati
(18) Sucala-Acala
(19) Sunetra
(20) Satyajit
(21) Viśvajit acc. 588 B. C.
(22) Ripuṇājaya acc. 563 acc.

Thus we have a line of 22 kings from Sōmadhi to the last king Ripuṇājaya both inclusive. Now the Vāyu Purāṇa was related when the 7th king Senajit was reigning. From and including Senajit 16 Bārhadratha kings successively ruled Magadha. The list is in complete agreement with the Puranic computation which says that the number of the future Bārhadrathas is sixteen.

Senajit was the younger contemporary of the Aikṣvāka king Divākara and the Paurava king Adhisīmakṛṣṇa and it was at the beginning of Senajit’s reign that the Vāyu Purāṇa was related to the audience Rṣis by the Paurāṇika Sūta, when the former were holding for two years a long three-year sacrifice on the banks of the Dr̥ṣadvatī. The number cannot be and is actually not 32 from and including Sōmadhi to Ripuṇājaya, as has been supposed by Mr. Jayswal; because there were only 6 kings above Senajit up to Sōmadhi and none have been omitted from the list of these latter.

Adhisīmakṛṣṇa whose contemporary Senajit was, was the famous son of Aśvamedhadatta, the grandson of Janamejaya Pārikṣita. Aśvamedhadatta’s father Śatānīta I read the Vedas from Yājñivalkya as we have said before. Consequently, in the Paurava line, we have 6 kings from Abhi manyu Ārjunī to Adhisīmakṛṣṇa both inclusive, and the last of whom was the contemporary of Senajit, the Māgadha king. Hence no Māgadha king has been omitted from

1 सेनक्षुद्र सामर्थ चालू रता वे भोजन्ते सया; II Va. 99, 300.
2 गोकृत्या नुष्पा च ब भूरितारी हष्ट्रवा; II Va. 99, 308; Mt. 271, 29.
the list. The number 32, should be made up from and including Br̥hadhratha I, the son of Uparicara Vasu. The last king, however, of the line, Ripuṇjayā after a long reign of 50 years was quite advanced in years when he was murdered by his minister Punika in 513 B. C. Thus according to the Puranic data Ripuṇjayā ascended the throne of Ujjayinī in 563 B. C.

Now we have 21 steps from the accession of Sōmadhi to the accession of Ripuṇjayā.

Alloting 28 years per step, the accession of Sōmadhi falls 588 years (=21 × 28) before the accession of Ripuṇjayā.

That is, the date of Mahābhārata war falls approximately about 1151 B. C. (=543 + 588) from the genealogical considerations of the Bārhadratha dynasty.

Now we place the lineal descendants of Arjuna Pāṇḍava thus:—

(1) Abhimanyu
(2) Parīśit
(3) Janamejaya
(4) Satānīka I
(5) Āśvamedhadatta
(6) Adhisimakṛṣṇa Here the Purāṇa was narrated.

*(7) Nicakṣu—Vivakṣu—Nirvaktra
(8) Uṣṇa—Ukta—Bhuri
(9) Citraratha
(10) Śuciratha
(11) Br̥ṣnimant
(12) Suṣena

1 Va. 99, 308a. 2 Mt. 271, 29; Va. 99, 308.
3 Mt. 272, 1; Va. 99, 310.
4 Va. 99, 249-277; Mt. 50, 56-87; Va. IV, 21; Bh. IX, 22, 33-44; Kat-sar-sag; R. Sen from Kalpa-Sūtra of Bhadravāhu pp. 155, 156.

* The correct form of the name seems to be Nṛcakṣas which means an observer, a father, a guardian of men (पुत्रोऽक्र, पिता, पालक) as stated in the Āraṇya Samhitā of the Sāmaveda II, 2, as well as in the Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa I, 5, 3; 19.
The Bhāgavata Purāṇa inserts one Sahasrānīka between (4) Śatānīka I and (5) Aśvamedhadatta; but it is certain that this Sahasrānīka is a spurious creation. Because Aśvamedhadatta is mentioned to be the son of Śatānīka I in the Vāyu,¹ the Viṣṇu² and the Matsya³; and the Mahābhārata explicitly states that Śatānīka I, the son of Janamejaya Pārikṣita begat Aśvamedhadatta on the daughter of the king of Videha.⁴ Again, the Vāyu introduces Ruca between (13) Sutirtha and (14) Nṛcakṣu and the Viṣṇu calls him Rca; but the Matsya and the Bhāgavata omit him and say that Nṛcakṣu was the son of Sunītha.⁵ We have come across many cases like this, particularly in the case of Śala, Dala

¹ Va. 99, 257. ² Vs. IV. 21, 3. ³ Mt. 50, 66. ⁴ भवती वधुराणां हि दृष्टे जयांति पालानीकः प्रकृतं च पालानीकसं देशां पुत्र वधुराण देवारुपमसः हुरिते II Gd. MBh. I, 95, 86. ⁵ Mt. 50, 82; Bh. IX, 22, 41.
and Bala, the sons of the Aikṣvāka king Pāripātra. The truth is that Rca was the elder brother of Nṛcakṣu and reigned for a short time, and after him, his brother Nṛcakṣu became the king. The Vāyu is right when it says that there were 25 future kings\(^1\) from and including Adhisimakṛṣṇa to the last king Kṣemaka. Again the grandfather of Udayana is named Sahasrāṇiḍa by Bhāsa,\(^2\) and Vasudāman by the Purāṇas\(^3\) Sahasrāṇiḍa was a contemporary of Bimbisāra and received religious instructions from Mahāvīra.\(^4\) The Jainas call him Sasāṇiḍa which is evidently a softening of ‘Sahasāṇiḍa,’ the Prakrit equivalent of the Sanskrit form ‘Sahasrāṇiḍa.’ Sasāṇiḍa was probably the same as the Puranic Vasudāman and had his son Satāniḍa II. Udayana was the son of Satāniḍa II. The Kathā-sarit-sāgara says that Satāniḍa’s son Sahasrāṇiḍa was the father of Udayana. Thus the Kathāsarit-sāgara reverses the order certainly wrongly. Vinayavijayagahanin in his Subodhikī commentary to the Kalpasūtra draws from old Jain sources and says that when Mahāvīra visited the town Kauśāmbi, the king of that place was Satāniḍa and the queen was Mrgāvatī.\(^5\) The Kathā-sarit-sāgara, in reversing the order says that Mrgāvatī was the wife of Sahasrāṇiḍa the son of Satāniḍa.\(^6\) But this is wrong for Mrgāvatī was the queen of Satāniḍa II. Then again the names Mrdu and Tigma after Nṛpaṇjaya, the 19th descendant from Arjuna, indicate that Nṛpaṇjaya’s first son was Mrdu (or blunt) and that his second son was Tigma (or sharp).

Thus according to this adjustment, Udayana was the 22nd in descent from Parikṣit and Vahīnara was the 23rd.

---

\(^1\) Va. 99, 277.  \(^2\) Car. Lec. p. 58.  \(^3\) Mt. 50, 85; Vs. IX, 21, 3.  
\(^4\) R. D. Sen’s Historical Essays P. 156 (from Kalpasūtra of Bhadravāhu).  
\(^5\) तत्त: क्रेण कौशल्या गतत्वव क्षतानीकी राजा, यागवती देवी, विकथा प्रतिकारी शालैनायकमण्डपणक; सुवर्णमालोष्ट्र। तत्त, ता च शालैका यागवत्वा यवम्। comm. Kalpasūtra VI. 118.  
\(^6\) Kat-sag-sag. ch. IX. 29; 39; 69; 71.
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CALCULATION OF DR. FLEET CLEARLY WRONG

From the accession of Parikṣit to the accession of Udayana 22 generations or 616 years (=22×28) passed away.

Now Dr. Fleet calculates mainly from the Śánti, the Anuśāsana, the Ásvamedha and the Áśrāmavāsika Parvans of the Mahābhārata that after the great war Yudhiṣṭhira reigned for 20 years only (J. R. A. S. 1911) and Mr. Pargiter follows it up (Dynasties of the Kali Age). Both of them think that the period of 36 years mentioned in the Mahābhārata¹ should be counted from the installation of Yudhiṣṭhira as Yuvarāja by Dhṛtarāṣṭra, before the Rājasūya. But the calculation of Dr. Fleet is wrong for the following reasons:

(i) The Mahābhārata does not and cannot mention all the events of the reign of Yudhiṣṭhira. It mentions only the important events, and the unimportant, events have been justly omitted; and although the sum of the periods between the important events appear to be 20 years approximately as shown by Dr. Fleet, there were intervening periods during which many things unworthy of the notice of the chroniclers happened. Consequently these small uneventful periods have been omitted from the Mahābhārata which however remembers that Yudhiṣṭhira observed portents of evil at the 36th year of his reign¹; and it is no good distorting this clear meaning of the verse we have quoted below from the Mauśalaparvan.

(ii) Śrīkiṣṇa observed² similarly that one dark lunar

¹ पद्येण मेल क्रीत क्रियापदः \| दन्तपत्रो द्वितीया शास्त्रविद्यानि निर्मितानि सुर्खितः \| Gd. MBh. Maus. 1, 1.
² एवं परशुराम दीपेति स प्राप्त कालपक्षम् \| चुरुद्रायामनश्चतान् हस्ता प्राबलं दिव्यं \| Gd. MBh. Maus. 2, 18—20.

Kumb. MBh. Maus. 3, 18—20.
fortnight consisted of 13 days only just on the eve of the Bhārata war, and that the same thing happened just before the civil war of the Yadus, and there were eclipses on both the days. He calculated mentally the period between the two events, and was convinced that the 36th year was come (or was over) after the Bhārata war.

(iii) Gāndhārī while on the battle field of Kurukṣetra inflicted a curse on Śrīkṛṣṇa that the latter with his kinsmen, friends, and sons would be killed at the 36th year after the great Mahābhārata war.¹

It is unfortunate that these decisive statements in the Mahābhārata have not been noticed by Dr. Fleet. Accordingly we conclude that the reign-period of Yudhiṣṭhira was one of 36 years, and that the calculation of Dr. Fleet is unacceptable.

Thus the Mahābhārata war took place 652 years (=616 +36) before the accession of Udayana i. e. before 500 B. C. This places the date of the great battle about 1152 B. C.

We shall now see how far these dates are supported by the figures given for the reign-periods of the successive kings of the Bāhradratha dynasty from Sōmadhi to Ripuṇjaya.

Corruptions have crept into the expressions for the reign-periods, but most of them are recoverable as the following table will show. The reign-period of Śrūtaśravas, the son of Sōmadhi, is stated as 64 years (Catuḥṣaṣṭhi), but so high a figure is absurd for two reasons. First, we have heard of no king in this world having reigned so long as 64 years. Secondly, his father Sōmadhi enjoyed an exceptionally long reign of 50 years after which the son Śrūtaśravas could reign

¹ लम्यं पुष्पिन्य वर्षं चट्टिशि समदृत्ति ।
हस्ताविषिदेशतामाधि चुतप्रयो वन्यफर ।
कुञ्जः निर्माण निर्माणं समवाय दिनम। ॥
² Gd. MBh. Stri. 25, 44.

I am indebted to my colleague Professor Vanamali Vedantatirtha for this reference.
only for a few years just like Edward VII after Victoria. The line most probably ran as युत्रवाचः तु षट् च सम्मासः खानवे &c. Afterwards, the letters in the line have been brought closer together and षट्च necessarily modified into प्रतिः.

Mr. Jayaswal is quite reasonable when he holds that 6 and 8 years should be allotted to Śuci and Drśhasena respectively. (J. B. O. R. S. Sept. 1915).

Lastly, the absurd figure 64 (चतुः षऽत (Va) for Bhubata-Subrata-Anubrata is rejected and the reasonable figure 24 is accepted because चतुः षऽत may mean four times six when it is recognized that there is and इ at the end.

There is another reason for which the reduction of the long reign-periods of the four kings mentioned above appears legitimate. In the Mahābhārata Parikṣit is spoken of as having protected his subjects for 60 years. The commentator Nilakaṇṭha says that this period is to be taken from the birth of Parikṣit and not from his accession. Nilakaṇṭha is perfectly right in his interpretation and is thus justified in reducing the reign-period of Parikṣit to 24 years because there is the explicit statement in the Mahābhārata that Parikṣit was quite old when he was sixty years of age. At this time the Nāga king killed him. Nilakaṇṭha correctly remembers that Parikṣit ascended the throne when he was 36 years old and thus he supports us in rejecting the calculation of Dr. Fleet mentioned before. Accordingly the long periods allotted to the four kings most probably represent their life periods. Each of them is marked with an asterisk.

1 प्रति ब्रह्मज्ञे पिता पश्चिमवर्षीयपालवत् | Gd. MBh. I, 49, 17.
2 अबाकः न तु राजजागरम् | Nilakaṇṭha.
3 परिप्रेक्ष्यो ब्रह्म कथितविः जनानवत् | Gd. MBh., I, 49, 26.
### Accepted reign-periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sōmādhi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>eVa 50; bMt. 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Srutasravas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Va. Mt. Bd. 64 or 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayutāyus</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Va. 26; bk Mt. 26; Bd. 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niramitra</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Va. 500; Mt. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suksattra</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>eVa. 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhatkarman</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Va. 23; Mt. 23; Bd. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senajit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Va. 23; Mt. 50; Bd. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srutañjaya</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>eVa. 35; fg Mt. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibhu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>eVa. 28; gm Va. 35; Mt. 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sucī</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Va. 58 but see J. B. O. R. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṣema</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Va. 28; Mt. 28; Bd. 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Subrata</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Va. 64 or 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmauetra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Va. 5; Bd. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivṛti</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Va. 58; Mt. 58; Bd. 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinetra-Suśrama</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Va. 38; Mt. 28; Bd. 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dṛḍhasena</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>fVa. 58, but see J. B. O. R. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumati-Mahīnetra</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Va. 33; Mt. 33; Bd. 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucala-Acala</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Va. 22; Mt. 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunetra</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Va. 40; Mt. 40; Bd. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyajit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>eVa. 30; Hall's Bd. 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvajit</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>dfmVa. 24; ek Mt. 25; Bd. 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripuñjaya</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Va. 50; Mt. 50; Bd. 50.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 638 years.**

The date of accession of Caṇḍa Prādyōta has been determined to be 513 B.C. Hence the sum total of the reign periods of the successive kings of the Barhadratha dynasty places the Mahābhārata battle in 1151 B.C. \( (=513 + 638) \).

Now we shall make some astronomical calculations. At the very outset, we may inform our readers that the method of calculation adopted by Babu Bankim Candra Chattōpādhyāya is defective inasmuch as Bankim Babu gratuitously
assumes that at the time of the death of Bhīṣma Sāntanava, the Uttarāyaṇa commenced on the 28th or the 29th day of Solar Māgha. The Bīsuddha Siddhānta Pañjikā (which calculates from the British and French Nautical Almanacs) for 15 or 16 successive years will convince the reader that the Suklā Aṣṭamī of the lunar month of Māgha, on which the great hero expired, may fall on any day between the 4th or the 5th day of the Solar Māgha and the 5th day of the Solar Phālguna. In the year in which the intercalary month is added, the Māghī Suklā Aṣṭamī falls back almost towards the first part of the Solar Phālguna. Hence the assumption of Bankim Babu that the winter-solstice occurred at that time on the 28th or the 29th day of Solar Māgha is purely gratuitous. Accordingly his calculation that by the period between the time of the Mahābhārata events and our time the Uttarāyaṇa has receded by 49 days, is unacceptable.

We have got to adopt other methods of doing it. Varāhamihira says¹ “At one time the sun’s southward course commenced on his reaching the middle of Āśleśā and its northward course on its reaching the beginning of Dhaniśṭhā; this must have been the case, as we find it so recorded in in ancient books.” Bhaṭṭotpala, the commentator of the Bṛhat Samhitā elucidates the verse quoted below by stating² that “in ancient books” means “in old books of astronomy like those of Parāsara &c.”

Varāhamihira himself says³ in speaking about Pauliśa Siddhānta that the Dakṣināyaṇa during the time of Pulīśa, as in Parāsara’s time, used to take place when the sun was at the middle of Āśleśā. In the Vedāṅga Jyōtiṣa ascribed

¹ भाषा वाणीच्यासूत्रम्यमुवम्ये लिंग निषायम्।
नूमं कदाचिदास्त्राद वैनीके पूर्वेषणे पु॥ Br. Samh. III, 1.
² पूर्वेषणे ष्ठ, पाराधारिष्। Bhaṭṭotpala.
³ भाषा ग्रांथादास्त्राद यदा निहत्ति। किद्वास्तास्त्रिष्के युक्तमयं तदावरिष्॥ Pañca Siddhāntikā III, 5, 59.
to Lagadha we find the same statement\(^1\) namely that the Uttarāyana commenced with the sun at the beginning of Śravisṭhā and the Dakṣiṇāyana with the sun at the middle of Āśleṣā.

Parāśara himself says\(^2\) that when the Uttarāyana will commence with the sun not quite reaching the Śravisṭhā then there will be a cause of great fear. Garga also supports\(^3\) Parāśara in this respect. What is the cause of the great fear alluded to by Parāśara and Garga? The great fear is due to a prospect of a great slaughter of human beings.\(^4\)

Now there was only one astronomer Parāśara in ancient Indian history. He was probably the father of Vyāsa, and the mention of Brddha Parāśara, Madhya Parāśara, Brhat Parāśara &c. indicates that Parāśara’s works were elaborated and abridged by later writers on Astronomy, who rendered the works of Parāśara into easy Sanskrit and made further additions to it. Now all these go to show that at the time when Parāśara observed the heavens, the Uttarāyana used to commence with the sun at the beginning of Śravisṭhā i.e. at that time, the longitude of the sun was 293° 20’, as measured from the fixed point of Hindu astronomers. The fixed point is the end of the space called the Ṛvati and the beginning of the space called the Aśvini.

This year \(^i.e.\) in 1921 A. D., the sun enters the winter solstice on the 21st December at 21h 8m\(^5\).

\(^1\) प्रपण् ते चंनिकी२ सुबङ्कूण्डमचमाकुदकः।
सापोधं द्रविष्टाक्ष्य लात्रालाभवयोः। मया II Vedaṅga-Jyōt. 7.

\(^2\) तथा च पराःः—
भवामासी न च वाचसुहस्त्रां प्रथम्।
द्रविष्टाक्ष्य गो वा महाब्याम् I I Quoted by Bhaṭṭopala.

\(^3\) तथा च गंगः—
मया निमहलद्रामाँ च भज्जकमुतरावः।
आयो यो द्रविष्टोऽरागान्तरं निमहि। निमहि। I I Quoted by Bhaṭṭopala

\(^4\) दिर्म्क चूर्ति—जनाकु नागवति। Bhaṭṭopala.

\(^5\) English Nautical Almanac for 1921 p. 505
Now the astronomical date is measured from noon to noon. Hence 21st Dec. 21h. 8m. at the longitude of Greenwich gives us 22nd Dec. 9h. 8m. Greenwich civil date.

Adding 5h. 53m. 21s. for the difference in longitude of Ālipura we get

9h. 8m.
5h. 53m. 21s.

15h. 1m. 21s.

That is, the sun enters the winter-solstice at 15h. 1m. 21s. on the 22nd Dec. Ālipura civil date.

Thus the Bisuddha Siddhānta Pañjikā is sufficiently accurate in this respect as we find it there that the Śayana Makaramkrānti just begins at the end of 20 Dāndas, 57 Palas on the 7th Pauṣa (the 22nd December).

Now the exact moment of the sun’s entering the winter-solstice could not be observed by the ancients. The very name ‘solstice’ indicates that. They were guided by the length of the day-time i. e. by the interval between the rising and the setting of the sun. When the length of the day just appreciably began to increase, the ancients used to consider that day to be the day of Uttarāyaṇa.

Even in our times we find¹ that the length of the day on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daṇḍas</th>
<th>Palas</th>
<th>Vipalas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th Pauṣa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th „</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th „</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in the lengths of the days on the above successive dates are so very small that they do not come within the calculation of the astronomer. It is only on the 9th Pauṣa (or the 24th December) that the length of the day just appreciably increases.

¹ The Bisuddha Siddhānta Pañjikā for 1921 (calculated from the English and French Nautical Almanacs) pp. 361—64
The length of the Daṇḍas, Palas, Vipalas day on the 9th Pauṣa 26. 44 15
The Biṣuddha Siddhānta Pañjikā calculates the length of the day from the Krānti of the sun at apparent noon neglecting atmospheric refraction. The same thing is done also by the western astronomers.

In the English Nautical Almanac we find that the longitude of the sun on the 24th December, 1921 at Greenwich noon, is 272° 9′ 35″.

This longitude is measured from the first point of Aries. From this, if we subtract the distance between the first point of Aries and the fixed point adopted by Indian astronomers we will get the Ravisphuṭa on the 9th Pauṣa for Ālipura 5h. 53m. 21s. p. m.

The distance in degrees between the first point of Aries and the fixed point of the Indian astronomers is called the Ayanāṃśa by the Hindus.

To find this Ayanāṃśa on the 9th Pauṣa or the 24th December 1921, we observe that the Bengali year 1328 Śāla began on the 13th April at 8h. 21m. 50s. Ālipura civil date, as calculated from the tables of Rāghavānanda. The longitude of the sun at this moment, as calculated from the tables of Leverier = 22°. 37′. 31″.

The end of the year 1328 Śāla just happens at the end of 22 Daṇḍas and 6 Palas on the 30th Caitra or the 13th April 1922, as calculated from the tables of Rāghavānanda.

The Ayanāṃśa at this moment from Leverier’s Tables = 22° 38′ 10″.

Thus it is seen that during the whole year, the Ayanāṃśa has increased by 39″ (=22°. 38′. 10″.—22° 37′. 31″.) seconds. It is due to the slow movement of the first point of Aries.

Distributing this increment in the Ayanāṃśa throughout the whole year, we see that the Ayanāṃśa on the 9th Pauṣa or the 24th December is 22°. 37′. 58″.
Subtracting this Ayanāṃśa from the sun’s longitude on the 24th December at Greenwich noon i.e. at Ālipura 5h. 53m. 21s. p.m., we get

\[
\begin{align*}
272° &. 9’ &. 34” \\
22° &. 37’ &. 58” \\
\hline
249° &. 31’ &. 36”
\end{align*}
\]

This last result is the Ravisphuṭa or the sun’s longitude measured from the Hindu fixed point, on the 24th December or the 9th Pauṣa at Ālipura 5h. 53m. 21s. p.m. Exactly this result is calculated by the Bīṣuddha Siddhānta Pañjikā which gives the Ravisphuṭa as 8° 9’ 31” 36’’ or 249° 31’ 36’’ at Ālipura 5h. 53m. 21s. p.m.

Now the Uttarāyaṇa was observed by Parāśara to begin appreciably with the sun at 293° 20’ i.e. at the beginning of Śraviṣṭhā.

The difference between the two points

\[
\begin{align*}
293° &. 20’ \\
249° &. 31’ &. 36” \\
\hline
=43° &. 48° &. 24” \\
= & 157704”
\end{align*}
\]

The present rate of precession of equinoxes per annum =50”26 from Newcomb’s formula.

Hence this amount of precession has taken place in \( \frac{157704}{50.26} \approx 3137 \) 3838 5026 =3138 years approx. This places the time of observation of Parāśara in 1217 B.C. (=3138—1921).

This is quite resonable for the approximate date of the Mahābhārata war, because Parāśara belongs to the 3rd step above Arjuna Pāṇḍava. If Parāśara be assumed to have made his observation at about his 70th year when he was quite mature in intellect, the date of the Mahābhārata war falls roughly about 1153 B.C. because Arjuna was roughly about 50 years old at the time when he fought at the war.
Parāśara and Garga have said that there would be a great slaughter of human beings when there would be Uttarāyana with the sun not require reaching the beginning of Śraviṣṭhā. By the phrase 'not quite reaching' they probably meant to fix the sun's position just a degree behind the beginning of Śraviṣṭhā. If 71 years during which there is a precession of a degree, be subtracted from the time of observation of Parāśara and if the great slaughter of human beings alludes to the Kurukṣetra, the date 1146 B.C. (= 1217—71) is obtained, while if the old Sūrya-Siddhānta rate of 66 years for precession be subtracted, the date 1151 B.C. is obtained for the battle.

We know that there was a solar eclipse just on the eve of the battle of Kurukṣetra.1 We also know that on the 9th August 1896 A.D. there was a solar eclipse which was visible in the North Europe and Asia and we observed it to be a total eclipse in our boyhood. It is very interesting that hundred and sixty-nine cycles of the Chaldean Saros places the early occurrence of the eclipse just in 1151 B.C., the Saros consisting of 6585½ days.

Now let us recapitulate the various calculated dates of the great battle.

(1) Calculations from the Kōsala genealogy give us 1149 B.C.
(2) " " " Māgadha " " 1151 B.C.
(3) " " " Paurava " " 1152 B.C.
(4) Sum-total of the reign-periods of the successive kings of the Bārhadratha dynasty gives us .. .. .. 1151 B.C.
(5) The time of Parāśara's observation checks the date of the battle and places it about .. .. .. 1152 B.C.

1 Gd. MBh. VI, 3, 28, 32, 33. Particularly consult Nilakanṭha for the meaning the verses referred to here.
(6) The probable date of the battle from the Chaldean Saros .. .. .. 1151 B.C.

Accordingly we take circa. 1150 B.C. as the most probable date of the great battle. (cf. The Mathematical Theory of Probability.)

Pratt's calculations:—

Archdeacon Pratt's calculations may best be stated in his own words from a letter addressed by him to Professor Cowell, March 21st, 1862. (J. A. S. B. 1862, p. 51). 'In reply to your question, how did Colebrooke deduce the age of the Vedas from the passage which he quotes from the Jyotisha or Vedic Calendar in the Essay (Vol. I, p. 110)? I beg to send you the following remarks:

'In that passage it is stated that the winter solstice was at the time the Vedas were written (?), at the beginning of Sravishtha or Dhanishtha and the summer solstice at the middle of Aslesha.

'Now the Hindus divided the Zodiac into twenty-seven equal parts, called lunar mansions, of 13° 20' each. Their names are

4. Rohini 13. Hastā 22. Śravaṇa

'The position of these lunar mansions among the stars is determined by the stars themselves and not by the sun, and is therefore unaffected by the precession of equinoxes. If,
therefore, we can determine their position at any one epoch, we know their position for all time. The Hindu books furnish us with the requisite information. In the translation of the Sūrya-Siddhānta, published in the Bibliotheca Indica, Chap. VIII, p. 62, you will find that the conspicuous star Regulus, or $\alpha$ Leonis, is placed by the Hindu astronomers at 4 signs, 9 degrees from the beginning of these lunar mansions (or asterisms as they are called). As 4 signs equal one-third of the whole zodiac, they equal 9 lunar mansions. Hence the position of Regulus is $9^\circ$ in Maghā, the 10th lunar mansion.

But by the Jyotisha, the summer solstice was in the middle ofĀśleṣā, the 9th lunar mansion, at the epoch of the Vedas: therefore Regulus was half a lunar mansion + $9^\circ$, that is, $15^\circ$. 40', east of the summer solstice at that time.

By the nautical Almanac for 1859, the position of Regulus is given as follows:

Right ascension, January 1st, 1859.....10h. 0m. 53s.
North declination, ditto $12^\circ$. 39'. 12''7

From this I obtain by spherical trigonometry, the following result:

Longitude of Regulus, January 1st 1859...147°. 52'. 30''

Hence Regulus was east of summer solstice at that date by $57^\circ$. 52'. 30''. The summer solstice had therefore retrograded through $42^\circ$. 12'. 30''=42°.208 since the epoch of the Vedas. As the equinoxes and the solstices move backward on the ecliptic at the rate of 1° in 72 years, it must have occupied $72 \times 42^\circ.208=3039$ years to effect this change.

Hence the age of the Vedas was 3039 on 1st January 1859; or this date is 1181 B. C., that is, the early part of the twelfth century before the Christian era.

This differs from Colebrooke's result: he makes it the fourteenth century. Two degrees more of precessional motion would lead to this; but where he gets these from,
I do not know, unless it be by taking the constellations loosely, instead of the exact lunar mansions. * * *, therefore I have no doubt the lunar mansion, and not the constellation, is what this Jyotisha refers to and the early part of the twelfth century is the correct result.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtavaman</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛti</td>
<td>131, 132, 133, 134, 139 140</td>
<td>119, 229, 230, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛttikā</td>
<td>141, 142 143, 144, 146</td>
<td>229, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtī</td>
<td>193, 196, 197, 269</td>
<td>253, 258, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtvi</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kṣema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛmi</td>
<td>107, 108, 109</td>
<td>Kṣemakā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kṣemadhanvan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇachandra</td>
<td>132, 142, 151, 166, 167, 194, 196 201</td>
<td>118, 130, 136, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Kṣemāri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekeya</td>
<td>134, 135</td>
<td>Kṣemya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekeya</td>
<td>70, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketumant</td>
<td>24, 153, 154</td>
<td>Ganga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern, Dr.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Ganges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keltic</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Gañparājas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevalīā</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Ganatas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keśādhvaja</td>
<td>138, 143, 144</td>
<td>Gandhakāli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keśin</td>
<td>138, 179, 188, 208</td>
<td>Gándhamadāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāikeyi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gayā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśika</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Garga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koraṇḍavarga</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Garbhahāũmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koraṇvyā</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Gavān Ḍaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopaṇḍhaṇa</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Gōtama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōmārabhacca</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Gāthās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrakalambaka</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Gāthīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōṣaliadevi</td>
<td>147, 150, 152, 203, 268</td>
<td>77, 158, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṭuliya</td>
<td>213, 214</td>
<td>Gāndhārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupleya</td>
<td>219, 227</td>
<td>Gāṛtasmada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumārabhṛtya</td>
<td>140, 208</td>
<td>Gāṛgṛya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumārabhṛtyā</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Gāḷavā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaurava</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Gāvalaṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaurava</td>
<td>97, 100</td>
<td>Giribṛaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauravya</td>
<td>75, 78, 102</td>
<td>Girīśendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauśālyā</td>
<td>123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 131</td>
<td>Gṛtasmadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauśāṃbi</td>
<td>31, 32, 34, 44</td>
<td>Geiger, Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauśāṃbi</td>
<td>132, 134, 141, 230</td>
<td>George I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauśāmarya</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>George II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauśārya</td>
<td>127, 128, 133, 135, 137</td>
<td>George III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūpika</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>George VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūpi̱ka</td>
<td>78, 151, 202</td>
<td>George V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūshikī</td>
<td>189, 209</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūssya</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gōmant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūsūya</td>
<td>127, 128, 133, 135, 137</td>
<td>Göti̱rātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛatujīt</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Götra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krānti</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Gödāvari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krittika</td>
<td>193, 195</td>
<td>Göpāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krōṭrī</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Göpavana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gólás</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gövišanaka</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama, 11, 12, 16, 37, 165, 213, 246, 249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauđa</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauri</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks, 96, 119, 186, 225, 226, 228, 249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>265, 266, 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gḥaggar</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gḥora</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gḥōsā</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakravartin</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čakṣu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čapḍa Pradyōta, 72, 76, 230, 236, 237, 244, 246, 247, 262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čapḍa Mahāśena</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čapḍāḷāsōka</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čapḍāḷa</td>
<td>233, 246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čaturanga, 110, 113, 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>238, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candanōdakadundubhi, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candragiri, 119, 120, 128, 130, 136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candragupta, 227, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantharapavata</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candrāvalōka, 119, 120, 130, 136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capetian</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campā, 110, 111, 112, 113, 214, 216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāyamāna, 9, 10, 11, 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čaṇa</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čākra</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čākroyaṇa</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cākapya, Viṣṇupuṇṭa</td>
<td>218, 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāyamāna, 10, 90, 161, 175, 187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čārāyapa</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrāratha</td>
<td>255, 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrā</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrāṅgada</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćetaka</td>
<td>212, 213, 215</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćeti</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćetiya</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćedi</td>
<td>152, 199, 202</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćedideśa</td>
<td>151, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćeylone</td>
<td>239, 243, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćellānā</td>
<td>121, 213, 215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćumari</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtius</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćaitra</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćaitrāratha</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćaitrārathī</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćaitrīff full moon</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćaidya</td>
<td>22, 61, 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćaidyavata</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćoggin Brown</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćowell</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćolebrooke</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćyavana, 14, 58, 82, 83, 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćyrene</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćrookback</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhāṭṭopāḍhyāya, Bankiṃ Candra</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta, 97, 171, 211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charpentier, Dr. Jarił</td>
<td>238n, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhala</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhaldean</td>
<td>268, 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhinese</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobi</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatukarṇa</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janaka, 12, 18, 30, 67, 94, 97, 101</td>
<td>133, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 160, 169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jantu</td>
<td>31, 32, 33, 35, 66, 99</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamadagnayab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamadagni</td>
<td>24, 93, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayā</td>
<td>139, 149, 144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayatsena</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čahnuratha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayatsena</td>
<td>68, 69, 70, 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadraṇtha, 19, 25, 103, 104, 105, 114, 115, 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasena</td>
<td>251, 252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaratkarū</td>
<td>132, 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jārā</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarāśandha, 64, 66, 67, 68, 82, 157, 169, 213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaritārī</td>
<td>167, 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaritṛ</td>
<td>167, 175, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javana</td>
<td>95, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahnāvi</td>
<td>198, 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahnū, 20, 21, 67, 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahnū I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahnukulājā</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāṭukarnya</td>
<td>157, 158, 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānakī</td>
<td>140, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānanantī</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jārasandhi</td>
<td>25, 68, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jālika</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāhnāvi</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jihvāvant</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivaka</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lackland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimini, 124, 125, 126, 127, 131, 141, 195, 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāntrikas</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyāmāgaha</td>
<td>150, 151, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyeṣṭhā</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyōtis</td>
<td>44, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Range</td>
<td>Dynasty/Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193, 269, 270</td>
<td>Jyotishya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119, 130, 136</td>
<td>Taksaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Taksasilā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Tatakṣaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tanuja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tapati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 42, 58, 60</td>
<td>Tama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Tamaramāṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Tāṇḍya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223, 224</td>
<td>Tāranāth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119, 120, 130, 136</td>
<td>Tāraṇīpātha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Tārāpati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 25, 26, 107, 235</td>
<td>Tālaṇjaṅgha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256, 257, 258</td>
<td>Tīgarasena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Tittirasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 43, 46, 48, 52</td>
<td>Tittirasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Timidhvaja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Tirthakarasena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196</td>
<td>Tilak, B. G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tiliri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73, 79, 96, 189</td>
<td>Tirtha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Teutonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 41, 42</td>
<td>Tumburu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158, 159, 160</td>
<td>Tura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Turamaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Turkistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94, 95</td>
<td>Turva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 94, 95, 96, 97</td>
<td>Turvasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 94, 95, 96</td>
<td>Turvasu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 86, 203</td>
<td>Tr̕sha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Treqaṣu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Trāsasuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Trāṇavindu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 43, 44</td>
<td>Taṭāiri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 93, 135</td>
<td>Trasadasyu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Trīkhāṇḍasessa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253, 258, 262</td>
<td>Trinetra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Trilochana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Trīśālā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Trividhātva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Traivṛṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Tryarupa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Thānāswar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Therapeutās</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, 90</td>
<td>Dākṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Dākṣipātha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263, 264</td>
<td>Dākṣāpāyaṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Daddarapura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Dadhiśāhana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 155</td>
<td>Dāpada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Dāpāddhāra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229, 256</td>
<td>Dāpādpāpiṣṭa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Dabhi Tībi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 29</td>
<td>Dabhiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 6, 145, 146, 203</td>
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p. 104 l. 3 „ Brhatkarman
p. 104 l. last „ Brhadiṣu
p. 112 l. 8 „ Brhanmanas
p. 116 in table below for Yasōdevi
p. 120 in table „ Bhānuscandra
p. 122 l. 7 „ Ayōḍyā
p. 122 l. 8 „ Short sime
p. 122 l. 8 „ drom
p. 122 l. 14 „ his
p. 123 l. 8 „ this
p. 123 l. 25 „ Ābhimanyu
p. 127 l. 12 „ Abhīnyu
p. 127 in table „ Panḍu
p. 131 l. 21 „ this
p. 134 in table „ Puluṣa
p. 134 in table „ Kṛajaṇaḷiṅkya
p. 135 l. 6 „ Āṭṭara
p. 136 l. 4 „ Saṅkhana
p. 136 l. 12 „ Divāḍāsa
p. 136 in table „ Singhra
p. 138 l. 9 „ Śrāddhavaja
p. 140 l. 12 „ Kṛta
p. 142 l. 12 „ Kṛti
p. 142 l. 16 „ Kṛta
p. 143 l. 8 „ detate
p. 144 in table „ Śrutāyus
p. 144 in table „ Suprāśva
p. 144 in table „ Saṅjaya
p. 144 in table „ Yājinvalkya
p. 146 footnote „ विशिष्टकङ्किपु
p. 149 l. 13 „ Madayanti
p. 157 l. 28 „ Atriśtra
p. 159 l. 7 „ Yajūvacas
p. 160 l. 9 „ Prācinayōgya
p. „ l. 10 „ Puluṣa's
p. „ l. 11 „ Prācināśāla
p. „ l. 23 „ Kaśyupa
p. 162 l. 18 „ eighth
p. „ l. in table „ (7), (18), (19) etc.
p. 193 l. in table „ (17), (18), (19) etc.
p. „ l. 11 „ remaining eminent in
p. „ l. 12 „ Kaśi
p. 169 „ „ Chapter XV
p. 175 l. 9 „ Śamvara
p. 176 l. 4 „ Sukta
p. 178 l. 4 „ Sarasvati
p. 198 l. 23 „ Etasa
p. 199 l. 17 „ Bhāgiratdi
p. 200 l. 26 "Yamunā" "Yamunā"

p. 209 l. 25 "Kuṣi" "Kuṣi"

p. 212 l. 20 "one" "one of"

p. 213 l. 11 "Kṛṣaṇā" "Kṛṣaṇa"

p. 219 l. 17 "thorne" "throne"

p. 254 l. 20 "Śatānīka I" "Śatānīka I"

p. 255 l. 13 "53" "563"

Other errors, if any, may be in the diacritical marks and will not present any difficulty.