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Not the truth which a man possesses or believes himself to possess, but the sincere attempt which he has made to reach the truth, constitutes his worth. For not through the possession of truth, but through inquiry after truth, are developed those powers in which his ever-increasing perfection consists. Possession makes the mind stagnant, inactive, proud. If God held in His right hand all truth, and in His left only the ever-active impulse to search for truth, even with the condition that I must for ever err, and said to me, "Choose!" I should bow before His left hand and say, "Father, give! Pure truth belongs to Thee alone!" — LESSING.
TO

THE SACRED MEMORY OF MY PARENTS

KĀLĪPRASĀD CHANDA AND SONĀTĀRĀ CHANDA.
FOREWORD.

In the second session of the Bengal Literary Conference held at Rajshahi in February, 1909, it was resolved to cause enquiries to be made and publish a monograph on the origin of the Bengali people. On behalf of the organisers of the Conference I requested my learned friend, Mr. Ramāprasād Chanda, who read a paper on this subject in the Conference, to undertake the work. It was originally contemplated that the monograph should be published in the Bengali language; but as Mr. Chanda was for writing out the results of his investigations in English for submitting them to the scrutiny of all scholars interested in the subject, I agreed to the proposal with the approval of my revered teacher and friend, Principal Ramendra Sundar Trivedi, who had moved the resolution in the Conference.

The delay in the publication is due partly to the many disadvantages under which the author had to work and partly to his natural diffidence. Meanwhile the Varendra Research Society was established and I placed funds at its disposal for the publication of this work.

I have now great pleasure in introducing this very interesting work to the public and hope it will stimulate further research in this new line.

SARAT KUMAR RAY

Dayārāmpur, Rajshahi,
June, 1916.

of Dighapatiya.
PREFACE.

These notes owe their publication to my esteemed friend Kūmār Sarat Kūmār Ray, M.A., M.R.A.S., of Dighapatiya, who has been pressing me to bring out a monograph on Bengali origins for the last seven years. The encouragement given by him as president of the Varendra Research Society and by my other colleagues, Mr. Akṣay Kumār Maitra, the Director of the Society, and Messrs. Rādhāgavinda Basāk, M.A., and Upendra-nāth Ghosāl, M.A., has sustained me in my investigations and emboldened me to submit the first instalment of the results to the public.

Chapter I is the outgrowth of a paper entitled India and Babylonia published in East and West of Bombay of 1905, and Chapter II of another paper published in the same magazine in 1907. The latter chapter in its present form was read in a public meeting held at Darjeeling in June, 1913, under the presidency of His Excellency Lord Carmichael, Governor of Bengal. In Chapter III I have failed to notice a very learned work on Vaiṣṇavism, Professor Brajendranāth Seal’s monograph submitted to the International Congress of Orientalists held in Rome in 1899. In this work the author mainly deals with the influence of Christianity on latter-day Vaiṣṇavism, but he recognises in Kṛṣṇa the historical founder of the religion. In Professor Seal’s opinion Vāsudeva, Śamkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha were originally hero-gods, and Śāṅḍilya derived the root ideas of the Bhāgavata philosophy from Vedic sources.

The anthropometric data embodied in the appendix are the results of measurements taken in 1909 and 1910. In 1909 Mr. Śaṣadhar Ray, the well-known Bengali writer, and myself, took measurements of the head form
of living subjects belonging to different sections of the Brāhman caste. In this work we were helped by Mr. Surya Kumār Guha, M.A., then Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rajshahi, Mr. Hem Chandra Ganguly, M.A., of the Rajshahi College, and other friends. In 1910 the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam placed me on special duty for ethnological researches for three months on the recommendation of the Hon’ble Mr. H. Sharp, M.A., then Director of Public Instruction. In taking measurements with instruments lent by the Ethnographical Survey of India during this period of deputation I was greatly assisted by Mahārāja Sir Giri jānāth Ray Bahadur, K.C.I.E., of Dinajpur, the Hon’ble Mahārāja Sir Manindra Chandra Nandi, K.C.I.E., of Kāśimbāzār, Mahāsāy Tārak Chandra Ghose of Bhag alpur, Paṇḍit Binodihari Vidyābinod of Bhātpāḍā, Dr. Mohini Mohan Ghosh of Champanagar, Bhagalpur, Principal Rāmendra Sundar Trivedi of Calcutta, and Mr. Rākhālāḍā Banerji of the Calcutta Museum, to all of whom I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness.

My thanks are also due to Professor Srish Chandra Śāstrī who drew my attention to some of the passages of the Mahābhāṣya quoted in the text and helped me in explaining their meaning, and to Mr. Akṣay Kumar Maitra and Professors Upendra Nath Ghosal and Ramesh Chandra Mazumdar who have rendered me occasional help in correcting the proofs.

The system of transliteration adopted is that recommended by the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society with the exception of \( \eta \) for \( \text{m} \). Owing to a large number of quotations it has not been possible to follow the system consistently. Unfortunately a considerable number of mistakes also have escaped my notice.

RAMĀPRASĀD CHANDA.

VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY,
Rajshahi, June, 1916.
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THE INDO-ARYAN RACES.

CHAPTER I.

THE ĀRYAS AND THE ANĀRYAS OF VEDIC INDIA.

The dawn of history is heralded in India by the hymns sung by the Rṣis and enshrined in the Rgveda Saṁhitā. These hymns reveal two hostile peoples in the Land of the Seven Rivers now called the Punjab—the deva-worshipping Ārya and the deva-less and rite-less Dasyu or Dāsa. The first problem that demands the attention of students of the anthropological history of India is,—who were these Dasyus or non-Āryas of Vedic India?

It is commonly assumed that in the four-fold division of castes (varṇa=colour) the aborigines, who submitted to, or were subdued by, the Āryan invaders, were represented by the Śūdras. "It is reasonable to reckon the Śūdra of the later texts as belonging to the aborigines who had been reduced to subjection by the Aryans."* But this view does not accord well with the data in hand.

The status of a Śūdra of the later Vedic age resembles that of slaves or serfs of Europe. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 29) it is said of the Śūdra: "One like a Śūdra shall be born in thy line, the servant of another, who may be expelled or slain at will." According to the Pañcabimiṣa Brāhmaṇa (VI. i. 11) a Śūdra, even if prosperous (bahu-paśu, 'having many cows') could not be other than a servant; his business was the washing of the feet of his superiors (pādāvanejya).* This accords well with Manu (VIII. 413-414, 417) who says:—

"The Śūdra, whether bought or unbought, should be made to act as a slave (dāsyam), for the Śūdra was created by the Self-existent for the service of the Brāhman.

"Even if freed by his master, the Śūdra is not released from servitude; for this (servitude) is innate in him: who then can take it from him?

"A Brāhman may take possession of the goods of a Śūdra without any hesitation, for nothing that belongs to him is his own, he is one whose property may be taken away by his master."

About the different ways of making slaves or Śūdras, Manu (VIII. 415) writes:—

"A war-captive, one serving as a slave for food, one born (of a female slave) within the house, one bought, one received as a gift, one inherited from the father, and one condemned to act as a slave

as a punishment,—these are the seven kinds of slaves.''

Some of these methods of making Śūdras, particularly enslaving a war-captive, must have been in vogue in the Vedic period. In the early Vedic period the Āryas were not only at war with Dāsa foes but also with Ārya foes. About the wars of the Rgvedic Āryas Professors Macdonell and Keith write:—

"Āryan foes (vṛtra) are referred to beside Dāsa foes, and there are many references to war of Āryan versus Āryan, as well as to war of Āryan against Dāsa. From this it can be fairly deduced that even by the time of the Rgveda the Āryan communities had advanced far beyond the stage of simple conquest of the aborigines. In the later Samhītās and Brāhmaṇas the wars alluded to seem mainly Āryan wars, no doubt in consequence of the fusion of Ārya and Dāsa into one community.'"*

It cannot be assumed that the Āryas treated Dāsa war-captives in one way, that is to say, made them slaves, and their Ārya war-captives in a different way, for the hymns breathe as bitter hatred of foes of one class as of the other. Therefore it is unreasonable to hold that the Śūdras of the Vedic period were recruited from among the aborigines alone.

For the true representatives of the Anāryyas of the Rgvedic age we should look, not to the

---

fourth order of the Vedic society, but to the fifth order, the Niṣādas. In the Rgveda the term pañcajanāh and its synonyms occur very often. According to Vāska (III. 8) the term means, "Gandharvas, manes, gods, demons, and monsters according to some, and the four varṇas according to the Upamanyus." But in two other places (X. 3. 5, 7) Vāska himself explains pañca-krṣi of the Rgveda as "pañca manusyaajātāni", 'five classes of men', which is explained by the scholiast as the four varṇas with the Niṣādas as the fifth. The author of the Brhad-devatā attributes this interpretation to Sākata-yana also (VII. 69). Niṣādas are first named as such in the Rudrādhyāya of the Vajurveda together with the Vrātās (nomads), Takṣans (carpenters), Rathakāras (chariot-makers), Kulālas (potters), Karmāras (blacksmiths), Puṇjiṣṭhas (fowlers), Śvanins (dog-keepers), and Mrgayus (hunters). The Mahābhārata (XII. 59. 94-97) contains the following account of the origin of the Niṣādas:—

"Vena, a slave of wrath and malice, became unrighteous in his conduct towards all creatures. The Rṣis, those utterers of Brahma, slew him with kuśa blades (as their weapon) inspired with mantras. Uttering mantras the while, those Rṣis pierced the right thigh of Vena. Thereupon, from that thigh, came out a short-limbed person on earth, resembling a charred brand, with blood-red eyes and black hair. Those utterers of Brahma then said unto him,—Niṣāda, sit here. From him have sprung the Niṣādas, viz. those wicked
tribes that have the hills and the forests for their abode, as also those hundreds and thousands of others, called Mlecchas, residing on the Vindhya mountains.” *

The same story is repeated in many of the Purāṇas. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (I. 13) the Niśāda is described as “of the complexion of a charred stake, with flattened feature and dwarfish stature.”. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (IV. 14. 44) describes the Niśāda as “black like crow, very low statured, short armed, having high cheek bones, low-topped nose, red eyes and copper-coloured hair.” † In the Padma Purāṇa (II. 27. 42—43) it is said, “His (Niśāda’s) descendants are settled in the hills and forests; the Niśādas, Kirātas, Bhillas, Nāhalkas, Bhramaras, Pulindas, and other Mleccha tribes addicted to vices are all sprung from his body.” These epic and Purānic legends evidently contain genuine traditions relating to the physical characters of the aborigines whom the Vedic Āryas met in the plains of Northern India. The Niśādas were too numerous to be annihilated and too powerful to be enslaved or expelled en masse. The Āryas were, therefore, compelled to meet them half way. In the Pañca-viṃśa Brāhmaṇa (XVI. 6. 7) the performer of the Viśvajit sacrifice is required “to live for three days among the Niśādas.” In the Śrauta Sūtra

* P. C. Ray’s translation.
† कालक्रोधस्मिष्टकोष्ठकः श्रवणांमतलाभम्।
श्रवणांमतलाभम् रक्षणांमतलाभम्।
of Kātyāyana (I. 12) and in the Mīmāṃsa Sūtra (VI. 1. 51-52) of Jaimini, Vedic texts are referred to that provided that Brāhman priests should make chiefs who were Niśādas by descent offer certain sacrifices.

In the mediæval Sanskrit literature, the barbarians of the Vindhya hills, belonging to the Niśāda stock according to the Purāṇas, are called Śabaras, Pulindas, and Kirātas. Bāṇa, who flourished in the first half of the seventh century A.D., thus describes a Savara youth in his Harṣacarita:—

"The young mountaineer (savara-yuvā) had his hair tied into a crest above his forehead with a band of Śyāmaśālā creeper dark like lamp black, and his dark forehead was like a night that always accompanied him in his wild exploits . . . . . . ; his ear had an ear-ring of grass-like crystal fastened in it, and assumed a green hue from a parrot’s wing which ornamented it, . . . . . . his nose was flat, his lower lip thick, his chin low, his jaws full, his forehead and cheekbones projecting."

* This agrees fully with the Purāṇic description of the Niśādas.

Niśāda characteristics are still conspicuous in the Bhils and Gonds of the Vindhya regions. "The typical Bhil is small, dark, broad-nosed, and ugly, but well-built and active."

† "The Gonds are of small stature and dark in colour. Their bodies are well proportioned, but their

---

† Rajputana Gazetteer (Calcutta, 1908), p. 87.
features are ugly, with a round head, distended nostrils, a wide mouth and thick lips, straight and black hair, and scanty beard and moustache." * Dark skin, short stature and broad nose indicate the physical relationship of the Bhils and the Gonds with the old Nişādas on the one hand, and the hill tribes of Chota-Nagpur and Orissa and the Paniyans, the Kadirs, the Kurumbas, the Sholagas, the Irulas, the Mala Vedars and the Kanikars of Southern India, on the other. Sir Herbert Risley classifies these dark, short, and broad-nosed savage tribes of Central and Southern India together with the civilised speakers of Dravidian languages under the head Dravidian type. But the first thing that suggests itself at a glance at the summary of measurements of the castes and tribes of the so-called Dravidian type arranged in order of nasal index in Appendix IV p. cxiii of his work, *The People of India* (Calcutta, 1908), is that a line should be drawn between Parayan and Irula in this table. The average nasal indices will be found to vary from 69.1 to 80.0 above the line, whereas they vary from 80.9 to 95.1 below it. Mr. Thurston gives 84.1 as the average nasal index of the Irula of the Nilgiris. So if we exclude the Mukkuvan of Malabar, the Moormen of Ceylon and the Dom and Kurmi of Chota Nagpur and Bengal, we are left face to face with twenty-seven broad-nosed jungle tribes with average nasal indices above 84. We are, there-

* Central Provinces Gazetteer (Calcutta, 1908), p. 163.
fore, hardly justified in classifying these broad-nosed tribesmen with the upper-group unless it is admitted that the nose-form of the latter has been modified by the influence of environment. Instances may be cited in which physical environment has produced no change in the shape of the nose. Three of the hill tribes of Southern India, the Toda, the Badaga, and the Kota, are medium-nosed like the civilised speakers of the Dravidian languages, the average nasal index of the Toda being 74.9, of the Badaga 75.6 and the Kota 77.2. The climate of the plains of the United Provinces has failed to modify the nose-form of the Pasi toddy-drawer (average nasal index 85.4), Chamar (86.0), Musahar (86.1) and other lower castes.*

In this connection greater weight should be attached to the views of two competent observers who have lived long among the population of Southern India. Mr. Thurston holds that the jungle tribes of Southern India "are the microscopic remnants of a pre-Dravidian people." † Robert Sewell writes, "At some very remote period the aborigines of Southern India were overcome by hordes of Dravidian invaders and driven to the mountains and desert tracts, where their descendants are still to be found." ‡ This dark, short and broad-nosed race is termed Pre-Dravidian by the Anthropologists. But since these

* The People of India, appendix iv, p. cxiv.
† Castes and Tribes of Southern India (Madras, 1904), Vol. I, p. iv.
physical features characterised the Purānic Niṣādas and indicate the affinities of the Purānic Niṣādas with the so-called Pre-Draśvīdian, so I should prefer to classify the dark, short-statured and broad-nosed jungle tribes as the modern Niṣādas representing the old Niṣāda race. The modern Niṣādas speak dialects belonging to three different linguistic families. The Bhils speak an Indo-Aryan language; the Gonds, the Khonds, the Oraons and the jungle tribes of Southern India speak Draśvīdian languages; and the jungle tribes of Chota Nagpur and the Šavaras and Juangs of Ōrissa speak languages of the Munda family. If our hypothesis relating to the Niṣāda race is correct, we must assume that Mundā was originally spoken by the Niṣāda race as a whole, and Indo-Aryan and Draśvīdian dialects have been adopted by some of the Niṣāda tribes as a result of their contact with their more civilised neighbours.

The physical characters of the Niṣādas indicate their affinities with the Veddas of Ceylon and the Sakais and Semangs of the Malay Peninsula. Thurston writes in his introduction to Castes and Tribes of Southern India (p. 33):—

"Speaking of the Sakais, the same authorities [Skeat and Blagden] state that 'in evidence of their striking resemblance to the Veddas, it is worth remarking that one of the brothers, Sarasin, who had lived among the Veddas and knew them very well, when shown a photograph of a typical Sakai, at first supposed it to be a
photograph of a Veddā. For myself, when I saw the photographs of Sakais published by Skeat and Blagden, it was difficult to realise that I was not looking at pictures of Kadir, Paniyans, Kurumbas or other jungle folk of Southern India."

The linguistic researches of Schmidt and Sten Konow enable us to trace the affinities of the Nišādas over a still wider range. Pater Schmidt in his Die Mon-Khmer-Völker establishes the intimate relationship between the following groups of languages:—the Munda languages of India; Nikobar spoken in the Nikobar Islands; Khasi spoken in the Khasi hills of Assam; Palong, Wa, and Riang of Salwin basin, Upper Burma; Sakai and Semang languages of the Malay Peninsula; and the Mon-Khmer languages. "Dr. Konow, working from the point of view of India proper, has been able to show not only that Munda languages are connected with Mon-Khmer, but that the former must once have extended much more widely over India than they do at the present day. There is a line of dialect of the lower Himalaya, stretching from Kunawar in the Punjab to near Darjeeling, —Tibeto-Burman in character, but nevertheless retaining many surviving traces of an old language of undoubted Munda character." Schmidt calls these allied groups of languages Austro-Asiatic and further postulates the existence of an Austro-Asiatic race characterised by long or medium head, horizontal non-oblique eyes, broad nostrils, dark skin, more or less wavy hair and short or medium stature. As regards the home of the
Austro-Asiatic race, Schmidt thinks that the point from which the movement of these peoples began is to be found at the extreme western end of the region which they traversed.*

The other division of the Rgvedic people—the Ārya folk—did not constitute a homogeneous body. We discern two different social grades within its pale—the Rṣi or priest-poet clans such as the Atharvans, Āṅgitās, Bhṛgus (Jamadagnis), Atris, Vasiṣṭhas, Bharadvājas, Gotamas, Kaśyapas, Agastyas, Kaṇvas, and Viśvāmitras (Kuśikas); and the other class included the warrior tribes such as the Yadus, Turvaśas, Pūrus, Anus, Druhyus, Tṛtsus, Bharatas, Śṝjaśas, Ruṣamas, Matsyas, Cedis, Krivis and others. These two social grades did not form endogamous castes as yet; nor were the Rṣi clans collectively known as Brāhmans and the warrior tribes as Kṣatriyas. But the former constituted a regular social order with a hereditary calling—that of officiating as sacrificial priests and hymn-making, though they did not eschew other occupations. Scholars still differ as to whether the hymns of the Rgveda are mere appendages of the soma sacrifice or embody in many cases the sincere outpourings of poets only and not priests. It is not difficult to quote texts supporting either theory. But no reader of the hymns can deny that in many of them sacrifice overshadows everything else. In the evolution of religion rites come first and

hymns of praise after. Vajña or sacrificial rite without hymn was not unknown even in the Rgvedic age. A Rṣi prays in a hymn (X.105.8), "With Rk verses we shall kill those who are without Rk verses. A sacrifice without hymn (abrahamā yajña) cannot be pleasing to you."
The soma sacrifice had grown so complicated even in what may be termed the early Rgvedic age that it required the services of seven Ṛtvijś or sacrificial priests (II.1.2). Dakṣiṇā (sacrificial priest's fee) is deified and identified with Uṣas (Dawn) and in one verse (I.126.6) the giver of dakṣiṇā is thus extolled: "'All kinds (of objects) are intended for the givers of dakṣiṇā; the Sun in heaven shines for the givers of dakṣiṇā; the givers of dakṣiṇā attain long life and immortality.'" The way in which dakṣiṇā is spoken of in this and in the other hymns indicates that the giving of dakṣiṇā, that is to say, the employment of sacrificial priests, was an essential part of a sacrificial ceremony in the Rgvedic age. And that the office of the priest was in many cases hereditary is amply demonstrated by the hymns of what are called the family books of the Rgveda—the eight mandalas from the second to the ninth inclusive, attributed respectively to Gr̥tsamada of the Bhṛgu clan, Viśvāmitra, Vāmadeva of the Gotama clan, Atri, Bharadvāja, Vaśiṣṭha, Kāṇva, and Aṅgiras and their descendants. Most of the hymns of the first book are attributed to poets of one or other of these clans or of other Rṣi clans already mentioned. Of
course there were exceptions. There is the case of Devāpi officiating as the purohita (domestic priest) in the sacrifice of his brother Saṃtanu (X. 98). In the Rgveda itself Devāpi is not stated to be a prince at all. He is called a Kuru prince by Yāska and Saunaka who flourished long after Saṃtanu's sacrifice celebrated in the Rgveda. The story is thus told by Saunaka in his Brhad-devatā (VII. 155-157; VIII. 1-6):—

'Now Devāpi, son of Rṣṭiśeṇa, and Saṃtanu of the race of Kuru were two brothers, princes among the Kurus.

'Now the elder of these two was Devāpi, and the younger Saṃtanu; but the (former) prince, the son of Rṣṭiśeṇa, was afflicted with skin-disease.

'When his father had gone to heaven, his subjects offered him the sovereignty. Reflecting for but a moment, he replied to his subjects:

'‘I am not worthy of the sovereignty: let Saṃtanu be your king.’ Assenting to this, his subjects anointed Saṃtanu king.

'When the scion of the Kuru had been anointed, Davāpi retired to the forest. Thereupon Parjanya did not reign in (that) realm for twelve years.

'Saṃtanu accordingly came with his subjects to Devāpi and propitiated him with regard to that dereliction of duty.

'Then in company with his subjects, he offered him the sovereignty. To him, as he stood humbly with folded hands, Devāpi replied:—
“‘I am not worthy of the sovereignty, my energy being impaired by skin disease; I will myself officiate, O king, as your priest in a sacrifice for rain.’

‘Then Śaṃtanu appointed him to be his chaplain (puro’dhatta) and to act as priest (ārtvijyāya). So he (Devāpi) duly performed the rites productive of rain.’*

This story clearly indicates that the appointment of Devāpi as priest was traditionally considered as something exceptional, and the exception proves the rule.

Not only was the office of the sacrificial priests hereditary in the Rgvedic age, but according to traditions preserved in the Taittiriya Saṃhitā, certain functions of the office were hereditary in particular families. Thus in the Taittiriya Saṃhitā (III.5.21) we are told: ‘‘The Rṣis did not see Indra clearly, but Vasiṣṭha saw him clearly. Indra said, ‘I shall tell you a Brāhmaṇa, so that all men that are born will have thee for Purohita but do not tell of me to the other Rṣis.’ Thus he told him these parts of the hymns; and ever since, men were born having Vasiṣṭha for their Purohita. Therefore Vasiṣṭha is to be chosen as Brahman priest and the (sacrificer) will have such offspring.’† The same ākhyāyikā

* Prof. Macdonell’s translation.

† “तद्वपि य त्रिद्व प्रज्ञनिधापदितम् विचिण्य प्रज्ञनिधापदितम् त्वो अविद्याधरां नि विवाहितम् यवः ललितारोऽविवाहिताः प्रज्ञाः प्रज्ञनिधापदि सत्यनिधि स किं रुप तथा यवः सण्व लोकस्मात्मात्मान्मक्रियासंतौ ततो विवाहिताः प्रज्ञाः प्रज्ञनिधापदि हि यवः सण्वाचार्यं प्रवेश जातायते ।”
(narrative) is told in the Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa (Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa XV. 5.24) in a modified form thus:—

"The Rṣis did not see Indra with their own eyes. Vasiṣṭha desired how he could see Indra with his own eyes. He saw this Nihavasāman. He (Vasiṣṭha) then saw Indra with his own eyes. He (Indra) said to him (Vasiṣṭha), 'I shall tell you a Brāhmaṇa text by means of which there will be born Bharatas who will have you (only) as their Purohitā; but then do not inform other Rṣis that I am Indra.' Indra communicated to him this part of the formula. Then were born Bharatas who had Vasiṣṭha for their priest.'*

The parts of the formula (stomabhāgān) referred to in these texts is "O sun, thou art bright; I pray to thee for propitiating the gods (raśmirasi kṣayāya tvā kṣayam jinvatī)." So it was the knowledge of this formula that enabled the Vasiṣṭhas to obtain the monopoly of the office of the Brahman or superintending priest. According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa it was the knowledge of the expiatory formulas that procured the Vasiṣṭhas the same monopoly. Therein we are told in connection with the expiatory oblations of the soma sacrifice (XII. 6. 1. 38-41):—

* "अधिष्ठो वा दल्द्र त्रयत्रवंपणम् स विविष्काःकामयत कथसिद्ध प्रवचनं प्रक्रियद्वितित स रस्विनिधसमपक्षतय वै दल्द्र त्रयत्रवंपणम् एव रस्माध्वीकृ प्राप्तद्वपने कथ्यासि यथालयुपरोक्षिता भरत: प्रजविवर्णाय मय सम्बन्धो निष्ठ्रो वा नवोष इति तथा यथास्तो यस्माद सिद्ध गुरोक्षिता भरत: प्राप्तिनातः।"
"The Brahman (superintending priest) himself should perform them, and no other than the Brahman; for the Brahman sits on the right (south) side of the sacrifice, and protects the sacrifice on the right side . . . . . Now as to the meaning of these (formulas) Vasiṣṭha knew the Virāj; Indra coveted it. He spake, 'Ṛṣi, thou knowest the Virāj; teach me it!' He replied, 'What would therefrom accrue to me?' 'I would teach the expiation for the whole sacrifice, I would show thee its form.' . . . . The Ṛṣi then taught Indra that Virāj . . . . And Indra then taught the Ṛṣi this expiation from the Agni-hotra up to the Great Litany. And formerly, indeed, the Vasiṣṭhas alone knew these utterances, hence formerly one of the Vasiṣṭha family became Brahman; but since nowadays anybody (may) study them, anybody may now become Brahman. And, indeed, he who thus knows these utterances is worthy to become Brahman, or may reply, when addressed as 'Brahman.'"*

Thus efficacious formulas or hymns were originally held as patents by the descendants of the author and thereby hereditability became an essential feature of Vedic sacerdotalism from the earliest times. We may, therefore, hold with Macdonell and Keith "that in the Rgveda this Brāhmaṇa, or Brahmin, is already a separate caste, differing from the warrior and agricultural

* Eggeling’s translation, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XLIV.
castes,"* and "that the caste system is one that has progressively developed, and that it is not legitimate to see in the Rgveda the full caste system even of the Yajurveda; but at the same time it is difficult to doubt that the system was already well on its way to general acceptance."†

Like the regular varṇas (castes) of later days the two sections of the Āryas—the priests and warriors—did not consider themselves as offshoots of the same stock. In the Rgveda mankind in general is described as descended from Manu, the son of Vivaśvat (sun-god). Rṣis describe Manu as "father Manu" and "our father." But in spite of this clear recognition of Manu as the eponymous ancestor of mankind, a direct divine origin is claimed for most of the Rṣi clans. The Āṅgirases are called "sons of heaven" (IV. 2.15) or "sons of Agni" (X. 62. 5). Vasiṣṭha and Agastya are said to have sprung from Mitra and Varuṇa (VII. 33. 11-13). Regarding the ancestry of Atharvan we are told in the Atharva-veda (V. 11 11): "Since thou, O self-ruling Varuṇa, hast generated father Atharvan, connection of the gods." In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (III. 34) Bhīgu is called Vāruṇi, "son of Varuṇa." According to a legend given in the Bhaddeväta (V. 97-101) Atri sprang from Prajāpati along with Bhīgu and Āṅgiras. In the same work (V. 143) we are told, "The son of Prajāpati was Marici, Marici's son was the sage Kaśyapa." The only two Rṣi clans

---

* Vedic Index, II, p. 81. † Ibid. II, p. 250.
for which divine origin is not claimed are the Viśvāmitras and the Kaṇvas, and there is clear traditional evidence to the effect that the founders of these two clans originally belonged to the yajamaṇa class. The Kuśikas or Viśvāmitras were evidently a branch of the Bharata tribe of the yajamaṇa group. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 17.6.7) Viśvāmitra is addressed as rājaputra, ‘prince,’ and bharata-rṣabha, ‘bull of the Bharatas.’ In the Rgveda (X. 31.11) Niṣad is given as the name of Kaṇva’s father. But according to the Purāṇas Kaṇva was originally a Kṣatriya. Ajamidā was a descendant of Pūru, the eponymous ancestor of the Rgvedic Pūrus. ‘From Ajamidā was born Kaṇva, from Kaṇva Medhātithi, and from Medhātithi the Brāhmins of the Kaṇva clan (kānvāyanāḥ) (Viṣṇu P. IV. 19. 10).’ ‘In one passage of the Atharvaveda (II. 25) they (the Kaṇvas) seem to be definitely regarded with hostility.’* Of these two groups of the Rṣi clans—the one claiming divine origin and the other sprung from the yajamaṇa class—the former formed the nucleus of the Rṣi class and the latter were Rṣi by adoption. According to the Rgveda the founders of the Atharvan, Aṅgiras, Bhūgu, and Vasiṣṭha clans were the founders of the sacrificial cult and are required to be worshipped as pītris, manes. In one hymn (X. 14) the Aṅgiras, the Atharvans, and the Bhūgas are called ‘the soma-loving fathers’ and ‘the makers of the path (pāthahṛdvyah).’ In another hymn

*Vedic Index, I, p. 134.
(X. 15. 8) the Vasiṣṭhas are classed in the same category. Atharvan is said to have extracted sacrificial fire by churning Puṣkara (VI. 16. 13). "A Rṣi named Atharvan first propitiated the gods by sacrifice; the gods and the Bhṛgus forced their way (to that place) and learnt the sacrifice (X. 92. 10)." "Like a friend Mātariśvan· (wind-god) brought this fire to the Bhṛgus (I. 60. 1)."
"The Āṅgiras first prepared food for Indra, and worshipped him by offering oblations to the fire (I. 83. 4)." "Atharvan first discovered the path by sacrifice (I. 83. 5)." Similar traditions relating to Āṅgiras, Atharvan and Bhṛgu are also found in the Vajurveda. The only rational interpretation that these hoary traditions admit of is that in the early Vedic age three or four Rṣi clans,—the Āṅgirases, Atharvanas, Bhṛgus, and Vasiṣṭhas—were regarded as the original Rṣi clans among whom the Vedic sacrificial cult originated, and other clans became members of the sacerdotal class by adoption. This early Vedic sacerdotal class afterwards came to be known as Brāhmans. In the Pariśiṣṭabhaṅga of the Śrauta Sūtra of Āśvalāyana it is said, "Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni Bharadvāja, Gotama, Atri, Vasiṣṭha and Kaśyapa are the seven Rṣis; the descendants of the seven Rṣis with Agastya as the eighth are called their gotras (clans)."

* "विश्वामित्रो जमदग्निभरद्वाजाय गोतमः।
शति विश्वामित्रो कश्यप द्वैवे शरस्त्रश्च।
श्रावणभोजनमक्षयःहस्तानि यद्यपत्य इम्भित्वतः।"

* Of these eight founders
of the Brähmanic gotras, Bharadvāja is said to have been the grandson of Aṅgiras (Bṛhad-devatā, V. 102); Gotama also belonged to the Aṅgiras clan; and Jāmadagni was the son of Bhṛgu. A tradition to the effect that the Brähmanic gotras fall into two groups, one representing the original priesthood and the other consisting of priests by adoption, survived down to the time of the Mahābhārata. Thus we are told in the Śāntiparvan (296. I-7-18): "Originally only four gotras arose, O King, viz. Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa, Vasiṣṭha, and Bhṛgu. In consequence of good deeds, O ruler of men, many other gotras came into existence in time. These gotras are named on account of the penances of those who have founded them. Good people use them."*

Vedic legends of the conflict between the Vasiṣṭhas and the Viśvāmitras indicate that the Rṣis or priest-poets of the original gotras (mula-gotrāṇi) did not recognise the claims of the aspiring members of the warrior tribes to Rṣihood without hard struggle. Vasiṣṭha was the priest of Sudās, the king of the Tītsus and Bharatas. According to a hymn of the Ṛgveda, Sudās won a great victory over ten allied kings with the assistance of Vasiṣṭha (VII. 18). In the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa we are told that Vasiṣṭha consecrated Sudās, son

* "यूज्योज्यायिनि चलारि समुत्तप्यायिनि पार्थिविच।
वहितराकामयवेव कवित्वो अमरं च ॥
कर्मोत्तप्यायिनि योज्यायिनि च समुत्तप्यायिनि पार्थिविच।
नामधेयायिनि तयां तान्वि च प्रचयं सतायु ॥"

"In order to follow the way of the higher, do things like a king.
Remember, however, that the poet is immortal.
In order to follow the way of the higher, do things like a king.
This is the name of the wise one, the wise one, who starts things.
"
of Pijavana, to sovereignty. The story of the conflict between Śakti, son of Vasiṣṭha, and the Viśvāmitras as referred to in the Rgveda (III. 53) is thus narrated in the Bṛhaddevatā (IV. 112-120):—

"At a great sacrifice of Sudās, by Śakti Gāthi’s son (Viśvāmitra) was forcibly deprived of consciousness. He sank down unconscious. But to him the Jamadagnis gave speech called Sasarpārī, daughter of Brahmā or of the Sun, having brought her from the dwelling of the Sun. Then that speech dispelled the Kuśikas’ loss of intelligence (a-matim). And in the (stanza) ‘Hither, (upa: iii. 53. 11) Viśvāmitra restored the Kuśikas to consciousness (anubodhayat). And gladdened at heart by receiving speech he paid homage to those seers (the Jamadagnis), himself praising speech with two stanzas ‘Sasarpārī’ (Sasarpārīḥ: iii. 53, 15, 16). (With the stanzas) ‘strong’ (sighvau: iii. 53. 17-20) (he praised) the parts of the cart and the oxen as he started for home. And then going home he deposited (them there) in person (svaśarīrenā). But the four stanzas which follow (iii. 53. 21-24) are traditionally held to be hostile to the Vasiṣṭhas. They were pronounced by Viśvāmitra, they are traditionally held to be ‘imprecations’ (abhisāpa). They are pronounced to be hostile to enemies and magical (abhicārika) incantations. The Vasiṣṭhas will not listen to them. This is the unanimous opinion of their authorities (ācāryaka): great guilt arises from repeating or listening (to them); by repeating or hearing (them) one’s head is
broken into a hundred fragments; the children of those (who do so) perish; therefore one should not repeat them.’’

The hymn (III. 53) read with this passage of the Bṛhaddevatā seems to indicate that in a sacrifice, evidently horse-sacrifice, performed by Sudās, Rṣis of the Kuśika family including Vismāmitra were invited to take part. Sakti, son of Vasiṣṭha, the family priest of the king, resented this intrusion and made them unconscious by means of a charm. Viśvāmitra and his kinsmen were no match for Vasiṣṭha’s son in the use of magical incantations. But the Jamadagnis, who like the Vasiṣṭhas, belonged to the older group of Rṣi clans and were as skilful in magic, came to the rescue of the Kuśikas. Visvāmitra thanked the Jamadagnis, started for home in his bullock cart and uttered four imprecatory stanzas against the Vasiṣṭhas. Perhaps this led to a sanguinary conflict between Sudās and Vasiṣṭha which is thus referred to in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā (VII. 4. 7, 1), ‘‘Vasiṣṭha, when his sons were killed, desired that he might beget children and humble the sons of Sudās. Then he saw this (sattrā called) ekonapaṅcāsadrātra, adopted it and performed it. Then he (Vasiṣṭha) obtained children and humbled the sons of Sudās.’’

* Macdonell’s translation.

† ‘‘विषिष्टो चतुर्व्र ज्ञामयस्मि भवेषमिति।
ष शतमेक्ष्मारणस्मप्रममस्य तथापरं तेनायत।
ततो तै च चविद्ध प्रशास्मि चौद्रामभवदु।’’
Some scholars do not admit that there is any reference to the strife of Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha in the hymn. But in the absence of a more satisfactory explanation we have no other course to follow than to fall back upon the traditional explanation preserved by Śaunaka and referred to by Kātyāyana in his Sarvānuksamāni. Vāska (II. 24) also states that ‘Viśvāmitra was the Purohita of Sudāsa, son of Pajjavana’ in connection with Ṛgveda III. 33. The suggestion made by Macdonell and Keith* that Visvāmitra originally held the office of the Purohita of Sudās and was afterwards deposed by Vasiṣṭha does not accord with the statement of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa that Vasiṣṭha consecrated Sudās to sovereignty and the statement of the Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa (XV. 5. 24) that the Bharatas adopted Vasisthas as their domestic priests as soon as they came into being. The fact seems to have been that the Vasiṣṭhas were originally the Purohitas of the Tr̥ṣus and Bharatas and so of their king Sudās. In the time of Sudās there flourished a number of poets in the Kuśika clan of the Bharata tribe including Viśvāmitra, who claimed the office of the Purohita of their tribal chief. This led to a quarrel with Śakti, the head of the Vasiṣṭha clan. Though Sudās was not loth to recognize their claims, it were the Saudāsas (sons of Sudās) who espoused their cause with zeal and put to death their opponents.

* Vedic Index, ii. 275-276.
The two sections of the sacerdotal class, Brâhmans by descent and Brâhmans by adoption, were of different physical types. In the Rgveda (VII. 33. r) the Vasiṣṭhas, who represent the first group, are described as svityam, 'white', while Kaṇva (X. 31. 11), representing the second group, is svāva or kṛṣṇa, 'dark.' In the Gopatha Brâhmaṇa (I. 1. 223) the Brahman's colour is white (sukla). The tradition of the existence of a group of Brâhmans with white complexion and yellow hair survived down to the time of the grammarian Patañjali (about 150 B.C.) who writes in his Mahābhāṣya (on Pāṇini V. 1. 115): "Penance, knowledge of the Veda, and birth make a Brāhman. He who is without penance and knowledge of the Veda is a Brāhman by birth only. White complexion, pure conduct, yellow or red hair, etc. are also characteristics that constitute Brāhmanhood."

* The Brāhman with white complexion and yellow hair seems so strange a being to Kaiyaṭa, the scholiast of Patañjali, that he assigns him to a previous cycle of existence. He writes, "White complexion, etc., were seen in Brâhmans who flourished in a previous cycle of existence and whose descendants are rarely met with even now."
The second division of the Ṛgvedic Āryas, the Yadus (yādva jana), Pūrus, Druhyus, Anus, Turvaśas, Bharatas (bhārata jana) and other Vajamāna tribes were traditionally akin to the dark section of the Rṣis, the Kaṇvas and the Viśvāmitras. The Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā (XI. 6) calls the Vaiśya ‘white’ (ṣukla), the Rājanya ‘swarthy’ (dhūmra).* To explain the difference of colour of skin and hair between the two groups of Vedic Āryas we have to assume that the ancestors of the ‘white and yellow-haired’ group migrated to India from the temperate region in the far North, and the dark section had their home in the tropics. There is clear traditional evidence in the Ṛgveda to show that two at least of the tribes of the latter group, the Turvaśas and the Yadus, came to India from South-Western Asia. We are told in one stanza (VI. 20. 12): ‘O hero (Indra)! when you crossed the sea (samudra), you brought Turvaśa and Yadu over the sea.’ Another stanza (VI. 45. 1) tells us, ‘Indra, who brought Turvaśa and Yadu from afar by his wise policy, is our youthful friend.’ In X. 62. 10 Yadu and Turva (Turvaśa) are called Dāsas or barbarians. According to some scholars samudra in the Ṛgveda does not mean sea, for the Āryas had not yet reached the sea, but only the lower course of the Indus. This interpretation of samudra may be traced to the preconceived notion that the Ṛgvedic Āryas were a homogeneous body of men.

who came from the North-West. But once this notion is dismissed from the mind, there is left nothing to prevent us from accepting *samudra* in its usual sense. The sea that lies nearest to the country of the Rgvedic Āryas is the Arabian Sea. So if we are to attach any value to this Vedic tradition, we are forced to assume that the Yadus and the Turvaśas came across the Arabian Sea. The evidences contained in the later Vedic and epic literatures relating to the Indian home of one of these two folks, the Yadus, lend support to this hypothesis.

It is generally assumed that the Yadus and Turvaśas must have been settled somewhere in the Punjab in the Rgvedic age. In the list of tribes dwelling in the land of the Five Rivers and in the valleys of the Ganges and the Jumna as given in the later Vedic and early Buddhist literatures neither the Yadus nor the Turvaśas find any mention. Where were they then? According to the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas the Satvatas or the Bhojas were a branch of the Yaddus. Though the Yadus are not mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa texts, the Satvats and the Bhojas are. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 21) a verse is quoted wherein it is said that Bharata seized the sacrificial horse of the Satvats. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) it is said, "Therefore in that southern region all the Kings of the Satvats are consecrated for the enjoyment of pleasures and are called Bhojas." The country of the Satvats and Bhojas is called southern region from the
view point of the land in the middle (asyām dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratisṭhāyāṁ dīśi) or the midland where dwelt the Uśinaras, the Kurus, the Pañcālas and the Vaṣas.

The Harivamśa and the Purāṇas enable us to define the early Indian home of the Yadus in the south with greater precision. The Harivamśa or the supplementary book of the Mahābhārata is the chief repository of legends and traditions relating to the Andhakas and the Vṛṣṇis, the two chief branches of the Yadu stock. The Harivamśa in its present form may not be very old, but it must have existed in an embryonic stage even in the time of the grammarian Paṇini. Suffixes and accents are as a rule prescribed for names of persons according to the actual forms of the words denoting those names and not according to tribes or clans to which the persons named might belong. And yet this is what is done by Paṇini in two of his aphorisms (IV. i. 115; VI. 2. 34.) In the former aphorism it is prescribed that the affix an denoting descendant is added to a word "denoting the name of a Rṣi, or the name of a person belonging to the Andhaka, Vṛṣṇi or Kuru clans’’; and the latter aphorism provides,—"' The first part of a dvandva compound formed of names denoting Kṣatriya clans in the plural number retains its original accent when the warrior belongs to the Andhaka or Vṛṣṇi clans.'’ Paṇini could hardly have made such rules unless he had before him names of descendants of persons of the Andhaka and Vṛṣṇi clans of all possible forms formed
by adding an and of dvandva compounds thus accented. And where could he get materials for such lists except in the narrative literature of his time? The Mahābhārata, of which the Harivaṃśa forms an integral part, is named in the Gṛhya Sūtra of Āśvalāyana and in Pāṇini VI. 2. 38. Pāṇini very probably flourished in the fourth century B.C.,* when genuine traditions of the early Vedic age may be expected to still survive in the Vedic schools. So the legends and traditions relating to the Andhakas and the Vṛṣṇis preserved in the Harivaṃśa may be considered as genuine traditions coming down from the Vedic age.

Two conflicting legends are given in the Harivaṃśa relating to the origin of the Yādus or Yādavas. In chapter 30 Yādu, the eponymous ancestor of the Yādavas, is represented as a son of King Yayāti of the lunar race. But in chapter 94 it is said that Yādu belonged to the solar Ikṣvāku race. As the original Indian home of the Yādavas is very clearly indicated in this version of the legendary history of the Yādava clans and princes, I shall reproduce it in substance. There was a rājā named Haryaśva, the son of Ikṣvāku, in Manu's line. Madhumatī, daughter of the demon Madhu, was Haryaśva's wife. He was driven out of Ayodhyā by his elder brother Mādhava, and, at the instance of his wife, took shelter with his father-in-law at Madhupura, the chief town of

---

Madhuvana. "In a short time his (Haryaśva’s) kingdom known as Ānarta and Saurāṣṭra enriched by cattle, and also called Anupa adorned by the sea beach and forest, became very prosperous." By his queen Madhumati Haryaśva had a son named Yadu, from whom sprung the Yadava clans, viz. Bhaima, Kakkura, Bhoja, Andhaka, Yadava, Dāsārha and Viśṇi. Yadu’s son was Mādhava; Mādhava’s son was Satvata; Satvata’s son was Bhima. From Satvata one section of the Yadavas came to be known as Sātvatas and from Bhima as Bhaimas. While Bhima was reigning over Surāṣṭra, Satrughna, half-brother of Rāma, the hero of the Rāmāyana, killed Lavaṇa, son of the demon Madhu, destroyed Madhuvana, and there founded a new city called Mathurā. After the death of Satrughna; Andhaka, son of Bhima, succeeded him to the throne of Mathurā.

These legends, by indicating that the Yadavas were originally settled in Saurāṣṭra or the Kathiwar peninsula and then spread to Mathurā, lend indirect support to the Rgvedic tradition that the Yadus, together with the Turvaśas, came from beyond the sea. There are strong evidences to show that in the sixteenth and the fifteenth centuries B.C., in Syria and Upper Mesopotamia, there were several colonies of men of Aryan speech, some of whom at least worshipped Vedic gods. In the cuneiform tablets discovered at Tell-el-Amarna in Upper Egypt containing letters from the tributary Kings of Western Asia to Egyptian Pharaohs, we find
such Aryan names of chieftains: "Artamanya, chief of Ziribašani, probably about Basan; Bawarzana or Mawarzana (or perhaps Mayarzana), chief of Hazi, probably to the north of Palestine; Šubandu or Šubandi, from Philistea (cf. S. Subandhu); Šuwardata, the adversary of Abdihiba of Jerusalem (cf. S. Svardatta); Šutarna or Šuttarna, chief of Mušihuma, probably in Northern Palestine; Yašdata or Wašdata, probably from the neighbourhood of Megidda; Zirdamiašda, probably from Northern Palestine, and so forth. The name of the Kassite sun-god Šuriaš (cf. S. sūrya) points to a similar Aryan element to the east of Babylonia . . . . The names of the Mitani Kings are of the same kind. They are Sa-uš-ša-tar, Artatama, Suttarna, Dušratta (or Tušratta); Artaššumara (or Artaššuwara), and Mattinaza." Regarding the place of the language of these names in the Indo-European family Sten Konow observes: "I think that the explanation of these facts has been given by Professor Bloomfield, who considers it possible that the 'Mitani and other Western Asiatic Iranoid proper names came from a dialect closely allied to Iranian but not yet exactly Iranian, i.e. a dialect which did not change s to h.' It seems as if the change of s to h is not so old as the other Iranian characteristics. It only began after Iranian branch had separated itself from the common Aryan stock and did not at once spread over the whole Iranian area."*

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1911, pp. 44-45.
Another great discovery, cuneiform writings from Boghaz-Kuei, have revealed the religion of the Kings of Mitanni. One of these writings embody a treaty between the Mitanni King Mattiuaza and the Hittite King Subbiluiiuma wherein the deities of the two countries are invoked as protectors of the treaty. Among the gods invoked by the Mitannian king occur the well-known Vedic names Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatyas. The Tell-el-amarna and the Boghaz-kuei writings carry us back to the fifteenth century B.C. With peoples of Āryan speech worshipping Indra, Varuṇa, and the Nāsatyas in Upper Mesopotamia in the fifteenth century B.C., it is not inconceivable that some among them should have found their way to Kathiwar through Eridu which had an immemorial coasting trade with India.* One probable link of the chain connecting ancient India with Mesopotamia seems to have been discovered. It is the Babylonian seal in the Central Museum of Nagpore. Unfortunately, as the seal has so long been mistaken for an ornament, no record has been kept to show where, when, and how it was found. Mr. L. W. King of the British Museum, who has deciphered the inscription writes: "The scene engraved on the seal represents a goddess standing with hands raised in adoration before the weather god Adad, or his West-Semitic equivalent Amurru... The inscription gives the owner’s name and reads ‘Liburbeli,

the servant of ( . . . . ).’ The seal dates from about 2000 B.C., the period of the first dynasty of Babylon.”* As the find-place of the seal is unknown, it is difficult to base any conclusion upon it. But had not the seal with a golden handle been found in India, and presumably in Central India, it could hardly have found its way to the Nagpore Museum. The Āryas of the Rgvedic age were not unfamiliar with sea voyage. “There are references,” observe Macdonell and Keith, “to the treasures of the ocean, perhaps pearls or the gains of trade, and the story of Bhujuv seems to allude to marine navigation.”† There are references to sea voyage in the Brāhmaṇas also indicating the maritime activity of the Āryas in the later Vedic age. In the Pañcavimśa-Brāhmaṇa (XIV. 5. 17) it is said, “Those who go to the sea without boat (aplavah) do not come out of that.”‡ Again in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VI. 21) we are told, “Know that this tristup formula is the first among the hymns that I am to recite. Those who perform the annual satra or Dvādaśāha are like men who wish to cross the sea. As men who desire to cross the sea get into boat full of provisions, so these performers of satra use tristup formula.”§

‡ “यो या भक्तम: समुद्रं, प्रभावित न स नत स्त्रियित।”
§ “चिद्रहो स द्रमा: खज्जातिनि रत्नयो विद्वानू तद्यथा समुद्रं, प्रभाववेदेवं द्रेह वे प्रभवे वे संयुक्तरं ड्रामान्त राप्तवे तद्यथा वर्णावती नाम पारकामा: समारोषय रेवमेवेता चिद्रह: समारोषित।”
So we may assume a continuous maritime connec-
tion of Āryāvarta with Western Asia from the
Ṛgvedic period till the time of the Bāveru Jātaka
of the Pāli canon.

The Ārya immigrants from Mesopotamia must
have absorbed a good deal of Semitic blood in
their Syrian home and were probably dark like the
Semitic. The Pūrus, Druhyus and Anus, men-
tioned in the Ṛgveda along with the Yadusand Tur-
vašas, may have come from the same quarters and
were probably of the same physical type. The fair
and fair-haired invaders who formed the nucleus
of the Brāhman caste came earlier direct from the
cradle of the Aryan folk in the far north and
elaborated the vedic sacrificial cult in their Indian
home from the primitive worship of Indra, Varuṇa
and the other gods of nature. They were probably
akin to the Āthravans and Magi of Ancient Iran,
for the Iranians, like the Indo-Āryans, but unlike
all other Indo-Germanic peoples, had, and the
Parsis still have in their Dasturs, a hereditary
priesthood. The ancestors of the Rṣi clans probably
came earlier. When later on the ancestors of the
Ṛgvedic warrior tribes entered India and came in
contact with the Rṣi clans, the former recognized
the cultural superiority of the latter and accepted
them as their religious guides.

Fair and fair-haired Rṣi clans from the north,
dark or brown yajamāṇa tribes from South-
Western Asia, and the very dark aboriginal Niṣādas
were the ethnic elements out of which grew up
the five primary varṇas or castes, viz. the Brāh-
mans, Rājanyas (Kṣatriyas), Vaiśyas, Śūdras, and Niśādas. Now the question is, how did this transformation take place. The earliest account of the origin of varnas is found in the following stanzas of the Puruṣa hymn of the Rgveda (X. 90. 11-12):—

"When they divided the Puruṣa, into how many parts did they divide him? What was his mouth? What were his arms? What were his thighs and feet called?"

"The Brāhmaṇ was his mouth; of his arms, the Rājanya was made; the Vaiśyas were his thighs; the Śūdra sprang from his feet."

The Vedic theory of the origin of castes finds a clearer expression in a Yajus text (Taittirīya Samhitā, VII. 1. 1. 4-6) wherein we read:—

"Prajāpati, desirous of offspring [performed the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice] and created trivṛt hymn, god Agni, Gāyatri metre, Rathantara sāman, Brāhmaṇ among men and goats among brutes from his mouth. As they were created from the mouth, therefore they are superior to all others.

"[He] created Pañcadaśa hymn, god Indra, Triṣṭup metre, Vṛhat sāman, Rājanya among men and sheep among brutes from his chest and arms. Therefore they are strong because they have been created from strength (strong arms). [He] created Saptadaśa hymn, Viśvadevas among the gods, Jagati metre, Vairupa Sāman, Vaiśya among men and the cows among brutes from the belly. As they have been created from the storehouse of food (belly), so they are the food (or intended to
be enjoyed by others). Therefore they (Vaiśyas) are more numerous than others (among men) because many gods were created.

"[He] created ekāvimśa hymn, anuṣṭup metre, Vairāja Sāman, Śūdra among men and horse among brutes from his feet. Therefore the Śūdra and the horse are dependent on other (castes). As no god was created from the feet, so the Śūdra is not competent to perform sacrifice. As the Śūdra and the horse were created from the feet, so they live by exerting their feet."

Here the four varṇas are recognized as separate creations of the creator, differing as widely as do goat, sheep, cow and horse; or in the language of natural history, the four varṇas were considered as four different species of animals and not merely four different groups of the same species. The conception that the difference between the different groups of men is congenital and not artificial was founded on the fact that the earliest social groups known to the Āryas,—the priests, the yajamāṇas, and the godless aborigines actually

* प्रजापिरिराकामयत प्राच्येवैति स शुक्तस्क्षिणं निर्मितोत तमधि-प्रेक्षान्वितः गायनीकर्तर रशनारः साम प्राण्यो मनुयाधिकासः पद्यवर्म तमधाने शुक्ते शुक्तो शुक्ते शुत्वनः। जलसो बाख्यो पद्यर्दशं निर्मितोत तमस्कृते देवान्वितः बिल्लुष्ट्रः बुद्धिः बुद्धिः बुद्धिः बुद्धिः बुद्धिः मनुयाधिकासः। सधस: दाशद्धयो निर्मितोत तस्म निर्मितो...
differed from one another in colour (vära) and other prominent physical characters. This, "the sense of distinctions of race indicated by differences of colour," to use the language of Risley, is "the basis of fact" in the development of caste system. When the slaves came to be recognized as a separate group termed Śūdra, and the tax-paying subject section of the yajamāna tribes as a separate social group termed Vaiśya, as distinguished from the ruling or Rājanya section, the conception of the identity of racial or colour difference and social difference was extended to them by fiction, and the Vaiśyas and Śūdras were recognized as separate varṇas or colours. With these two elements, fact and fiction, was combined a third element, heredity of function, copied from the Rṣi clans. Colour or race differences, real and fancied, together with hereditary function, gave birth to the caste system. But as newer groups formed or attached themselves to the Ārya nations, the absurdity of regarding them all as distinct colours or varṇas was recognized, and the theory of varna-saṅkara or mixed caste was started to explain their origins.
CHAPTER II.

INDO-ARYANS OF THE OUTER COUNTRIES.

Vedic Aryandom or the country inhabited by the people who called themselves Āryas and among whom the Vedic civilization originated and developed, comprised only a limited portion of Northern India. The boundaries of this land in the later Vedic period may be ascertained from a list of nations given in the Kauśitaki Upaniṣad (VI. 1). This list contains the following names—the Uśīnaras, the Vaśas, the Matsyas, the Kuruś, the Pańcālas, the Kāśis and the Videhas. One important name, that of the Kośalas, is omitted from this list. The land of the Uśīnaras marked the western boundary of Vedic India and the land of the Videhas marked the eastern boundary. From Pāṇini (IV. 2. 117-118) we learn that Vāhika villages were situated within Uśīnara. So Uśīnara formed a part of, if not identical with, the Vāhika country. According to the Mahābhārata (Karṇa-parvaṇ XLV. 40) the land of the five rivers was known as the country of the Vāhikas. Videha is now represented by Tirhut or North Bihar and the Kośi river formed its eastern boundary in ancient times. The Āryas who lived within these limits were very hostile to the peoples that lived around them. In a well-known hymn of the Atharvaveda takman or fever is thus addressed (V. 22. 5-14):—
"His home is with the Mujavants, his home is with the Mahāvṛṣas. From the moment of thy birth thou art indigenous with the Bahlukas.

"To the Gandhāris, the Mujavants, the Aṅgas and the Magadhas we deliver over takman like a servant, like a treasure."

Gandhāri is the modern Peshawar district of the North-West Frontier Province, and Magadha and Aṅga make up South Bihar. In the Vṛātya-book of the Atharvaveda (XV) the Māgadha or the native of Magadha is represented as closely related to the Vṛātya who is there deified. The account of the Vṛātya as given in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (XVII. 4) is thus summed up by Keith: "We are there told that they do not practise Kṛṣi [agriculture] or trade, i.e. that they are distinct in culture from the Brāhmanical Indians who practise in the time of the Brāhmaṇas both. Moreover they have a different code of law, for that is the real meaning of adandyum dandena ghanntas caranti, and they have different speech, for they call what is easy to say difficult, a point indicating at the least a Prākṛta speech in which conjunct consonants had been softened. They are described as speaking ḍīkṣitavācam [the language of the initiated] though adīkṣita [un-initiated], but this characteristic is really unintelligible."* This last characteristic probably indicates that the Vṛātyas had adopted the vocabulary of the Vedic religion while retaining their

---

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1913, p. 159.
own faith. They had evidently adopted the names of the Vedic gods while attributing to them the characteristics of their own gods. That Magadha was recognized as the chief centre of Vrātya culture is evident from the fact that in the Śrauta Sūtras of Kātyāyana (VIII. 6. 28) and Lātyāyana (XXII. 4. 22) it is enjoined that after the Vrātya-stoma, a rite that procured the admission of the Vrātya to the Brāhmanic fold, his belongings or outfit had to be bestowed either upon an inferior Brāhman or Brāhman in name only (brahma-bandhu) of Magadha, or one who had not given up the Vrātya practices. This shows that the Brāhmans of Magadha were looked down upon as priests of the Vrātya and consequently the mass of the population of Magadha were regarded as Vrātyas.

In connection with the shape of the burial mound (śmasāna) built on charred bones the Easterners are called Asuras in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 8. 1. 5):—"Four-cornered (is the sepulchral mound). Now the gods and the Asuras, both of them sprung from Prajāpati were contending in the (four) regions (quarters). The gods drove out Asuras, their rivals and enemies, from the regions, and being regionless, they were overcome. Wherefore the people who are godly make their burial-places four-cornered, whilst those who are of the Asura nature, the Easterners and others, (make them) round, for they (the gods) drove them out from the regions." Here the 'Easterners and others' are evidently the
Magadhas, Aṅgas and their eastern neighbours; and differences in the size of the sepulchral mound is recognised as a mark of ethnic difference."

In the Smṛti literature Magadha and Aṅga are included among countries migration to which is strictly forbidden. Thus Baudhāyana ordains in his Dharmasūtra (I. i. 32-33):—

"The inhabitants of Ānarṭṭa, of Aṅga, of Ma-
gadha, of Saurāṣṭra, of the Deccan, of Upavrit, of Sind, and the Sauvīras are of mixed origin. He who has visited the (countries of the) Āraṭṭas, Kāraskaras, Puṇḍras, Sauvīras, Vaṅgas, Kaliṅgas, (or) Pranūnas shall offer a Punastoma or Sarva-
prṣṭhi."

Another law-giver, Devala. (as quoted by Viññā-
neśvara on Vājñavalkya III. 292), says:—

"He who has visited the (countries of the) Sindhus, Sauvīras, Saurāṣṭras, inhabitants of the frontier regions, of the Aṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kaliṅgas, and Andhras, should go through the ceremony of intiation anew."

How this injunction will be violated in the Kaliyuga or the iron-age is thus predicted in the Harivaṃśa (CXCIV. 11199-11203):—

"At that time, owing to the lapse of time, all men, having been reduced to poverty, will leave their native land with their relatives. Pressed by hunger and fear, taking their children on their shoulders, men will cross the Kauśikī (Kośi) river in haste out of fear. Men will take shelter in the

(countries of the) Áṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kálingas, Káśmiras, Mekalás, the caves of the mount Rṣīka, the borderland of the Himalaya and the shore of the sea. Men will live in the forest with the Mlecchas.''*

These outer countries to which migration from Vedic Aryandom was so strictly forbidden formed a ring round it. To begin with the east, the Kośi (Kauṣikī) formed the boundary between the countries of the Videhas and the Puṇḍras (Varendra). To the south-east of the Puṇḍras lived the Vaṅgas (Eastern Bengal) and to the west of the Vaṅgas lay the country of the Suhmas or Rādhās which is omitted from the lists. The country of the Kálingas lay to the south of the Rādhās and that of the Andhras south of the Kálingas. Dākṣiṇātya or the Deccan extended to the west of the Kálingas, and Saurāṣṭra (Kathiwar), Ānartta (Gujarat), Sind and probably the country of the Sauvīras lay to the north-west of the Deccan. The Áraṭṭas and the Káraskaras lived in the Western Punjab. The following extract from the Mahābhārata (KarṇaparvaṇXLV) adds the Khasas, who

* 'भेण्येवः परिच्छन्दिः मनोहरः प्रवेणमाहः ||
नराः सब्रेः भविष्यनि सदा काल्पपिरंचुयात् ||
ततः खरेः समाराम्य कुसाराम्य विकुतता भयात् ||
कौशिकीं प्रतिच्छन्नि नराः चुन्द्रयपीडिताः ||
भद्रान्त विभान्त काव्यांग्य काम्ब्रांग्य नेत्रकान्ता ||
श्रविकालमिरिटोषोः संबंधिताः सामायः ||
जनमां बिनमां पारं कुछं लघश्राणबालं भवानीः ||
धरणेषु नियस्मख्या नराः संख्यां च च ||

Harivamśa, Calcutta, 1839.
still live on the southern slope of the Himālayās, to the list of the Outer nationalities and indicates the reason why immigration to their countries was forbidden:—

"The lands through which the five rivers flow after issuing from the mountains are called Āraṭṭa; virtuous men should not spend there more than two days. There are two Piśācas called Vāha and Hīka in the Vipāsa (Beas). The Vāhikas are their offspring. They have not been created by Prajāpati, therefore, being low-born, how can they know the rules of piety prescribed in the sacred books? One should avoid the Kāraskaras, Māhisakas, Kaliṅgas, Keralas, Karkotas and Virakas who follow the path of vice . . . . The Vāhikas dwell in the Āraṭṭa country; and the low Brāhmans of that country, who have been living there from the time of Prajāpati, do not either study Veda or perform sacrifice. The gods do not eat food offered by these wicked Vrātyas. The Prasthalas, Madras, Gandhāras, Āraṭṭas, Khaṣas, Vasātis, Sindhus, and Sauviras are mostly very wicked."

Baudhāyana’s statement that the inhabitants of Ānarta, Aṅga, Magadha and other Outer countries are of mixed origin, and the statement in the above extract that the Vāhikas were not created by Prajāpati, clearly indicate the belief of the dwellers of Vedic Aryandom that the Outer nationalities originated from ethnic stock or stocks that were quite different from the stock or stocks from which they themselves originated and cultur-
ally the latter were Vṛātyas or heathens who had not yet adopted the Vedic cult.

The fundamental cultural difference that separated the two groups of Indo-Aryan nationalities—the Inner or the Vedic group and the Outer group—in the olden days is still manifest in the different types of social organisations existing among the modern representations of the two groups. In the Punjab, Rajputana, and the United Provinces, and among the countries of the Outer ring, in Gujarat and Bihar, the fourfold division of society still survives. Besides the Brāhmans and the Śūdras, there are the Rajputs or the Chatris who represent the ancient Kṣatriya order and the Vanias who follow the usages of the Vaiśyas. But the social organisation of the Marāṭhā country, of Orissa, of Bengal and of other countries lying beyond, is of a different type. In these countries there are only two orders from the Brāhmanic standpoint,—the Brāhman and the Śūdra. Mādhava, who flourished in the fourteenth century in Vijayanagar, writes in his commentary on Parāśara Smṛti, ‘‘The Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas have totally disappeared.’’ Raghunandana, a Bengali writer who flourished in the sixteenth century, writes in his Śuddhītattva: ‘‘The Kṣatriyas of modern times have been degraded to the status of Śūdras. On account of the abandonment of rites the Vaiśyas and the Ambaṣṭhas also have degenerated [into Śūdras].’’ To explain away the absence of regular Kṣatriya and Vaiśya orders in the Outer countries the orthodox students of the Brāhmanic
codes were compelled to assume the existence of these orders in the remote past and their subsequent disappearance or degeneration. But if it were really so, the Kṣatriya and Vaiśya orders would have been non-existent in Hindusthan proper, which roughly corresponds to ancient Vedic Āryāvarta, as well. It is, therefore, more reasonable to suppose that the fourfold division of society was not indigenous in the Outer countries, but was imported from Vedic Aryandom in an imperfect form and the Kṣatriya and Vaiśya usages failed to make their way therein. This could hardly have been so if the two groups of Indo-Aryans—the Inner or the Hindusthani group and the Outer group—had come of the same stock—if the Outer group had been mainly descended from immigrants from the Vedic country.

The linguistic difference between the two groups of the Indo-Aryan folk is still more significant. Sir George Grierson writes:—

"The Midland extended from the Himālayas on the north to the Vindhyas Hills on the south, and from Sarhind (vulgo Sirhind) in the Eastern Punjab on the west to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna on the east. It thus consisted of the Gangetic Doab, and of the country immediately to its north and south. The population of this tract had extended from its original seat near the Upper Doab and the sacred river, the Sarasvatī. The particular Indo-Aryan dialect of these people developed into the modern language of the Midland."
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"Round it, on three sides—west, south, and east—lay a country inhabited, even in Vedic times, by other Indo-Aryan tribes. This tract included the modern Punjab, Sind, Gujarāt, Rājputāna, and the country to the east—Oudh and Bihar. Rājputāna belongs geographically to the Midland, but it was a late conquest, and for our present purposes may be considered as belonging to the Outer Band. Over this band were scattered different tribes, each with its own dialect; but it is important to note that a comparison of the modern vernaculars shows that these outer dialects were all more closely related to each other than any of them were to the language of the Midland. In fact, at an early period of the linguistic history of India there must have been two sets of Indo-Aryan dialects—one the language of the Midland, and the other the group of dialects forming the Outer Band. From this it has been argued, and the contention is entirely borne out by the results of the ethnological enquiries, that the inhabitants of the Midland represent the latest stage of Indo-Aryan immigration. The earliest arrivals spoke one dialect, and the new-comers another. According to Dr. Hœrnle, who first suggested the theory, the latest invaders probably entered the Punjab like a wedge, into the heart of the country already occupied by the first immigrants, forcing the latter outwards in three directions, to the east, to the south and to the west.

"The next process which we observe in the geographical distribution of the Indo-Aryan
languages is one of expansion. The population of the Midland increased, and history shows that it exercised an important influence over the rest of India. The imperial cities of Delhi and Kanauj, and the holy city of Mathurā . . . . lay within its territory. With increased population and increased power it expanded and conquered the Eastern Punjab, Rājputāna and Gujarāt (where it reached the sea, and gained access to maritime commerce), and Oudh. With its armies and with its settlers it carried its language, and hence in these territories we find mixed form of speech. The basis of each is that of the Outer Band, but its body is that of the Midland. Almost everywhere the nature of the phenomena is the same. In the country near the borders of the Midland, the Midland language has overwhelmed the ancient language and few traces of the latter can be recognized. As we go farther from the centre, the influence of the Midland weakens and that of the Outer Band becomes stronger and stronger, till the traces of the Midland speech disappear altogether. The present language of the Eastern Punjab is closely allied to that of the Upper Doāb, but it gradually becomes the Lahnda of the Western Punjab, which has nothing to do with the Midland. So the language of North-eastern Rājputāna is very similar to that of Agra, but as we go south and west we see more and more of the original language of the Outer Band, until it is quite prominent in Gujarāt. Again in Oudh, which was a country with a literature and
history of its own, there is a mixture of the same nature, although here the Midland language has not established itself so firmly as it has in the west and south.

"Finally, where possible, the inhabitants of the Outer Band also expanded to the south and east. In this way we find Marāṭhī in the Central Provinces, Berār, and Bombay; and, to the east, Orīyā, Bengali, and Assamese, all of them true Outer languages unaffected in their essence by the speech of the Midland.

"The state of affairs at the present day is therefore as follows:—There is a Midland Indo-Aryan language, occupying the Gangetic Doāb and the country immediately to its north and south. Round it on three sides is a band of Mixed languages, occupying the Eastern Punjab, Gujarāt, Rājputāna and Oudh, with extensions to the South in Bāghelkhand and Chattīsgarh. Again, beyond these, there is a band of Outer languages, occupying Kashmir, the Western Punjab, Sind (here it is broken by Gujarāt), the Marāṭhā country, Orissa, Bihār, Bengal and Assam."*

This long extract perhaps embodies the final classification of the Indo-Aryan languages and therefore deserves careful attention from all students of Indian ethnology and history. But Grierson's reconstruction of the history of the Indo-Aryan movements mainly based on this classification can not be reconciled to what we

learn from other sources. Grierson’s statement that in Vedic times there lived in the Punjab and Oudh other Indian tribes speaking dialects that differed widely from the language of Midland is baseless. Uśīnara, as we have already seen, evidently corresponding to the Eastern Punjab, formed an integral part of the Vedic Aryandom. In the ethnographical list of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) we are told:—“In this firmly fixed middle country (asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyāmāyāṁ diśi) all the rulers of the Kurus and the Pañcālas, together with those of the Vaśas and the Uśīnaras, are consecrated to kingdom and called Rājās.” “In treating of other territories” as Oldenberg observes, “instead of asyām, the word etasyām is used: asyām contains a significant hint that the compiler of the text belongs to this territory.” The Vaśas of the Vedic literature corresponds to the Vaśas of the Pali Buddhist texts and Vatsya of the later Sanskrit literature with Kanśāmbi as their capital, and their country extended as far as the junction of the Ganges and the Jumna. So that Vedic Midland as defined in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa included the whole area where Grierson’s Midland Indo-Aryan language is spoken as well as Eastern Punjab or the country of the Uśīnaras.

Though geographically outside Vedic Midland, Vedic culture flourished in full vigour in Kośala, Kāśi and Videha and the Brāhmans of the Kuru-pancālas were held in great esteem by the rulers of these countries. The satra or the twelve
years sacrificial session of Prajäpati performed by the Rśis of Naimiśa is referred to in the Pañca-
viṃśa (XXV. 6. 4) and the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa.* Kośala was the home of the Ikṣvākus. According
to the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa (IV. 6. 1) King Bhageratha Aikṣvāka wishing to perform a
wish-fulfilling sacrifice sought the advice of the Brāhmans of the Kuru-Paṅcālas.† According to
the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 4) the Kośala
ing Para Āṭnāra Hairanyanābha is described as
having performed the Aśvamedha or horse sacrifice.
According to the Brhadāraṇyaka and Kauṣitaki
Upaniṣads, Ajātasatru, King of Kāsi, instructs a
proud Brāhman on the real nature of self (ātman).
According to the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (XXV. 10.
17) Namī Sāpya, King of Videha, attained to
heaven quickly by performing a sessional sacrifice
at the place where the Sarasvati disappears in the
sands of the desert. The story of the great sacrifice
performed by Janaka, King of Videha, and
attended by Brāhmans of the Kuru-Paṅcālas
where thousand cows were set apart for the most
learned Brāhman and seized by Vājñavalkya, is
told in the Jaiminiya (II. 76-77) and the Śata-
patha Brāhmaṇa (XI. 6. 3; XIV. 6. 1. 9). It is
highly probable that Vājñavalkya, the founder of
the Vājasaney school of the Yajurveda, was a
native of Videha. But he was a pupil of Uddā-
laka Āruni, a Paṅcāla Brahman.

† Ibid., Vol. 16.
But the reason why Kośala and Kāśi were not considered as holy as Kuru and Pañcāla probably was, that there was a tendency to heterodoxy among the inhabitants of these countries. In the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (III. 94-95) we are told the story of a dispute between an Aikṣvāka King and his priest, Vṛṣa Jāna. King Tryaruna Traivṛṣṇa Aikṣvāka was being driven by the latter in a chariot. A Brāhman boy who was playing on the road was run down by the wheel of the chariot. Then there was a dispute between the King and the priest as regards the responsibility of the crime. The two said, ‘‘Let us submit the question.’’ To the Iksvākus they submitted the question. The Iksvākus said, ‘‘None other than he who drives the chariot is controller of the chariot.’’ It was to Vṛṣa that they declared: ‘‘It is thou that hast killed him!’’ Vṛṣa revived the child with a sāman, but went away in anger. Thereupon strength departed from the fire of the Iksvākus and consequently they had to recall Vṛṣa.* As regards the heterodoxy of the Kāśis we learn from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 19): ‘‘Śatānīka Sātrājita performed the Govinata (form of Asvamedha) after taking away the horse of the Kāśya (King); and since that time the Kāśis do not keep up the (sacrificial) fire, saying ‘The Soma-drink has been taken from us.’’† According to Jaina and Baudhā tradition Pārśva, the predecessor of Mahāvīra, and Kassapa Buddha, the

---

* Ibid., Vol. 18.  † Eggeling’s translation.
predecessor of Gautama Buddha, were both born in Benares. At one time Kośala and Kāśi had closer social intercourse with Magadha, Aṅga and other outer countries than with Kuru-Pañcāla. In the Rāmāyaṇa (I. 13, 21-28) Vasiṣṭha advises Daśaratha, King of Ayodhyā, to invite the Kings of Mithilā, Kāśi, Kekaya, Aṅga, Kośala, Magadha, the Eastern countries (prācinān), Sindhu, Sauvīra, Saurāṣṭra and Dākṣinātya to his horse sacrifice. It will be observed that the rulers of Kuru-Pañcāla, Matsya and other countries of Madhyadeśa are omitted from the list. But heterodoxy and absence of social intercourse between the Kṣatriyas of Kuru-Pañcāla on the one hand and of Kāśi-Kośala on the other do not warrant us to assume any great linguistic difference in the Vedic period. It is to be noted that Daśaratha’s domestic priest was a Vasiṣṭha, a clan that originally lived among the Bharatas on the Sarasvatī.

The case of Videha or Mithilā, where Maithili, a language belonging to the Outer Band, is now spoken, is somewhat different. The following well-known legend of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (I, 4, 1, 14-17) throws light on the colonisation of Videha by the Vedic Āryas:—

‘‘Māthava, the Videgha, was at that time on the (river) Sarasvatī. He (Agni) thence went burning along this earth towards the east; and Gotama Rāhuṭana and the Videgha Māthava followed after him as he was burning along. He burnt over (dried up) all these rivers. Now that (river), which is called ‘Sadānirā’, flows from
the northern (Himālaya) mountain: that one he did not burn over. That one the Brāhmans did not cross in former times, thinking, 'it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara.'

'Nowadays, however, there are many Brāhmans to the east of it. At that time it (the land east of the Sadānirā) was very uncultivated, very marshy, because it had not been tasted by Agni Vaiśvānara.

'Nowadays, however, it is very cultivated, for the Brāhmans have caused (Agni) to taste it through sacrifices. Even in late summer that (river), as it were, rages along: so cold is it, not having been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara.

'Māthava, the Videgha, then said (to Agni), 'where am I to abide?' 'To the east of this (river) is to be thy abode!' said he. Even now this (river) forms the boundary of the Kośalas and Videhas; for these are the Māthavas (or descendants of Māthava).'' *

This legend clearly indicates that at the time of the composition of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa it was distinctly remembered that at one time Videha lay outside Vedic Aryandom, and that the Brāhmans and Kṣatriyas who introduced Vedic culture came from the land watered by the Sarasa-vati. The Brāhmanic codes name an inferior caste (mixed caste) called Vaideha who are evidently named after Videha and probably represented the pre-Vedic folk of the country. In the

* Eggeling’s translation.
Vedic literature and the epic Rāmāyaṇa we find Videha ruled over by a line of hereditary sovereigns. But a different order of things prevailed in the sixth century B.C., at the time when Gotama Buddha flourished. Videha was no longer a monarchy, but there had sprung up a number of oligarchies headed by ruling tribes and clans within and in the neighbourhood of Janaka’s realm. Chief among these were the Vajjians and the Licchavis of Vesāli, the Mallas of Pāvā and Kusināra, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Koliyas of Rāmagrāma and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana. The Licchavis (Licchivis) and the Mallas are named by Manu (X. 22) among the Vṛātyas along with the Khasas and the Draviḍas. These and the other independent tribes of Videha were probably akin to the people of the Outer countries and were only partially Brāhmanised.

Though Videha, therefore, in spite of a veneer of Vedic culture, was only partially Aryanised, the Eastern Punjab on the one hand and Kośala and Kāśi on the other can not be excluded from the same ethnic sphere, and it can not be held with Grierson that Indo-Aryan tribes who originally occupied these areas spoke languages differing from the language of the Midland, and that owing to their nearness to “the borders of Midland, the Midland language has overwhelmed the ancient language.” To explain the peculiar position of the mixed or intermediate Indo-Aryan languages, Grierson assumes that the population and power of the Midland increased and its armies and its settlers carried
its language to the Eastern Punjab, Gujarāt and Oudh. But the Vedic, the Pali-Buddhist, and Purāṇic literatures preserve no tradition relating to the conquest and annexation of Uśīnara on the one hand, Kośala and Kāśi on the other, by the Kurus, Pañcālas, Matsyas or Vaśas. According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) while the kings (rājās) of the Middle country,—of Uśīnara, Kuru, Pañcāla, and Vaśa,—were consecrated to "kingdoms" (rājyāya), in the eastern country (prācyām dīṣi), the rulers (rājās) of the eastern peoples,—of the Kośalas, and Videhas,—were consecrated to "empire" (sāmrājyāya). This seems to indicate that at the time of the composition of this Brāhmaṇa, the rulers of the East were much more powerful than the rulers of the Middle country.

The dynasties and clans that held sway contemporaneously in the Middle and Outer countries of Northern India according to the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads survived down to about a century after Buddha. Pali texts give a list of sixteen powers of Northern India in Buddhah’s time, viz. Aṅgā, Magadhā, Kāśi, Kośalā, Vajji, Mallā, Ceti, Vaṃsā, Kuru, Pañcālā, Macchā, Śūrasena, Assakā, Avanti, Gandhārā and Kambojā. The Purāṇas also bear witness to the same state of affairs. After giving the genealogies of the different dynasties that reigned in Magadha in succession down to the last of the Siṣunāgas the Purāṇas tell us:—

"Contemporaneous with these aforesaid kings
there will be other kings; all these following kings will endure an equal time: namely, 24 Aikṣvākus, 27 Pañcālas, 24 kings of Kāsi, 28 Haihayas, 32 Kaliṅgas, 25 Aśmakas, 36 Kuruś, 28 Maithilas, 23 Śūrasenas and 20 Vītihotras. All these kings will endure the same time.”*

The tide of conquest, when it started, started not from the west but from the east—from Magadha, for we are told of Mahānandīn, the last Śīsunāga King of Magadha:—

“A son of Mahānandīn by a śūdra woman will be born a king, Mahāpadma (Nanda), who will exterminate all kṣatriyas. Thereafter kings will be of śūdra origin. Mahāpadma will be sole monarch, bringing all under his sole sway. He will be 88 years on the earth. He will uproot all kṣatriyas, being urged on by prospective fortune.”†

The Purānic story of Nanda Mahāpadma is not a mere fable, but a historical event of very great moment. The historians of Alexander the Great, who invaded the Panjab only a generation after Nanda, corroborate the story in substance. Alexander reached the Hyphasis (Beas) towards the end of 326 B.C. Beyond the Sutlej lay the territories once ruled over by the Kuru, Pañcāla, Matsya, Vaṃśa and Ikṣvāku dynasties. But Alexander heard not a word about the princes of these dynasties. On the contrary, he was informed

---

† Ibid., p. 69.
that the king of the Prasii (Magadha) was waiting to offer him resistance with an army of 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8000 war chariots and 6000 fighting elephants. Where were the representatives of the old dynasties then? We have no other alternative but to accept the Purânic story of their overthrow by Nanda of Magadha as genuine history. It is corroborated from the southeastern side by the Hâthigumphâ inscription of Khâravela, King of Kaliṅga. According to the Purâṇas an old dynasty ruled over Kaliṅga contemporaneously with the Śiśunāgas, and, according to the Pali Buddhist texts, Dantapura was the capital of the kingdom. In the Hâthigumphâ inscription we are told of King Khâravela that, "In the fifth year he had an aqueduct that had not been used for 103 years since King Nanda (or since the Nanda kings?) conducted into the city."* This shows that Nanda was in possession of Kaliṅganagarî 103 years before the fifth year of Khâravela’s reign.

The subjugation of Vedic Aryandom by a low-born conqueror from semi-barbarous Magadha probably contributed much more towards the overthrow of the Vedic culture than the teachings of Buddha and Mahâvîra. It inaugurated the real kaliyuga or iron age. We are told in the Viṣṇu Purâṇa (IV.24) "When the seven Rśis are in Pūrvāśâdha, then Nanda will begin to reign; and thenceforward the influence of the Kali will augment.''

---

The Nandas were succeeded by the mightier Mauryas of Magadha who exercised imperial sway over the whole of Northern India for nearly a century. Then the empire fell a prey to invaders from beyond the North-west frontiers such as the Yavanas (Bactrians), Pahlavas (Parthians), Tuṣāras (Veutis) and Śakas.

Then there arose in Magadha a second Mahāpadma Nanda. We are told in the Purāṇa:—

"Of the Māgadhas the king will be very valiant Viśvasphāṇi. Overthrowing all kings he will make other castes kings, namely, Kaivartas, Pañcakas, Pulindas, and Brāhmans. He will establish those persons as kings in various countries. Viśvasphāṇi is called eunuch-like in appearance. Overthrowing the Kṣatriya caste he will create another Kṣaṭriya caste. After gratifying the gods, the pitṛs and Brāhmans once and again, he will resort to the bank of the Ganges and subdue his body; after resigning his body he will go to Indra's world." *

Though no contemporaneous record bearing witness to the existence of this king has hitherto come to light, yet his account given after the accounts of the historical Andhras, Ābhīras, and the foreign dynasties and immediately before those of the historical Nāga and Gupta dynasties, can not be treated lightly. The founders of the Gupta empire were also natives of Magadha, and owed their elevation to an alliance with the Licchavis of Vaiśāli. The only native of the holy Madhya-

* The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 73.
deśa who ever succeeded in subduing the whole of Northern India was Harśavardhana of Thaneśvara and Kanauj. After his death his empire broke up into small kingdoms which lasted till the Mussalmān conquest. It was not, therefore, the conquering armies of the Midland, but the armies and settlers from Magadha and other Outer countries that carried their languages to Oudh and other places where mixed languages are now spoken.

To the north-west and the north of the Midland lived the Khaśas whose early history is thus summed up by Sir George Grierson:—

"We gather that according to the most ancient Indian authorities in the extreme north-west of India, on the Hindu Kush and the mountainous tracts to the south, and in the Western Punjab there was a group of tribes, one of which was called Khaśa, which were looked upon as Kṣatriyas of Aryan origin. These spoke a language closely allied to Sanskrit, but with a vocabulary partly allied to that of the Iranian Avesta.

"It is probable that they occupied an important position in Central Asia, and that countries, places and rivers, such as Kashmir, Kashgar in Central Asia, and the Kashgar of Chitral were named after them. They were closely connected with the group of tribes nicknamed 'Piśāchaś' or 'cannibals' by Indian writers, and before the sixth century they were stated to speak the same language as the people of Balkh. At the same period they had apparently penetrated along the southern slope of the Himālayas as far east as Nepāl,
and in the twelfth century they certainly occupied in considerable force the hills to the south, south-west and south-east of Kashmir.

Not only social institutions, and language, but an important physical feature also—the shape of the skull—lends support to the testimony of the Śruti, Smṛti, and Purāṇa, that the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries originally came of an ethnic stock that was different from the stock from which the Vedic Āryas originated. Long heads preponderate in all ranks of society in the provinces that now represent the ancient Vedic Aryandom and among the Maithil Brāhmans of Bihar with only 25 per cent of medium heads and 1.5 per cent round heads.† But among the typical

---

* Indian Antiquary, vol. XLIII, p. 150.
† Summary of measurements of headforms of typical Hindustani Castes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of subjects measured</th>
<th>Name of caste</th>
<th>Province of birth</th>
<th>Percentage of long or dolichocephalic heads (Index under 75)</th>
<th>Percentage of mesaticephalic heads (Index 75 to under 80)</th>
<th>Percentage of brachycephalic heads (Index 80 and above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>United Provinces</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bhuinhār</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Chāmār</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kāyastha</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kurmi</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Goala (Abir)</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Khatri</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Chuhrā</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Rajput</td>
<td>Rājputāna</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Maithil Brāhma-</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Castes of the Outer countries there is a preponderance of medium and round heads indicating, roughly speaking, an admixture of 50 per cent round heads, with the exception of Bihar where a larger percentage of long heads as well as the survival of the four-fold division of caste, are due to the absorption of larger Midlandic elements.* Other Indian peoples among whom broad or medium heads are present in as large numbers as

With the exception of the Maithil Brahmans of the previous table and the Pāścātya Vaidik Brahman and the Uttarārdhiya Kayasthas of the following table all other figures are taken from Sir Herbert Risley’s *Tribes and Castes of Bengal and People of India.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of subjects measured</th>
<th>Name of caste</th>
<th>Province of birth</th>
<th>Percentage of long or dolichocephalic heads</th>
<th>Percentage of medium or mesaticephalic heads</th>
<th>Percentage of broad or brachicephalic heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Nagar Brahman</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Bania</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Marāṭha</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Prabhu</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Chitpavan Brahman</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kunbi</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pāścātya Vaidik Brahman</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Uttarārdhiya Kayastha</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kayastha</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Namasūdra</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bhuinhar</td>
<td>Behar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Chamar</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kurmi</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
among the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries are the Telugu, the Kodagu and the Canarese-speaking population of the Deccan. After analysing the head-measurements of the population of the different linguistic areas of the Madras Presidency, Thurston writes:

"I am not prepared to hazard any new theory to account for the marked difference in the type of cranium in the various areas under consideration, and must content myself with the observation that whatever may have been the influence which has brought about the existing sub-brachycephalic or mesaticephalic types in the Northern areas, this influence has not extended into the Tamil and Malayalam countries, where Dravidian man remains dolicho or sub-dolichocephalic."

The speakers of Tamil and Malayalam languages of Southern India who represent the ancient Cholas, Pândyas, and Keralas, are long-headed, and so are the tribesmen of the Nişāda stock. So to account for the presence of round and medium-headed elements in such large numbers in the population of the Indo-Aryan Outland we are constrained to assume the immigration of round-headed and medium-headed tribes who have commingled with the long-headed men of Nişāda, Vedic Ārya, and Tamil stocks in different proportions in different parts of the wide area inhabited by them.

Physical characteristics, and, particularly the head index, do not find recognition in certain

* Castes and Tribes of Southern India, Vol. I.
quarters as tests of physical relationship. Mr. O'Malley writes:

"Of late years anthropometry as a test of race has begun to fall out of favour. Professor Ridge-way considers that physical type depends far more on environment than on race. 'From the evidence already to hand there is high probability that inter-marriage can do little to form a new race, unless the parents on both sides are of races evolved in similar environments.' Elsewhere he points out that 'as the physical anthropologists cannot agree upon any principles of skull measurement, the historical inquirer must not at present base any argument in this class of evidence.' Another writer (Professor Homersham Cox) remarks:— 'Neither cephalic nor nasal index is of much use in determining race. The truth is, the method on indices has been thoroughly discredited among anthropologists, and were it not employed in the 'People of India,' a book published in 1908, we should have supposed it had no longer any followers.' . . . . . His (Prof. Ridgeway's) views appear to be confirmed by the recent discoveries of Walcher, who has drawn attention to the changes which can be made in the shape of the skull of newly-born infants by inducing them to lie constantly on the side or on the back, according as it is desired to make the head long or short."*

---

Regarding the recent discoveries of Walcher it may be observed that though it is possible to make changes in the shape of the skull of newly-born infants, there is no evidence to show that in countries where long-heads predominate the infants are deliberately and invariably made to lie on the side, and in countries where short heads predominate the infants are similarly made to lie on the back. Students of physical anthropology do not seem to have taken serious notice of the views of the two other authorities cited by Mr. O'Malley, but have gone on with their researches as before. We are here mainly concerned with one physical character, the shape of the skull as indicated by the cephalic index, as a test of race. The influence of environment on the head-form has been a subject of keen controversy in America. I reproduce Dr. W. L. H. Duckworth's summary of the discussion:—

"The contribution to the study of environment provided by Dr. Boas in his report on the immigrants into the United States deserves special attention here. Two striking announcements are made in that report. In the first place, it is claimed that in regard to head-form, the offspring of immigrants stand in distinct and even marked contrast to their parents. Again the data are said to show that a change in every case takes place in the direction of convergence towards a common form or type. So that whether the parents themselves be of long-headed or of the bullet-headed type, these characteristics are not transmitted."
The offspring tends towards an intermediate form. Environment is made prominent in the speculations as to the influence determining these results. The latter are extraordinary for two reasons. First on account of the acting force, and again for the rapidity with which it acts. Acceptance of the conclusions in such a matter must depend on the nature of the evidence, including \textit{inter alia} the method of collection and the actual numerical differences shown by the figures. Having regard to such points, the severe criticism which has been passed on these statements is not without justification, and it is clear that further support is needed before anything like complete recognition can be accorded to the conclusions."

The anthropological history of Europe, of which Prof. Arthur Keith has given a luminous summary in his Presidential Address delivered to the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (on January 26th, 1915) furnishes unerring testimony of the value of head-form as a test of race. This history covers a period of 4000 to 5000 years and is thus put in a nutshell:

"In the first place we have clear proof that at one time — some 4000 or 5000 years ago — the round-headed stock did break through and reached the western shores of Europe. It leavened England, but became submerged; it met a similar fate in Western Germany and in Holland. In the earlier centuries of the present era the long-heads

* \textit{The Britannica Year Book, 1913}, p. 155.
in North-Western Europe must have undergone a recrudescence in numbers and in power. They broke eastwards in the plains of the Vistula and the Danube; they imposed their speech on the conquered peoples, but the vanquished imposed on them their features of face, head, and body. They broke westwards in France and lost both their tongue and their head-form; they crossed the North Sea and kept both their tongue and their shape of head."*

Sir Herbert Risley traces the round-headed elements among the Gujarātīs, Marāṭhis, and Coorgs to Scythian admixture; and those among the Bengalis and Oriyas to Mongoloid admixture. The Central Asian nomads who followed the Bactrians and Parthians to India in the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era and are generally known as Indo-Scythians consisted of Śaka and Yeŭṭi or Tokhāra (Skt. Tuṣāra) hordes. The history of their dominion in India is involved in obscurity. But it is possible to distinguish two different phases of Indo-Scythian rule. First, the dominions of the Kṣatrapas or Satrāps of North-Western and Western India who were the representatives of Parthian suzerains; second, the empire of the Kushan branch of the Yeūtis. The inscriptions of the Kṣatrapas and Mahākṣatrapas of North-Western India have been discovered at Taxila and Mathura, and their coins have been found in the Punjab and in the western

districts of the Agra province. Śaka-Parthian dominion in the North-West was probably overthrown by the Kushan branch of the Yeu'tis. We know the names of no less than seven Kushan kings from their coins and inscriptions. Inscriptions dated in the reign of Kanishka have been found as far east as Sārnath, and, according to tradition, his kingdom extended as far as Paṭaliputra in Magadha. An inscription dated in the reign of the Kushan King Vāsashka has been found on a Buddhist statue at Sanchi.* Coins of the Kushan Kings have been found all over Northern India. These Indo-Scythians were evidently round-headed. But the Indo-Scythian strain has failed to modify the physical type of Hindusthān which is predominantly long-headed. This is no doubt due to the fact that Indo-Scythian invaders were too small in number to produce any impression on the physical features of the general population that absorbed them. If this was the case in Northern India, it cannot be assumed that the Indo-Scythians who invaded Western India and the Deccan modified the physical character of the long-headed Dravidian or Niṣāda aborigines. Indo-Scythian Kṣatrapas ruled over Gujarat and part of Mālava for above three centuries beginning from A.D. 78, but their dominion farther south was short-lived and intermittent. Both Northern Konkan and Northern Mahārāṣṭra were in possession of the Kṣaharātas under Nahapāna (A.D.

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1903, p. 325.
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1129-124) and were then re-conquered by the Andhra King Gautamiputra. Northern Mahārāṣṭra continued under the Andhras till it passed into the possession of the Ābhīras early in the third century A.D. Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman conquered Northern Konkan about A.D 150; but it was recovered by the Andhra King Yajña-Śrī (A.D. 169-198). The Indo-Scythians who held only the outskirts of the Deccan for such short intervals can hardly be regarded as the ancestors of the vast broad or medium-headed population of the entire table-land. We must therefore reject Risley’s Indo-Scythian theory and trace their origin to brachycephalic hordes who migrated in large numbers in the prehistoric period and by intermingling with the Niṣāda, Dravidian, and Vedic Aryan, elements produced the hybrid population of Gujarāt, Mahāraṣṭrā, Coorg, Karnāṭaka and Andhra (Telugu Country).

From the same group of prehistoric immigrants are derived the round-headed and medium-headed elements in the population of Bihar, Orissa, and Bengal. Mongoloids are not recognised as autochthones in India but are immigrants,* and Risley’s theory of Mongolo-Dravidian origin of the Bengalis and Oriyas involves the assumption that Mongoloid invaders preceded in large numbers the carriers of Aryan speech and culture in Bengal and Orissa. But neither the physiognomy of the bulk of the Bengali and Oriya folk,

nor the legends and traditions relating to their origin, support this hypothesis, while legends and traditions bearing testimony to Mongoloid affinities are well-known relating to the Nepalese and Assamese among whom men with Mongoloid physiognomy still predominate. According to the Sīâyambhū Purāṇa and the local annals the valley of Nepal was originally a lake called Kālihrada or 'dark lake'. Mañjudeva (Bodhisatva Mañjuśrī or Mañjughoṣa) came from China with a body of Chinese (cinadesajamānusāh), drained the lake by cutting out a passage, and colonized the valley with his followers. He also imported from China a prince named Dharmākara and made him the ruler of the Chinese colony. These legends bear strong resemblance to the legends contained in the Nīlamata relating to the origin of the population of Kashmir which will be referred to presently. According to the Kalika-Purāṇa (XXXIX.104)*, Kāmarūpa or Assam, bounded on the west by the Karatoyā, was inhabited "by powerful, cruel, and ignorant Kirātas." Naraka, a demon, with the help of Viṣṇu, drove out the Kirātas and established Brāhmans well versed in the Vedas and other castes in Kāmarūpa. But Purāṇic legends relating to the origin of the people of Aṅga (southeastern Bihar), Kaliṅga (Orissa), and the three main divisions of Bengal—Punţra (Varendra), Suhma (Rāḍha) and Vaṅga (Eastern Bengal)—know nothing of Chinese and Kirāta immigrants or

* Published by Kṣemaraja, Bombay, 1814 Sāka.
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aborigines. According to these legends as told in the Harivamśa (chapter 31), in the line of Pūru, son of Yayāti, there was a king named Bali who had five sons,—Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Suhma and Puṇḍra. The five kingdoms ruled over by them came to be known after them. "Anga was first born, then Vaṅga, Suhma, Puṇḍra and Kaliṅga. These are called Bāleya Kṣatriyas. Bāleya Brāhmans on earth are also his descendants. O Bhārata, Brāhmaṇa, being pleased with him, granted him this boon . . . Here you will establish the four permanent castes."* These verses also occur in the Matsya Purāṇa (48. 24-28). Vāyu Purāṇa (99, 27) says of Bali, "He gave birth to sons that created the four castes on earth."† These legends also throw light on the question of the origin of caste in the Outer countries.

Head-form alone, unless accompanied by other Mongoloid characteristics, can not be accepted

* सङ्गोगोङ्गों स तु वशविचारवं शपित: पुरा ||
पुत्राकुःधर्मायामश्च पप्पूर्वकरान्ं मुखिः ||
परम: प्रथमस्वत्वः वहः खुःपाचार्याः भ ||
पव: कलिर्मः तथाप बालियं चवसुष्थते ||
बालेयं ब्राध्यायायु तस्य वश्वकरा मुखिः ||
बकेशु द्राध्याद्विवर: प्रौद्यम भारतः ||
* * *

चतुरो भिन्ननां वर्णोऽश्च खापियवयो तिष्ठ ||
* * *

तेषां जनयत: पप्प:अभवः खुःपाचार्यः ||
कलिर्मः पुत्राखुः पव ||
† "पुत्राकुःधर्मायामश्च पप्पूर्वकरान्ं मुखिः !"
as a sign of considerable Mongolian strain, for all the Mongoloid tribes within the Indian border are not round-headed. Among 84 male members of the Abor tribe measured by Messrs. J. Coggin Brown and S. W. Kemp, 32 per cent are long-headed and only 6 per cent are round-head.* The Koch, Paliya, and the Rajvaṃśis of Northern Bengal, whose physiognomy displays Mongoloid traits, are evidently the descendants of Mongoloid invaders from the Himālayas or the Brahmaputra Valley who settled in the historic period. To account for the linguistic, social, and physical differences between the Hindusthānis on the one hand and the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries on the other, we have to assume the immigration of round and medium-headed invaders of Aryan speech in the pre-historic period. Now the question is, wherefrom did these pre-historic round-headed Aryan invaders come?

The home of the round-headed Aryans is not far to seek. Beyond the Indus, in Baluchistan and Afghanistan, live the Baluch and the Pathans who are Aryan in speech (Iranian) and medium-headed. Sir Herbert Risley classified these Baluch and Pathans as Turko-Iranian type on the assumption that the dolichocephalic elements among them are of Iranian stock and the brachycephalic elements are of Turanian stock. But the physical anthropology of the Pāmirs and Chinese Turkistan

as gathered from data collected by Ujfalvy and Sir Aurel Stein indicates that we need not lay the Turks, the Scythians, and the Mongolians under contribution to explain the presence of broad or medium heads among Outlandic Indo-Aryans or Indo-Afghans. The final conclusions from these data are thus stated by Mr. T. A. Joyce*:

"To sum up, the measurements show that the majority of people surrounding the Taklamakan desert have a very large common element. Further, this element is seen in its purest form in the Wakhi. The fact that the Wakhi display so close a relationship with the Galcha proves that the basis of the Takla makan population is Iranian (?). At the North-Western edge of the desert an intrusive element, which can be sharply differentiated from the Iranian (?), makes its appearance, the Turki element. Besides this there seems to be some common bond between the peoples of the desert and of Tibet. This probably means that the Iranian (?) element has penetrated to Northern Tibet, though it is not unlikely that Tibetan (modified Mongolian) influence has been exercised, to slight degree, upon the desert peoples. In any case the relationship with Tibet required confirmation by more measurements taken in the latter country. In the Pamirs is a series of tribes, who, though chiefly of Iranian (?) stock, begin to exhibit slight traces of Indo-Afghan blood. In at least one tribe,

* Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 1912, pp. 467-468.
the Kāfīr, these traces are considerably more than slight. The Chitrāli also seem to stand in closer relationship to an Indo-Afghan people (but a rather specialized Indo-Afghan people) than the other Pamir tribes. Some admixture has taken place between the Turki and Desert folk. In the case of Aksu, the Turki element predominates. In the case of Nīya and Keriya, who should be classed as rather aberrant members of the Desert group, it seems probable that their departure from the North is due to Turki admixture. Faizabad appears to be a mixture of all three groups, Pamir, Turki, and Desert; and this is what might be expected, the root stock of the population would thus be Iranian (?), though it has been exposed to Turki influences since Indo-Scythian times and has thus become somewhat modified. In the East, Chinese influence begins to make itself felt, but only over a very restricted area. Hami, Turfan, and Koro have been thus affected, and it is not unlikely that the desert people have had some corresponding, though perhaps slight, effect upon the population of Nan-huo and Tun-huang.

The great differentiation of the Chinese and Turki groups is interesting, since both are regarded as ‘Mongolian.’ It is evident that they belong to widely different branches of the Mongolian race, and it must be concluded that the Turki are allied to the Southern Mongolian.

If this is so, and the Turki peoples do, in fact, contain a large Southern Mongolian element, their stature has been greatly increased in the
course of their wanderings, by contact, probably, with Iranian (?) peoples. This leads us to the question to what extent we may regard the Turki as a distinct branch of Mongolians, and whether it would not be more correct to look upon the various tribes which fall under this heading as being originally mixtures, in varying proportions, of Mongolian and Iranian (?) elements, which time has reduced to comparative homogeneity. Finally, the point which emerges most clearly from the welter of measurements and descriptive data contained in this paper is this: that the original inhabitant of the Pamirs and Takla-Makan Desert, including the cities now buried beneath the sand, is that type of man described by Lapouge as Homo Alpinus, with, in the west, traces of the Indo-Afghan; and that the Mongolian has had very little influence upon the population. In using the Homo Alpinus term, I wish it to be understood that I employ it merely as the name of certain type already described, and not necessarily imply that the actual population of the Alps is closely allied to the population of Chinese Turkistan.

"In conclusion, I will quote from my previous paper (already cited) the description of these types:—

"1. A white-rosy race, very brachycephalic, stature about the average, with thin prominent nose, varying from aquiline to straight, long, oval face, hair brown, usually dark, always abundant and wavy (I think this should now be altered
to curly), eyes medium in the main. This is Lapouge’s *Homo Alpinus*.

"2. A race, also white, but with a slight tendency to brownish, also very brachycephalic and with stature above the average, nose broader and usually straight, cheekbones broad, hairs straighter, darker and less abundant, eyes dark. The ‘Turkish’ race.

"3. A brown mesaticephalic, tall type, thin, prominent and aquiline nose, long, oval face, black, wavy hair, dark eyes. This race may be termed the Indo-Afghan."

From this classification of the physical types of Chinese Turkistan and the Pamirs, it is evident that in the pre-historic period the Takla-Makan desert and the Pamirs were inhabited by a very brachycephalic population of Aryan or Indo-European speech. Mr. Joyce calls this root stock Iranian. But several documents written in the language spoken in Chinese Turkestan that have been unearthed indicate that the language spoken in the ancient kingdoms of Khotan and Kucha was neither Indo-Aryan nor Iranian. Some savants designate this language ‘Tokharian’ (A and B). The ‘B’ dialect of the Tokharian language was spoken in the small kingdom of Kucha in the seventh century A.D. Professor Sylvain Levi names this dialect Kuchean, and about its place in the Indo-European family he writes, ‘One would expect the Kuchean to be intimately connected with the Aryan languages of Iran and India. Not at all. Special features show its near relationship to the
Western languages of Europe, particularly Italo-Celtic."* In the North-Western Frontier Province and Baluchistan this *Homo Albinus* type has been modified into medium-headed Indo-Afghan by contact with the long-headed Vedic Ārya and the Avestic Ārya on the one hand, and the Dravidian, whose language, the Brahuī, still survives in Baluchistan, on the other. In India the same type has been turned into the mesaticephalic Indo-Aryan of the Outland by Nisāda, Vedic Ārya, and Draviḍa, admixture.

According to Hoernle’s theory adopted by Grierson, the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries came earlier and the inhabitants of the Midland represent the latest wave of immigration. There is no clear evidence to show that the Magadhas, the Āṅgas, and the Puṇḍras preceded the Vedic Āryas. It is more reasonable to suppose that when immigrants of the *Homo Alpinus* type entered India they found the middle portion of the Gangetic plain in possession of the Vedic Āryas, and therefore the first batch found their way to the lower Gangetic plain (Bihar) across the tableland of Central India. Other bands, the Rāṣṭikas or Raṭṭas after whom Mahāraṣṭra and Saurāṣṭra are named, wandered into the Kathiwar Peninsula and the Deccan.

A later wave consisted of the Vāhikas of the Land of the Five Rivers who are referred to in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (I. 7. 3. 8) as worshippers

* *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1914, p. 959.
of Rudra under the name of Bhava. The latest wave is represented by the speakers of what Grierson calls the modern Piśāca languages,—the Kashmiris, the Darads, and the Kāfirs of the Hindukush. The legends of Nilamata enshrine the traditions of the movements of the different strata of the population of Kashmir. Like Nepal, Kashmir was originally a lake called Satisara. The Nāgas with Nila their king lived in this lake. Śiva drained off the water of the lake and produced Kashmir. Kaśyapa, Nila’s father, peopled Kashmir with gods and goddesses as well as Nāgas. He wished to introduce men, but the Nāgas objected to their company. Kaśyapa cursed and condemned the Nāgas henceforth to dwell with Piśācas. Nila interceded on behalf of the Nāgas. Kaśyapa said there was an island, six yojanas in area, in the sand ocean. Fierce Piśācas, Yakṣas, and Daityas lived in that island. Every year Nikumbha, the King of the Piśācas, would lead five crores of Piśācas to Kashmir and live there six months. The Nāgas would live with men for the remaining six months. Regarding the ethnographical significance of these legends Grierson writes:—

"By the expression ‘an island in the sand ocean’ to the north of Kāśmir, the Nilamata can only mean an oasis in the Central Asian desert lately explored by Dr. Stein. . . . . . . That these mythological Nāgas represented an actual people has never, I believe, been doubted; and here, in the Nilamata, we see them described as the original inhabitants of Kāśmir, and as half conquered by
Piśāca invaders from an oasis in the Central Asian desert. If we now turn to the Sūryagarbha Sūtra of the Mahasaṃnipāta, the Māhātmya of Khotan, we find the same story repeated. The Yakṣas (i.e., Piśācas) are again brought into prominence as superseding the Nāgas. The latter refuse to accept the charge of the twenty holy places of Buddhism. The Yakṣas then accept the responsibility of nineteen, the twentieth, Gośringa in Khotan, being left to the Nāgas.’’

Regarding the Nāgas, Grierson adds in a note, “I am inclined to believe that they may have been the ancestors of the Non-Aryan inhabitants of Hunza-Nagar, whose language, Burusaski, has not yet been identified as belonging to any known family of speech.” The Piśāca characteristics are not confined to the dialects of Kāshmir and Hindu-kush but are found in most of the Outer Indo-Aryan languages. Grierson writes:—

“But there are traces of the former prevalence of these languages over an area much wider than North-Western India. The Khasa languages of the Western Himalaya as far as Kumaon present many peculiarities which are also found in ‘Modern Piśāca’ forms of speech; and only in these. So also the Lahndā of the Western Punjab, Sindhi, and Punjabi itself. . . . . . .

“But these ‘Modern Piśāca’ features have spread much further than the Punjab. They have

* Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1912, p. 72.
gone from Sindhī into Northern Gujaraṭhi, and thence, as already stated, into the Vindhya country of the Bhils. They are traceable so far south as the Konkaṇi dialect of Marathi."

These Piśāca peculiarities are probably derived not from invaders of Piśāca speech, but from the stock language spoken by the invaders akin to the Homo Alpinus of Eastern Turkestan, and the dialects of the Hindukush and Kaśmir retain a greater number of these peculiarities because they have been much less influenced by the Midlandic Indo-Aryan language than the other Outer Indo-Aryan languages.

* Ibid., p. 77.
CHAPTER III.

RACE AND CULT—VAIŚṆAVISM.

The Vedic literature—Mantra, Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra—yields materials for reconstructing the history of the culture of the Vedic Aryans as Avesta does of the Iranians. But no ancient literary monument of the Outlandic Indo-Aryans revealing any aspect of their primitive culture has come down to us. The little that we as yet know of their distant kinsmen of Central Asia (Chinese Turkestan) does not throw any light on this question. The earliest documents hitherto discovered in the sands of Turkestan do not carry us further than the early centuries of the Christian era when the whole local civilization was Buddhistic, and nothing has as yet come to light that enables us to obtain a glimpse of the pre-Buddhistic culture of the Aryan round-heads of Central Asia. But by analysing the post-Vedic Indo-Aryan cults ethnographically, it may be possible to trace some elements of the primitive culture of the Outlandic Indo-Aryans and to ascertain their share in building up the latter-day Hindu culture as distinguished from the early Vedic culture. I shall here deal with the history of VaiśṆavism from the ethnographical standpoint.

The origin of the different phases of VaiśṆavism has long been a subject of keen controversy. In 1868 Weber first called attention to the strange
coincidences between the legends of child Kṛṣṇa and Christ. He writes, "Now, when Christianity, by whatever way it arrived, became known to the Indians, the similarity of the names of Kṛṣṇa (which in Southern India is pronounced Krishtna, with a 't') and of Christ seems to have given rise to the identification of the two personalities, and to have caused the transfer of the stories regarding our Lord, the birth of the Babe in the manger, and so forth, to Kṛṣṇa, whose mother's name, Devakī, it may be remarked, can also be interpreted as meaning 'the divine one'."* About the way in which Christianity arrived in India and influenced Kṛṣṇa worship Weber writes:—

"The observance of the feast of the birth of Christ in connection with that of His baptism is traceable in Egypt from the second half of the fourth century up to the year 431 A.D.; and it is natural to assume that it was about this time that the transfer of this kind of festival to India took place, and, with it, the other connected materials which point to Christian legends and conceptions in the story of Kṛṣṇa. Two ways lay open for their communication. In the first place, Indian travellers, merchants, and the like may have come to Alexandria. There they may have learnt about Christianity, and on their return home may have transferred its legends to their own Kṛṣṇa, whom they already worshipped in

India as a demigod. In the second place Christian missionaries may have gone to India, and have found there among the Kṛṣṇa worshippers a good soil for the propagation of their doctrines."

Weber’s theory of the Christian origin of the cult of Gopāla or child Kṛṣṇa has been adopted by almost all scholars with the exception of Barth, but Weber’s view relating to the time and way of the arrival of Christianity in India has not met with general approval. Hopkins, considering how late are these legends about the child Kṛṣṇa, dated them tentatively as arising after A.D. 600.† Kennedy holds that in the fifth or sixth century A.D. Scythian nomads from Central Asia, called Gurjaras or Gujars, ‘‘who roamed through the woods of Braj, brought with them a child-god, a Christian legend, and Christmas festival; and in a city of lax Buddhists and eager Hindus this germ sufficed for the birth of a new if hybrid divinity . . . . . . . The name of the new god sounded in the ears of the Hindus like that of elder Kṛṣṇa, whom the popular epic had exalted to the highest rank: the new god, like the elder Kṛṣṇa, was an incarnation of the Most High; and so the youthful Kṛṣṇa was born.’’‡ Grierson, following Weber, Hopkins and Kennedy, writes: ‘‘It is possible, and perhaps probable, that the worship of the infant Kṛṣṇa was a local adaptation of the worship of the infant Christ introduced to India from

---

* Ibid., p. 287.
† The Religions of India, 1894, p. 431.
‡ Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1907, pp. 989—990.
the North-West, and the ritual of Kṛṣṇa's birth-
festival was certainly borrowed from Christian
authorities."*  
The distinguished Indian scholar, Sir Ram-
śrṣṇa G. Bhandarkar, pushes back the importa-
tion of the Christian influence to an earlier epoch.
He says that inscriptions, the work of Patañjali,
and the Nārāyaṇiya section of the Mahābhārata
indicate no knowledge of the cowherd (Gopāla)
Kṛṣṇa. The only passage of the Mahābhārata
(II. 41), northern recension, which refers to the
deeds of cowherd Kṛṣṇa, is an evident interpola-
tion. "'The Harivaṇṣa, which is the chief
authority, contains the word dināra, correspond-
ing to the Latin word denarius, and consequently
must have been written about the third century
of the Christian era.' "'The cowherds among
whom the boy-god Kṛṣṇa lived were the nomadic
Ābhīras 'who must have migrated into the
country in the first century A.D.' "'They probably
brought with them the worship of the boy-god
and the story of his humble birth, his reputed
father's knowledge that he was not his son, and
the massacre of the innocents. The two last cor-
respond to Nanda's knowing that he was not the
father of Kṛṣṇa and Kaṁśa's killing all children
. . . . It is possible that they brought with them
the name of Christ also, and this name probably
led to the identification of the boy-god with Vāsu-

* Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II; art.
'Bhakti-Mārga', p. 550b.
deva-Kṛṣṇa. The Goanese and the Bengalis often pronounce the name Kṛṣṇa as Kusto or Kṛsto, and so the Christ of the Ābhīras was recognised as the Sanskrit Kṛṣṇa.”’*

The main reason that has led these eminent authorities to assume a Christian origin of the cult of child Kṛṣṇa is the presence of certain common elements in the legends of child Kṛṣṇa and those of Christ. If these elements remind one of the story of Christ as told in the gospel, there are other elements in the legend of Gopāla, such as Nārada’s prediction to Kaṁśa (according to Harivanaṣa) that he would be killed by the eighth child of Devaki, precautions taken by Kaṁśa, and Kṛṣṇa’s ultimately killing Kaṁśa, bear striking analogy to the legends of the Greek hero Perseus whose maternal grandfather Acrisius was forewarned by a prophet that he would be killed by the hand of his daughter Danae’s son and was ultimately killed by Danae’s son Perseus. If we admit the possibility of the independent origin of these legends, it is not necessary to postulate borrowing from Christianity of such elements in the Kṛṣṇa legend as Nanda’s knowledge that Kṛṣṇa was not really his son and Kaṁśa’s massacre of Devaki’s children. There is a great deal of resemblance between the career of boy Kṛṣṇa and of young Perseus, whereas Christ is a character of different type. Two of Perseus’s greatest

feats, slaughter of Medusa the Gorgon, and of the sea-monster bred of slime to save Andromeda, have their counterparts in Kṛṣṇa’s slaughter of Putanā and the subjugation of Kāliya, the snake-demon.

Another argument advanced by Bhandarkar is, that Ghoṣa, where, according to the Harivaṃśa, child Kṛṣṇa’s foster-father lived, ‘‘is defined as Ābhīrapalli, which is generally understood as the enclosure of cowherds. But the original signification of the word Ābhīra is not a cowherd. It is the name of a race.’’ Amara and later lexicographers define ghoṣa as ābhīrapalli or Ābhīra settlement. But the term also occurs in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (on Pāṇini II. 4. 1) together with grāma (village) and nagara (town).* So we must either admit that the Ābhīras migrated to India before Patañjali or there were other cowherds who lived in ghoṣas before the advent of the Ābhīras. The admission of either of these alternatives render the theory of the Christian origin of the cult of Gopāla untenable. That there were Ābhīras in India even when Kātyāyana, Patañjali’s predecessor, wrote, is evident from his Vārttika on Pāṇini IV. 1. 4 where the word mahāśūdri is excluded from the operation of the rule. Mahāśūdri, according to Amara, means ābhīrī, cowherdess. According to Kāśikā ‘‘the word mahāśūdra denotes a man of ābhīra caste.’’† The

---

* कः प्रवर्तकमिनासः | ग्रामो धोषो नगरं संघात दृष्टि |
† मन्त्रायुक्तमध्ये स्थानोर्गोगस्तिष्ठम् |
author of *The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea* (§ 41), who wrote about A.D. 60, places Abiria, the land of the Ābhīras, between Scythia (Śaka-Kṣatrapa dominions) and the coast land called Syrastrene (Saurāṣtra), thus corresponding to the area assigned to the Ābhīras in the Harivamśa (5161-5163). If, therefore, the legend of Gopāla grew among the Ābhīras, as it very probably did, it grew independently of Christian influence.

The dramatic representation of *Kamsavadha* or slaughter of Kamsa by Kṛṣṇa, referred to in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (on Pāṇini III. 1. 26) indicates that these legends are older than Christianity. Professor Keith truly observes, "But surely the existence of standing enmity between Kṛṣṇa and Kamsa, his uncle, of which the Mahābhāṣya presents the most conclusive proof, essentially presupposes the existence of a legend of the youthful Kṛṣṇa. The relationship would normally be accompanied by friendship and protection: when the reverse is found, and the nephew slays the uncle, the similar legends found elsewhere justify us in thinking that tradition must have told some tale of the efforts of the uncle to remove from his path the unwelcome nephew. It can hardly be supposed that it was left for Christianity, as Mr. Kennedy seems to suggest, to find a justification for the killing of Kamsa in the massacre of the Innocents."

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1908, p. 173.*
In Bhāsa's Bālācarita* we actually possess an old drama of which Kaṃśavadha or the slaughter of Kaṃśa is the theme. Kālidāsa, in his Mālavikāgnimitra, calls Bhāsa 'far-famed' (prathita yaṣas) and 'ancient' (purāṇa). This indicates a considerable distance of time between Kālidāsa and Bhāsa. A comparison of the Prākṛt used by Bhāsa and by Aśvaghoṣa leads Sten Konow to place Bhāsa a century after Aśvaghoṣa, that is to say, in the third century A.D.† The wish expressed in the concluding stanza of the Bālcaritā (bharatavākya) that the King might be the sole ruler from sea to sea between the Himālaya and the Vindhyā does not necessarily imply that Bhāsa's royal patron was the sole ruler of Northern India and a poet whom Kālidāsa calls purāṇa can not very well be placed later than the third century A.D. But whatever be the date of Bhāsa, comparison of the Bālācarita and Harivāṃśa shows that in Bhāsa's play we have an independent version of the story of child Kṛṣṇa. Bhāsa's story differs in certain points from the story as told in the Harivāṃśa. In the Harivāṃśa Nārada warns Kaṃśa that he will be killed by the eighth issue of his sister Devakī, while, according to Bālācarita, a Rṣi named Madhuka cursed Kaṃśa that he would come by his end in that way. But the difference in the accounts of the hallīṣa sport

* Bālācarita of Bhāsa, edited with notes by Ganapati Śāstrī, Trivandrum, 1912.
† Indian Antiquary, 1914.
is very remarkable. It forms the subject matter of adhyāya 77 (4078-4098) of the Harivamśa. Herein halliśa kṛḍā is treated as synonymous with rati, or sexual enjoyment, and we are further told that the boy Kṛṣṇa spent night after night in the company of young gopa girls who were forbidden to do so by their parents and brothers.* But in Bhāsa’s play halliśaka is the name of an innocent village dance. I shall reproduce Bhāsa’s account in translation:—

‘‘Samkarṣana. Dāmaka, are all the gopa girls here?

Dāmaka. Yes, sir, all are assembled here.

Dāmodara (Kṛṣṇa). O Ghoṣasundari, O Vanamālā, O Candrarekhā, O Mṛgākṣi, perform the Halliśaka dance which well suits a ghoṣa.

Aśī. As your lordship commands.

Samkarṣana. O Dāmaka, O Meghanāda, play on the musical instruments.

Both. Very well, sir.

Old cowherd. Sir, you play the halliśaka; what shall I do?

Dāmodara. Be a spectator.

Old cowherd. Very well, sir (all dance) Ho! Ho! very good music! very good dance! I shall also dance. But I am tired. (Act III).’’

In Act IV of Bālacārīta, Kṛṣṇa, after subduing Kāliya, comes out of the Yamunā (Jumna) with some flowers and presents them to the gopa girls.

* ना वाज्यमाणा: चिदविष्णुष्टिःभिभक्षयि।

हण्यं गोपानां राजी वनमयो रतिप्रिया॥
Bhāsa's play contains no reference to Kīṣṇa's love-making with the Ābhīra maidens, a theme which is so well-suited to dramatic treatment, and therefore seems to be older than chapter 77 of the Harivaṃśa in its present form.

As regards the antiquity of the cult of Gopāla it may be observed that Indians are extremely conservative in religious matters and refuse to adopt any cult unless it can be recognized as sanātana or coming from time immemorial. Consequently absence of archæological or literary evidence can not be construed as a conclusive proof of the non-existence of the cult before the time of Bhāsa or Harivaṃśa. Farnell's observation relating to the history of Greek cults holds good of Indian cults as well. He writes, "The chronologic statement is embarrassed by the absence of any record of date for the institution and diffusion of most of the cults, and for the growth of certain religious ideas; nor can we safely date a religious fact by the date of the author who first mentions it; a detail of ritual, a myth, a religious concept attested only by Pausanias or a late scholiast may descend from an age far anterior to the Homeric."* Sir Rāmkṛṣṇa Bhāndārkar holds that the cult of Rāma "must have come into existence about the eleventh century," because Madhva or Ānandatīrtha is said to have brought an image of Rāma from Bādarikāśrama and sent a disciple to Jagannātha

---

about the year A.D. 1264 to bring what was called the original idols of Rāma and Sītā.* But he has overlooked the fact that Varāhamihira, who died in A.D. 587, gives the measurements of the image of Rāma in his Brhatsamhitā. "The image of Rāma, son of Daśaratha, and Bali, son of Virocana, should be made one hundred and twenty aṅgulas (LVII. 30)." A deity called Rāma-devatā is named in the Avadānaśataka which is assigned to about A.D. 100 by Speyer and was translated into Chinese in the first half of the third century.† The Nānāghāt cave inscription wherein Vāsudeva and Saṃkarṣaṇa of the lunar race (canda-suta) are invoked is assigned to the first century B.C. by Sir Rāmakṛṣṇa and to an earlier epoch by Bühler. "For about five hundred years after this," Bhandarkar writes, "there are no epigraphical or sculptural traces of any Brāhmānic religious system; and they reappear about the time when the Guptas rose to power in the first quarter of the fourth century."‡ But the Sanskrit Buddhist texts of this period, to say nothing of the plays of Bhāsa, contain clear references to the cults of Viṣṇu, Śiva and other Brāhmānic gods. In Avadāna 7 of the Avadānaśataka it is said that before the birth of Bhagavān (Buddha) King Prasenajit

* Vaiśṇavism, etc., p. 47.
† "भृतष: पुराभिः प्रकृतविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रамविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषव�्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद্রमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्रमविषवদ्रमविषवद्र}\n
‡ Vaiśṇavism, etc., pp. 42-43.
of Srāvastī worshipped the "Tirthika gods" with flowers, incense, sweet-smelling garlands, etc. One day a gardener came to Srāvastī with nine lotus flowers for Prasenajit and was met by a Tirthika (heathen) worshipper who wanted to buy the flowers. They came to where Anāthapindāda was, who offered double the price offered by the Tirthika. Then both of them went on bidding more and more till it came up to 100,000. The gardener now asked the Tirthika, "For whose sake you offer higher price?" He replied, "I offer higher price for the sake of Bhagavān Nārāyaṇa."* In Avadāna 23 it is said that the young wife of a merchant of Rājagṛha (in Magadhā) who had gone to the sea was very anxious for his safe return. Then "prostrating herself before Nārāyaṇa she promised, 'if my husband return shortly, I shall make an offering of a golden wheel'." When her husband returned safe and successful, she had a golden wheel made, and surrounded by her maid-servants, set out with the wheel and incense and flowers for the Devakula or the temple of Nārāyaṇa.† The few early epigraphic records which relate to the worship of Vāsudeva contain nothing that preclude the possibility of the existence of the cult of child Kṛṣṇa in those days. The earliest one, assigned to about 200 B.C., at Ghasundi in Rajputāna, records the erection of a pujā stone at the Nārāyanavātā for bhagavat

† Ibid. I, p. 129.
Saṃkarśaṇa and Vāsudeva.* The next in point of time is the Besnagar pillar inscription dating from about 140 B.C., which records the erection of a Garuḍadhvaja of Vāsudeva the god of gods, by the Bhāgavata Heliodora, a native of Taxila and a Yona (Yavana) ambassador from Maharāja Aṃtalikita.† The third epigraph, the Nānāghāṭ cave inscription referred to above, which opens with an invocation of Saṃkarśaṇa and Vāsudeva of the lunar race, also indicates that at the time of this inscription Saṃkarśaṇa and Vāsudeva were believed to have been born on this earth in the lunar race and must have passed through childhood. Instead of pushing argumentum ad silentio too far, it is, therefore, more reasonable to recognize the cult of child Kṛṣṇa as a necessary appanage of the cult of elder Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva than as an offshoot of Christianity.

The orthodox view regarding the origin of the cult of Vāsudeva (known as Bhāgavata, Pāṇca-rātra, or Sātvata system) held by scholars like Hopkins, Garbe, Grierson, Jacobi and Bhandarkar, is that it was founded by a Kṣatriya teacher named Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva, who was later on identified with Bhagavat under which name the Bhāga-vatas worshipped the Supreme Being. This view has been disputed by the champions of comparative anthropology. Professor Berridale Keith, referring to a passage in the Mahābhāṣya (on

---

* Lüder's *List of Brāhmi Inscriptions*, No. 6.
† Lüder's *List*, No. 669.
Pāṇini III, 1, 26), writes, "The Mahābhāṣya tells us that in the Kaṃśavadha the Granthikas divided themselves into parties, the one, followers of Kaṃśa, the other, followers of Krṣṇa, and that the former were kālamukhāḥ and the latter rakta-mukhāḥ. Weber was naturally puzzled to find that Krṣṇa’s friends were red in colour, but the whole thing explains itself when we regard the contest as one of the many old nature rituals where two parties join in mimic strife, the one striving to rescue, the other to capture, the sun. . . . . The supporters of Krṣṇa as identified with the sun, Viṣṇu, naturally wear the red colour of the luminary as an act of sympathetic magic."* Professor Keith has restated this theory in his two essays on the origin of Indian drama and ākhyāṇa.† In the second of these essays he observes, "It is true that Indian tradition tells us that Kaṃśa was Krṣṇa’s uncle, and that we can, if we like, insist that this is a piece of history, but such euhemerism is, if at present again fashionable, hardly likely to remain long in vogue." Professor Keith’s theory has found an adherent in Mr. N. Macnicol, who considers the passage in the Mahābhāṣya "perhaps the most conclusive evidence in support of the explanation of the Krṣṇa cult as originally that of a vegetation spirit."‡ Kaṃśavadha described by Patañjali was a "vegetation masque," "a play in

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1908, pp. 172-173.
† Ibid., 1911, p. 1008; Ibid., 1912, p. 416.
‡ Ibid. 1913, p. 149.
which the struggle of the spring with the winter is represented and sympathetically aided.'

This "most conclusive evidence" regarding the significance of Kaṃśavatadhā is based on a misunderstanding of the text of Patañjali.* The question that is discussed in this obscure passage is, why present tense is used in such sentences as,

'He causes Kaṃśa to be killed', 'He causes Bali to be bound', instead of past tense, for Kaṃśa was killed and Bali was bound long long ago. According to Kaiyāta those who explain the acting of the actors are called Saubhikas. The Saubhikas cause Kaṃśa to be killed and Bali to be bound (by the actors) in the presence of the audience. So present tense is used in connection with the acting of the actors in the dramatic performance of Balibandha and Kaṃsavatadhā. The same may be said in connection with the pictorial representation of Kaṃsavatadhā. The next question raised is, how can present tense be used in

* ऋष थु कथम वर्णमानकालान धातुवर्णित वक्तक्षेत्रीति. चिररथेः च कथम चिररथेऽ च च धारी। ऋषाधिपि युक्ता, कथम। वै नाथेनेन्द्रियकाला [भौमिकाकृ K] नाम ये प्रयत्नं च कथम धातुवर्णित प्रत्ययं च वक्तक्षेत्रीति। चिररथेः कथम। चिररथेः धारिताः निपातिताः प्रकाशाः हयाने कक्षाः कक्षाः च [कक्षाप्रयत्नं K]। ययातेः कथम। यह श्रवणमासाः [श्रवण गदयां K] धारिते। नैरसि स्वतं निधानमिनस्वमाहाः भुजी-वायंचारण: [वायंचारण: K] सतो बुद्धिवित्वा प्रकाशिति। शास्त्रां शत:। यालिङ्गमात्य [यालिङ्गमात्य K] हयाने। केषितां कक्षां भविता। केषित्कक्षाः भविता। केषित्कक्षा: कालाः।'

Benares edition of Mahābhāṣya (variants adopted by Keilhorn noted within square brackets).
connection with the Granthikas. By a Granthika is meant a Kathaka or narrator of sacred legends. The meaning of the question is, how can present tense be used in connection with the story of Kamsavadha narrated by a Kathaka by the combination of words only, without the aid of actors or pictures. Patañjali’s answer is thus summed up by Bhatṛhari (Vākyapadīya III.5.5):—“Kāṃśa and others who are given shape by means of words that describe them and are perceived by the mind are considered as moving under the eyes of the audience.”* Helarāja, commenting on this stanza, writes, “The narrator (Kathaka) creating faith in the bodily forms of Kāṃśa and others in the hearers, causes Kāṃśa, existing in the mind (imagination) only, to be slain by Vāsudeva existing in imagination.”† Haradatta, in his Kāśikāpadamañjari, explains the whole passage as follows:—

“The narrators who narrate Kamsavadha from a book tell the story of Kāṃśa and others from their birth to their death. They (Kāṃśa and others), being described, appear as if visible in the minds of the audience. The minds of the audience are occupied by them. Therefore they (the audience) take different sides, some turn partisans of KĀṃśa and others become partisans of Vāsu-

---

* “शब्दोपपितकपाल्युर्जनविषयस्य मतस्य। प्रयाचित्व पवयादित्व साधकवेन भवति।”

† “तथा च कथक शोतरि काशिः धारिकार प्रतिवर्णमात्र बुढ़ि बालुकेवो बुढ़ि कांस्क्ष शालरतीति प्रयोवकल धमसारोपात् प्रयोगोपपर्न।”
deva. They assume different colours also, some are red-faced, some are dark-faced.’’ *

So, according to the Indian interpreters of Patañjali, it was not the granthikas or narrators who divided themselves into two parties, but the audience, some of whom sided with Kamśa and others with Kṛṣṇa, the partisans of the former becoming pale with grief and the partisans of the latter beaming red with joy on the triumph of their hero. The granthikas still narrate Kamsavadha and other episodes in the life of Kṛṣṇa from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in the villages of India. But they never do so divided in parties or with faces coloured. We are, therefore, hardly justified in assuming that they did so in the time of Patañjali.

Perhaps the earliest account of the doctrines of the Bhāgavatas is found in Brahma Sūtras II, 2. 42-45, as explained by both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. The doctrine of the four vyūhas or ‘divisions’ of the Supreme Being is the corner-stone of the system. The vyūhas are, Vāsudeva, Saṃkarśaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. From Vāsudeva, who is the highest Brahman and the highest cause, there originates the individual soul called Saṃkarśaṇa; from Saṃkarśaṇa, the inter-

* “देवि प्रभु वाष्पन : कवसवभाषिष्टे काथिका नाम त्रयोष्णिज्ञानसा
विवाहातुः कथादीनु : वर्णयन्ति देवि वर्षीयाना : चोद्याः मुदियन्तिः प्रत्ययक्तस्मि
मन्ति विनामापि देस्याः तदायकतम्भ कवसिः, कवस्य वाष्पतिसाय भविष्यस्ति, नामाय
प्राचेरिताय वाष्पः के चित्तां कवस्य : के चित्ताय यंत्रेत्याभन्ति : वर्षा वनं खलपि
प्राणिः, के चित्तां त्रज्ञमुखः के चित्तां काछमुखः।”
nal organ called Pradyumna; and from Pradyumna, the principle of egoity called Aniruddha. The root of Vaiṣṇavism lies buried in this theory of the four vyūhas. Grierson seems to hold that this theory is but a Bhāgavata adaptation of Saṃkhya-yoga. For, speaking of the process of creation, he writes, "The principles according to which creation is held to have developed resemble those of Sāṅkhyayoga, but, owing to the assumed necessity of connecting the immaterial Vāsudeva with the material world, are more complicated."* Bhandarkar traces the root of the four vyūhas to Bhāgavadgītā. He writes:—

"But the Bhāgavadgītā contains no allusion to the vyūhas or forms of the supreme, Saṃkarṣaṇa and others, while the latter form a characteristic of the Bhāgavata school. The Gītā, however, mentions as the Prakṛtis of Vāsudeva the five elements, the mind, Buddhi or knowledge, and egoism as well as Jīva (VII, 4.5). The last is identified with Saṃkarṣaṇa in the Bhāgavata system, egoism with Aniruddha, and mind, with which probably Buddhi is associated, with Pradyumna. What appears to be the fact is this: The Bhāgavadgītā was composed before the doctrines of the Bhāgavata school were reduced to a system, and it was then that the three of the Prakṛtis of the supreme were personified into Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, who were members of the family of Vāsudeva."†

* Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, II, p. 543b.
† Vaiṣṇavism, etc., pp. 12-13.
The personification of abstract ideas into minor historical personages seems rather strange, and the theory itself is based on a confusion of the twofold nature (Prakṛti) of the Supreme Being as defined in the Bhāgavadgītā (VII, 4-6) wherein we are told, “Earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind, intellect, egoity—thus eightfold is my nature divided. Lower is this nature; other than this and higher know that nature of mine which has become the individual soul by which this world is supported. Remember that all beings spring from this; I am the origin and the dissolution of the Universe.”* Śaṅkara in his bhāṣya takes the eightfold lower nature (aparā prakṛti) of the Supreme Being as illusion-force (māyā-śakti) and the parā prakṛti, ‘higher nature’, as pure. Vāsudeva himself (mamātmanabhūtām), and Kṣetrajñā or one who knows the body. Commenting on Brahmastra II. 2. 42, Śaṅkara observes regarding the four vyūhas, “Among them Vāsudeva is the parā Prakṛti.” Sir R.G. Bhandarkar ignores the fundamental distinction between parā and aparā prakṛtis of the Gītā when he places Jīva in the same category with mind, buddhi, and egoism. The vyūhas, Saṃkarṣaṇa or individual soul, Pradyumṇa or the internal organ (mind), and Aniruddha or egoism of the Bhāgavatas do not constitute the Prakṛti or Māyā of Vāsudeva, but are evolved from him in a causal chain—the individual soul (Saṃkarṣaṇa) originating from Vāsudeva,

* Thibaut’s translation.
the internal organ (Prādyumna) from the individual soul and the principle of egoity (Aniruddha) from the internal organ. But both the Prākṛtis of the Gītā—parā and aparā—are without beginning. We are told in XIII. 19, 'Know thou both Prakṛti and Puruṣa to be without beginning.'

Professor Garbe's view regarding the chronological position of the Gītā in the history of Vaiṣṇavism appears to be more in accordance with facts. Summing up his views, Professor E. W. Hopkins writes:

'About two centuries before Buddha, the warrior chief of the Yādava clan, who was also a religious teacher, but not of the Brāhmanic schools, founded a moral religion of monotheism, God being in his system called simply Bhagavat. This religiously-minded chieftain was the 'son of Devaki,' and his religion was at first confined to his own clan. But as time went on, the teaching of Krishna extended beyond tribal limits, and at the same time the founder of the religion was himself identified with the god he taught, so that the 'son of Vasudeva' became god by virtue of the same euhemerism that changed Buddha into God. This was the form of the Vāsudeva religion recognized in the fourth century B.C. by Pāṇini, and the doctrine of bhakti belonged to it as early as this time. But for a century or more after this Krishnaism still lay outside the Brahmanism. During this period, till c. 300 B.C., the religion of Krishna was united with Sāṃkhya-yoga philosophy. After this, in the second period, from
300 B.C. till the Christian era, Krishna was identified with Vishnu, as the religion became Brahmanized, and in this same period arose the original Gītā."

Professor Garbe's view that Kṛṣṇaism or Vāsudevism in its original form lay outside the pale of Brāhmanism is historically correct. The orthodox followers of Vedism and Vedāntism recognize the Bhāgavadgītā as authoritative, but condemn the Bhāgavata or Pāṇcarātra system as un-Vedic or heterodox. Kumārila, in his Tantravārttika, refers to Kṛṣṇa as "a great law-giver," "who is always cited as an example of righteous conduct," and quotes Gītā IV. 11†; but he includes Pāṇcarātra among smṛtis or systems, such as Bauddha, Śāṅkhya, Yoga, Pāṣupata and Nigrantha, that are "opposed to Veda" and "are not honoured by those who know the Vedas." ‡ Śaṅkara, who in the introduction to his bhāṣya on the Gītā calls it "the quintessence of the meaning of all the Vedas (samasta-vedārthasāra-samgrahabhātan)," proves the un-Vedic character of the Pāṇcarātra by reproducing, in his bhāṣya on the Brahmaśūtras II. 2. 45, this text,—"Śāndilya is said to have promulgated the Pāṇcarātra doctrine because he did not find a sure basis for the highest welfare of man in the Veda and its auxiliary disciplines." According to the Purāṇas, like Bud-

---

† Tantravārttika, translated by Prof. Gaṅgānath Jhā, p. 194.
‡ Ibid., p. 165.
dhism and other similar systems, Pāṇcarātra was deliberately promulgated for misleading wicked men. Purusottama in his Bhāṣya-prakāśa on Ballabhācārya’s Anubhāṣya (II. 2. 42) quotes from Kūrma Purāṇa (I. 16. 115-116), “O Viṣadhvaja (one with a bull as his emblem on the banner), we shall make sāstras (sacred books) for protecting (rakṣanārthāya) those who are outside the Vedic pale (Vedabāhyānām) and for misleading sinners. Thus addressed by Viṣṇu, Śiva, and so also Viṣṇu advised in turn by Śiva, promulgated misleading systems such as Kāpāla, Lāguḍa, Vāma, Bhairava—eastern and western, Pāṇcarātra, Paśupata and thousand others.”* Purusottama also quotes from Sāmba Purāṇa,—“The husband of Laksmi (Viṣṇu) promulgated the tantra (system) called Pāṇcarātra, Bhāgavata or Vaikhānasa for those who have strayed from the Veda.”† But Appaya Dikṣita writes in his Vedāntakalpataruparimala,—“As it is un-Vedic, so Pāṇcarātra has been declared as unworthy of acceptance by those who follow the Veda in the Vaikhānasa-sāstra thus,

* “तस्माइ वेदांश्च मर्यादाः रचयायां साहित्यायां पावित्राः ।
विद्वानानि श्राक्षाष्टि करिष्यावेऽहप्चह ॥
यथा समविभागो चतुर्मात्रवेत्युपेक्षिन् ।
चान्ह साहित्यापिभागिनि भविष्यितः ॥
कालाः बामुद्ग वासं भेरवं फूल्लकपथिस्य ।
पाराधारां पाराधारां वा यथायानं यन्तं वचनं ॥”

† “पाराधारां पाराधारां ततन्तं वैष्णवसा भाषणां ।
वेदांश्च वसुदेवां कमलामपतिष्ठानां ॥”

‘Āgneya Pāñcarātra, together with Tantrik initiation, is un-Vedic, therefore the god of gods (Viṣṇu) should be worshipped according to Vaikhānasatantra which is agreeable (saumya) and based on the Veda (Vaidik).’ 

These texts show that Pāñcarātra was considered un-Vedic by the orthodox; and this could hardly have been the case had it been based upon Bhāgavadgītā.

The un-Brāhmānic Vāsudeivism or Pāñcarātra was probably first confined to the Yādava clan of Kṣatriyas to which Krṣṇa-Vāsudeva himself belonged. As we have already seen,† the Yādavas or Sātvatas were originally settled in Saurāṣṭra or the Kāthiāwaḍ Peninsula and then spread to Mathura. Krṣṇa-Vāsudeva (or Keśava) the son of Vasudeva of the Yādava or Sātvata clan and of his wife Devaki, was born in Mathura and afterwards migrated to Dvārakā in Saurāṣṭra. The Pāñcarātra system is called Sātvata-bidhi evidently after the Sātvata clan. Epic, Purānic, Bauddha and Jaina traditions agree in bearing testimony to the existence of Krṣṇa-Vāsudeva and Baladeva or Saṁkarṣaṇa as historical persons. If the identity of Krṣṇa-Vāsudeva with Krṣṇa, son of Devaki, mentioned in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad III. 17. 6,

* “स्वामवैदिकलाभेव वैदिकारपिरियान्स्लां पाषाराजस्यों सैकान्तश्च,”—

“शायथे पाषारां सु दौष्ट्रयुक्तं च साम्तिकम्।

शविदिकानलाश्च सरस वैदिकश्च तु।

श्रीमेन हैदारस्वयं देववेयं समवेत्व। इद्यादिना ॥”

Vedāntakalpataru-Parimala, Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, p. 453.

† Chapter I, pp. 28-29.
is once admitted, all difficulties of tracing the evo-
lution of the Bhāgavata religion disappear. Dhṛta-
rāṣṭra, son of Vicitravīrya, is mentioned in the
Kāṭhaka Samhitā, the Kauravya King Parīkṣit in
the Atharvan, and Parīkṣita’s son Janamejaya in
the Brāhmaṇas. If Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva is a his-
torical person, he was born in the same epoch in
which these undoubtedly historical Kuru sove-
reigns flourished; that is to say, at the time of
the composition of the later Samhitās and the Brāhma-
ṇas, but before the Upaniṣads—before the
development of the monism of the Upaniṣads and
the dualism of the Sāmkhya-Yoga. The Chān-
dogyā Upaniṣad III. 17. 6 tells us what Kṛṣṇa
learnt from his teacher. This text is very clearly
explained by Professor Hopkins in the following
passage:—

“Krishna, son of Devakī, was taught by his
teacher, Ghora Āngirasa, that sacrifice may be
performed without objective means; that gener-
osity, kindness, and other moral traits are the real
signs of sacrifice; and it is then said: “The
priest Ghora Āngirasa having said this to Krishna,
the son of Devakī—and the latter was thereby
freed from (thirst) desire—said: ‘When a man
is about to die let him resort to this triad; ‘the
imperishable art thou,’ ‘the unmoved art thou’;
‘breath’s firmness art thou’; in regard to which
are these two verses in the Rig-Veda (VIII. 6. 30;
I. 50. 10): ‘ till they see the light of the old seed
which is kindled in the sky,’ and ‘perceiving
above the darkness the higher light, the sun, god
among gods, we come to the highest light.’’ Krishna thus learned the abolition of sacrifice, and the worship of the sun, the highest light (Vishnu), as true being,—for this is the meaning of the philosophical passage taken with its context.’’*

Perhaps the great Sātvata chief—great in war and policy as well as in philosophy and religion—taught what he had learnt from his teacher—practice of morality as the true sacrifice and worship of Viṣṇu as ‘god among gods’ (monotheism)—to men of his own clan whose guide, friend and philosopher he was. But Epic, Purāṇic, Jaina and Baudhā traditions agree in telling us that destruction overtook the Sātvatas of Dvārakā in the life-time and under the very eyes of this mighty hero and teacher who also met with a tragic end. In the Mahābhārata, Book XVI, we are told that some hot-headed Yādava warriors played pranks with three great Brāhmaṇ sages, Viśvāmitra, Kaṇva and Nārada, and brought on a fearful curse on their whole clan which resulted in destructive internal dissensions. After witnessing the extermination of his kith and kin in deep sorrow, Vāsudeva retired to a forest where he was shot dead through mistake by a hunter named Jarā. The story is thus told in the Antagadā-Dasāo of the Jainas in the shape of a prophecy by Ariṣṭanemi, the twenty-second Tirthaṅkara: “Verily, Kaṇhe, thou shalt be sent

* Hopkins’ Religions of India, p. 465.
forth by thy mother and father's behest from the city of Bāravaś when it shall be consumed by reason of strong waters, fire, and the wrath of Divāyane; ...... and in the Kosamba forest, underneath a goodly nyagrodha tree, upon a daīs of earthen-block, thy body covered with a yellow robe, thou shalt be wounded in the left foot by a sharp arrow shot by Jarākumāra from his bow."* Here Divāyane or Dvaipāyana is named in place of the three sages of the Mahābhārata. The story of the destruction of the Andhakas and the Vṛṣṇis as told in the Ghata Jātaka (No. 454) resembles the epic version in many points. Here also it is stated that Vāsudeva was shot dead by an old huntsman named Jarā, and the sage whose curse caused the catastrophe is called Kaṇha-dipāyana (Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana). In the Kumbha Jātaka (No. 512) occurs this gāthā (stanza):—

"'Twas after drinking this, I ween,
The Andhakas and Vrishni race,
Roaming along the shore, were seen
To fall, each by his kinsman's mace."

Again in the Saṃkicca Jātaka (No. 530):—

"Assailing black Dīpaṇa the men of Vrishni race
With Andhaka sought Yama's realm, each slain by other's mace."

In the Arthaśātra of Kauṭilya I. 6 (3) also the destruction of the Vṛṣṇis is connected with Dvaipāyana.

These legends preserved by three rival sects do

* Antāgaṇa-dasā, translated by L. D. Barnett, Chapter V.
not seem to be baseless. The Saurāṣṭras, classed as men of mixed origin by Baudhāyana, and the Ābhīras, called Mlecchas in the Mahābhārata (XVI. 7. 63), became dominant in Western India after the fall of the Yādavas. In the Harivaṃśa (94, 5161) the Yādava Kingdom called Ānarta is described as ‘‘mostly inhabited by the Ābhīras (ābhīra-prāya-mānuṣam).’’ The Ānarta country and its inhabitants were called Surāṣṭras or Sauraṣṭras, probably after the Rāṭhas (Rāṣṭras), akin to the Rāṣṭikas of Asoka’s rock edicts, now represented by the Mahārāṣtras or Marāṭhas. These Saurāṣṭras and Ābhīras, from whom the Gujаратis of our day have evidently sprung, were Aryan in speech and belonged to the Indo-Afghan stock. The monotheistic religion that Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva taught to the men of his own clan was handed on by the Sātvatas (Yādavas) to the Saurāṣṭras and the Ābhīras, who gave it the un-Vedic turn. Vāsudeva, his brother Saṃkarṣaṇa, his son Pradūmna, and his grandson Aniruddha were probably deified by these Outlanders who lay outside the pale of Vedism.

The doctrines underlying the Sātvata religion of the Saurāṣṭras and Ābhīras were probably first reduced to system by a teacher named Śāndilya Kaśyapa. According to the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma Parva, 66. 40) the religion of Vāsudeva was preached by Saṃkarṣaṇa in accordance with the Sātvata system (vīdhi) at the end of the Dvāpara and in the beginning of the Kali Age. In a Pāncarātra text namedĪśvara-Saṃhitā (I. 38-41) the
initiation of Śāndilya to Bhāgavatism is thus described:—"In days past, in Totādri peak, Śāndilya, the great sage, sat fixed in severe austerities (tapas) for many, many years. In the end he obtained from Śaṃkarṣaṇa—in the interim between the Dvāpara Age and Kali Age—the Veda going by the name of Ekāyana, and taught them well to Sumantu, Jaimini, Bhṛgu, Aupagāyana, and Mauṇjāyana."* The Vṛddha-Hārita-Saṃhitā contains this legend about un-Vedic Vaiṣṇavism originally taught by Śāndilya. In ancient time there was a noble Brāhmaṇ of the Kāśyapa family named Śāndilya who was learned in all the sacred literature. He promulgated a religious code (dharma-saṃhitā) for the worship of Viṣṇu drawn up in un-Vedic spirit. Adopting his (Śāndilya’s) system some of the great sages (maharṣayaḥ) worshipped Keśava in un-Vedic manner. Men performed religious rites in a way not ordained in the sāstra (Veda) and the earth was deprived of svāhā, svadāhā, and vaṣatkāra. Angered at this Viṣṇu condemned Śāndilya to live in hell. Śāndilya was struck with terror and bowing repeatedly prayed, "O Lord, I am a sinner; save me." Viṣṇu took pity on him and thus modified his curse, "O Brāhmaṇ, after suffering the tortures of hell for hundred years according to the calculation of gods you will be born in the family of Bhṛgu and will be known as Jamadagni. There again worshipping me according to rules laid down in the Veda,

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1911, p. 942.
you will attain, O best of sages, my pure world.’” Śāndilya did as advised by Viṣṇu when he was again born on the earth and ultimately entered the world of Hari. The author of the Vṛddha-Harita-Saṃhitā draws this moral from the legend, ‘’Therefore un-Vedic religion should be avoided from a distance and Hari should be worshipped with devotion in accordance with rules laid down in the Veda. Drawing the wheel (emblem of Viṣṇu) on the upper part of both arms according to the rule of the Śrutī and the uḍḍhapūndra mark (on the forehead) Hari should be worshipped with pure heart according to proper rules.’’
What was the un-Vedic method of worshipping Viṣṇu originally taught by Śandilya we are not told in the Vṛddha-Hārīta-Saṃhitā. The Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śānti Parvaṇ (Chaps. 336-353) of the Mahābhārata contains the earliest exposition of the Pāñcarātra in its Brāhmanized form. It may be possible to distinguish the different stages—the pre-Brāhmanic and the Brāhmanic—in the evolution of Vaiṣṇavism by analysing this document. About the origin of the Pāñcarātra we are told (Chap. 337),—"This supreme scripture was compiled and uttered by the seven Citraśikhandin Rṣis (Marici, Atri, Āngiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vaśiṣṭha) and (Manu) Svāyambhuva, after worshipping Hari Nārāyaṇa for a thousand years of heaven. They then read it to Nārāyaṇa, who praised it and certified it to be in complete accord with the four Vedas."* This of course refers to the Nārāyaṇīya
section wherein Śāndilya-Kāśyapa is not recognized as a teacher. The philosophical doctrine of the successive origination of the four 'vyūhas' which is declared 'impossible' by Bādarāyana in his Brahma Sūtras II. 2.42 both according to Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, finds a place in the Nārāyaṇīya side by side with the orthodox view that the four 'vyūhas' are the four different manifestations of the Supreme Being and not originating in succession. 'It was my fourth form (Vāsudeva),’ we are told, ‘that created Śeṣa or Saṃkarṣaṇa. He produced Pradyumna, and in turn Pradyumna produced Aniruddha. From the lotus sprung from Aniruddha’s navel was produced Brahmā.’*

The Nārāyaṇīya also contains evidences of a living cult of the four 'Vyūhas.' The way in which a devotee attains final emancipation or union with the Supreme Being is thus described (Chap. 346), ‘The place, where he dwells, with Wisdom (vidyā) for His companion is named by the Veda ‘Sat,’ the existing, the productive cause of things created (bhūta). The perfect who are free from actions, whether good or bad (punyapa-pāpa-vivarjita), go thither. The first enter the sun (āditya) as the door. There their bodies are consumed and they become atomic entities (paramāñubhūta). Thence they enter that god, and then, freed from him, they stand in the body (tanu) of Aniruddha. Then having become men-

tal entities (*manobhūtā*) they enter Pradyumna. Freed from Pradyumna, the best Brahmans and Sāṃkhyas, with the Bhāgavatas, enter Sāṃkarśaṇa who is living soul. Thence, void of the three constituents (*traiguna-hīna*), they instantly enter the Supreme Self (*paramātman*), the Kṣetrajña, himself without constituents, who is Vāsudeva, the abode of all things (*sarvāvāsa*).”* The vyūhas were worshipped in different groups. “By some Hari is worshipped under one manifestation (vyūha, i.e. Aniruddha), by some under two (i.e., Aniruddha and Pradyumna), by some under three (i.e., Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Sāṃkarśaṇa), and by some under four (i.e., Aniruddha, Pradyumna, Sāṃkarśaṇa and Vāsudeva).”†

Side by side with the cult of the four ‘vyūhas,’ the Nārāyaṇīya reveals to us another phase of Vaiṣṇavism, the cult of the incarnations (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu. It contains (Chap. 341) brief accounts of the six incarnations of Viṣṇu, viz. the boar, the man-lion, the dwarf, Parāśurāma, Rāma, son of Daśaratha and Kṛṣṇa, also called Śātvata. This is followed by a list of ten incarnations wherein Haṃsa is substituted for Buddha of our modern standard list and placed at the top. Bhandarkar considers this stanza containing the list of the ten incarnations as a later interpolation.‡ The theory of the incarnations is Vedic

---

*Indian Antiquary, XXXVII (1908), p. 38r.
† Ibid., p. 384.
‡ Vairāvism, &c., pp. 39-40.
in origin. It is found in an embryonic stage in the Rgveda. In one stanza of the Rgveda (VII. 100. 6) reference is made to a form of Viṣṇu different from his ordinary one in the following words: "Do not assume this form, since thou didst assume another form in battle." Professor Macdonell traces the roots of four of the incarnations of Viṣṇu—the tortoise, the fish, the dwarf and the boar—in the Vedic literature and concludes, "Thus we see that when the doctrine of the Avatārs of Viṣṇu became established in Hinduism through the fusion with him of the popular deity Kṛṣṇa, four mythological conceptions derived from the Veda were ready to be appropriated as incarnations of Viṣṇu in his character as Preserver and Benefactor of the world."* The man-god Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva worshipped by the Sātvatas, the Saurāstras and the Ābhīras was evidently brought into line with the gods of the Vedic pantheon by being recognized as an incarnation of Viṣṇu and thereby Pāncarātra was Brāhmanized.

The Ikṣvāku hero Rāma was probably recognized as an incarnation of Viṣṇu at a later period in imitation of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. "It is not likely," writes Jacobi, "that the theory of incarnation was first suggested by the story of Rāma; in all probability there was already another similar incarnation of Viṣṇu acknowledged by the people of India. This must have been his

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1895, p. 188.
incarnation as Kṛṣṇa, since the preceding incarnations, as appears from our remarks on them, seem to have had little importance as far as popular religion was concerned."* It has long been recognized by scholars that those parts of the Rāmāyaṇa (Bks. I and VII) wherein Rāma is recognized as an incarnation of Viṣṇu did not form part of the original epic of Vālmīki, but are later additions and interpolations.† The opening canto of the Rāmāyaṇa indicates that in the original version of the poem Rāma was represented as a mere man and not an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Vālmīki asks Nārada to name the man who was then the greatest and the best of men—who was the most perfect man then living. Hearing this Nārada, who is described as "one knowing the three worlds" (heaven, earth and the nether world) said, "The manifold virtues described by you are difficult to meet with (in one person). (However) hear, O Muni, I shall speak to you of the man (nurarh) possessing those (virtues) whom I remember."‡ Nārada then goes on to give an account of Rāma's person, character and career from his proposed installation as heir-apparent to his attaining brahmaloka or the world of Brahmā (not Vaikuntha, the world of Viṣṇu) after a reign of 11,000 years. In this narrative no reference is made to Rāma's identity with Viṣṇu; on the

*Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, VII, p. 195α
†Ibid., 1915, p. 326.
‡बल्लो दुर्भाष्येऽव स्वयं कीर्तिता गुणः।
镦े विष्णुराम्यनं बुद्धा वेदेश्या श्ययां गरि:। (I. 1. 7).
contrary it is said, that "(he was) equal in valour to Viṣṇu," thereby indicating that he was not yet recognized as Viṣṇu. Episodes like those of Kavandha and of the Śramaṇī (nun) Śavarī described in Book III, cantos 69-74, afforded the poet suitable opportunities of declaring Rāma as the incarnation of Viṣṇu, had he been aware of it. Kabandha was a hideous demon with a mouth in his belly and a pair of long arms. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa cut off his two arms that rendered him helpless. Then Kabandha narrated his story. He was an asura as handsome as Indra, Sun-god and Moon-god. Sometimes he used to assume the terrible form in order to frighten the Rṣīs. One day a great sage named Sthūlaśirā cursed him that he would retain that hideous form permanently. Kabandha then sought to appease the sage who said, "When Rāma, cutting off your arms, will burn you in a deep forest, then you will regain your huge and handsome form (71. 6-7)." Kavandha performed great penances and propitiated Brahmā who granted him long life. Emboldened by this he attacked Indra who destroyed his knees and turned him into a Kavandha with two long arms. Indra also said, "You will go to heaven when Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa will cut off your arms in battle (71. 15-16)." Kavandha requested Rāma to burn his body in a funeral pyre and said that when his body would be burnt he would be able to know who had abducted Sītā and how she was to be recovered. When Kavandha's body was placed on a pyre, a beautiful being rose out of it
in the sky, and getting into a vimāna or aerial chariot advised Rāma to seek the assistance of Sugrīva and on his way to Sugrīva’s place visit the Śramaṇī named Śavari. “O Rāma, seeing you who is worthy of being saluted by all creatures and who is like a god, Savari, who is ever devoted to her pious duties, will go to heaven."* If the poet who wrote this stanza recognized Rāma to be the incarnation of Viṣṇu, he could not have resisted the temptation of referring to that fact here. Again when Rāma and Lākṣmanā reached the hermitage of Śavari, she welcomed Rāma in a speech wherein she called him “devavara,” “foremost of gods,” “bull among men (purusarṣabha),” “tiger among men (puruṣavyāghra),” but not as Bhagavat or Nārāyaṇa. Śavari told Rāma that when he was at Citrakūṭa the sages of the hermitage whom she had served all her life, when about to depart for heaven in aerial chariots, said to her, “Rāma will come to your very holy hermitage. Entertain that guest with Lākṣmanā. Seeing him you will go to the highest eternal world (74. 15-15).”

In Book VI of the epic we are told, when Rāvaṇa was killed and Sītā was brought before Rāma, he refused to take her back on the ground that she had lived too long in Rāvaṇa’s city to remain chaste. Hearing these cruel words, Sītā determined to put an end to herself and entered

* लाँ तु घण्यां खिता नित्यं चर्चप्रतिपक्षणम्
हष्ट देवोपरं राम चवेलोकः गमिद्धि (73. 27)
a pyre prepared for her by Lakṣmaṇa. When she did so Vaiśravana, the Pitṛs, Yama, Indra, Varuṇa, Śiva, Brahmā and other gods appeared before Rāma and said that though he (Rāma) was the creator of the worlds and omniscient, why did he forget himself and refused to take back Sītā like an ordinary man. Rāma inquired in reply, "I know myself to be a man named Rāma, son of Daśaratha. Tell me, O Bhagavat (Brahmā), who am I and whence am I?"* Brahmad told him in reply that he was Nārāyana, Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa and Sītā was Lakṣmi. This seems to indicate that there was a time when Rāma was not recognized as an incarnation of Viṣṇu.† Even as it is, this canto appears to be out of place and a superfluity in the poem. Brahmad's speech reminding Rāma of his identity with Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa evidently produced no impression upon him. The next following canto (118) opens thus, "Hearing this auspicious speech uttered by Brahmad (pitā-maha), Agni (Vibhāvasu) arose [from the pyre] with Vaidehī (Sītā) in his lap."‡ Agni then speaks to Rāma in a quite different tone. He does not refer to the fact that Sītā was the incar-

---
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† See Jacobi's remarks, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, VII, p.194a.
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बिभावद: ||"
nation of Lakṣmī. All that Agni says is, Sītā is chaste and requests Rāma to take her back without scruple (VI. 118. 5-10). So cantos 117 and 118 of the Rāmāyaṇa Book VI can not be recognized as the composition of the same authors, but are the work of two different authors belonging to two different ages. In the abstract of the epic as given in the opening canto of Book I the episode of Sita’s entering the pyre and Rāma’s recognition of her innocence on the testimony of Agni is referred to, but nothing is said about the intervention of Brahmā or the very important revelation made by him (I. r. 8r-83).

These evidences indicate that in the original Rāmāyaṇa, probably the work of a single poet, Vālmīki, who flourished before 500 B.C. according to Jacobi, and in the fourth century B.C. according to Keith, Rāma was depicted as a man and not as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. The portions of the Rāmāyaṇa wherein Rāma is represented as an Avatāra (incarnation) were probably added at the time when the Māhābhārata was reduced to its present Krṣṇaite form about 200 B.C.

The cult of the avatāras of Viṣṇu taught by the Brāhmaṇic epics and the Purāṇas proved a formidable rival to the older Pāṇcarātra or Bhāgavata cult of the four vyūhas and ultimately ousted it. The orthodox Vaiṣṇavas of course could not persuade themselves to believe that the Pāṇcarātra was really un-Vedic and found a way out of the difficulty by interpreting the theory of the Vyūhas in a different way. Rāmānuja writes
in his Śrībhāṣya (II. 2. 42): "The criticism that the Bhāgavatas teach an inadmissible origination of the individual soul, is made by people who do not understand that system. What it teaches is that the highest Brahman, there called Vāsudeva, from kindness to those devoted to it, voluntarily abides in a fourfold form, so as to render itself accessible to its devotees." The identification of all the four Vyūhas with the highest Brahman proved injurious to the old cult. The way in which the orthodox Vaiṣṇavas endeavoured to reconcile these rival cults is thus explained by Rāmānuja in the Śrībhāṣya (II. 2. 42):—

"That highest Brahman, called Vāsudeva, having for its body the complete aggregation of the six qualities, divides itself in so far as it is either the 'Subtle' (sūkṣma), or 'division' (vyūha), or 'manifestation' (vibhava), and is attained in its fulness by the devotees who, according to their qualifications, do worship it by means of works guided by knowledge. 'From the worship of vibhava-aspect one attains to the vyūha, and from the worship of the vyūha one attains to the "Subtle"' called Vāsudeva, i.e. highest Brahman' —such is their doctrine. By the 'vibhava' we have to understand the aggregate of beings, such as Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, etc., in whom the highest Being becomes manifest; by the 'vyūha,' the fourfold arrangement or division of the highest Reality, as Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha; by the 'Subtle' the highest Brahman
itself, in so far as it has for its body the mere aggregate of the six qualities—as which it is called Vāsudeva."*

The following passage of the Sātvata Samhitā, quoted by Bhandarkar, is very significant:—

"When the pure Brahman, which is the aim and end of the creation, exists in the heart of qualified Brähmaṇas, who worship Vāsudeva, the highest Śastra, which is the great Upaniṣad of Brahman, springs forth from it for the redemption of the world and confers discrimination; it contains divine methods and has for its fruit final deliverance. I will then explain that to you which is of various kinds. This Śastra, along with Rahasya, is fruitful to those who have gone through Yoga with its eight parts and whose soul is devoted to mental sacrifice. The Yogins, who are Brähmaṇas guided by the Vedas and who have given up the mixed worship, are competent for the worship of the single one, dwelling in the heart. The three orders, Kṣatriya and others, and those who are prāpanna or have resorted to self-surrender are competent for the worship of the four Vyūhas accompanied by mantras, and also unaccompanied by them, so far as regards the series of ceremonies concerning the four Vyūhas as well as the actions and the collection of mantras concerning the Vibhavas."†

Here the worship of Vāsudeva as "the single

---

* Thibaut's translation, S.B.E. XLVII, p. 525.
† Vaiṣṇavism, etc., pp. 39-40.
one'" is assigned to Brāhmans "guided by the Veda" and "have given up the mixed worship"; and the worship of the four Vyūhas with or without mantras to three other orders (castes) who were evidently addicted to mixed, that is to say, Vedic as well as un-Vedic, worship. The worship of the Vyūhas unaccompanied by mantras was of course un-Vedic. In practice the worship of the Vibhava forms or incarnations on the one hand, and of 'the single form' Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu on the other, threw the worship of the Vyūhas in the background and finally ousted it. Amarasiṃha in his lexicon gives the synonyms of Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha (I. 23-27) after those of Vāsudeva (I. 18-22). Varāhamihira in the chapter (XLVII) on characteristics of images of his Brāhatansāhita makes no reference to Aniruddha vyūha, but gives directions for making the images of Baladeva (Saṃkarṣaṇa), Pradyumna and Śamba. "Baladeva should be made with plough in one hand, drunken eyes, adorned with one ear-ring and body as white as conch shell, moon and lotus-stem."∗ "Śamba (should be made) with a club in one hand; Pradyumna (should be made) handsome and holding a bow. The wives of these two deities should be made holding shield (khetaka) and sword."†

* बलादेवो चण्डेयार्यमेवधववा वर्षाचं यथाय: | विभ्वतं कुष्माञ्चनेक श्रेयसक्षणं गर्गस्त: || २५ ॥
† शास्त्रं गदाधरेण प्रवृत्तीपरावरुपं दुर्गमयाः | अनुमो: ब्रजयो बाज्यो खेताकंस्तांगारिष्टो || ४० ॥
Thus though there is literary evidence of the survival of the worship of all the four Vyūhas up to the sixth century A.D., archæological evidences regarding the cults of Pradyumna and Aniruddha (or Śāmba according to Varāhamihira) are non-existent and evidences of the worship of Baladeva (Saṃkarṣaṇa) along with Vāsudeva are very rare. This latter form of worship appears to have been quite common before the Christian era. Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra (XIII. 3) refers to "ascetics with shaved head or braided hair and pretending to be the worshippers of god, Saṃkarṣaṇa" and to their "sacrificial beverage." In the Ghasundī inscription already referred to, the construction of a wall round the hall of worship of Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva is mentioned. Under Pāṇini II. 2. 34 Patañjali notices "a verse in which it is stated that certain musical instruments are sounded in a gathering in the temple of Dhanapati, Rāma and Keśava. Here Rāma and Keśava are Balarāma and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, and it is clear that there were festive gatherings at their temples in Patañjali’s time."† I have already referred to the Nānāghāt cave inscription, wherein Saṃkarṣaṇa is invoked along with Vāsudeva. But in the archæological remains of the Gupta period when there was evidently a revival of Vaiṣṇavism under the patronage of the Gupta

† Vaiṣṇavism, etc., p. 13.
emperors, some of whom are called *paramabha-gavata* on their coins, traces of Saṃkarṣaṇa worship are practically absent. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, in section XII of his work where later traces of the Bhāgavata school and general Vaiṣṇavism are described, is able to refer only to one piece of sculpture found in a temple at Osia in Rajputana bearing a representation of Saṃkarṣaṇa.* The only well-known instance of the survival of the worship of Balarāma (Saṃkarṣaṇa) along with Vāsudeva (Jagannātha) up to our own time is found in the temple of Puri in Orissa. Some features of the worship of Jagannātha, Balarāma, and Subhadrā at Puri, such as the non-observance of the caste rules in connection with the *mahāprasāda* or cooked food offered to the gods, and the presence of a class of priests called Daitas, who are said to be of aboriginal Śavara descent, may perhaps be the last remnants of the primitive un-Vedic Pāṇcarātra ritual.

---

CHAPTER IV.

RACE AND CULT—ŚĀKTISM.

The Indian cult of Śakti or the cosmic energy personified as a female is far more primitive than the cult of Krṣṇa-Vāsudeva. Female deities play very minor parts in the Vedic pantheon and Vedic polytheism culminated in the monotheistic conception of Prajāpati on the one hand, and the pantheistic conception of Brahman-Ātman on the other. But some of the names of the Śakti of the Śākta occur in the latest works of the Vedic literature. These references are thus summarised by Jacobi:

"Ambikā is called Rudra's sister in the Vāja-saneya Samhitā, but in the Taittirīya Āranyaka X. r8, she has already become the spouse of Rudra, just as in later times. In the same work X. r, we find an invocation of Durgā Devī, who is there styled Vairochanī, daughter of the Sun or Fire; and in X. r, 7, among verses addressed to Agni, we meet with two more names of Durgā (here called Durgī), viz. Kātyāyanī and Kanyākumārī. Umā, daughter of Himavat, is mentioned in the Kena Upaniṣad, III. 25, as a heavenly woman conversant with Brahma, on which account the commentator regards her as a personification of the Brahmavidyā; but in Taitt. Ār X. 18 (according to the Dravidā text) Rudra is invoked as Umā-pati, 'husband of Umā.' Kāli and Karāli, two
names of Durgā, occur in the Mundaka Upaniṣad I, 2, 4, among names of the seven tongues of Agni.”

The epithet ‘Haimavatī’ or ‘daughter of Himavat’ indicates that the goddess Umā was originally worshipped by the dwellers in the Himalayan region. As Rudra is Giriṣa, ‘lord of the mountains,’ according to the Śatarudrīya of the Yajurveda, so Umā Haimavatī is his consort. Jacobī writes about Umā:—“Apparently she was originally an independent goddess, or at least a kind of divine being, perhaps a female mountain ghost haunting the Himalayas, and was later identified with Rudra’s wife.”

Etymologically Ambikā means ‘mother,’ and Durgā means ‘one who is approached with difficulty.’ Bhadrakāli is named in the Sānkhyāyana-grīhysūtra II. 15, 14 in connection with the Vaiśvādeva rite which a householder was required to perform daily; “‘Adoration to Śrī’—(thus) in the bed at the head, ‘to Bhadrakāli’ at the foot.’” So also Manu III. 89, “Near the head (of the bed) he shall make an offering to Śrī (fortune), and near the foot (of the bed) to Bhadrakāli.”

Ambikā, Durgā, Umā, Kātyāyanī and Bhadrakāli of the later Vedic literature are obscure minor divinities who can hardly be accepted as the proto-types of the Devī (goddess) or the Śakti of the Śākta. The Devī is first revealed in

her true character in two hymns of the epic, \textit{Mahābhārata}. In one of these hymns (VI. 23) she is addressed as Siddhasenāṇī (generaless of the Siddhas), the dweller on Mandara, Kumārī (maiden), Kālī (black or time as destroyer), Kapālī (wearer of skulls), Bhadrakālī, Mahākālī, Candī (angry), Candā (angry), Tārini (delivery), Karālī (frightful), Vijayā (victory), Jayā, "younger sister of the chief of cowherds [Krṣṇa], eldest born in the family of the cowherd Nanda, delighting always in Mahiṣa's blood," Kauśikī, Umā, Śākambhari, "destroyer of Kaitabha," Vedaśruti, she "who dwellest continually near Jambu, mountain-precipices, and sepulchres," "the great sleep of embodied beings," "mother of Skanda," "divine Durgā," "dweller in wildernesses," Svāhā, Svadhā, Sarasvatī, Śāvitri, "mother of the Vedas, and the Vedānta," Mahādevī, Jambhāni, Mohinī, Māyā, Hṛi, Śrī, and Sandhyā. In the other hymn (IV. 6) the goddess is described as "born in the womb of Yaśodā," "the favourite of Nārāyaṇa," "who rose to the sky when thrown on a piece of stone," "holding sword and shield," "four-armed," "four-faced," "consort of Nārāyaṇa," she "who destroyed the demon Mahiṣa to save the three worlds," "whose perpetual abode is in the Vindhyas, the best of the hills," and "who is fond of spirituous liquor, flesh, and sacrificial victims."

The legends alluded to in the epithets younger sister of the chief of the cowherds, daughter of
Nanda and Yaśoda, etc., are narrated in the *Harivamsa* (58). Therein we are told that Viṣṇu descended to the nether world (*pātāla*) and asked sleep in the form of destroying time (*nidrā kālarupini*) to put the six demons named *saṅgarbhas* into the womb of Devakī in succession, to transfer the seventh child of Devakī from her womb to that of Rohini, and then herself be born as the ninth child of Yaśodā, wife of Nanda, the Gopa chief, on the same night on which he himself was to be born as the eighth child of Devakī, to baffle the designs of Kaṁsa. Viṣṇu told her that she would be carried to Devakī, and when seizing her by her feet Kaṁsa would be ready to throw her on a piece of rock, she would rise to the sky; then Indra would assign the Vindhyā mountains as her perpetual abode wherein, meditating on Viṣṇu, she would slay the two demons, Śumbha and Niśumbha. These legends seem to indicate that the nomadic Ābhīras of Western India were originally worshippers of a goddess who was later on identified with the mountain deity presiding over the Vindhyā hills conceived as a female and worshipped by the hill tribes. Jacobi writes, "A similar mountain-goddess had her home in the Vindhyas; she was of cruel character, as might be expected from a goddess of the savage tribes living in those hills. Her name is Vindhyāvāsini, and she too is identified with Siva’s wife."* 

59, it is said of her, "You are worshipped by the Šavaras, Barbbaras (savages), and Pulindas (śavarai rbbarbarai sćaiva pulindaiśca supujitā 3234)." In the Prākrit-poem Gaudavaho of Vākpati, a contemporary of Bhavabhuti, the goddess is addressed as Šavari (v. 305), 'Šavara woman.' In the Varāha Purāṇa (28, 34) she is addressed as Kirātini, 'Kirāta woman,' and in the Abhidhānacintāmanapiṣṭā of Hemacandra Kirātī is given as one of her names. One of the rites ordained in connection with the annual autumnal worship of Durgā is called Śāvarotsava. From a text reproduced by Śūlapāṇi in his Dur-gotsava-Viveka from the Kālikapurāṇa it appears that this śāvarotsava was a licentious revel and was performed at the time of throwing the image of the goddess into the water.* In the Merutantra one of the five subdivisions of vānamārga, the 'left-hand path' of worshipping the goddess, is called śāvara, 'relating to the Šavaras'.†

* The well-known legend of Dakṣa’s sacrifice indicates that the orthodox followers of Vedism did not acknowledge the right of Siva’s

---

* विनयज्ञ नवमामाल े?दुर्माल | कुमारि मश्रवोथवे: |
  मूलाङादनविवेष: ब्राह्मणोऽपूज्यस्य: ॥
  भगवान्दिसिद्धिनिष्ठ भगविन्दश्वेतास्य: ॥
  भगविन्दश्वेतियासिपिञ्जिनीं ॥
  कौशिकोऽक्षरां प्रांश्रो वाम: उत्पत्तिपातिः: ॥
  चौड़त्तर सम्प्रद: सात्त् विवाहीणोऽदरो भवतु ॥
  कमिन्द्र: मश्रवी सर्गं: नूति वांमाल पवभा: ॥

Purascaryārṇava, Benares, 1901, p. 22.
consort, to say nothing of Devi herself, to a share of the sacrificial food along with the Vedic gods. The earliest version of the legend is given in the Mahābhārata XII. 284-285. Herein it is said that Dakṣa, son of Pracetas, began a horse sacrifice (Aśvamedha) at Hardwar at the foot of the Himalayas. All the gods with their wives, Rṣis, Dānavas, Gandharvas and all other classes of beings attended the sacrifice. A sage named Dadhici happened to notice that Mahādeva (Rudra), the consort of Pārvatī, was not present in the assembly and asked the reason why. Dakṣa replied, "In this world there are eleven Rudras with matted hair and holding spear; but I do not know who is Maheśvara among them."* In Kailāsa, the mountain-abode of Śiva, the Goddess Pārvatī was much grieved because her husband had not been invited by Dakṣa and offered an adequate share of the sacrificial food. Instigated by her, Śiva created the fierce Bīrabhadra out of his own mouth to destroy Dakṣa's sacrifice. Fierce-looking Mahākāli, also called Bhadrakāli, born of Devi's wrath, followed Bīrabhadra to the place of Dakṣa's sacrifice. They destroyed all the sacrificial materials. This brought Dakṣa to his senses, who was advised by Bīrabhadra to propitiate Śiva. Dakṣa prayed to Śiva who issued out of the fire and conferred on him the desired boon. Then Dakṣa repeated

* "शिष्य नो वर्णो ब्रह्मा गुंथुष्यां: कपरिन्दः |
एकादशम्यान्यायं नाथे वङ्गमि सकिष्यस्य"
a long hymn containing the thousand and eight names of Śiva. Highly pleased with the hymn Śiva thus advised Dakṣa (XII. 185, 122-127):—

"The Devas and Dānavas, extracting it (the Pāṣupata religion) with the help of arguments addressed to reason from the Vedas, the six auxiliary sciences (of the Veda) and Sāṃkhya and Yoga, practised for long very hard penances; it is transcendental (apūrva) and productive of benefits of all sorts; it is open to men of all castes and orders; it leads to final emancipation; it may be mastered in several years or by restraining the organs of sense; it is esoteric, and it is censured by the unwise only; it is opposed to the rules laid down for the observance of castes and orders and agrees with them in certain points only; those who know the true logical conclusions have really grasped it; it is intended for those who are above the four orders. This excellent Pāṣupata religion was created by mē, O Dakṣa, in days of yore. He who practises it obtains full recompense. Let that recompense be thine, O very fortunate one, and cast off thy grief.' Saying so Mahādeva, who possessed immeasurable prowess, disappeared from the view of Dakṣa with his wife and attendants."

* वेदार्थं पक्षादकुत्यं सांख्योगितं युक्तं।
सप्त: हस्तां विपलं दुःखरं रेवादनकै।
श्रृवृष्यं सच्चीतो भई विस्तरोखश्च।
अध्वरेदभृच्: ष्ठयं गुरुमपापमनिर्भक्तस।
विद्वत्मानं भेष्यविवरोंकाधितं समस।*
Vināyakapāla are thus named along with their sects:—

2. His son *paramamāheśvara* (devout Śaiva) Mahārāja-śrī-Vatsarājadeva.
3. His son *paramabhagavatībhakta* (devout worshipper of Bhagavati, i.e., a Śākta) Mahārāja-śrī-Nāgabhata.
4. His son *paramādityābhakta* (devout worshipper of Āditya, i.e., a Saura) Mahārāja-śrī-Rāmabhadradeva.
5. His son *paramabhagavatībhakta* (devout Śākta) Mahārāja-śrī-Bhojadева.
6. His son *paramabhagavatībhakta* (devout Śākta) Mahārāja-śrī-Mahendrapāladeva.
8. His brother *paramādityābhakta* (devout Saura) Mahārāja-śrī-Vināvakapāladeva (Mahīpāladeva).*

Though the bulk of the modern Hindus may not be sectaries, their ancestors were, and it is yet possible to collect statistics relating to the geographical distribution of sects twenty-five to fifty years before. For without such statistics the scientific study of Hinduism is not practicable.

The sectarian Śākta conception of Sakti is thus defined in the opening verse of Brahmā—

---

* Indian Antiquary, XV, pp. 140-141.
nanda's Śaktānandatarāṅgini, 'the stream of Śakta's joy':—"After saluting Prakṛti (Nature), Nityā (Eternal), and she who is Parmātman, Śaktānandatarāṅgini is compiled for the enjoyment (of worldly happiness) and final emancipation (mukti)."* The author then quotes this definition of Prakṛti from Yāmala:—"Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas are the three guṇas (constituents of primitive matter); when these (guṇas) are in a state of equilibrium it is known as undifferentiated Prakṛti; she is Mūla-Prakṛti (primordial substance), Pradhāna as well as Puruṣa.' † Here Śakti is identified with both Prakṛti and Puruṣa of the Sāṁkhya philosophy. The Śakta or Tāntrik conception of Prakṛti is very clearly defined in a hymn to Prakṛti in the Prapanchasāra Tantra, XI, 48-67. I shall reproduce a few stanzas of this hymn in Arthur Avalon's translation:—‡

"Be gracious to me, O Pradhāna,
Who art Prakṛti in the form of the elemental world.
Life of all that lives. [Our Lady,
With folded hands I make obeisance to Thee Whose very nature and will it is to do That which we cannot understand. (I).

* प्रथम प्रकटिः भित्राः परमात्मासत्तत्त्वादिः ।
नन्यावत्सुलिख्यात् भाजात्मानंतरब्रह्म ॥
† एष राजसाम-रूपिते गुणवसूचृतस्तमस ।
शायानविश्वविरंगेयक्षणिः प्रकटिः विदः ॥
Even Aja (Brahmā), Adhokshaja (Viṣṇu) and Trikṣaṇa (Śiva)
Know not Thy Supreme form which is Māyā,
But pray to Thee in Thy gross form as Ruler.
Therefore so must I pray to Thee. (3).

Thou art Antarātmā,
Who by the Sun upholdest all living creatures,
And Who by the Moon ever nourishes them,
Again assuming the appearance of Fire the carrier of oblations Thou burnest:
O Mahādevī, verily do these three lights and fires issue from Thee. (7).

Assuming the form of Brahmā with active quality,
The four-headed one seated on a shining white swan,
Thou dost create the world
Of which Thou becomest the Mother.
Who is there indeed, Oh Supreme Ruler,
Who can imagine Thy supreme state? (8).

Adorned with crown,
Resplendent with conch and discus
As Nārāyaṇa with quality of manifestation (sattvaguna),
Thou dost maintain the world;
For He also is part of Thee. (9).

Again in the form of the three-eyed Rudra
Carrying axe and a rosary,
On whose matted hair are moon, serpent and Ganges,
He with the quality which veils (tamo-guna)
Thou dost at the end of the Kalpa destroy the
whole universe,
And then alone shinest. (10).

The author of Śaktīnandataraṅgini quotes this
description of Nityā from Śaktīyāmala:—"She
from whom and according to whose will Brahmā,
Viṣṇu, Śiva and others come into being and in
whom again they disappear is called Nityā, 'the
Eternal one.'" *

From this sketch of the traits of the goddess
it is possible to distinguish two different strata—
one primitive and the other advanced. The
primitive form of Durga is the result of syncretism
of a mountain-goddess worshipped by the
dwellers of the Himalaya and the Vindhyās,
a goddess worshipped by the nomadic Abhīra
shepherds, the vegetation spirit conceived as a
female, and a war-goddess. As her votaries
advanced in civilisation the primitive war-goddess
was transformed into the personification of the
all-destroying time (Kāli), the vegetation spirit
into the primordial energy (Adyā Sakti) and the
saviouress from sāmsāra (cycle of rebirths), and
gradually brought into line with the Brāhmanic
mythology and philosophy. \)

For a conception of the god-head analogous to
that of the Śākta conception of the Devī we
should travel beyond countries dominated by the

---

* उपवर्णः समस्तायोर्मात्र भवो वष्णो निषिद्धस्या ।
पुनः उपवर्षे वष्णो भिया शा परिकूपिताः ||
Vedic Aryans and the Avestic Iranians to Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and other countries bordering on the Mediterranean. Hogarth writes, "In regard to the Ægean Divine spirit itself, personified in the iconic age as a goddess and a young god, the student of comparative religion finds himself on very familiar ground. A goddess with a young subordinate god is known in early times, in every coast of the Mediterranean which looked towards Crete. In Punic Africa she is Tanit with her son; in Egypt, Isis with Horus; in Phoenicia, Ashtaroth with Tammuz (Adonis); in Asia Minor Cybele with Attis; in Greece (and especially in Greek Crete itself), Rhea with the young Zeus. Everywhere she is παρθένος, i.e. unwed, but made the mother first of her companion by immaculate conception, and then of the gods and all life by the embrace of her own son. In memory of these orginal facts her cult (especially the most esoteric mysteries of it) is marked by various practices and observances symbolic of the negation of true marriage and obliteration of sex. A part of her male votaries are castrated; and her female votaries must ignore their married state when in her personal service, and often practise ceremonial promiscuity."*

It should be noted in this connection that the Aryan-Hellenic invaders of Greece were not Śāktas. "We know now that they found in many centres a culture superior to their own and a religion of

* Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, I, p. 147a.
an advanced theistic type with elaborate, though mainly aniconic, ritual, devoted pre-eminently to a great goddess, by whose side a god was only the subordinate partner. It has then been pointed out that, where we find in historic Greece the goddess-cult predominant and especially the prevalence of a virgin-goddess, we should recognise the Minoan-Mycenean (Ægean) tradition in antagonism to the Aryan, the latter invariably maintaining the predominance of god.' * From the Śākta world of the West should also be excluded the Sumerians and their successors, the Babylonians and the Assyrians. Ishtar, the most prominent female deity in the Babylonian pantheon, corresponding to Ashtarte (Astarte) or Ashtoreth of the other Semites, occupied a subordinate place as compared to Anu, the heaven-god, Enlil, the earth-god, Ea, the water-god, Sin, the moon-god; and Shamash, the sun-god.

As there is a strong resemblance between the Indian Śākta conception of Śakti and the Śākta ritual of the followers of bāmācāra and kulācāra, who practised ceremonial promiscuity, on the one hand, and the Semitic conception of Ashtart (Astarte), the Egyptian conception of Isis, and the Phrygian conception of Cybele on the other, it may be assumed that Śāktism arose in India under the same social conditions as those under which Astarte was conceived in Syria, Cybele in Asia Minor, and Isis in Egypt.

* Ibid. VI, p. 396a.
Regarding the origin of Astarte. Professor Paton writes:—

"There is a large body of evidence to show that the Semites before their separation passed through a matriarchal stage of society. The tribe was a group of people inhabiting a particular oasis in the Arabian desert. It was made up of mothers and their brothers and children. The fathers were men of other tribes, dwelling in other oasis, who contracted only temporary unions with the mothers. Descent was traced through the mother, and she was the head of the clan in peace and in war. In such a society the chief deity of the tribe must have been conceived as a counterpart of the human matriarch. Male divinities might exist and be known as 'maternal uncle' but they would not be called 'father,' and would play so unimportant a part that they would survive only sporadically in later religion. This view is confirmed by the fact that all those traits which are oldest and most permanent in the character of Ashtart-Ishtar are those which for other reasons we must predicate of the ancient Semitic tribal mother."*

In Asia Minor, the home of the cult of the Great Mother Cybele, matriarchate, mother-right or mother-kin, a social system which traces descent and transmits property through women and not through men, "lingered in Lycia down to historical period; and we may conjecture that in former

times it was widely spread through Asia Minor.’’

In Egypt, the home of Isis, ‘‘the archaic system
of mother-kin, with its preference for women over
men in matters of property and inheritance,
lasted down to Roman times.’’† To this is traced
another strange Egyptian custom, the marriage
of full brothers with full sisters. ‘‘Such unions
were the rule, not the exception, in ancient
Egypt, and they continued to form the majority
of marriages long after the Romans had obtained
a firm footing in the country.’’‡ The explanation
of this custom offered by the Egyptologists and
anthropologists is thus summed up by Sir James
Frazer:—

‘‘It would be doubtless a mistake to treat these
marriages as a relic of savagery, as a survival of
a tribal communism which knew no bar to the
intercourse of the sexes. For such a theory would
not explain why union with a sister was not only
allowed, but preferred to all others. The true
motive of that preference was most probably the
wish of brothers to obtain for their own use the
family property, which belonged of right to their
sisters, and which otherwise they would have seen
in the enjoyment of strangers, the husbands of
their sisters...... This simple and perfectly effec-
tive expedient for keeping the property in the
family most probably explains the custom of
brother and sister marriage in Egypt.’’‡

The Śākta conception of the Devī as Ādyā Śākti ‘the primordial energy’ and Jagadambā, ‘the mother of the universe’ also very probably arose in a society where matriarchate or mother-kin was prevalent. The most important question in connection with Śāktism is, among what division of the Indian people did it originate? A Sanskrit stanza in anustūp metre recited by the Śākta Pāṇḍits of Bengal affords the traditional answer to this question. In this stanza we are told:—“The cult (vidyā) was revealed in Gauḍa (Bengal), popularised (prabalīkṛtā, lit. ‘strengthened’) by the Maithilas, it here and there prevails in Mahārāṣtra, and has disappeared in Gujarāt.”* Bengal is still the stronghold of Śāktism, and there are Śāktas in Mithilā (North Bihar), the Marāṭhā country and Gujarāt. Here, with the questionable exception of Mithilā, all other countries belong to the Outer Indo-Aryan belt. Did Śāktism then originate among the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries? If evidences were forthcoming to prove that mother-kin at one time prevailed among them, the traditional view regarding the origin of Śāktism could be accepted as a working hypothesis. An overwhelming majority of the higher caste Hindus of

* “गौड़े प्रकाशिता विद्या, भैयणे प्राभीकरता।
करिचुः करिचुः मचाराष्ट्रु गुजराटे प्रक्षेपं गता॥”

This stanza has been communicated to me by Pandit Bā- manadāsa Vidyāratna, Principal, Rānī Hemanta Kumārī Sanskrit College, Rajshahi.
Bengal—the Brāhmans, the Kāyasthas, and the Vaidyas—are Śākta. There is no evidence to show that these castes ever passed through a mother-kin stage in course of their history. But a usage that still survives among some sections of the Marāthā Brāhmans indicates the existence of mother-kin among them at one time. Mandlik writes:—"The question of marriage of a man with the daughter of his mother’s brother was once considered debatable by some writers. Usage has however sanctioned such marriages amongst the Dekkani Brāhmans of various denominations. Thus among various sections of the Deśastha-Brāhmans and among the Karhādas such connections are very frequent; and it is said that if a man can get such a bride, he will often have no other." * The marrying of maternal uncle’s daughter is an old custom. Baudhāyana refers to it in his Dharmaśūtra. Kumārila (who flourished in the seventh century A.D.) writes in his Tantravārtika: "The people of the south are happy when they get a chance of marrying the daughter of their maternal uncle." † This custom, called menarikam in the Tamil country, is evidently a survival of the mother-kin stage. When property was transmitted through woman a man would be naturally happy to see his daughter married to his sister’s son, the heir to the family property. The Mahā-

* Rao Saheb V. N. Mandlik’s Hindu Law or Mayukha, Yājñavalkya, Bombay, 1880, p. 415.
† English Trans., p. 184.
bhārata contains positive evidence of the prevalence of mother-kin among one division of the Outlandic Indo-Aryan folk, the Āraṭṭa-Vāhikas. In Book VIII, 45. 13, we are told, "O Salya, for this reason among the Āraṭṭas the nephews and not the sons inherit the property."* In the Ambaṭṭha Sutta and the Mahāvastu Aavadāna we are told that the Ikṣvāku princes, who were banished by their father and took shelter on the slope of the Himalayas, and from whom the Sākyas traced their descent, married their own sisters in order to maintain the purity of their line. Dr. D. B. Spooner, in his recently published paper on The Zoroastrian Period of Indian History, argues that this indicates the Zoroastrian or Magian affinities of the Śākyas, for the next-of-kin marriage was one of the points insisted by Zoroaster, and his patron Vishtasp married his sister Hutos.† Both the Buddhist and the Brāhmanic (Purānic) authorities agree in tracing the descent of the Śākyas from the Ikṣvākus of Kośala. The name of Ikṣvāku occurs in the Rgveda and there is evidence to show that the Ikṣvāku line was originally a line of princes of Purus.‡ Therefore an un-Vedic custom like sister-marriage can not be ascribed to the Śākyas. But the legend indicates that the men among whom it grew up, presumably the Buddhist monks of Eastern India, were

* तख्कामेता भागचरा भागिनेया न खुतयः ।


‡ Vedic Index, I, p. 75.
familiar with the custom. In the *Dasarathajātaka* Sitā is represented as the sister as well as the wife of Rāma, son of Dasaratha of the Ikṣvāku line. The *Rāmāyana*, the kernel of which cannot be later in date than the *Dasarathajātaka*, leaves no doubt about the fact that the story of sister-marriage on the part of Rāma was an invention of the Buddhist author or authors of the Jātaka. But probably sister-marriage was at one time practised in Magadha, the early centre of Buddhism. According to the Ceylonese *Mahāvamsa*, it was at one time practised in Bengal. In this work we are told (VI. 36) that Siḥbāhu, King of Vāṅga and Rādhā (Lāla), married his sister Sihasīvali. These Buddhist stories of sister-marriage indicate the existence of mother-kin in Eastern India. From these evidences we may infer that mother-kin was at one time universal among the Indo-Aryans of the Outer belt and led to the growth of Śāktism among them. Mother-kin still prevails among certain Malayāli-castes of Malabar and was evidently universal among the Draviḍas at one time; and so it may be argued that Śāktism might as well have originated among the Draviḍas and was borrowed from them by their Indo-Aryan neighbours. One strong objection to this view is the absence of Śāktism among the Tamils. The Draviḍas very probably fell under the influence of Vedic culture before they had advanced to the monotheistic stage of spiritual development independently.
Dr. Spooner, in the above-mentioned paper, traces the origin of the conception Śakti to a Persian (Magian) origin. He writes:—‘And is not the great Ishtar, perhaps the most popular divinity among the Persians, peculiarly associated with the Asuras or Dānavas? Witness the compounds asuraguru, ‘teachers of the Asuras’ and ‘dānavapūjitā,’ ‘worshipped by the Dānavas,’ both of which are Sanskrit names for Venus, well-attested.’ *

Bhadgatta, King of Prāgjyotiṣa [Kāmarupa], is called Yavana and asura in the Mahābhārata. From this Dr. Spooner derives the ‘undoubted truth that Bhagadatta was a Persian, and Prāgjyotiṣa a Magian settlement’ and proceeds:—‘Let us remember further that the most popular of goddesses among these Persians was the goddess Ishtar, whose peculiar associations with the Magians in India has been noted above (p. 81). Are not the Tāntrik system and the Śākta cult a development on Indian soil of the sympathetic magic rites in connection with this goddess as the symbol of fertility which Jastrow tells of? This unravels for us the whole mystery to which Wilson calls attention [i.e., ‘that Assam, or at least the north-east of Bengal, seems to have been, in a great degree, the source from which the Tāntrik and Śākta corruptions of the Religion of the Vedas and Purāṇas proceeded’], and furthermore explains the ‘curious fact’ mentioned to me by

---

Mahāmāhopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstri, that, according to his own researches, the Śākadvīpin Brāhmans were specially associated with this cult. This is a valuable bit of confirmatory evidence, for which I am much obliged to the Mahāmāhopādhyāya.”

The first point to be noted in this connection is that Ishtar was not a Persian or Magian, but a Babylonian, divinity, and she became Persian by her identification with the truly Persian divinity Anāhita. “After the conquest of Elam by the Indo-European Medes and Persians the old goddess [Innana of Erech] was identified with Anāhita, and under this name enjoyed extensive homage.”† Cumont’s description of the Avestic Anāhita is reproduced here:

“Ardvi Surā Anāhita, that is, undoubtedly, ‘the high, powerful, immaculate one’ is a goddess of fertilising waters, and more particularly of a supernatural spring, located in the region of stars, from which all the rivers of the world flow (Darmasteter). The fertility which the divine water caused in the earth was extended to the animal kingdom, and, according to the Avesta, Anāhita purifies the seed of males and the womb and milk of females’ (Vendidad, VII, 16; Yāst V, 5), and is invoked by marriageable girls, and by women at the time of child-birth (Yāst V). At the same time she is thought of as a goddess of

† Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, VII, p. 433a.
war, who rides in a chariot drawn by four white horses (Yast V, 11-13), which are wind, rain, cloud, and hail (Yast. v, 120), and she bestows victory on the combatants, and gives them sturdy teams and brave companions. The Avestan hymn, after enumerating all the heroes of the past who sacrificed to Anahita, including Zoroaster, whom she instructed in her worship, concludes with a very exact description of her appearance and her dress (Yast V, 126 ff.). 'She is a beautiful maiden, powerful and tall, her girdle fastened high, wrapped in a gold-embroidered cloak, wearing earrings, a necklace, and a crown of gold, and adorned with thirty otter skins.'*

The cult of Anahita spread from Iran to the west, 'but she was always regarded as the goddess of sacred waters.' In Iran, 'under the influence of the Chaldean star-worship, Anahita had become the planet Venus.'† But one great fact that distinguishes the Sakti of the Indian Saktta and the Persian Anahita is that while in the Avestan pantheon Anahita occupies a position subordinate to Ahura Mazda, in the Saktta pantheon Sakti is above all, the mother of all, the creator even of Brahma, Vishnu and Siva. The Sakti of the Saktta really resembles the Great Mother Cybele worshipped by the Lydian neighbours of Persians and not the Persian Anahita.

* Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, I, p. 414b.
† Ibid., p. 415b.
If Cybele could be conceived by the Lydians independently of Mazdaism, it is not necessary to assume a Mazdayasnian origin of Šakti on the ground of sex. The Hindu divinity who is identified with Venus is not the goddess Durgā but the god Sukṛcārya, the preceptor of the Asuras. Dr. Spooner does not indicate the source from which Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Šāstri learnt that “the Šāka-dvipin Brāhmans were specially associated with this [Šākta] cult.” The Šākadvipin Brāhmans in Bengal are represented by the Gaṇakas. According to the Vṛhadādharmapuruṣāṁ (Uttarakhandā, XIII, 52) the Gaṇaka was born of Šākadvipi father and Vaiśya mother.* The Gaṇaka Brāhmans of Bengal are specially associated with the worship of the grahas or planets and the Brāhmans who are specially associated with Šakti worship are the Rādhiya, Vārenda and Vaidika Brāhmans. The authentic history of the Šākadvipīya, Bhojaka, or Maga Brāhmans, so far as it is known to us, shows that they have ever been specially associated with the worship of the sun and stars. Varāhamihira, who died in A.D. 587, says in his Bṛhatśamhitā (60, 19), that the installation and consecration of the images and temples of the sun should be caused to be made by the Magas. Bāṇa in his Harṣacarita (Chap. IV) introduces us to an astrologer

* शाकदिविधौ दुपश्रेष्ठ चामोित यः म ईवम्।
शाकदिविधो हिंिा चिमुगृते धर्मिति।
ईवम् ईवको जानो व्यायायं वाइकोपि च॥
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called Tāraka the Bhojaka (Maga) who is thus described, "Hundreds and hundreds of times he had shown supernatural insight by announcing facts beyond the ken of man, a calculator, deeply read in all the treatises on astronomy, extolled and liked among all astrologers, endowed with the knowledge of three times." In the Deo-Baranak inscription of Jīvítagupta II of Magadha, who flourished in the eighth century A.D., recorded with the object of continuing the grant of a village to the Sun under the name of Varuṇavāsin, several generations of Bhojakas are referred to; viz. Bhojaka Śūryamitra, who was evidently patronised by Bālāditya (c. A.D. 485 to 535), Bhojaka Hamsamitra patronised by the Maukhari King Sarvavarman (c. A.D. 575 to 600), Bhojaka Rśimitra patronised by king Avantivarman, and Bhojaka Durdharamitra, who obtained the assent of Jīvítagupta II to the enjoyment of the village.†

---

* Cowell and Thomas, English translation, pp. 109, 110; text (Bombay, 1912), p. 128.
† Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, pp. 213-218.
CHAPTER V.

RACE AND CASTE—THE BRĀHMANS OF THE OUTER COUNTRIES.

Religion is universal and universal also is the minister of religion or priest. But hereditary priesthood independent of and claiming superiority to the king is a peculiarly Indian institution. Castes making up the Hindu laity are known by different names in different ethnic regions of India, and are organised on different models. But Hindu priests all over India are known by the same designation, Brāhman, and all Indian Brāhmans trace their descent from the same Rṣis first known from the Ṛgveda—the eight founders of the Brāhmanic gotras, viz., Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gotama, Atri, Vasiṣṭha, Kaśyapa, Agastya, and others.* This Brāhmanic claim to Midlandic origin offers a difficulty to the ethnic classification of Indo-Aryans proposed in Chapter II. Physically the Brāhmans of the Outer countries—of Gujarat, of the Marāṭhā country, and of Orissa and Bengal—are more closely related to their non-Brāhman neighbours than to the Brāhmans of the Midland. The head form of the Outlandic Brāhman does not support his claim to be the pure-blooded descendant of the Midlandic Vedic Rṣis, but indicates his close physical rela-

*See above, p. 19.
tionship to his non-Brâhman neighbours classed as Śûdras and anyâjas or outcastes. The wide difference in the head form of the Kânvakubjiya Brâhmans of the United Provinces and the Maitîlila Brâhmans of Bihar on the one hand, and the Nâgar Brâhmans of Gujarat and the Râdhiya, Vârendra, and Vaidika Brâhmans of Bengal on the other, cannot be explained by miscegenation alone, but indicates that the Brâhmans of the Outer countries are at base Outlandic in stock, and have not absorbed Midlandic elements in larger proportions than their non-Brâhman clients (yajmâna). This may perhaps lead some to doubt the value of the head form as indicated by the cephalic index as a test of race. But there are not wanting traditions and legends that confirm the data of cephalometric measurements, whereas traditions and legends pointing to the contrary view seem to be baseless.

Among the Outer countries inhabited by men of mixed origin according to Baudhâyana, Bihar, comprising the ancient Videha, Aûga and Magadha, now contains a population wherein the Midlandic elements predominate.* This is partly due to the mingling of the descendants of those invaders from the holy land watered by the Sarsvatî who, according to the legend of Mâthava, the Videgha, narrated in the Satapatha Brâhmaṇa, † settled in and Brâhmanised Videha, with the natives of Magadha and Auûga, and partly to a larger influx of immigrants from the Midland

*See above, p. 60. †See above, pp. 51—52.
later on than was possible elsewhere. The Maithila Brāhmans of Bihar evidently represent the invaders from the region of the Sarsvatī who Brāhmanised Videha in the Vedic period, and the Kanaujia Brāhmans and Rājputs of Bihar represent later immigrants. But even in Bihar, which is now ethnographically only a province of the Midland, it is yet possible to recognise the representatives of those Brāhmans or brahmabandhūs of Magadha* who were originally the priests of the primitive Vṛātya or un-Vedic cults of Magadha.

One such group of Bihāri Brāhmans are the Gayāwals of Gayā. In the Gayāmāhātmya of the Vāyu-purāṇa (112, 1-6) we are told that when at the end of the great sacrifice performed by King Gaya the gods requested him to ask for a boon, Gaya prayed, "Let those Brāhmans who were cursed by Brahmā in days of yore be purified and worshipped in sacrifice, and let this city be called Gayā after my name and become [as holy as] the city of Brahmā.''

† The story of

*See above, p. 39.
the great sacrifice performed by the royal sage (rājarṣi) Gaya, son of Amurtarayas, in the vicinity of the akṣaya (immortal) Vata (Ficus Indica) and the Gayaśīra hill, is also referred to in the Mahābhārata (III. 95).

Another Bihar caste in which we may recognise the representatives of the primitive Brāhmans of Bihar are the Bābhans or Bhuiyāhār Brāhmans. According to the Census returns of 1901 Bābhans in Bihar (1,108,438) exceeded in number all sub-castes of Brāhmans put together (1,094,500). Bābhan is peculiarly a Bihar caste. In the United Provinces Bābhans numbered only 205,951 in 1901. MM. H. P. Sāstrī has called attention to the fact that the term bābhan occurs in the inscription of Asoka "as a corruption of the word brāhmaṇa".

* In the Manserha and the Shahbazgarhī versions of the Rock Edicts of Asoka Brāhmaṇa is written as Brahmana, and in the Girnar version as Bāmhana with the exception of Edict IV. wherein the Sanskrit form Brāhmaṇa is retained. In all other versions of the Rock Edicts that are written in a dialect—the old Māgadhī Prākrit—that differs from both the divergent dialects of Girnar and Shahbazgarhī, two alternative forms, Bāmhana and Bābhana,

* Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1902, Part I, p. 61.
are met with. *Bambhama* is uniformly used in the Kalsi version of the edicts. *Bambhama* is used twice (III and IV) and *Bābhana* thrice in the Dhauli version, and both the forms are met with in the Jagauda version as far as it has been read. *Bābhana* also occurs in the Delhi-Sivalik Pillar Edict VII. *Bambhama* is evidently the same as *Bābhana* with ā shortened and nasalised in accordance with the phonology of a sub-dialect. In the spoken language of Western Bengal, Brāhman is called *Bāmun* and in that of Eastern Bengal, *Bāman*. We may, therefore, conclude that in the dialect spoken in Magadha in the third century B.C. Brāhmans were called *Bāhans*, and the modern Bāhans are the representatives of the ancient local Bāhans who have been deprived of their priestly functions by the Brāhman immigrants from the Midland. MM. H. P. Sāstrī holds, "that the Bāhans were Brāhman-Buddhists who lost their caste and position in Hindu society." But in the Rock Edicts of Asoka the *Bābhana* (and its equivalents, *Bamhana* retained in the later literary Prākṛts, and *Bramaṇa*, of Girnar and the north-western versions respectively) is mentioned side by side with the Samana or Śramaṇa. There is nothing in the Edicts to show that the Bāhans or Brāhmans of Magadha of the time of Aśoka were all Buddhists. The Aśoka of the Edicts is not an orthodox Buddhist himself, for the goal that he holds out to his subjects who are commanded to follow his sacred law (*dhamma*) is not nirvāna but para-
dise. If the modern Bābhans were the representatives of the Buddhist Brāhmans of old then we should have found them not only in Bihar but also in Bengal and other parts of India where Buddhism lingered as long. The indigenous Brāhmans of Magadha were called Bābhans probably because they spoke Prākṛt and were distinguished from the Sanskrit-speaking Brāhman immigrants from the Madhyadeśa by their Prākṛt name. We do not hear of Bābhans elsewhere, because elsewhere in the Outer countries there had never been such a large influx of Brāhmans from the Madhayadeśa as in Bihar. The Brāhmans of the other Outer countries—of Bengal, Orissa, the Deccan and Gujarat—are mostly Bābhans in blood, that is to say, descendants of the native Prākṛt-speaking primitive priests, though known by the Sanskrit form of the name.

Quite opposed to this view of the origin of the Outlandic Brāhmans are the evidences furnished by the Kulapañjikās or the genealogical works of the Rāḍhiya, Varendra and Pāścatya Vaidika Brāhmans of Bengal that represent them as pure-blooded descendants of immigrants from the Madhyadeśa. All the Rāḍhiya and the Varendra Brāhmans belong to five gotras or clans tracing their descent from the following five Rṣis, viz., Śāndilya, Kaśyapa, Bharadvāja, Vatsa and Sāvarṇa. The genealogists, not content with the remote connection with the Brāhmans of the Madhyadeśa indicated by the names of these Rṣi ancestors, further assert that all the Rāḍhiya
and Vārendra Brāhmans of Bengal making up nearly 80 per cent of the total Brāhman population are the descendants of five Brāhmans belonging to the five above-named gotras who came from Kanauj to Bengal with their wives on the invitation of a king named Ādiśūra, thirty to thirty-five generations before. Epigraphical evidences bear witness to the existence of a Śūra line of kings in Southern Bengal in the eleventh century A.D., and evidences are not also wanting to show that in those days Brāhmans belonging to one or other of these gotras were freely migrating to Bengal from the Madhyadesā of which the city of Kanauj or Kānyakubja was then the capital. Thus the donee of the Belāba grant of Bhojavarman issued from Vikramapura, a Brāhman named Rāmadevaśarman, belonging to Sāvarṇa gotra, and a student of the Kānva recension of the White Yajurveda, is described as ‘the great-grandson of Pitāmbara-devaśarman, a native of Siddhalagrama in Uttara-Rādhā who came from Madhyadesa (madhyadesa-vinirgata).’ * So of course it is quite possible that a king named Ādiśūra, from whom, according to the Vārendra genealogists, Ballālasena (about A.D. 1150-1169) is said to have been ninth in descent through his mother Vīlāsadevi, might have imported Brahmans from Kanauj, then the capital of the Gurjāra-Pratihāra kingdom, for performing certain Vedic rites. In an unpublished grant of the 33rd year of King

Vijayasena issued from Vikramapura it is said that his chief queen, Vilāsadevi, the mother of the heir-apparent, Ballālasena, came of the Śūra family. But the story of the descent of all the Rāḍhīya and Vārendra Brāhmans from five immigrants from Kanauj imported by Adiśūra appears to be a much later invention. It finds no place in the genealogical tables that were drawn up in the tenth, eleventh, twelfth and even fifteenth centuries. The earliest genealogical table of evidently a Vārendra Brāhman family belonging to the Śāṇḍīlya gotra is embodied in the so-called Badal Pillar inscription of the time of Nārāyaṇapala, still standing in a village called Haragaurī in the district of Dinajpur in the Vārendra country. Herein we are told that in Śāṇḍīlyā’s race was Viṣṇu (?), in his lineage Vīradeva, in his family Pāṇcāla; from him was born Garga, the minister of Dharma, or Dharmapāla, “the regent of the east.” Garga’s son was Darbhapāṇi, ‘distinguished by his knowledge of the four Vedas’, who was the minister of Devapāla. Darbhapāṇi’s son was Someśvara, from whom was born Kedāramiśra who filled “the circle of the quarters with the abundant (sacrificial) fires.” “At the sacrifice of him, the image of Bṛhaspati, the illustrious Prince Śūrapāla, having destroyed the forces of his enemies, often attended of his own accord, like Indra himself, the destroyer of the demon Vāla; and ever desirous of the welfare of the earth, girt by the several oceans, he there with bent head received the pure water, his soul being
bathed in the water of faith."' Kedāramiśra's son was Guravamiśra, the minister of King Nārāyaṇapāla, who "expounded the Vedas in books of moral tales, which excited a thrill of joy and showed that he was a born Vālmiki of the Kali age." *

A stone inscription † assigned to the eleventh century discovered at Selimpur in the district of Bogra in the Varendra country gives the history of a Varendra Brāhman family belonging to the Bhāradhvāja gotra. In this record it is said that a place called Tarkāri, forming a part of Śrāvastī, was the original home of the Brāhmans of the Bhāradvāja gotra. In the Puṇḍra country there was a village called Bālagrāma which was "the ornament of Varendra." Between Bālagrāma and Tarkāri lay Sakatī. Mr. Rādhāgovinda Basāk, who discovered this inscription and has edited and translated it, ‡ regards Sakatī as the name of a river and places Śrāvastī of the record within Puṇḍra (Varendra). In the early Sanskrit literature we meet with two cities called Śrāvastī—one founded by Lava, son of Rāma (Rāmāyaṇa VII.) and another by Śrāvasta in Gauḍa-deśa (Matsya Purāṇa, XII. 30). Cunningham regarded both the Śrāvastis as identical and identi-

---

† The stone bearing the inscription has been presented to the Varendra Research Society by Babu Vijayagovinda Basu Chaudhury, Zeminder of Khalsi.
‡ See the Bengali Magazine Bhāratavarṣa of 1322, pp. 1044–1055.
fied Gauḍa-deśa with the Gonda district of Oudh. But in all other texts and records Gauḍa is applied to Varendra in Bengal or to Bengal as a whole. So it seems more reasonable to identify the Gauḍa of the Purāṇa with Varendra or Bengal, and recognise in the Śrāvastī of Srāvasta an ancient city in Bengal which was separated from Bālagrāma of this record by Sakatī. Brāhmans belonging to the Bhāradvāja gotra migrated from Śrāvastī to Bālagrāma, and one family of Bālagrāma again migrated to the neighbouring Siamva. In this family was born Paśupati. His son was Sāhīla; Sāhīla’s son was Manoratha; Manoratha’s son was Sucarita. From Sucarita was born Taponidhi, from Taponidhi Kārttikeya, and from Kārttikeya and his wife Kaliparvva (daughter of Aṅgada, grand-daughter of Ajamiśra, and the great grand-daughter of Viṣṇu belonging to the Kūtumbapalli family) was born Prahāsa, who was well-versed in Tarka (the Nyāya philosophy), Tantra, and the Dharmasāstra or sacred law and caused this inscription to be recorded. It is also said in this record (v. 22) that Prahāsa refused to accept a donation of 900 gold coins and a grant of land yielding one thousand a year from Jayapāla, King of Kāmarupa.

A record of the twelfth century, the Bhuvanesvara inscription of Bhavadeva, surnamed Bālabalabhībhujaṅga (the paramour or lord of Bālabalabhī) gives the genealogy of a Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇ family belonging to Sāvarṇa gotra and Siddhalagrāma whither Pitāmbara, the great grand-
father, as we have already seen, of the donee of Bhojavarman's grant, also belonging to the Sāvarṇa gotra, migrated from the Madhyadeśa. The contents of this inscription is thus summed up by Keilhorn:

"Of the villages granted to, and the homes of, Brāhmans learned in the Vedas who are born in the family of the sage Sāvarṇa, a hundred may adorn the land of Aryāvarta; but foremost among all is Siddhala which is the ornament of the country of Rādhā. At that village prospered a family to which belonged a certain Bhavadeva [I] whose elder and younger brothers were Mahādeva and Atthāsa. He, to whom the King of Gauḍa granted the village of Hastinībhītta, had eight sons, the chief (or eldest) of whom was Rathānaga. From Rathānaga sprang Atyaṅga; and his son was Budha, surnamed Sphurita. From him Ādideva was born, who became minister of peace and war of the King of Vaṅga. His son was Govardhana, distinguished as a warrior and a scholar. He married Sāṅgokā, the daughter of a Bandyaghatiya Brāhman and begat on her the person in whose honour this prāśasti was composed, Bhavadeva [II], whom the poet glorifies as a divine being, while he indicates his worldly position by telling us that, aided by his council (the king) Harivarmadeva long exercised the government, and that his policy rendered prosperous the reign of the king's son also."

* Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, p. 205.*
One section of the Varendra Brahmans belonging to the Kaśyapa gotra are known as Karaṇjāgāīn from a village named Karaṇja. Caturbhuj, who composed his Sanskrit poem, the Haricaritam, at Rāmakeli in the district of Maldah in the Varendra country in Śakavarga 1415 (A.D. 1493), was a Brahm of the Karaṇjāgāīn. In the concluding stanzas of the Haricaritam Caturbhuj gives this account of his ancestors. There was a village in Varendra named Karaṇja where many learned Brahmans lived. Svarṇarekha, the foremost man among the Brahmans, obtained the whole of that village as a grant from King Dharmapala. Bhundu was born in his family. Bhundu’s son was Divākara, “the Sun of the Kaśyapa clan” (Kaśypagotrabhāskara). In his line was born Nityānanda Kavindra (‘king of poets’), who compiled the Smytikaumudī. From Nityānanda was born Śivadāsa whose youngest brother was the poet Caturbhuj, the author of Haricaritam.* We know of only one Dharmapala who ever ruled over Varendra. This was the second king of the Pala dynasty who flourished in the first half of the ninth century A.D. Attempts have been made by some Bengali writers to identify the Dharmapala named by Caturbhuj with a Dharmapala who, according to tradition, reigned in Kāmarupa on the one hand, and with Dharmapala of Daṇḍābhukti, who, according to the Tirumalai rock inscription

of King Rajendra Chola I, "was destroyed in a hot battle" by that Chola conqueror between A.D. 1020 and 1024.* This Dharmapāla of Daṇḍabhukti was evidently a vassal of King Mahipāla I of the Pāla dynasty who recovered Varendra from a usurper of the Kamboja family. So the grant of a village in Varendra on the part of Dharmapāla of Daṇḍabhukti is inconceivable. The history of Varendra from the time of Dharmapāla, the second King of the Pāla dynasty, to the invasion of Muhammad Bakhtiyar (from about A.D. 800 to 1198) is too well-known from contemporary sources to admit of the foisting of a second Dharmapāla within this epoch. It may be said that Caturbhujā who wrote more than six centuries after Dharmapāla cannot be accepted as an authority for the history of Dharmapāla's time. But it is probable that Caturbhujā derived his information that his ancestor Svarṇarekha obtained the grant of Karanīja-grāma from Dharmapāla either from the copper-plate grant itself or from a genuine family tradition based on the deed. In any case, the absence of the name Suṣena, who, according to the genealogical works, was the Brāhman belonging to the Kāśyapa-gotra who is said to have been imported by Ādisūra from Kanauj, and to whom every Varendra Brāhman of Kāśyapa gotra of our day traces his descent, in the family history of a learned Brāhman of the Kāśyapa-gotra and Karanījagāinī written by himself, shows that

the story of Suṣeṇa's coming was unknown in A.D. 1494 when Caturbhuja wrote, and was invented by the genealogists later on.

Not only does Suṣeṇa find no mention in the history of the Kāśyapā-gotriya Brāhmans of Karanįjarāīn written by Caturbhuja, but the man who first lived in Karanįja is represented as the great-great-grandson of a Svarṇarekha in the works of the genealogists. The genealogy of the Kāśyapa section of the Varendra Brāhmans as given in these works is thus reproduced by the author of the Bengali work, Gauḍe Brāhmaṇ.*---

1. Suṣeṇa (came from Kanauj on the invitation of Ādiśūra).

2. Brahmā Ojha.

3. Dakṣa.

4. Pītāmbar.

5. Hiraṇyagarbha.

6. Vedagarbha.


8. Svarṇarekha (in his time King Ballālāsesa is said to have divided the Brāhmans into Rāḍhiya and Varendra subcastes and he was included in the latter group).

* Gauḍe Brāhmaṇ by Mahimā Candra Majumdar, second edition.

10. Kratu (founder of the Bhāduri family, created Kulin by Ballālasena).
10. Maitra (founder of the Maitreya family, created Kulin by Ballālasena).

11. Saṃkarṣāna.


13. Divākara (lived in Karaṇja and became the founder of the Karaṇjagāin).

It may be noted in this connection that the well-known Bengali historian Mr. Akṣay Kumar Maitra, who first pointed out the wide divergence between the genealogy of the Vārendra Brāhmans belonging to Kaśyapa-gotra as given in the Hari-caritam of Caturbhuj on the one hand, and that of the Kulapañjikās of the genealogists on the other, is himself a kulin (noble) Brāhman of the same gotra.*

One other obstacle to the credibility of the

* For further discussions of the historical value of the Kulapañjikās, the reader is referred to the author's articles 'Ādi-sūra' in the Bengali Magazine Sāhitya of 1321, pp. 751-759, and 'Bāṅgālār viśāsār upādān' in Bhārati of 1322, pp. 941-952. The Kulapañjikās of the Pāscatya Vaidik Brāhmans are as valueless for the history of origins. See Mr. R. D. Banerji's Bāṅgālār viśāsās, pp. 135-131, and Mr. S. Kumār's article 'Earliest seat of the Senas,' in the Indian Antiquary, XLIV, pp. 270-274.
stories of the origin of the Bengali Brāhmans as given in the genealogical works of the Rādhīyas and Varendra, is that it involves the assumption of the practical absence of Brāhmans in Bengal 30 to 35 generations, or say, eight to ten centuries, before. According to the genealogists of the Rādhīyas there were seven hundred Brāhman families in Bengal at the time of the coming of the five Brāhmans from Kanauj. But now-a-days representatives of the seven hundred families are nowhere to be met with, whereas the descendants of the five immigrants fill the whole country. Copper-plate grants, such as the Dhanaidaha grant of the time of the Emperor Kumaragupta I of A.D. 432,* a set of five grants of the time of Buddhagupta and Kumara-gupta II recently discovered in the district of Dinajpur,† and the Faridpur grants of the time of Dharmāditya, Gopacandra and Samacāradeva,‡ bear witness to the fact that there were Brāhmans in Bengal well-versed in the Vedas in the fifth and the sixth centuries. The inclusion of the Karatoya, the Lauhitya (Brahmaputra), and the place where the Ganges falls into the sea, among the tirthas or holy places and rivers in the Mahābhārata (III. 85. 2--4), shows that Bengal was recognised as a seat of Brāhmanism even in the time of the composition of this part

* Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1910.
† These plates have been sent to the Varendra Research Society by Mr. Ezekiel, the Collector of Dinajpur, and are now being deciphered by Mr. Rādhāgovinda Basāk.
‡ Indian Antiquary, 1910, pp. 193-216.
of the epic, for there could not have been Brāhma
manical tīrthās without a Brāhman population in
the neighbourhood.

A legend narrated in the Vāyupurāṇa (104)
giving a list of the tīrthas or holy places shows
that at the time of the composition of this text
Pauṇḍravardhana, the ancient capital of Pūndra
or Varendra, was a well-known centre of orthodox
Brāhmanism. Once upon a time doubts arose in
the mind of Vyāsa, son of Satyavatī, as regards
the meaning of a Vedic text. He then went to a
cave of the Mount Meru to perform austerities in
order to remove his doubts. After a lapse of
three hundred years spent in the performance of
severe penances, the four Vedas, crowned with
matted hair, holding bunches of kūsa grass, and
with deer-skin hanging over their shoulders, ap-
peared before Vyāsa (67—70). Then—

"He found Mathurā, where Bhagavān Hari (Viṣ-
ṇu) himself incarnated, in their lotus-like hearts;
Kāśī resembling Māyā (illusion) in a receptacle be-
tween the eye-brows; Kāñcī in the organ of gen-
eration; Avantī in the navel; Dwārakā in the throat;
Prayāga in the breath of life; the rivers Gangā
and Yamunā on their left and right; the Sarasvatī
herself in the middle; Gayā in the face; the
good place Prabhāsa between the jaw and the
neck; the hermitage of Badarī in the aperture in
the crown of the head; the pīthas Pauṇḍravard-
dhana and Nepāla in the two eyes; the pītha
called Pūrṇagiri on the forehead; Mathurā-pītha
in the neck; Kāñcī-pītha in the loin; Jālandhara-
pitha on the breast; Bhṛgu-pitha in the ear; and Ayodhya in the nostril. Brāhma (the cult of Brahmā) was in the aperture of the crown of their head, Śaiva (cult) in the parting of the hair, Śakta (cult) on the end of the tongue, Vaiṣṇava (cult) in the heart, Saura (cult) in the eyes and Baudhā (cult) was attached to their shadows."

Owing to the existence of Brāhmaṇic tīrthas in the Outer countries the rule forbidding migration to them had thus to be modified:—"He who visits Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Saurāstra and Magadha except on pilgrimage should be invested with the

* "समसरामेयां चुद्याभोजकलिपताम् ||
चर्मभैरवं: साहायसार्वभावश्री स्वभा ।
काशीसपात्र सुमध्ये सावासागारसशिवासाम् ||
किलारद्ये तस: काशीसवनाम नाभिकालः ।
कष्ठखं द्वारकाम्यां प्रयांग प्राप्तं तथा ।
सवापवसयज्ञों महापि वधुं नदी ।
सधे सरस्तान्तो साहां गुराष्टने तथानने ।
ह्रन्यायासताम भवासयज्ञं समसरामासम् ।
बदयायसम्भवेण ब्रह्मरग्ने ददर्षे च ।
पर्षवसनेवयपार्षन्योऽन्यवसनयोऽपृथे ।
पीठ पूर्णांगिरि नाभ लक्षाऱ्म समद्वस्त ।
कष्ठे च महुरापीठ काशीपीठ जतिसिमासम् ।
जाध्वंति तथा पीठ सन्नेत्योद्वसम ।
मयुपीठ कष्ठेण ब्रह्म्यां नाभिकाकुटे ।
ब्राह्मरङ्गे विषाण ब्राह्मण स्वयं विश्वकाव्यम्भ ।
शाली भल्लाघोषितं वैश्यं चुद्यामूले ।
सौरं च चुन्त्याप्रेषेष्वं वौधायासंसर्गम ।"

Vāyu Purāṇa (Ānandāśram Sanskrit Series, No. 49) Adhyāya, 104. 79-82.
sacred thread anew." * The incredible character of the stories of the genealogical works on the one hand, and the data of cephalometric measurements considered in the light of such injunctions in the Brāhmaṇic sacred books (ante, p. 40) on the other, point to the conclusion that the legend regarding the common origin of the (Bāleya) Brāhmans and the non-Brāhmans of Āṅga, Paṇḍra, Vaṅga, Suhma, and Kaliṅga narrated in the Harivaṃsa and the Purāṇas (ante, p. 69) is not baseless.

The legends relating to the origin of some of the important divisions of the Brāhmans of Mahārāṣtra and Gujarat appear to bear direct testimony to their local origin. About the Konkanasthas or Chittapāvans of Konkan we are told, "In the Sahyādri Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa, —which bears marks of the composition or interpolation of some Deshastha of Kolhāpura (which city is much praised in it), —they are absurdly enough said to have been made by the Avatarā Paraśurāma (in want of Brāhmans to perform for him a śrāddha) from the chitā, or funeral pile, of sixty men, whom he consecrated or endowed with the Brāhmanhood, bestowing on them learning and beauty, and conferring on them fourteen gotras, and sixteen upanāmas (surnames)." †. Re-

* जयप्रकटविकृतयो शैराच्छे मन्देन्तुं ।
   नीत्यायां दिना महन्तु पुनः संख्यास्थितिः ॥

Quoted by Mitramiśra in the Vīramitrodaya.

garding the Karhāda Brāhmans of Mahārāṣṭra, "in the Sahyādri Khāṇḍa, which shows a spirit of violent hostility to them, they are said to have been made by Paraśurāma from camel's bones." * In themselves these legends are valueless and may disclose a spirit of violent hostility on the part of the author. But the absence of any rival tradition purporting to ascribe a nobler origin to the Karhādas and the Konkanasthas shows that they are based on a common belief that these Brāhmans are of local origin and not immigrants from Madhyadeśa.

Mr. Bhimbhai Kirparam in his work on the Hindus of Gujarat (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. IX, Part I) divides the numerous sections of the Gujerati Brāhmans into three groups,—the early original Gujarati Brāhmans, the Brāhmans who migrated to Gujarat in the Middle Ages, and the modern or later immigrants. The first group includes these nine sub-castes:—the Anarvalās, the Bhārgavas, the Sajodras, the Jambus, the Kapils, the Khedavals, the Matālas, and the Nāgars. Of the Anarvalās the author writes, "According to local tradition, Rāma, on his return from the conquest of Ceylon, halted at a place called Pālār-vāḍa in the hills called Bānsvāḍa, about fifty-five miles south-east of Surat. Determining to hold a sacrifice he required the services of a large body of priests. He searched the country round, and failing to find priests enough collected eighteen

* Ibid., p. 21.
thousand of the hill tribes and made them Brāhmans.’’ A very similar legend is narrated in connection with the Sajodras, named after Sajod, a village in the Broach district. “The tradition is that Rāma made them Brāhmans to assist him in the performance of sacrifice and in a small mound near Sajod sacrificial ashes and burnt betelnuts are said still to be found.”

No less than four legends are given by Mr. Kirparam in connection with the origin of the Nāgar Brāhmans of Gujarat. Two of them connect the origin of the Nāgar Brāhmans with the marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī. “Brahmā went to officiate [as priest] at Śiva’s marriage with Pārvatī. He was smitten with Pārvatī’s beauty and being unable to control himself left the marriage booth. Finding that there was nobody to officiate at the ceremony, Śiva threw down six grains of rice and from them arose six Brāhmans. There being no Brāhman girls, Śiva married these newly created Brāhmans to six Nāga girls to fit them to officiate as priests at the ceremony.” The second legend is but a modification of this one, and the third connects the Nāgar Brāhmans with Śiva’s sacrifice when that god was compelled to create a new set of Brāhmans. The fourth legend traces their origin from a Nāg (serpent) who assumed the form of a Brāhman, married a Brāhman girl, and had several children by her. Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar, following Sir George Campbell, holds that the Nāgar Brāhmans of Gujarat, the Gurjar Nāgars of Bulandshahar in the United Provinces, and the
Jāt Nagres come of the same stock and the Nāgar Brāhmans came to Gujarat from the north.* The Gujarātī language now spoken in Gujarat and Mārwārī spoken in Western Rajputana are traced by philologists to a common source called the old Western Rājasthānī which was a modification of the Śaurasena Apabhraṃśa, and this linguistic phenomenon is explained by the ethnological theory that Rājputāna and Gujarat were colonised by the Gurjaras who came from the ancient Sapādalakṣa (comprising the hilly country extending from Chamba on the west to Western Nepal on the east) imposing their language over the whole tract covered by their immigration.† Though the Gurjar invaders of Rājputāna and Gujarat might have imposed their language on the early inhabitants of Gujarat and Rājputāna, it is not possible to admit that they came in such large numbers as to modify the physical features of the natives of these areas in any appreciable degree. The typical Rajputs of Rājputāna are long-headed, and so also are the Sikh Jats and Gujars of the Punjab;‡ but the Nāgar Brāhmans of Gujarat are broad or medium-headed. So we have as little reason for recognising the Gurjara invaders as an important factor in determining the physical type

* Indian Antiquary, Vol. XL, pp. 33-34;
† Ibid., Vol. XLIII, pp. 22, and 164-166.
‡ Thirteen Gujars of the Punjab measured under the supervision of Sir Herbert Risley gave an average cephalic index of 72.4 and a maximum index of 78 and a minimum of 68; 80 Sikh Jats yielded—average 72.7, maximum 81, minimum 66.
of Western India as we have for the Śakas and Kushans.

Most of the other sections of the early group of Gujarāt Brāhmans are recognised as immigrants, not from the Madhyadeśa in the north, but from the south. "According to a legend the Motala Brāhmans were brought into Gujarat by Hanumāna from Kolhāpur." The Jambu and the Kapil Brāhmans are regarded as akin to the Motalas who came to Gujarat from the Deccan at about the same time. The Khedavals are believed to be immigrants from Śrīraṅgam in Mysore. It was probably owing to a suspicion regarding their origin that it was enjoined that the Brāhmans of the Outer countries should not be fed at the funeral ceremony. Hemādri, who flourished in the Deccan in the thirteenth century, quotes this text from the Saurapūrāṇa in his Śrāddhakalpa: "The Brāhmans of Āṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Saurāśtra, Gurjara, Ābhira, Koṅkaṇa, Dravīda, Dakṣināpatha, Avanti, and Magadha should be avoided.''

The Ābhiras are a class of Brāhmans of Maharāṣtra who are the priests of Ābhira or Āhir herdsmen and cultivators and are probably themselves of Ābhira origin. The broad, depressed noses of the Brāhmans of Southern India indicate that they are mainly Dravidian in blood like their neighbours.

---

* "महाभरत कौशल्यानं, भावाणिस्वर विरचितः *
* "मावः वाज्यां सामवेदिक वाणिज्यां सिद्धांस्वायतः *
* Chaturvargacintāmaṇi, Śrāddhakalpa (Bib. Ind.)
Among the non-Brāhmaṇ castes of the Outer countries, five exogamous sub-sections of the Vaṅgaja and the Dakṣiṇarāḍhiya Kāyasthas of Bengal, viz., the Boses, Ghoṣes, Guhas, Mitras and Dattas, are said to be the descendants of five Śūdra attendants who accompanied the five Brāhmaṇ immigrants from Kanauj imported by Ādiśūra. It is also said that the ancestors of the Boses, Ghoṣes, Guhas and Mitras, when questioned by King Ādiśūra, admitted that they were the servants of the Brāhmaṇs, but Puruṣottam Datta is said to have declared, "Sir, listen to me; Datta is not the servant of anybody; he has only accompanied (the five Brāhmaṇs); this is to be known about him."

The King, offended at the arrogance shown by this speech, deprived him of his claim to the noble rank (kaulīṇya). The social life of the Vaṅgaja and Dakṣiṇarāḍhiya Kāyasthas of Bengal is still guided by an unquestioned faith in this story. But it is as baseless as the story of the descent of all the Rāḍhiya and Vārendra Brāhmaṇs from the five Brāhmaṇs of Kanauj who came to Bengal on the invitation of Ādiśūra of which it is but an appanage. There are two very strong reasons for disbelieving this story of the origin of these five sub-sections of the Kāyastha caste as told in the genealogical works. The Vārendra and Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇs of our day are mostly thirty to thirty-five generations re-

* মন্ত কারে ভৃত্ত নয় জন মহাশয়।
সঙ্গে আশিয়াচে মাতে এই পরিচয়।
moved from the five Brāhmans who originally came from Kanauj, whereas the present generation of Boses, Ghoṣes, Guhas, Mitras and Dattas are mostly twenty-two to twenty-five generations removed from their five Śūdra companions or servants whose descendants are now known as Kāyasthas. This wide divergence shows that the so-called Kanaujia ancestors of the present generation of the Vaṅgaja and Dakṣiṇarādhīya kulin Kāyasthas could not have come with the five Brāhmans, but if they came at all, they came ten generations later. Some writers have endeavoured to reconcile the Brāhman and Kāyastha genealogical tables by assuming that the names of about ten generations have been dropped from the Kāyastha genealogy. But as the genealogical tables of the five sub-sections of the Kāyasthas fully agree among themselves there is hardly any room for such an assumption. Another serious objection to the current story of the origin of the Boses, Ghoṣes, Guhas, Mitras and Dattas is that in Kanauj and its neighbourhood—in what is now the United Provinces, and even in Bihar—we do not find Kāyasthas or other castes with such surnames, while men with the surnames of Ghoṣa and Mitra are met with in Bengal long before the coming of a Ghoṣa and a Mitra from Kanauj.

In the four Faridpur grants of the sixth century already referred to, officials bearing such surnames as Datta, Candra, Deva, Mitra, Sena, Ghoṣa, Kunda, Pālita and Nāga find mention. Traces of such surnames are also found in other
Outer countries. The copper-plate grants of the so-called Somavamśī kings of Trikaliṅga, who ruled over parts of Odra (Orissa) and [Southern] Kośala in the eleventh century A.D. contains the names of officials bearing Ghoṣa, Datta and Nāga titles. The writer of the grants of the third and sixth years of King Mahābhavagupta is, ‘Kāyastha Koighoṣa, son of Vallabhaghoṣa attached (pratibaddāha) to the office of the minister of peace and war who was the son of Mallādharadatta.’

A copper-plate grant of the eighth year of the same king ‘was written by Āllava, son of Kailāsa, who was attached to the office of Mahāsūndhivigrahī Rānaka Mallādatta, son of Dhāradatta’

The same minister is mentioned in a grant of the 31st year of Mahābhavagupta I as Malladatta. A grant of the fifteenth regnal year of the next King, Mahāśivagupta, ‘was written by the Mahākṣapatalaka Śrī Ucchava Nāga, son of Āllava Naga, who was known to Mahāsūndhivigrahika-rāṇaka Śrī Carudatta.’ In a grant of the 28th year of the same king we are told that Śiṃhadatta occupied the office of the minister of peace and war (sāndhivigrapada) and the grant was written by the Kāyastha Suryasena attached to the office of the same Sāndhivigrahī of Kośala. A grant of the third year of Mahā-Bhavagupta II, successor of Mahāśivagupta,

* Epigraphia Indica, XI, 95; Ibid. III, p. 344.
† Ibid. VIII, p. 140. ✧ Ibid. III, p. 350.
§ Ibid. XI, p. 98.
|| Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1905, p. 23.
was written by Kāyastha Maṅgaladatta on the staff of the same minister Siṃhadatta. Mr. B. C. Mazumdar takes these officers surnamed Datta, Ghoṣa, and Nāga as Bengali Kāyasthas.* But these surnames were also once quite common among the Nāgar Brahmans of Gujarat. Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar writes:—

"Mr. Vallabhji Haridatt Achārya of Rajkot has kindly supplied me with a verse which sets forth what are called the 'Sarmans,' i.e., name-endings, of the various gotras of the Nāgar Brāhmins. It has been found by him in three MSS. of the work Pravarādhyāya connected with the Nāgars. One of the MSS. is dated Samvat 1788 Vaiśākha Suda 8 Bhṛgu, and all distinctly and unmistakably state that the gotras, pravaras, etc., therein specified are those which were in existence before Samvat 1283. This verse, which is of great importance, runs as follows:—

"Datta-guṇṭau nanda-ghoṣau ṣarma-dasau ca varma ca.
Nāga-datta-strāta-bhūṭau mitrādevau bhavasta-thā."

"Here is a list of thirteen 'Sarmans,' which were in use amongst the Nāgar Brāhmins nearly 700 years ago. Even now they are affixed to their names, when they perform the religious ceremonies.

* * * * *

'No less than ten of these thirteen 'Sarmans'

* Epigraphia Indica XI, p. 104.
are found as family names among Kāyasthas in Bengal, corresponding to Datta, Gupta, Nandi, Ghoṣa, Šarma, Dās, Barmā, Bhut, Mitra and Dev. * * * The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that at least ten of these ‘Śarmans’ represent the names of families or tribes that were incorporated into the Nāgar Brāhman caste. This seems to point to a racial identity between the Kāyasthas of Bengal and the Nāgar Brāhmans of Gujarat.”*

These surnames, called paddhatis in Bengal, seem to point not only to a racial identity between the Kāyasthas of Bengal and the Nāgar Brāhmans of Gujarat, but also indicate that all castes in Bengal having such surnames in common are of common origin. Nearly a hundred paddhatis or surnames are met with among the Kāyas-thas. These are—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aṅkura</th>
<th>Kṣur</th>
<th>Jāma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arṇa</td>
<td>Kṣom</td>
<td>Dḥol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āic</td>
<td>Khil</td>
<td>Tej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āg</td>
<td>Gaṇḍa</td>
<td>Toṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḍhya</td>
<td>Guiṅ</td>
<td>Datta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āditya</td>
<td>Guṇa</td>
<td>Dānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>Guha</td>
<td>Dāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamān</td>
<td>Gupt</td>
<td>Dāhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Om</td>
<td>Gauḍ</td>
<td>Deva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīrtti</td>
<td>Ghoṣa</td>
<td>Dūta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunda</td>
<td>Candra</td>
<td>Dharani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṣām</td>
<td>(Chanda)</td>
<td>Dhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṣem</td>
<td>Caṇḍa</td>
<td>Dhanu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indian Antiquary, XL (1911), pp. 32-33.
| Nandana | Bandi | Śani |
| Nandī | Bīṣṇu (Viṣṇu) | Śara |
| Nāga | Baiś | Śarmmā |
| Nāda | Brahma | Śāiṅ |
| Nātha | Bhaṅja | Śānā |
| Pāla | Bhadra | Śīla |
| Pālita | Bhuiṅ | Śūiṅ |
| Pila | Bhūti | Śūra |
| Pūiṅ | Manu | Sāma |
| Preta | Māhut | Śimha |
| Bandhu | Mitra | Sen |
| Bardhana | Yaśa | Soma |
| Bal | Rakṣita | Hanu |
| Barmmā | Rāja | Hāti |
| (Varman) | Rāṅā | Hem |
| Bāna | Rājpūt | Heś |
| Binda | Rāhā | Hui |
| Bīda | Rāhut | Hoḍ |
| Bīja | Rudra | Hom * |
| Baṅga (Vanga). Lodha | | |
| Basu (Bose) | Śakti | |

The Baidya or Vaidya (physician) caste of Bengal shares thirteen of these paddhatis—Sena, Dāsa, Gupta, Datta, Dev, Kar, Rāj, Som, Nandī, Candra, Dhar, Kunda and Rakṣit—with the Kāyas-thas. Some of the Kāyastha-paddhatis are found among the Bārajīvīs, Tilis (Taulikas), Tāntis (Tantuvāyas), Tāmbulis and Suvarṇavaṇīks, and

are also to be met with among some other castes. In these paddhatis we should probably recognise the names of the primitive Alpine tribes who colonised all the Outer countries from Gujarat to Bengal. As the largest number of paddhatis survive among the Kāyasthas of Bengal, they should be considered, not merely as a functional caste like the writer castes of the other provinces of India, but as a caste of the national type, like the Marāthā caste of the Deccan, retaining an important feature of the organisation of the Aryan invaders from whom they are mainly descended. It should be noted that one of the Kāyastha paddhatis is Baṅga (Vaṅga). I know of a family belonging to the Tantuvaṅga (weaver) caste with this remarkable surname. One of the reproaches levelled against the Kāyasthas of Bengal by their opponents is that their organisation is not as rigid as that of the other castes, and men of lower castes, known by Kāyastha surnames, often get themselves admitted to its fold by contracting matrimonial alliances with stereotyped Kāyasthas. This allegation is not without foundation, and the comparative laxity of the Kāyastha organisation is due to the survival of primitive traits pertaining to a caste of the national type. Within the Kāyastha fold, the Kulins (nobles), that is to say, the Bosses, Ghoṣes, Guhas and Mitras, view with suspicion the origin of Kāyastha families bearing other surnames and refuse to admit their claim to Kāyastha rank unless they are related to the Kulins by marriage. As the status of the Kāyastha caste of
Bengal is now a subject of very keen controversy, I shall conclude this chapter with a brief reference to it.

The writers engaged in the Kāyastha controversy may be divided into two schools. One school, of which the most well-known representative is Panḍit Lālmohan Vidyānidhi, author of the Sambandhanirnāya, regards the Kāyasthas in general, and the Bengali Kāyasthas in particular, as of Śūdra origin. For this view of the origin of the Kāyasthas they rely on the Jātimālā said to be attached to the Agnipurāṇa and the works of the Brāhmaṇ genealogists. I have already dealt with the testimony of the genealogical works. According to the Jātimālā, Śūdrarāṇi sprung from the lotus feet of Brahmā; Śūdrarāṇi begat Hīma; Hīma begat Pradīpa; Pradīpa begat Kāyastha; Kāyastha begat three sons—Citra Gupta, Citrāsena, and Vicitra. From Citrāsena was born Bose (Basu), Ghoṣa, Guha, Mitrā, Dattā, Kārana, Mṛtyunjaya, and Anukarana. Of these brothers Kārana begat Nāga, Nātha, and Dāsa, and Mṛtyunjaya begat Dev, Sen, Pālit, Simha, and many others.*

The other school traces the Kāyastha caste to Kṣatriya origins and advise those among the Kāyasthas who follow Śūdra usages to adopt Kṣatriya usages. The authorities relied on by this school are put in a nutshell in a vyāvasthāpatra or a paper containing the opinion of the

* Ibid., p. 125.
leading Pāṇḍits of Benares issued in 1873.* In this paper extracts are given from the Padmapurāṇa and the Skandapurāṇa, wherein we are told that the Kāyasthas are the descendants of two Kṣatriyas, Citragupta and Candrasena, who were degraded to the rank of writers by two sages, Māṇḍavya and Dālbhya, respectively. These texts can not be regarded as mere modern fabrications, for they are quoted in an authoritative compilation, the Śūradharmatattva by Kamalakara, better known as Śūdra-kamalākara. But all these legends throw little or no light on the origin of the Kāyasthas. The only basis of fact that may be discerned in them is the reflection of the opinion of the contemporaries of the writers regarding the place of the Kāyastha caste in the Hindu society. The authors of the different legends probably had in view Kāyasthas of different provinces and the author of the Jātimālā evidently had in view the Kāyastha caste of Bengal, four sub-sections of which are said to have purchased the patent of kulinism by declaring themselves as Śūdra servants of Brahmans. But kulinism, which involved the admission of Śūdra origin, was not recognised by two of the four sub-castes,—the Uttara Rāḍhiya and the Vārendra Kāyasthas. These Kāyasthas preferred to be known as members of the mixed Karaṇa caste than as pure-blood Śūdras.

* The Annual Reports of the Vaṅgadeśiya Kāyastha-Sabhā (in Bengali), second and third years, appendix ca (b).
All the Kāyasthas of Bengal were probably known as Kāraṇas before the rise of kulinism in Vaṅga and Southern Rāḍha. In the accounts of castes given in the Brahmakhaṇḍa of the Brahma-
vaivarta Purāṇa* and the Brāhaddharma Purāṇa the Kāraṇa occupies the place of the Kāyastha. The authors of both these accounts seem to disclose a familiarity with the caste system of Bengal and agree in assigning to the Kāraṇa the place of honour in their list of the mixed castes. The legend relating to the origin of these mixed castes is narrated in the Brāhaddharma Purāṇa, Uttarkhaṇḍa (chapter xiii). It is said that when Vṛṇa obtained the sovereignty of the earth he stopped the performance of sacrifices and other religious rites. The Brāhmans then approached him and said, “O king, if religious rites are not performed and Viṣṇu is not worshipped, anarchy will follow and mixed castes will spring up from the illicit connection of men and women of different castes.” The wicked king took the hint and compelled men and women of unequal castes to procreate mixed castes. When mixed castes of the first degree had been created, Vṛṇa compelled them again to create other mixed castes. The names of the so-called thirty-six mixed castes, as given in the Brāhaddharma Purāṇa, show how conversant the author was with the caste system of Bengal. I name them in the order in which they are mentioned in the text.

I. Twenty good mixed castes (uttama saṅkarāḥ) having Śrotiyya Brāhmans as their Purohitas—Karaṇa (Kāyastha), Ambaṣṭha (Vaidya), Gandha Vaṇik, Kaṃṣakāra (brazier), Śaṅkhakāra (shell-dresser), Ugra, Rājaputra (Rajput), Kumbhakāra (potter), Tantravāya (weaver), Karma-kāra (blacksmith), Dāsa (Cāsi Kāivartta), Māgadha, Gopa (Goālā, milkman), Nāpīta (barber), Modaka (Mayrā), Vāraṇī (Bārui, grower of betel leaves), Sūta, Mālākāra (gardener), Tāmbulī (seller of betel leaves), Taulikā (seller of betel nuts, Tili traders).

II. Twelve madhyama or intermediate mixed castes—Takṣāṇ (wood-cutter), Rajaka (washer-man), Svarṇakāra (goldsmith), Suvarṇavaṇīk, Ābhīra, Tailakāraka (oil presser), Dhīvara (fisherman), Śauṇḍika (wine-seller), Naṭa, Sāvāka or Śāvāra, Sekhara, Jālika (fisherman).

III. Aṇṭyajas or outcastes—Malegrāhi, Kuḍava, Cāṇḍāla, Varūḍa, Carmakāra (Chāmār), Ghaṭṭājīvi (ferryman), Dolāvāhi, Malla.

Besides these thirty-six (really forty), the author names the Śākadvīpi or Devala Brāhmans and two other mixed castes, Gaṇaka and Vāḍaka. From the body of Veṇa also sprung Mleccha, Pulinda, Pukkasa, Khaṣa, Yavana, Suhma, Kamboja, Śavara, and Khara. When the Rṣis saw these castes born of sin they put Veṇa to death. Then they rubbed the arms of Veṇa and Prthu sprung up from them. Prthu restored religious rites, worshipped the Rṣis and requested them to assign to the mixed castes their occupations.
and duties. The Brāhmans asked the thirty-six mixed castes, also called Śūdras, what calling each of them would adopt according to which they should also be named. "When all of them were thus addressed by the Brāhmans versed in the sacred books, they began to speak, and Karaṇa first (ādau) spake thus, 'We are ignorant outcastes totally devoid of wisdom. Men like you are omniscient; please ordain for us what is fit.'" Then the Brāhmans said, addressing the King, "This is the Karaṇa; let him always prosper. He possesses humility and is well-behaved; he hath spoken well. He looks like one who is well versed in polity (nīlijña) and he should do administrative work (rājakārya). He should worship the Brāhmans and gods. This (Karaṇa) is a Sat-Śūdra (good Śūdra); there is no doubt about it. Reverence for Brāhman, desire for worshipping gods, and good conduct, are the characteristics of a Sat-Śūdra." The Karaṇa then bowed his head before the Brāhmans who added, "Son, live on this earth, skilful in administrative work (rājakāryavisārāda) and expert in writing (lipikarma-visārāda)."*

---

*शास्या अनुिः | पञ्चविःश्चात्यः प्रत्य पूर्वं प्रसादा प्रहर ||
कः फँ करियते कथं य तद्युतां कमलनामः ||
कमालगुप्तासामानो यूषं चर्मं विहिष्ठः ||

व्यास अवाच | द्वयाम चेत तद्व सर्वः प्रकृति: गभर्युषयानाति ||
कुमारारीभिरे विशास्वाचादी कर्मोऽवीत ||

कर्ष अवाच | वषं दुष्टान्त्वा जातिकृत्व: प्रकाशाला विशेषत् |
महाभिषास सर्थ्य: कुबधं नो वाणिषातम ||
The *Vṛhaddharmā Purāṇa* is recognized in Bengal as one of the minor Purāṇas (*Upanītā Purāṇa*) and has been printed more than once. The legend of Veṇa told in this Purāṇa is but an expansion of the older legend (*ante*, pp. 4—5) to explain the origin of the outlandish castes of Bengal. Historically it is of as little or as much value as other similar caste legends. It probably enshrines a true picture of the social organisation of Bengal before the Muhammadan conquest. The account of the Kāraṇa or Kāyastha is in agreement with little that is known of the authentic history of the caste. This history shows that the Kāyasthas of Bengal were no mere clerks but administrators, scholars and enlightened patrons of learning, who really governed the country and took up arms in its defence whenever necessary.

Śrīdhara in his *NyāyakāndaLī*, a widely known...
commentary on Praśastapāda’s treatise on the Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy and called Padārthadharmasaṅgroha, introduces us to a learned Kāyastha of the tenth century who was also a liberal patron of learning. Śrīdhara was a Brāhmaṇ born in a village called Bhūrīṣṭī in Daksīṇa-Rādhā or South-Western Bengal. Śrīdhara writes in the concluding stanza of his work, “Requested by Pāṇḍudāsa, Bhatta Śrīdhara wrote this Nyāyakandali in the year 913 of the Śaka era.”* Śrīdhara also refers to his patron in the body of the book thus, “Adorned with virtues resembling jewels, foremost of the Kāyastha race (is) Pāṇḍudāsa” † by way of example. Pāṇḍudāsa could hardly have requested Śrīdhara to write a commentary on a difficult text dealing with a dry and abstruse system of philosophy had he not been himself a student of the system. In his Nyāyakandali Śrīdhara refers to four other philosophical works written by himself. But among these only Nyāyakandali has survived and must have enjoyed a wide circulation at one time as a standard work on Vaiśeṣika. It is referred to by Mādhava in the Sarvadarśanasamgraha. There is a sub-commentary on it called Pañjikā by a Jaina writer named Rajaśekhara. ‡ The printed edition

* अधिकदलोधरयमयमवकको न्यायकंदली रचितम्।

नीपाण्डुरामयाचितं भद नीपौधकर्मयम्॥

The Vizianagram Sanskrit series, No. 6, p. 331.

† गुप्तवज्जवर्म: काण्यकुवलकं पाण्डुदास रत्नाखिदु (p. 269).

‡ See the editor’s preface to Nyāyakandali.
of the Nyāyakandali is based on manuscripts obtained from Kashmir, Poona and Benares. Pāṇḍudāsa, at whose request Nyāyakandali was written, deserves a place in the history of Indian philosophy, and the Bengali Kāyasthas of the tenth century, of whom he was one, must have been very much advanced in wealth and culture.

A century after Pāṇḍudāsa flourished Sandhyākara Nandī, the author of the Sanskrit poem Rāmacaritam, wherein the story of Rāma of Ayodhyā, and the history of Rāmapāla, King of Gauḍa, are narrated in the same words yielding double meaning. Prajāpati Nandī, the father of Sandhyākara, who was the minister of peace and war of King Madanapāla, son of Rāmapāla, is described in the poem as the foremost of the Kāraṇas (karanyānāmagrāṇī).*

After the Muhammadan conquest the country was really ruled by semi-independent chiefs called Bhuiṇyās (Bhaumikas, landholders). The number of these Bhuiṇyās of Bengal is traditionally put down at twelve and the whole country was known as 'the dominion of the twelve Bhuiṇyas' (bāra bhuiṇyār muluk). All the Hindu Bhuiṇyās known to us, who held sway in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, were Kāyasthas. The principality of Bāklā Candradvīpa was founded by a Vaṅgaja Kāyastha named Danujamardana Deva early in the fifteenth century. Many of his silver coins

dated in Sāka 1339 (A.D. 1417), minted at Candra-
dvipa and Pāṇḍunagara, have been discovered in
several districts of Bengal.* The principality of
Bhuluśa was founded by Bīsvambhar Rāy, a
Kāyastha of the Śūra family, probably at about the
same time. The Bhuiṇyās of Vikrampur and Jes-
sore were Vaṅgaja Kāyasthas and the Bhuiṇyā of
Bhoosna was a Uttara-Rāḍhiya Kāyastha. The
Bhuiṇyā of Bāklā was overcome by Murād Khan,
a general of Akbar, in A.D. 1574.† Ralph Fitch
writes of south-eastern Bengal through which he
travelled in 1582: — ‘They be all hereabouts rebels
against their King Zebaldin Echebar [Jalaluddin
Akbar], for here are so many rivers and islands
that they flee from one to another, whereby his
horsemen can not prevail against them.’ Kedār
Rāy of Vikrampur died fighting against the
imperial army under Mān Singh in A.D. 1603. Pratā-
pāditya of Jessore is said to have been defeated
and carried to Delhi by the same Mān Singh in
the reign of Jahangir. Mukunda Rāy of Bhoosna
came into collision with Murad Khan, the con-
quерor of Bāklā, and, in order to get rid of him,
invited him to a feast and murdered him, to-
gether with his sons. Mukunda Rāy’s son
Satrajit ‘gave Jahangir’s governors of Bengal no
end of trouble, and refused to send in the custom-

† Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1878, Part I,
p. 288. For details regarding the Bāra Bhuiṇiśyās see Dr. J.
Wise’s paper in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,
ary *peshkash* or do homage at the court of Dhākā. He was in secret understanding with the Rājāhs of Koch Bihār and Koch Hājo, and was at last, in the reign of Shāhjahān, captured and executed at Dhākā (about A.D. 1636).” *Sitārām Rāy, who revolted against Nawab Murshid Kuli Khan and perished in the struggle about A.D. 1712, was the last prince of the line of Mukunda Rāy. The struggle carried on by the Bhuiṇyās of Bengal against the Mughul Emperors was no less obstinate than that of the Rājputs of Rājputāna, though, unfortunately, there were no bards in Bengal to enshrine the stirring events of this struggle in heroic ballads. Had not these Kāyastha Bhuiṇyās of Bengal been inspired by a tradition of long independent rule, they could hardly have maintained this unequal struggle for so long. Not only the Bhuiṇyās, but the minor zemindars of those days, were mostly Kāyasthas. Abul Fazl writes in his *Ain-i-Akbari*, completed in A.D. 1594:—“The zamindars are mostly Kāyaths.” † The establishment of the centralised Mughal imperial rule marked the beginning of the downfall of the Kāyasthas of Bengal. The Mughal viceroys replaced the turbulent Bhuiṇyās by more accommodating Brāhman zemindars and thereby reduced the ruling class of Bengal to the condition of mere writers or literate serfs.

---

CHAPTER VI.

INDO-ARYANS AND IRANIANS.

In Chapter I, I have already touched on the kinship between the Indo-Aryans and the Iranians by suggesting that the ṛṣi clans, like the Atharvans, Aṅgiras, Bhṛgus and Vasiṣṭhas who formed the nucleus of the Brāhmaṇ caste, were akin to the Magi of Iran on the ground that the Magi also, like the Indian Brāhmaṇs, formed a hereditary priesthood (p. 33). An eminent Iranist, Professor J. H. Moulton, recently questioned the Aryan origin of the Magi in his lectures on Early Zoroas-trianism (London, 1913), and Dr. D. B. Spooner of the Archaeological Department of India has declared that the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries are the descendants of Magian immigrants.* In this concluding chapter I shall deal with Iranian origins and the supposed Iranian affinities of the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries.

The very close relationship between the language and the religion of the Veda on the one hand, and the language and the religion of the Avesta on the other, has long been recognized by scholars. Geldner writes:—

"The clearest evidence of the extreme age of the language of the gāthās is its striking resemblance to the oldest Sanskrit, the language of the

---

Vedic poems. The gāthā language (much more than the later Zend) and the language of the Vedas have a close resemblance, exceeding that of any two Romanic languages; they seem hardly more than two dialects of one tongue. Whole strophes of the gāthās can be turned into good old Sanskrit by the application of certain phonetic laws.''

Among the common elements of the Vedic and Avestic religions are a great number of gods—Asura, Mithra, the Dragon-slayer Verethragna (the Indra of the Indian), the Water-shoot Apāmnapāt, etc. Eduard Meyer thus summarises the other common elements: "So, too, fire-worship, especially the sacrificial flame; the preparation of the intoxicating soma, which fills man with divine strength and uplifts him to the gods; the injunction to "good thoughts and good works," imposed on the pious by Veda and Avesta alike; the belief in an unwavering order (ṛta)—a law controlling gods and men and dominating them all; yet with this, a belief in the power of the magical formulæ (mantra), exclamations and prayers, to whose compulsion not merely demons (the evil spirits of deception—druh) but even the gods (daeva) must submit; and, lastly, the institution of a priesthood of fire-kindlers (āthravan), who are at once the repositories of all sacred traditions and mediators in all intercourse between earth and heaven.''

† Ibid., p. 203.
This intimate relationship between the language and the religion of the Veda and those of the Avesta has led scholars to assume that the ancestors of the Vedic Indians and the Iranians at one time formed a single people—that of the Aryans. According to Eduard Meyer "their residence must have lain chiefly in the great steppe which stretches north of the Black Sea and the Caspian, through South Russia, to Turan (Turkestan) and the Oxus and Jaxartes. For here we continually discover traces of Iranian nationality . . . . From the region of the steppes the Aryans must have penetrated into the cultivable land of Eastern Iran: thence one part spread over the district of the Indus, then on again to the Ganges; another moved westward to Zagros and the borders of the Semitic world." * The "undoubtedly Iranian" names borne by some of the princelings of Syria and Palestine and the Kings of Matanni named in the Tell-el-Amarna letters and other cuneiform inscriptions and the appearance of horse in Babylonia, Egypt and Greece about 1700 B.C., have led the same authority to hold "that towards the middle of the second millennium before Christ, the Iranians made a great forward movement to the West, and that certain of their princes—at first probably in the role of mercenary leaders, reached Mesopotamia and Syria and there founded principalities of their own, much as did the Germans under the

Roman Empire, the Normans, Turks, etc."* The names of the gods invoked by a Mitanni King in a Boghaz-keui inscription of about 1400 B.C. —Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, and the Nāsatyas—further show that there was complete agreement of the ancestors of Indians and Iranians in language and religion still in the fourteenth century B.C.† Though this theory of Eduard Meyer has been adopted by Geldner,‡ other Iranists hold divergent views. Professor Jackson considers it "premature to theorize" on Boghaz-keui inscriptions and adds: "The mention may be merely a direct reference to Indian deities without having any immediate connection with Iran."§ Professor N. Söderblom of Upsala (quoted by Moulton) is of opinion that the Boghaz-keui inscription confirms the belief that the Hittites were of Aryan origin, and the names "depend perhaps on a branch of the Aryans slowly pushing their way from the Baltic coasts to their new home in the East."|| Dr. B. B. Charles, a Semitist, holds that "the Hittites were a people, possibly of mixed Aryan and Caucasian elements," and the Mitannians were "apparently a Hittite people."¶ Professor Moulton writes: "Here I would only observe that we know nothing about the movements of Indian or Iranian

* Ibid., p. 203.
‡ Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 28, p. 1041.
§ Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, IV, p. 620a.
|| Early Zoroastrianism, p. 6.
¶ Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, VI. 723a.
tribes in the second millennium, and could postulate an ebb from India to the North-West without compromising anything that is really established.” * Moulton’s latest view regarding the prehistoric migration of the Aryans deserves notice. Referring to an essay of his on some points in Iranian ethnography contributed to the volume dedicated to Professor William Ridgeway, he writes in a note to his Early Zoroastrianism (p. 5): “I make the founders of the Aryan culture—or rather the speakers of the language in which it expressed itself—to have been a German tribe which made a very rapid trek across Russia past the north end of the Caspian, into the country north of the Punjab, into which before very long the bulk of the invading tribe passed on.” This hypothesis well explains the presence of white and yellow-haired Brāhmans in India (p. 25).

But we are not here concerned with the hypothetical prehistoric Aryan movements or the Mitannian controversy, but with Aryans who settled in Iran and specially the Magi who dwelt in Western Iran or Media. According to Herodotus the Magi were one of the six tribes of Media. Herodotus writes (i. 132) that whenever a Persian offers a sacrifice, “a Magian man stands by and chants a theogony thereto, for such the Persians say the chant is. Without a Magian it is not lawful for him to offer sacrifices.” We also learn from Herodotus and later classical writers that the Magi not merely played the role

* Early Zoroastrianism, p. 7.
of "Fire-kindlers" (āthravan) of the Avesta, but formed a hereditary sacredotal caste, acting an important part in the state—advisers and spiritual guides to the King, and so forth. Moulton writes: "From the first the Greek writers assume that the Magi were priests, with special skill in divination and oneiromancy. They were already essential for all priestly acts, and identified thoroughly with the Persian religious system. Moreover, from the fourth century [B.C.] down there are frequent allusions to Zoroaster himself as a Magus, and many of the foremost modern authorities have accepted this as probably true." *

Among the foremost modern authorities Geldner writes of Zoroaster:—"Probably he emanated from the old school of Median Magi, and appeared first in Media as the prophet of a new faith, but met with sacredotal opposition, and turned his step eastward. In the east of Iran the novel creed first acquired a solid footing, and subsequently reacted with success upon the West." †

In one passage of the Gāthās (Ys. 33. 6) Zoroaster calls himself a priest (Zaotar=skt. hotar).

Professor Moulton endeavours "to blaze a path off the beaten track of scholarship" "through a rather difficult wood" by theorising "that the Magi were part of the indigenous population of Media" with "several remarkable peculiarities of belief and habits which distinguish them sharply from Aryans and Semites alike."

* Early Zoroastrianism, pp. 196-197.
† Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 28, p. 1041.
Instead of dealing with the arguments of Professor Moulton in support of his hypothesis, I should first point out the consequences this hypothesis involves. According to Parsi tradition (Arda Virāf, 1, 2) Zoroaster taught, in round numbers, some 300 years before the invasion of Alexander \((330 + 300 = 630 \text{ B.C.})\). This date is accepted by Jackson, West and a few other scholars. Eduard Meyer conjecturally puts the date of Zoroaster at 1000 B.C., which "may be too high" according to Geldner.* Moulton writes of the date of Zoroaster: "The traditional date (660-583 B.C.) is a minimum, but there are strong reasons for placing Zarathushtra and his Gāthās some generations earlier still."† The rebellion of Gaumata the Magus broke out in the reign of Cambyses (528-521 B.C.). This was not a national rising of the Magians or Medians against their Achæmenian rulers, but Gaumata, though a Magian, adopted the role of an Achæmenian (Persian) in the revolt and pretended to be Bardiya (Smerdis) the younger son of Cyrus who had been secretly slain by Cambyses. Gaumata was slain by Darius in 521 B.C. The statements of Herodotus (B.C. 484-424) about the position of the Magi in the Persian empire seem contradictory. While stating that it is not lawful for a Persian to offer sacrifices without a Magi, Herodotus gives an account of a festival called Magophonia which was a celebration of the slay-

ing of the Magian Gaumata, the pseudo-Smerdis, by Darius, and then, 'no Magian may appear in the light, but the Magians keep themselves in their houses that day.'

* But Dr. L. H. Gray has furnished a very satisfactory explanation of this curious festival. He writes:

"Why the Magi, so universally honoured in Iran, were obliged to keep within doors during the Magophonia has been a hard problem on the basis of the current explanation; but if, as Marquart holds, it was originally a New Year celebration, to be connected with the Mihrājān, which was also a New Year feast, it may probably be connected further with the Sacæa, which, from the statement of Dio Chrysostom and Berosus, was almost certainly a New Year festival, the prominent feature of which was the killing of a criminal who had for five days been permitted to wear royal robes, to sit on the royal throne, and empowered not only to issue whatsoever mandates he would, but even to consort with the royal concubines, and who, after his brief tenure of office, was scourged and hanged, so that the Sacæa probably represents, in attenuated form, the wide-spread practice (found also in Babylonia) of killing the priest-king. It would then follow that the origin of the Magophonia was the actual killing of a Magus who was at the same time both priest and king. This explains why the Magians were both reverenced and also liable to be killed, although

* Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, V, p. 374.
long before the historical period the actual killing had been abandoned, and the festival survived merely in a season of merriment, during which the Magi were perhaps the butt of practical jokes and prudently remained indoors. The success of the attack of Darius and his comrades on the pseudo-Smerdis was very likely due in great part to the fact that Gaumata was himself a Magian; and later, as already noted, the Magophonia (‘Magus-slaying’) was rationalised to commemorate this event, just as in Strabo's day the Sacæa itself had come to be reinterpreted as commemorating a victory over the Scythians which may, indeed, have been won at the time of the celebration of the ancient festival of the Sacæa, after it had long since lost its primal significance.'*

This theory regarding the origin of Magophonia indicates that it was celebrated by the Persians even in the time of Darius and it involved on their part the recognition of the Magi as representatives of their primitive priesthood. But even if we refuse our assent to this theory and its consequences and hold with Moulton that Magophonia was nothing but an anniversary of the slaying of Gaumata ‘intended to remind the subject population of the consequences that would follow if they tempted fortune again with an effort to throw off the yoke,’† it is very difficult to understand how could the Magi gain the ascendancy that they

---

* Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, V, pp. 874b-75a.
† Early Zoroastrianism, p. 186.
enjoyed in the Achaemenian empire in the time of Herodotus in spite of such celebrations. Professor Moulton puts his case thus briefly in his Preface (p. x):—"It is argued that the Magi were an indigenous tribe of priests or shamans, the leaders of the non-Aryan population of Media, who, after failing to gain political supremacy in the revolt of Gaumata, secured in two or three generations a religious ascendancy which compensated for any failure." History furnishes no parallel to the change of which these lines contain a hint. Darius’s inscriptions show that he was an ardent devotee of the great God Aoramazda "who made this earth and yon heaven, who made man and amenity (civilization) for men, who made Darius King."

According to Moulton the early Achaemenian Kings belonged to the unreformed Iranian religion and Darius was the first true Zoroastrian of the dynasty. But whether the religion professed by Cyrus, Cambyses and Darius was the reformed Iranian religion or no, the question of questions in this connection is, whether this religion required the services of priests or it was a priestless religion—a thing as yet unknown. Professor Moulton does not deny the existence of priests in the time of the early Achaemenian Kings. He writes, "The Aryan Medes and Persians had known them [Magi] for generations as skilled magicians and occultists; and when they volunteered for the work of the Persian Āthravan and Zaotar, which was confined to no special class, the people would feel that they had a special guarantee of cor-
rect and effective ritual.’’ * If the work of the Āthravan and Zaotar was not confined to any special class, it was open to people of all classes. In the time of rulers like Cyrus and Darius when the Persians reached the height of power and prosperity, the work of Āthravan and Zaotar must have brought considerable profit, honour, and influence to those who undertook it. That Aryan Medes and Persians, after enjoying such profits and privileges from time immemorial down to the time of the early Achaemenian Kings, should then quietly surrender the right to the shamans of an inferior race in return for a guarantee of correct and effective ritual is simply incredible. Such a surrender is not only incredible but impossible. If the work of Āthravan and Zaotar was confined to no special class in the time of Darius and before, it could not have gone on a-begging for so long, it must have been included among the functions of the king and must have been exercised by the king and his deputies. This conclusion is forced upon us by the history of the priesthood of almost all civilised nations, whether Aryan, Semitic or Hamitic.

Sir James Frazer writes: “The union of a royal title with priestly duties was common in ancient Italy and Greece. At Rome and in other cities of Latium there was a priest called the Sacrificial King or King of the Sacred Rites. In republican Athens the second annual-magis-

* Ibid., p. 194.
trate of the State was called the King, and his wife Queen; the functions of both were religious. Many other Greek democracies had titular kings, whose duties, so far as they are known, seem to have been priestly, and to have centred round the Common Hearth of the State. Some Greek states had several of these titular kings, who held office simultaneously. At Rome the tradition was that the Sacrificial King had been appointed after the abolition of the monarchy in order to offer the sacrifices which before had been offered by the kings. A similar view as to the origin of priestly kings appears to have prevailed in Greece. In itself the opinion is not improbable, and it is borne out by the example of Sparta, almost the only purely Greek State which retained the kingly form of government in historical times. For in Sparta all State sacrifices were offered by the kings as descendants of the God

"This combination of priestly functions with royal authority is familiar to every one. Asia Minor, for example, was the seat of various great religious capitals peopled by thousands of sacred slaves, and ruled by pontiffs who wielded at once temporal and spiritual authority, like the popes of mediæval Rome. Such priest-ridden cities were Zela and Pessinus. Teutonic Kings, again, in the old heathen days seem to have stood in the position, and to have exercised the powers, of high priests."*

In the Semitic world, among the Babylonians and the Assyrians—"At first the ruler was supreme in both the secular and the religious sides of life, but in time the priesthood developed till its help was needed for all religious actions. Yet the King remained priest in theory.... The priests were always under the control of their chief, the King." * Among the Hebrews,—"The King was judge, general, and priest, the officers set apart for these duties being only his deputies. There is no clear statement of the King being the chief priest, but there are many indications that he sometimes exercised priestly functions. In Phoenicia, Tabnit styles himself 'priest of Astarte, King of the Sidonians,' like his father. His son Eshmunazar calls his mother (she was his father's sister) 'priestess of Astarte' and 'queen,' though he himself does not bear priestly title." †

In Egypt—"As son and successor of all the divinities (national or local) of the kingdom, the Pharaoh is by right the chief servitor of the Supreme God and the chief pontiff of all the priesthoods. In the bas-reliefs of the temples he is figured as the chief officiating priest, and everywhere he is represented in the dwellings of his divine fathers, celebrating sacrifice, offering incense or libations, or consecrating the offering, opening the tabernacle, adoring the divine image, and going in front of his retinue." ‡

The observation of the same phenomenon among

* Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, VII, p. 726b.
† Ibid., p. 725b. ‡ Ibid., p. 714a.
both savages and civilised peoples have led Sir James Frazer to the following generalisation as regards the evolution of kingship:—

"On the whole then we seem to be justified in concluding that in many parts of the world the King is the lineal successor of the old magician or medicine-man. When once a special class of sorcerers have been segregated from the community and entrusted by it with the discharge of duties on which the public safety and welfare are believed to depend, these men gradually rise to wealth and power, till their leaders blossom out into sacred kings. But the great social evolution which thus begins with democracy and ends in despotism is attended by an intellectual revolution which affects both the conception and the functions of royalty. For as time goes on, the fallacy becomes more and more apparent to the acuter minds and is slowly displaced by religion; in other words, the magician gives way to the priest, who, renouncing the attempt to control directly the processes of nature for the good of man, seeks to attain the same end directly by appealing to the gods to do for him what he no longer fancies he can do for himself. Hence the King, starting as a magician, tends gradually to exchange the practice of magic for the priestly functions of prayer and sacrifice."

Frazer's view has revolutionized our idea of the origin of kingship. Mr. A. E. Crawley writes, "Anthropological research has lately revolution-

ized opinion as to the origin of kingly office. Without excluding the elements of leadership, organization, and generalship in war, J. G. Frazer has established by a long array of facts the theory that among the primitive peoples it was the medicine-man, the shaman, or public magician who laid the foundations at least in part of the kingly office."

The theory explains the origin of the union of the political and sacredotal functions in the person of the King.

The Kṣatriya King of India and the Khshāyathiā (King) of Persia are the two prominent exceptions to the rule. In India, from the very dawn of history, the sacredotal function is confined to an exclusive social class, the Brāhman caste. According to Professor Moulton's own admission the same state of things obtained in Persia two or three generations after Gaumata when the Magi gained the monopoly of priesthood. The reason why Moulton requires this interval of two or three generations between the revolt of Gaumata and the appointment of the non-Aryan Magi as the sole priests of the Aryan religion of Persia is that when Herodotus gained the opportunity of gathering first-hand information about this religion some seventy years after the failure of Gaumata during his travels in the Persian empire, he found the Magi "in undisputed possession of the priesthood."

If this undisputed possession had been the result of a very recent change, the historian could hardly

* Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, VII, p. 709a.
† Early Zoroastrianism, p. 76.
have failed to notice it. Even if we hold with Moulton that "the success of the foreign shamans (Magi) in securing a monopoly of the priesthood for a cultus wholly alien to their own is no difficulty when we consider the conditions" (p. 174), the silence of 'the father of history, about a change of so great a magnitude cannot be ignored. If in course of his travels Herodotus could meet with men who supplied him with authentic informations about the failure of the Magi two to three generations before, it is difficult to believe that there was nobody to tell him anything of the Magi's great triumph in his own generation. And if Herodotus had heard of the way in which the Magi had very lately secured the monopoly of the priesthood of the 'alien' Persian religion, he could not have passed it over in silence. Therefore, in the absence of any positive evidence to show that the early Achaemenian kings and their predecessors exercised the priestly functions, which their successors voluntarily surrendered to the alien Magi, we have no other alternative but to accept as a historical fact the traditional view that the Magi were the hereditary priests of the Aryan Medes and Persians from time immemorial and that Zarathushtra himself was a Magus.

The origin of the Magian priesthood of Iran may be explained on the analogy of the Brähman priesthood of India (ante, p. 33). The Magi were perhaps the most pure-blooded of Aryan settlers of Iran who elaborated the Iranian religion and gave it its peculiar shape and imposed it upon their
neighbours who were mixed in origin and inferior in culture. The Magophonia indicates that the Magus was at one time both the king and the priest. He was probably deprived of his sceptre by some one of his powerful subjects who dared not deprive him of his priestly functions. In some such way the separation of the political and sacerdotal functions might have been brought about in ancient Iran. The analogous division of functions happened in India probably under similar conditions. The arguments adduced by Professor Moulton in support of his theory have been ably dealt with by Professor A. Berriedale Keith in a short article on the Magi published in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1915, pp. 790-799, which should be carefully read by every one interested in the question.

While recognising the distant kinship between the Vedic Indian Brähman and the Median Magi, it is difficult to subscribe to the theories of Dr. D. B. Spooner enunciated in his second paper on the Zoroastrian Period of India History already referred to (ante, p. 155). Dr. Spooner’s theories practically amount to this:—After the coming of “those Aryans who first invaded Northern India, and to whom we attribute rightly the Rigveda,” there followed a series of invasions of the Magians from Persia that continued till the rise of the Maurya empire. These Persian invaders inaugurated the Zoroastrian period of Indian history that closely followed the Rgvedic period and bequeathed to India the Outer band of Indo-Aryan
languages, the Atharvaveda among the Vedas, the Buddha and Buddhism, and the powerful empire of the Mauryas. As was to be expected, these views have already been subjected to a good deal of adverse criticism.* Dr. Spooner has restated his main theory in a somewhat modified form in a letter published in *The Bengalee* (Calcutta) of March 11th, 1916. In this letter his position is thus defined:

“I do not say that either Chandragupta or the Buddha was a Persian in our modern sense. I say they were members of a body of Aryans who came into this country at a date subsequent to the arrival of the first Aryan immigrations, when sufficient time had elapsed for the Vedic Hindus and their Iranian cousins to have developed differences of faith.”

Dr. Spooner then goes on to sum up the evidences upon which he bases his theory in this way:

“When the Linguistic Survey of India shows us, at that time beyond all explanation, that the Aryan languages of North India fall into two groups; when the Prākrit Grammarians assert

---

that the (obviously Iranian) dialect of Balkh was integral part of Māgadhi; when the language of these Outer Band Districts display Iranian characteristics; when excavation at Pataliputra discloses pottery with the Persian fire-altar emblazoned on it, as well as a group of palaces agreeing in minute detail and even in grouping with the complex of Persipolis; when the Prabodhacandrododaya tells us that Magadha was a country peopled mostly by foreigners; and when the present population of Bihar shows such a number of admittedly Sākadvipin Brāhmans, is it so wholly preposterous to suggest that this region must have been settled by an Iranian body in prehistoric times?"

(1) The classification of the Aryan languages of Northern India into two groups was never regarded as beyond all explanation. One explanation was suggested by Dr. Hœrnle, the author of this classification, and has been adopted by Sir George Grierson in whose opinion "the contention is entirely borne out by the results of ethnological enquiries" (ante, p. 45). The present writer put forward another explanation in a paper entitled the Origin of the Bengalis published in East and West (Bombay) of April, 1907 (noticed in Nature, July 25th, 1907) which is elaborated above in Chapter II. Dr. A. C. Haddon has expressed very similar views with regard to the western section of the Indo-Aryans of the Outer countries. He writes in The Races of Man (pp. 60-61):—

"A zone of relatively broad-headed people extends from the great grazing country of the West-
ern Punjab through the Deccan to the Coorgs. Risley supports the view that this may be the track of the Scythians, who found their progress east blocked by the Indo-Aryans and so turned south, and mingled with the Dravidian population, and became the ancestors of the Marathas and Canarese. But evidence seems to be lacking that the Scythians penetrated far into the Deccan, and apart from brachycephaly there is little to associate these peoples with Scythians. It seems quite possible that these brachycephals are the result of an unrecorded migration of some members of the Alpine race from the highlands of south-west Asia in pre-historic times."

Dr. Haddon repeats this opinion in The Wanderings of the Peoples (Cambridge, 1911), p. 27, where he adds that "the foreign element is certainly Alpine, not Mongolian."

(2) Dr. Spooner’s linguistic arguments are not likely to commend themselves to philologists. Among the languages of the Outer Band, the modern languages of Eastern India, viz., Behāri, Bengali, Assamese and Oriya owe their origins to Māgadhi Prākṛt. According to Pischel Māgadhi Prākṛt "included all those Prākṛt dialects which had ya instead of ja, la for ra, sa for sa, and in which the nominative of nouns in a ended e." * Some of these peculiarities, the nominative of nouns in a terminating in e, and the change of r into l, are also found in all the inscriptions of Aśoka except those of Girnar and of North-West-

* The Indian Antiquary, XXX, p. 555.
ern India.* The latter peculiarity is found in a Mleccha word spoken by the Asuras according to the *Sapapatha Brāhmaṇa* III, 2. r. 23. The text runs—

\[ \text{te' surā āttavacaso he'lavō he'lava iti vandaṇāḥ parābabhūbuh.} \]

"The Asuras, being deprived of speech, were undone, crying, 'He'lavaḥ! he'lavaḥ.'"

Pataṅjali in his *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya* (I. r. r) quotes this passage in this modified form—

\[ \text{te' surā helayo helaya iti kuvantaḥ parābabhūbuh.} \]

"The Asuras were undone crying, 'He alayaḥ (=arayaḥ, 'enemies'); he alayaḥ!'"

The Mleccha speech here assigned to the Asuras which changed \( r \) into \( l \) was evidently a Prākrit dialect with an important phonetic peculiarity that characterises the Prākrit used in eastern part of the empire of Aśoka and the Māgadhi Prākrit of the Grammarians. This change of \( r \) into \( l \) distinguishes the Māgadhi Prākrit not only from Sanskrit but also from Zend and Persian. Another peculiarity that distinguishes the Māgadhi Prākrit from Zend is the change of \( s \) into \( s \), while the latter changes the original \( s \) into \( h \). Therefore it is more reasonable to trace Māgadhi to an independent source than to Zend or to Vedic Sanskrit.

(3) The pottery with the Persian altar emblazoned on it and the Persipolitan style and grouping of the Maurya palaces disclosed by the

---

* Ibid., XXI., p. 173.*
excavation of the site of Pātaliputra should perhaps be attributed to the Persian architects and artisans employed by the Mauryas and not to the natives of Magadha whose ancestors are supposed to have come from Iran in the prehistoric period. The style of high-class architecture cannot be recognised as an evidence of the ethnic origin of the native population among whom the buildings are erected. The buildings of Darius and Xerxes at Persepolis and Susa are not Persian in style. Eduard Meyer writes: "The royal edifices and sculptures are dependent mainly on Babylonian models, but, at the same time, we can trace in them the influence of Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor; the last in the rock-sepulchres."

(4) The well-known Sanskrit drama Prabodhacandrodaya was written in the reign of King Kṛttivarman Chandel of Kālañjar who reigned from A.D. 1049 to 1100 and was performed about A.D. 1065.† The statement contained in this work that "Magadha is mostly inhabited by the Mlecchas (mlecchaprāya)" cannot be accepted as evidence of prehistoric Iranian immigration.

(5) The presence of the Śakadvipī Brāhmans in Bihar throws no light on the ethnic origin of the bulk of the population of Bihar. The Śakadvipī Brāhmans are also known as Bhojaka or Maga Brāhmans, the last designation being considered as identical with Magus and on that ground the

† V. A. Smith's Early History of India, 3rd edition, pp. 392-393.
Maga Brāhmans are recognised by some scholars as the modern representatives of the Persian Magi who migrated to India in the past. The legend of the coming of the Magi as narrated in the Bhavisyapurāṇa (137) is thus summed up by Bhandarkar:

"Sāmba, the son of Kṛṣṇa by Jāmbavatī, constructed a temple of the sun on the banks of the Candrabhāgā, the modern Chenāb in the Punjāb, and no local Brāhman would accept the office of a regular priest of the temple. He thereupon asked Gauramukha, the priest of Ugrasena. He told him to get Magas, who were special sun-worshippers, from Śākadvīpa. Then is given the history of the Magas. Sujihva was a Brāhmaṇ of the Mihira Gotra. He had a daughter of the name of Nikṣubhā, with whom the sun fell in love. The son of these two was called Jarasabda or Jarasasta [=Zarathushtra], and from him sprang all Magas. They wore a girdle round their waist, which was called Avyaṅga. Thereupon Sāmba went on the back of Garuḍa, his father's vehicle, to Śākadvīpa, brought some Magas from it and installed them into the office of priests of the temple he had constructed."

The legend of the importation of the Magas by Sāmba is referred to in the Govindapur stone inscription of the poet Gangādhara, dated Śaka 1059, corresponding to A.D. 1137-38, thus:

"Hail to that gem of the three worlds, the divine

* Vaishnavism, etc., p. 153.
† Epigraphia Indica, II, p. 338.
Aruṇa, whose presence sanctifies the milk-ocean-encircled Śākadvipa where the Brāhmans are named Magas! There a race of twice-born [sprang] from the sun’s own body, grazed by the lathe, whom Śāamba himself brought hither. Glorious are they honoured in the world!” This legend cannot be as old as the other legends about Kṛṣṇa and his descendants that are narrated in the Harivamsa, the Viṣṇupurāṇa and the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, for in that case it would have found a place in these standard authorities. So it cannot be treated as an evidence of the early migration of the Zoroastrians to India. But this legend is probably based on a tradition that the Magas were foreigners in origin—evidently related to the race of Jarasasta or Zarathushtra—and inaugurated the Saura cult in India. In the Viṣṇupurāṇa II. 4. 69-70 Magāhi (variant, Mṛgāh), Magadhāh, Mānasāh and Mandagāh are given as the names of the Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras respectively of Śākadvipa. In a palm-leaf manuscript of the Mahābhārata in Bengali character in the collection of the Varendra Research Society, in the Bhiṣmaparvan (II, 35-38) we read:—

| tatra puṇyā janapadā śatvāro lokasamma-tāh |
| magāśca masakā ścaiva mānasā mandagā stathā |
| magā brāhmaṇabhūiṣṭhāḥ svakarmmaniratā nṛpa |
| masakeṣu tu rājanyā dhārmnikāḥ sarvva-kāmadāh |

15
mānasāśca mahārāja vaiśyadharmmopajivi

*     *     *

śūdrā śca mandagā nityaṁ puruṣā dharm-

masālinah

"There (in Śākvipa) are four holy countries
praised by men—Magā, Masakā, Mānasā and
Mandagā. Magā (contains) numerous Brāhmans
devoted to their own duties. In Masakā there
are Rājanyas pious and munificent, O King. O
Mahārāja, Mānasas earn their bread by performing
the duties of the Vaiśya... The Mandagas
are ever pious Śūdras."

In the Bombay edition of the Mahābhārata and
in the new edition based on the South Indian MSS.
(printed in Bombay) we have maṅgāḥ, and in
other editions mṛgāḥ, instead of magā. Magadhā
of the Viṣṇupurāṇa is evidently a misreading for
Masakā of the Mahābhārata and so the Magadhā
cannot be connected with Śākvipa. But as the
Magas are not mentioned in any of the earlier texts,
though the Magadhās and the Magadhadeśiyabrāhm-
manabandhus are (ante, pp. 37-38), the time of the
coming of the Magi cannot be pushed very far
back. According to Weber, "The Magas go back
to an old mission of the Mithra-cult, the members
of which, after their arrival in India (about the
first two centuries A.D.), were incorporated in the
Brāhmaṇ caste." * Sir R. G. Bhandarkar writes:
"On the coins of Kanishka there occurs a figure

* The Indian Antiquary, XVI, p. 162.
with the name Miir-o = Mihira [Persian Mihr = Mithra] by its side.... The cult, therefore, must have penetrated to India about the time of that Kushana prince, and the Multan [Skt. Mūlasthāna] temple, which was its original seat, must have been constructed about the same time.‘’* This supposition is, I believe, correct. The Magas, as we have already seen (ante, pp. 160-161), appear in Indian history in connection with the worship of the sun-image, and the appearance of the name of Miir-o [Mithra] on the Indian coin may be recognized as the first indication of their advent. The Magian missionaries of Mithraism probably did not come to India alone, and were partly adopted, as Weber observes, ‘‘probably together with some members of the other stratum of the Iranian immigrants, into the ranks of the Brāhmans themselves under the name of Śākadvipa Brāhmanas.’’† Anyhow, the immigration of a class of men whose foreign origin was remembered by a people like the Hindus usually forgetful of the past cannot be pushed back to a remote antiquity. This unique tradition further shows that the Maga Brāhmans have always been recognized as aliens in Magadha and therefore a Magian origin cannot be postulated for the non-Maga population on the strength of this tradition.

Though pottery with the Persian fire-altar emblazoned on it is said to have been unearthed at the site of Pāṭaliputra, there is nothing peculiarly

* Vaisnavism, etc., p. 154.
† The Indian Antiquary, XXX, p. 287.
Persian in the religion of Magadha in the Maurya period as known from the Kauṭiliya Arthasastra, the edicts of Aśoka and other sources. We discern three different strata in this religion,—a higher or philosophical stratum, and a Vedic stratum side by side with another that is evidently of local origin. Kauṭiliya assigns to Ānvikṣakī the first place among the sciences, the three others being—trayī (the triple Vedas), vārttā (agriculture or business generally) and the science of government. In the Arthasastra 1, 2, Ānvikṣakī is said to comprise Śāmkhya, Yoga and Lokaṭya. The Śāmkhya and Yoga are the names of well-known systems of philosophy. The meaning of Lokaṭya is doubtful.* Patañjali (on Pāṇini VII 3, 1) names a commentary (varnikā) on Lokaṭya called Bhāgūrī. The reason why Ānvikṣakī is placed above the other sciences including trayī is thus explained by Kauṭiliya 1, 2:—

"Righteous and unrighteous acts are learnt from the triple Vedas; wealth and non-wealth from Vārttā; the expedient and the inexpedient, as well as potency and impotency, from the science of Government; (Ānvikṣakī), viewing these (sciences) in the light of reason (hetubhiṣk), does good to the world, keeps the mind steady in weal and woe alike, and bestows skill in knowledge, speech, and action.†

† Mr. Shamsastry translates "तत्तार्थ इत्यभि राजीवमाना" in
“Ānvikṣakī is ever held to be the lamp of all branches of knowledge, the means of performing all rites, and the support of all the sacred laws.”

Ānvikṣakī is grammatically irregular and the regular form Ānvikṣikī is used in all other texts. The characteristic of viewing all other sciences in the light of reason better suits the Nyāya philosophy than Sāṃkhya and Yoga as we now have them. Vātsyāyana, the author of the Bhāṣya on Nyāya Sūtras of Gautama, takes Ānvikṣikī in the sense of Nyāya philosophy. Commenting on Sūtra I, 1, 1. Vātsyāyana writes:—

“What do you mean by this Nyāya or reasoning? It means the examination of things [i.e. categories] by means of proofs, that is to say, Inference based upon Perception and Verbal Testimony is called ‘Nyāya’ or ‘Reasoning’; it is also called Ānvikṣā (‘investigation’), because it consists in the reviewing (anu-iksana) of a thing previously apprehended (iksita) by Perception and Verbal Testimony; the science that proceeds by this ‘investigation’ is called Ānvikṣikī, Nyāyavidyā, Nyāyaśāstra.”*

Vātsyāyana, in the concluding portion of his commentary on I, 11, reproduces the above this original as, “when seen in the light of these sciences.” But this interpretation is not in agreement with the meaning of the stanza that follows wherein Ānvikṣaki is called प्रदीपसमविख्यात, ‘the lamp of all sciences.’ Therefore श्लोका is taken as the object of श्रवणम and Anvikṣaki as the subject (understood).

* M. M. Gaṅganāth Jhā’s translation, Indian Thought, Vol IV, pp. 174-175.
quoted stanza of Kauṭilya with one little variation, viḍyoddese prakīrtitā, ‘it has been expounded at
the very outset of all viḍyā or branches of know-
ledge’ instead of sāsvadānvikṣakī matā. Vātsyā-
yana is traditionally identified with Kauṭilya or
Chānaka. The Bhāṣya on the Nyāyasūtra attri-
buted to Vātsyāyana is later in date than the
Arthaśāstra; but the tradition of Chānaka’s
authorship of the Bhāṣya may be taken to indi-
cate that it is a later production of a school of
philosophy founded by Kauṭilya himself that sub-
sequently specialised in Nyāya. Kāmandaka,
whose Nītisāra is professedly a summary of
Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra, writes of Ānvikṣikī (II,
11), ‘Ānvikṣikī is ātmavidyā (=padārthasvabha
vavidyā, ‘science of the nature of categories’) or
metaphysics; from observing (iṣṭanāt) happiness
and misery and finding out (iṣṭamānāḥ) truth by
means of that (Ānvikṣikī) (one) removes pleasure
and pain.’’ *

The Arthaśāstra furnishes us with considerable
materials for reconstructing the popular religion of
the Maurya period. In the section (II, 4) on
‘Buildings within the Fort’ Kauṭilya ordains:—
‘To the north, the royal deity of the city (na-
gararāja-devatā). . . .

‘In the centre of the city, the apartments
of gods such as Aparājita Apratihata, Jayanta,
Vaijayanta, Siva, Vaiśravana, Aśvin, and the

* जाशीकायामविभा जाशीवचालात् जस्कुशयोः।
   देशमाशिष्या तत्क श्रवणीकी युद्धसा।
glorious liquor-house (*sri-madirāgrham*) shall be situated.‘‘*

Deśadēvatā or the guardian deity of the country is also referred to by Kauṭilya. In the chapter on Remedies against National Calamities (IV, 3) Kauṭilya provides remedial measures against fire, flood, disease, famine, rats, tigers, serpents and demons (*rakṣāṃsi*). Against fire he ordains:—

‘‘Not only on ordinary days, but also on full-moon days Agni should be worshipped (*agnipujāh kārayet*) with offerings, oblations, and prayers.’’

Against floods:—

‘‘On new and full-moon days also (*parvasu ca*) shall rivers be worshipped (*nadīpuṣjāh kārayet*).

‘‘Experts in magic and yoga (*māyāyoga vidāḥ*), and persons learned in the Vedas, shall perform rites against rain (*varṣamabhicareyuh*).

‘‘During drought shall the husband of Saci (Indra), Gangā, mountain, and Mahākaccha be worshipped.’’

Against epidemic (*maraka*):—

‘‘Sprinkling water on sacred spots (*tīrthābhīṣecanam*), performance of the ceremonial called Mahākchavardhana, milking the cows on the cremation ground, burning the trunk of a corpse, and spending nights in devotion to gods (*devarātriḥ*) shall also be performed.

‘‘In case of epidemic among the cattle, . . . the worship of one’s own favourite god (*svadaivata-pūjanam*) also shall be carried out.’’ †

* English tr., p. 6r.
† English tr., p. 262. Mr. Shamsastry renders तीर्थाभिषेकम्
Against rats:—

“Holy men and ascetics (siddhatāpasāh) may also perform propitiatory rites.

“On new and full-moon days rats may be worshipped (mūṣikāpūjāh kārayet).”

Against snakes:—

“Those who are learned in the Atharvaveda may perform auspicious rites. On new and full-moon days (snakes) may be worshipped.”

Against tigers:—

“On new and full-moon days mountains may be worshipped.”

Against Rakṣas (demons):—

“Persons acquainted with the rituals of the Atharvaveda, and experts in magic and yoga, shall perform such ceremonials as ward off the danger from demons.

“On new and full-moon days the worship of caityas may be performed by placing on a verandah offerings such as an umbrella, the picture of an arm, a flag and some goat’s flesh.” *

In the concluding stanza of IX, 7 it is enjoined:—

“Whether demonical (āsurī) troubles are absent or are too many, or normal, the rites prescribed in the Atharvaveda as well as the rites undertaken by accomplished ascetics (siddhayah) are performed for success.”

---

as oblations to gods; and शदेवस्तूजनं as the worship of family gods.

* Ibid., p. 264.
The chapter on Means to Injure Enemy (XIV. 1) concludes with these formulas:—

"Salutation to Aditi! salutation to Anumati! salutation to Sarasvati! salutation to Savitṛ! Svāhā to Agni! svāhā to Soma! svāhā to Bhūḥ! svāhā to Bhūvah!"

The formulas contained in the chapter on the application of medicines and Mantras (XIV. 3) furnish us with valuable materials for reconstructing the Mauriyan pantheon. These are:—

"I bow to Bali, son of Vairocana; to Śambara acquainted with a hundred kinds of magic (sata-māyam); to Bhaṇḍīrapāka, Narakā, Nikumbha and Kumbha.

"I bow to Devala and Nārada; I bow to Śāvarṇīgalava; with the permission of these I cause deep slumber to thee.

* * *

"Having bowed to Manu, and having tethered the roguish dogs, and having also bowed to those gods who are in heaven (devalokesu), to Brāhmans among men;

"to those who are well-versed in the Veda, to Siddhas (holy men), and to ascetics dwelling in the Kailāsa mountain (Kailāsa tāpasaḥ), to all these holy men (Siddhas), I do cause slumber to thee.

* * *

"Oblation to Manu, Aliti and Paliti.

* * *

"I bow to (the goddess) Suvarṇapuṣpī and Brahmāni, to (the god) Brahmā and Kuśadvaja, to serpents and goddesses; I bow to all ascetics.
6. "If a navigable river is betweeen (them and the Caitya, he gives him) also something like a raft with (the words), 'Hereby thou shalt cross.'" *

Āśvalāyana’s statement, read in the light of the Arthasastra, leaves no room for doubting that Caitya denoted a mound worshipped as a fetish. The Caitya was an object of popular worship and was borrowed both by the Brāhmans and the Buddhists from the folk religion. The author of the Arthasastra, as an orthodox Brāhmaṇ, is hostile to the Buddhists. Under ‘Miscellaneous offences’ he ordains (III. 20): ‘When a person entertains, in dinner dedicated to gods or ancestors, Buddhists (Sakya), Ājīvakas, Śūdras and exiled persons (pravrajita), a fine of 100 paṇas shall be imposed.’ †

The Gayāśīrṣa hill and the Akṣaya (imperishable) Vata tree of Gaya were the two very holy objects of Magadha. In the Institutes of Viṣṇu (LXXXV, 4-5) it is enjoined that Śrāddha (funeral oblations) offered at Gayāśīrṣa and near the Vata (Akṣayavata) confers eternal bliss upon the giver. In the Mahābhārata (III. 84, 83) we are told: ‘There (at Gaya) is the Akṣayavata renowned in the three worlds; it is said that what is offered there to the ancestors never perishes.’ In the Gṛhya Sūtras and in the Dharmasūtras of Āpastamba, Gautama and Vaudhāyana Gaya is not mentioned in connection with the funeral

* Sacred Books of the East, XXIX, pp. 178-179.
† English tr., p. 251.
oblations. But Gautama ordains (XV. 5) that when one is near a particularly sacred place no restrictions as to time need be observed regarding funeral oblations. The holy Gayāśirṣa hill and the Akṣayavata of Gaya were chosen for funeral oblations evidently under this rule.

The edicts of Aśoka also afford us glimpses of the folk religion of the Maurya period. In the fourth rock edict Aśoka proclaims: "But now; in consequence of the adoption of the dharmā (law of morality) by Devānāṃpriya Priyadarśin, the sound of the drum is, lo! but the sound of the dharmā, the spectacle presented to the people, processional cars, elephants, bonfires and others, the representations of the devas.''

Here Aśoka refers to religious processions that he arranged for the edification of his subjects. In these processions images of gods riding on chariots and elephants were exhibited. The correct translation of the term misā in the Rūpnāth, Sahasrām and Brahmagiri edicts by M. Sylvain Levi has revealed to us another phase of Aśoka's activities in the same line. The passage in the Rūpnāth edict containing the term is thus translated by Hultsch:—

"Those gods who up to this time had been un-associated (with men) in Jambudvīpa have now been made associated (with them)."

The corresponding passage of the Sahasrām edict is thus rendered:—

---

“Men in Jambudvipa who up to this time had been unassociated with the gods have (now) been made associated with the gods.’’

The same fact is also stated in a passage of the newly discovered Maski rock edict of Aśoka.†

The text of the passage runs:—

\[\text{puru} \text{Jambu \ldots s [i]} \ldots [\text{deva husu}]]

\[\text{te d [a] ni misibhūtā}\]

misibhūtā, like misā in the Rūpnāth and other edicts, is derived from Pāli missa, Sanskrit miśra, ‘mixed,’ and should be rendered as ‘got mixed,’ ‘got associated’; and the passage should be rendered thus:—

“(Those gods who) were (not) formerly (associated with men) in Jambu [dvipa] \ldots have now been made associated (with them).’’ ‡

The most important question in this connection is, who were the gods whose cults were propagated by Aśoka all over his empire? Dr. F. W. Thomas suggests: “Are we to understand a conversion of people who previously did not recognize the Brähmanical gods?” § This view is endorsed by Professor Hultzsch who adds, “In a slightly modified form, this suggestion finds support in many passages of the rock and pillar edicts, in which Aśoka declares that his chief

---

† Hyderabad Archaeological Series, No. I, New Asonak Edict of Maski, p. 4.
‡ Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, the editor and translator of the edict, takes misibhūtā in the sense mṛṣibhūtāh (p. 5).
aim was to secure the ‘attainment of heaven’ (svagaradhi, Girnār, ix, l. 9) by his subjects through the practice of morality.”∗ Perhaps this is the correct view. But I would venture to suggest that by “Brāhmanical gods” we must neither understand the ancient Brāhmanical Vedic gods, nor the Brāhmanical gods recognized by the modern Hindus, but the Brāhmanical gods recognized by the natives of Magadha. The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya affords us a glimpse of those gods.

In the religion of the Maurya period as set forth above we do not discern any element that is peculiarly Persian or Magian. Of course magic (māyāyoga) occupied a very prominent place in this religion. But magic was not the monopoly of the Magi, it was universal. Dr. Otto Schrader writes, “There was among the Aryans, just as among all other people, a more ancient way of bringing the supernatural within reach of the natural than sacrifice and prayer, namely, magic.”† Other elements may be traced to the Indo-Iranian or even the Aryan period.

I shall bring this criticism of Dr. Spooner’s theory to a close with a few observations on one other aspect of his theory,—his rejection of the accepted view regarding the origin of Buddhism that Gautama, “having been born a Hindu,” “repudiated the teachings of Hinduism, denied the authority of its scriptures, broke from it altogether and founded a rival church which grew

∗ Ibid., p. 1059.
† Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, II, p. 40a.
and flourished at the expense of the Hindu faith.’’ Dr. Spooner defines his own view as follows:—

‘‘I hold that Gautama broke away, not from the Hindu faith, but from the Magian, and stepped out, not away from Hinduism but towards it, and built up his following not primarily from the ranks of Hinduism but from those of the Iranian community in this country, thereby setting in motion forces which reached their culmination when at length the Buddhist community in India merged by slow degrees imperceptively into the Hindu fold and ceased to have an individual existence.’’

One proof of Gautama’s Magian origin adduced by Dr. Spooner is the name Śākyamuni, the dictionaries asserting that this word Śākya means ‘‘descendants of the Śakas or Scythians.’’ It is now generally held that the Scythians were Iranian in speech, but that they were also Magian in religion has not yet been seriously suggested. Whatever the dictionaries may say, the oldest Buddhist texts, the Ambattha Sutta* and the Mahāvastu, † derive Śākya from Śakya, ‘able’ (see also ante, p. 155). In Vedic India Śāka was quite a common name among the Brähman teachers. A Śakadāsa Bhādityana is mentioned in the Vaṃsa Brāhmaṇa. Śākāyanya, ‘descendant of Śaka,’ is the patronymic of one Jāta in the Kāthaka Saṃhitā (XXVII, 7). Śākāyanins or followers of Śākāyanya are referred to in the Śatapatha Brāh-

* Rhys David’s Dialogues of the Buddha (I), p. 115.
maṇa (X, 4. 5). In the Maitrāyani Upaniṣad one Sākāyanya is the teacher of Bṛhadṛatha, a king of the Ikṣvāku line.* In the dictionaries ‘Sāka’ is also as explained ‘relating to Sāka or Indo-scythians.’

The accepted view that Gautama Buddha was born a Hindu is based on traditions and legends enshrined in such canonical works as the Mahāvastu, the Divyāvadāna, and the Lalita Vistara, and non-canonical works like Aśvaghoṣa’s Buddhacarita and the Pali Nidānakathā. These works agree in representing Suddhodana as a Brāhmanist. A Brāhman named Udayana was his Purohita (domestic priest).† Ten days after the birth of the future Buddha, we are told in the Buddhacarita I, 88-89, Suddhodana “offered for his son most elaborate sacrifices to the gods with muttered prayers, oblations” and gave to the Brāhmans cows full of milk. When the child first entered Kapilavastu with his mother, he was taken to the temple named Sākyavarādhana for bowing to the feet of the image of the goddess Abhayā, according to the Mahāvastu.‡ Abhayā was probably a form of Durgā. In the Divyāvadāna the temple (devakula) is called Sākyavarādha, but the presiding deity is not named. § In the Lalita Vistara the name of the temple is omitted, but it is said that the temple

* Vedic Index, II, pp. 368-369.
† Lalita Vistara (Lefmann), p. 121.
‡ राज्या भुवोद्वैभ चामात्मा भविता। रत्नय यव कुमारं शास्त्रविणं देबकुलं
 नेश चाभयाय देवो ये पादवन्ध्यं। Mahāvastu (Senart) II, p. 26.
contained the images of the following gods—Śiva, Skanda, Nārāyaṇa, Moon, Sun, Vaiśravaṇa, Śakra, Brahmā and the Lokapālas (viz., Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Vīruḍhaka, Vīrūpākṣa and Vaiśravaṇa).* If one chooses to ignore these traditions, while crediting others like the next-of-kin marriage practised by Gautama Buddha’s remote ancestors, anything can be proved about him.

Traditional evidences are also not wanting to show that Gautama Buddha deliberately repudiated Brāhmaṇanism. The great renunciation of Sarvārthasiddha took place in the dead of night. Leaving Kapilavastu he rode southward. We are told in the Mahāvastu that after riding on Kanṭhaka for twelve yojanas the prince reached a place (aḍhīśṭhāna) called Anomiya in the Malla country not far from the hermitage of the Rṣi Vasiṣṭha (i.e., of the Vasiṣṭha clan). After assuming the garb of a monk Gautama entered the hermitage of the old Rṣi and was cordially welcomed there. The Rṣi asked the prince, ‘Who are you, and why have you come to this hermitage?’ Gautama said that he came of the Ikṣvāku line (vaṃśa) and was the son of King Suddhodana; he had renounced the world to seek liberation from birth, disease, old age, and death. The Rṣi replied that nothing was unattainable for one like him. Nothing more is said in the Mahāvastu about Gautama’s doings in the hermitage, and the narrative is abruptly cut off with the statement that the Bodhisattva (‘future Buddha’) went to

* Lalīta Vistara (Lefmann), pp. 119-120.
Vaiśāli, and sought instructions from Ārađa Kālāma.* In the Divyāvadāna it is said that the sage to whose hermitage the Bodhisattva went after donning the yellow robe of a monk was Bhārgava (son of Bhṛgu).† In the Buddhacarita also the same tradition is preserved. "Then when the sun, the eye of the world, was just risen, he, the noblest of men, beheld the hermitage of the son of Bhṛgu" (VI. 1).‡ In this hermitage of the son of Bhṛgu the prince met with Brāhmaṇa ascetics who, desirous of heaven, were performing different kinds of penance. "He spent several nights there, himself like the moon, examining their penances; and he departed from that penance field, feeling that he comprehended the whole nature of penance" (VII, 34). As Gautama was leaving the hermitage, the chief of the ascetics implored him to stay in the hermitage. Gautama replied, "But this devotion of yours is for the sake of heaven,—while my desire is that there may be no fresh birth; therefore I wish not to dwell in this wood; the nature of cessation is different from that of activity" (VII. 48). Leaving the hermitage of the Brāhmaṇa ascetics, the Bodhisattva sought the help of the Śramaṇas Arāđa Kālāma of Vaiśāli and Udāraka Rāmaputra of Rajagṛha in succession. Dissatisfied with their teachings, the Bodhisattva retired to the forest of Uruvilva near Gaya and

---

† Divyāvadāna, p. 391. See also Lalita Vistara (Leffmann), p. 238.
‡ Mahāvastu II, pp. 124-130.
there performed for six years penances practised by the Sramaṇas and the Brāhmaṇas of those days.* After practising severe penances for six years he discovered that "this is not the way to enlightenment" (nāyam mārga bodhāya), "this is not the way to liberation" (nāyam mārga mokṣāye). Thus was Hinduism repudiated by Gautama the Bodhisattva. But it was not a complete repudiation of Hinduism. One aspect of Hinduism, faith in the doctrine of transmigration, led this Kṣatriya monk to repudiate another aspect—the practices leading to heaven.

* Cowell's translation, Sacred Books of the East, XLIX.
NOTES.

A. ĀRYA AND ŚŪDRA (P. 2).

In the early Rgvedic age, before there were Vaiśyas and Śūdras, the 'noseless' aborigines who opposed the Āryas were called Dasyus or Dāsas. In the later Vedic literature, the Śūdra, instead of the Dasyu or Dāsa, is contrasted with the Ārya. It is usually assumed that the term Ārya is used in the ethnic sense in the Rgveda as well as in the later Vedas. But such a view is opposed to tradition which should not be ignored in the interpretation of texts like the Yajurveda wherein not only the four castes, but also some of the so-called mixed castes find mention, and the Atharvaveda which is even later in form. According to Pāṇini (III. 1. 103) Ārya means 'master' (svāmī) as well as 'Vaiśya.' So when Ārya is not used in the sense of 'Vaiśya,' it denotes the first three castes—Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, and Vaiśya—not because they are Aryan in blood, but because they are 'masters,' that is to say, freemen, and not slaves. This is evident from the following passages of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (III. 13) wherein even a Śūdra freeman is classed as an Ārya:—

"The selling or mortgaging by kinsmen of the life of a Śūdra, who is not a born slave, and has not attained majority, but is an Ārya in birth, shall be punished with a fine of 12 paṇas; of a Vaiśya, 24 paṇas; of a Kṣatriya, 36 paṇas; and of a Brāhmaṇa, 48 paṇas.

* * * * *

"It is no crime for Mlecchas to sell or mortgage the life of their own offspring. But never shall an Ārya be subjected to slavery.

* * * *

"Deceiving a slave of his money or depriving him of the privileges he can exercise as an Ārya (Āryabhāva) shall be
punished with half the fine (levied for enslaving the life of an Ārya). *

"The offspring of a man who has sold off himself as a slave shall be an Ārya. A slave shall be entitled to enjoy not only whatever he has earned without prejudice to his master's work, but also the inheritance he has received from his father.

"On paying the value (for which one is enslaved), a slave shall regain his Āryahood (āryatwam). The same rule shall apply either to born or pledged slaves."*

To attach any ethnic significance to the term Śūdra and also to the term Ārya as used in the later Vedic and Sanskrit literature is, therefore, misleading.

B. The Piśāca Affinities of Lahndā, Sindhi and Kashmirī.

In a paper on The North-Western group of the Indo-Aryan Vernaculars (Indian Antiquary, XLIV, p. 226) Sir George Grierson writes:

"The position of Lahndā in regard to Pañjābī is altogether peculiar. The whole Pañjāb is the meeting ground of two entirely distinct languages, viz. the Piśācha parent of Lahndā which expanded from the Indus Valley eastwards, and the old Midland language, the parent of the modern Western Hindi, which expanded from the Jamna Valley westwards. In the Pañjab they overlapped. In the Eastern Pañjāb, the wave of old Lahndā had nearly exhausted itself, and old Western Hindi had the mastery, the resulting language being Pañjābī. In the Western Pañjāb, the old Western Hindi had nearly exhausted itself, and old Lahndā had the mastery, the resulting language being modern Lahndā. The latter language is therefore in the main of Piśācha origin but bears traces of the old Western Hindi. Such traces are much more numerous, and of much greater importance in Pañjābī. Lahndā may be described as a Piśācha language.

infected by Western Hindi, while Pañjābī is a form of Western Hindi infected by Piśācha.

"Sindhī, on the contrary, shows a much more clear relationship to the Piśācha languages, being protected from invasion from the East by the desert of Western Rajputānā. While modern Lahndā, from its origin, merges imperceptively into Pañjābī, Sindhī does not merge into Rājasthānī, but remains quite distinct from it. Such border dialects as exist are mere mechanical mixtures, not stages in a gradual linguistic change.

"On the South the case of Sindhī and Gujarātī is nearly the same; but there is a certain amount of real change from one language to another in the border dialect of Kachchhī owing to the fact that Gujarātī, although now, like Rājasthānī, a member of the Central Group of Indo-Aryan Vernaculars, has at its base remnants of some north-western language."

Sir George Grierson writes about Kāshmīrī:—"Kāshmīrī is a mixed language, having as its basis a language of the Dard group of the Piśācha family allied to Shinā. It has been powerfully influenced by Indian culture and Indian literature, and the greater part of its vocabulary is now of Indian origin and is allied to that of the Sanskritic Indo-Aryan languages of Northern India. As, however, its basis—in other words, its phonetic system, its accidence, its syntax, its prosody—is Piśācha, it must be classed as such, and not as a Sanskritic form of speech." (Indian Antiquary, XLIV, p. 270).

The place of the so-called Piśācha languages in the Aryan family is thus defined by the same authority:—"It has been previously pointed out that the Piśācha languages, which include the Shinā-khōwār group, occupy a position intermediate between the Sanskritic languages of India proper and the Eranian languages further to their West. They thus possess many features that are common to them and to the Sanskritic languages, But they also possess features peculiar to themselves, and others in which they agree rather with the languages of the Eranian family." (Ibid., p. 257).
C. Sound Changes in Bengali.

Speaking of Kāshmirī phonetics, Sir George Grierson writes in the second article quoted in the last note: “In none of the modern Piśācha languages, except in the case of a few borrowed words, are there any sonant aspirates. When such letters originally formed part of a word, the aspiration is dropped, so that gh becomes g, jh becomes ʃ or z, dh becomes ʃ or r, dh becomes d, and bh becomes g. There is nothing like this in India proper, but it is a universal rule in Kāshmirī” (p. 258).

Sir George Grierson has already noted in his Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. V, Part I (Specimens of the Bengali and Assamese Languages) that in the dialects of Eastern Bengal aspiration is often omitted from soft consonants, gh, jh, dh, dh, and bh. The present writer can speak from personal knowledge about the dialect spoken by the common people of Vikrampur (Munshigunge Subdivision), Dacca District. In this dialect sonant consonants gh, jh, dh, dh and bh have no place.

1. (a) ghar, ‘house,’ is pronounced as gar; ghōdā is gorā.
   (b) aghor is pronounced as agor.
   (c) bāgh, ‘tiger,’ is pronounced as bāg.

2. (a) jhaqq, ‘storm,’ is pronounced as jar or zar and jhāmtā is pronounced as jātā or zātā.
   (b) bujiltām, ‘I understand,’ is pronounced as bujiltām.
   (c) bojha is pronounced as bōjā, sojha is pronounced as sojā. Medial and terminal jh is pronounced j even in the spoken language of Calcutta.

3. (a) dhūti, ‘loin-cloth,’ is pronounced as duti,
   (b) adhar is pronounced as adar.
   (c) kāmdh is pronounced as kānd, bāmdh as bānd.

4. (a) dhāk, ‘drum,’ is pronounced as dāk, dhākā as dākā, ‘covered’ (hence Dacca).

5. (a) bāvavanā, ‘anxiety,’ is pronounced as bāb’na, bhāri, ‘heavy,’ as bāri.
   (b) abhay is pronounced as abay.
   (c) ābhh, ‘mica,’ is pronounced as āb.
While Sir George Grierson traces the Bengali pronunciation of kṣ as kkha, hy as jjh, kt as t, and sāgara as sāgara or sāyara to the influence of Māgadhī Prākrit as illustrated by the grammarian Hemacandra,* he lays no stress on the absence of sonant aspirates in the spoken language of Eastern Bengal. This cannot be a mere accident, but an heirloom from the non-Sanskritic predecessor of the present Sanskritic Bengali. In Eastern Bengal the Sanskritic Bengali of our day is pronounced not with genuine Sanskritic sounds, but with the sounds of its predecessor or parent as far as the sonant aspirates are concerned. This non-Sanskritic parent of modern Bengali was akin to the parent language of Kāshmirī and other languages spoken in the North-West of India and named Piśāca languages by Sir George Grierson. Another phonetic peculiarity of the spoken language of the illiterate classes of Eastern Bengal which points to the same conclusion is the pronunciation of the initial sibilant ś as h. Thus, śvāṣur, ‘father-in-law,’ is pronounced as hasur or haur; sāṇḍ, ‘bull,’ as hār; and sāp, ‘serpent,’ as hāp, and sakal, ‘all,’ as hagal or haggal. Though in the written Bengali ś, s, and s find place, yet in the spoken Bengali there is only one sibilant ś, a legacy from the Māgadhī Prākrit and in Eastern Bengal, as in Kashmir, this initial ś is pronounced as h.

D. UN-VEDIC PĀṇCARĀTRA (CHAPTER III, p. 108).

The orthodox view regarding the un-Vedic phase of the Pāṇcarātra is thus stated by Mitra Miśra in his Vīramitrodaya:—

"Further, the Pāśupata scriptures have to be divided into the 'Vedic' and the 'Non-Vedic': in view of what the Kūrmapurāṇa says in regard to it......

*  *  *

In the Vāyusamhitā also we find the following:—"The Śaiva (Pāśupata) scripture also is of two kinds—Vedic and non-

---

Vedic; the Vedic is that which contains the essence of the Veda, and the non-Vedic is that which is independent. The independent one is of ten kinds; that which contains the essence of the Veda extends a millionfold. The highest Pāṣupata is that which lays down observances and right knowledge.

Here also the distinction between the 'Vedic' and the 'non-Vedic' is made quite clear. We find above the phrase 'the Śaiva scripture also', the 'also' of which indicates the other cognate scriptures of the Vaiṣṇava, the Pāñcarātra and the like—the activities and results connected therewith are similar to those of the Pāṣupata, and which also are of two kinds, Vedic and non-Vedic.

That the Pāñcarātra and other scriptures are Vedic in their character is thus declared in the Viṣṇudharmottara as quoted in the Hemādri:—

'The Śaṅkhyā, the Yoga, the Pāñcarātra, the Vedas and the Pāṣupata—these constitute the five doctrines in the seeking of Brahman. These are the road to the ending of birth and rebirth, and also to the bringing about of the sovereignty of Heaven. That which extends up to the Vaiṣṇavadharma has been described as the very essence. Such is the entire Vedic path, as described by you.'

The term 'bhāva' here stands for sovereignty; and 'setu' for road. In the Kūrmapurāṇa we read:—

'The Kāpāla, the Pāñcarātra, the Vāmala, the Vāma, the Ārhatas—these and several other systems are for the purpose of deluding people.'

But the 'delusive' character here attributed to the Pāñcarātra refers to the non-Vedic Pāñcarātra; because in the same Purāṇa we find the passage—'The several scriptures that are found in this world to be contrary to the Veda and the Smṛtis, the foundation of all these is purely delusive';—where what are referred to are clearly only those that are contrary to the Veda.
NOTES.

In the Śāmba-Purāṇa we find the passage—'A man who has fallen off from the Veda, and is afraid of having to perform the expiatory rites laid down in the Veda, should, in due course, have recourse to the Tantra, for the purpose of accomplishing Vedic knowledge.' Again in the Kurma-purāṇa we read:—'Amśu, the high-souled Śātvata, the great devotee of Viṣṇu, was addicted to charity, he was the best of archers, was engaged, by Nārada's advice, in the worshipping of Vāsudeva; he propounded the scripture which is followed by lower born persons; the excellent scripture came to be known by his name, as Śātvata; and this scripture, duly propounded, became conducive to the welfare of the low-born.' The Śrī Bhāgavata also says as follows:—'The Śātvata Tantra was propounded by him, knowing which one becomes a participant in Final Release; it is in accordance with this Tantra that women and Śūdras are entitled to the Vaiṣṇava rites.' On the basis of these passages some people have asserted that, inasmuch as these texts lay down that only such people as have fallen off from the Veda are entitled to the Āgama-scriptures, it means that persons not so fallen have nothing to do with them. But this is not a statement by persons acquainted with logic. Because the texts speaking of those 'fallen off from the Veda' do not lay down such people as the 'Agents' in connection with Tantra,—in the way in which the King is laid down as the Agent in regard to the Rājasūya sacrifice: and inasmuch as the texts do not lay down any such Agents, it cannot follow that people other than those mentioned are not entitled to the performance of the acts laid down in the Tantra. What the passages do is to assert that the Tantra is for the people mentioned (i.e., those who have fallen from the Veda). So that, just as in the case of the text—'inasmuch as the Veda is not heard by women, Śūdras and low Brāhmans, the Bhārata has been put forward—even though the Bhārata is spoken of as propounded for the sake of women and Śūdras, yet that does not preclude the title of other persons also to that work,—in
the same manner, even in the face of the aforesaid passages, the title of others (i.e., those not fallen from the Veda) also to the Āgama scriptures remains unshaken (Indian Thought, VII, pp. 387-390)."
APPENDIX.

ANTHROPOMETRIC DATA.

To supplement the data of anthropometry published in the Ethnographical Appendices to Census of India, 1901, Report, and to test the historical value of the tradition that Rādhiya and Vārendra Brāhmans of Bengal are the descendants of five Brāhmans imported by King Ādiśūra from Kanauj, Mr. Sasadhār Ray, M.A., B.L., and myself measured, in 1909, the head form of 35 Rādhiya and 76 Vārendra Brāhmans of Bengal and Rao Sahib Pundit Matadin Sukul, M.A., B.E., then Executive Engineer, Rajshahi Division, measured on our behalf 63 Kanaujia (Kānyakubjiya) Brāhmans of the Cawnpore district (U. P. and Oudh). Unfortunately the papers containing the figures relating to head length and head breadth are lost and the indices that were recorded in a separate note-book are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RĀDHIYA BRĀHMANS.</th>
<th>VĀRENDRA BRĀHMANS.</th>
<th>KĀNAUJIA BRĀHMANS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cephalic indices under 70.</td>
<td>1 29</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalic indices from 70 to 72.4.</td>
<td>6 17.2</td>
<td>9 12</td>
<td>16 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalic indices from 72.5 to 74.9.</td>
<td>10 28.6</td>
<td>20 26</td>
<td>21 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalic indices from 75 to 77.9.</td>
<td>5 14.3</td>
<td>16 21</td>
<td>5 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalic indices from 78 to 79.9. and over.</td>
<td>13 37</td>
<td>28 37</td>
<td>4 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1910 I was placed on special duty for ethnological researches for three months by the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam and measured the head form, nose form
and stature of the male members of the following castes and sub-castes of Bengal and Bihar with anthrometrical instruments lent by the Ethnographical Survey of India.

**Santals.**
*(Settled near Ghoraghat in the District of Dinajpur.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Santal Parganas</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>165.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>154.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>157.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>157.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>160.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>157.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>156.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>160.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>157.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>144.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>170.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>163.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>164.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>163.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX.

**Brähman (Bengal).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pubna</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>Vārendra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>172.1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pubna</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mymensingh</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>182.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>161.2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>175.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>169.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>162.2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>168.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mymensingh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>Rādhiya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>170.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hughli</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>174.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>171.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>166.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rungpur</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hughli</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>164.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jessore</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>165.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Khulna</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>161.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jessore</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>162.2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>24-Parganas</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>167.2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24-Parganas (Bhatpāḍa)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>76'3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60'7</td>
<td>178'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82'6</td>
<td>170'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75'0</td>
<td>165'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76'0</td>
<td>159'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70'0</td>
<td>157'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>76'9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76'6</td>
<td>156'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75'5</td>
<td>156'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79'7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64'7</td>
<td>165'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>82'4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71'7</td>
<td>163'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81'3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60'8</td>
<td>169'7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72'1</td>
<td>167'5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>78'3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79'5</td>
<td>157'7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>78'9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76'6</td>
<td>174'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>89'6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74'4</td>
<td>172'7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79'5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73'1</td>
<td>162'8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68'6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68'0</td>
<td>173'7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80'4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58'8</td>
<td>159'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>82'7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77'5</td>
<td>159'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>77'3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82'9</td>
<td>162'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80'0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59'6</td>
<td>159'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>78'2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63'9</td>
<td>168'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>78'7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80'4</td>
<td>173'5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>81'5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60'8</td>
<td>174'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>77'6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68'6</td>
<td>165'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>75'8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59'6</td>
<td>165'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79'4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78'0</td>
<td>174'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>85'7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63'3</td>
<td>169'7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>82'2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63'8</td>
<td>168'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>79'3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63'2</td>
<td>167'4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>76'5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66'6</td>
<td>162'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>85'2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60'0</td>
<td>162'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>83'6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62'2</td>
<td>156'8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>81'4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66'6</td>
<td>159'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>82'1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80'0</td>
<td>159'8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>84'3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71'4</td>
<td>168'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>82'1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75'0</td>
<td>170'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>80'7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76'6</td>
<td>156'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>79'4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81'2</td>
<td>161'5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>77'1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>95'3</td>
<td>166'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77'3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90'7</td>
<td>164'3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78'3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67'3</td>
<td>169'5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24-Parganas</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bhatpadha).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>171.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>164.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>179.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>172.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>162.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Uttararādhīya Kāyastha.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>District of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Head length</th>
<th>Head breadth</th>
<th>Cephalic index</th>
<th>Nasal length</th>
<th>Nasal breadth</th>
<th>Nasal index</th>
<th>Stature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>165:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>74°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68°</td>
<td>165:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>83°</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89°</td>
<td>162:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64°</td>
<td>167:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95°</td>
<td>165:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>79°</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91°</td>
<td>171:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>78°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>170:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>70°</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>171:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>172:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>82°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>169:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>170:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>78°</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68°</td>
<td>161:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78°</td>
<td>155:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>164:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>83°</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67°</td>
<td>172:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>72°</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63°</td>
<td>179:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84°</td>
<td>155:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>71°</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>161:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70°</td>
<td>170:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78°</td>
<td>171:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>74°</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>164:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87°</td>
<td>162:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>71°</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>171:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>79°</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82°</td>
<td>170:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74°</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72°</td>
<td>169:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Birbhum</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72°</td>
<td>171:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72°</td>
<td>175:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>70°</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82°</td>
<td>166:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bhagalpur</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>79°</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86°</td>
<td>169:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>82°</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67°</td>
<td>162:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>159:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Birbhum</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68°</td>
<td>171:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>165:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hughly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>85°</td>
<td>167:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>168:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77°</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>165:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Jessore</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>181:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>82°</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82°</td>
<td>161:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Jessore</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79°</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73°</td>
<td>174:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>74°</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86°</td>
<td>173:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Birbhum</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69°</td>
<td>179:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>75°</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76°</td>
<td>169:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Uttara Rādhīya Kāyastha—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>District of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Head length</th>
<th>Head breadth</th>
<th>Cephalic index</th>
<th>Nasal height</th>
<th>Nasal breadth</th>
<th>Nasal index</th>
<th>Stature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>162.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>161.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Hughly</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>169.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>161.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Hughly</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kāyastha (Bengal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>District of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Head length</th>
<th>Head breadth</th>
<th>Cephalic index</th>
<th>Nasal height</th>
<th>Nasal breadth</th>
<th>Nasal index</th>
<th>Stature</th>
<th>Sub-caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79'4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79'5</td>
<td>163'0</td>
<td>Vaṅgaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>73'4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68'1</td>
<td>159'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>81'1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72'1</td>
<td>162'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>79'0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66'0</td>
<td>182'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>79'0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89'5</td>
<td>164'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mymensingh</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>78'6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80'2</td>
<td>161'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72'7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72'2</td>
<td>175'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75'8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74'5</td>
<td>164'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>72'3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60'0</td>
<td>169'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24-Parganas</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>74'7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84'8</td>
<td>172'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>83'3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82'0</td>
<td>178'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79'4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82'2</td>
<td>161'1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Khulna</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73'9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86'0</td>
<td>169'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Murshidabad</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80'0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80'0</td>
<td>171'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>87'5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69'4</td>
<td>168'4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>86'3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77'0</td>
<td>167'8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>77'1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85'4</td>
<td>174'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Howrah</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>85'1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84'9</td>
<td>165'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hughly</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73'5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82'2</td>
<td>161'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>77'3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88'4</td>
<td>172'2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>77'3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88'4</td>
<td>169'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>72'3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73'9</td>
<td>163'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>74'0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68'0</td>
<td>163'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>84'2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77'3</td>
<td>166'4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hughly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>76'5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82'6</td>
<td>167'4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>24-Parganas</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>85'8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69'2</td>
<td>172'4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Khulna</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>79'6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73'4</td>
<td>163'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pubna</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>87'8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79'0</td>
<td>142'8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>81'0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74'0</td>
<td>174'6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>80'0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61'2</td>
<td>166'0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tili or Taulika (Bengal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>District of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Head length</th>
<th>Head breadth</th>
<th>Cephalic index</th>
<th>Nasal height</th>
<th>Nasal breadth</th>
<th>Nasal index</th>
<th>Stature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>169.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>163.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>170.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>153.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>167.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>167.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>158.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>169.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>160.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>169.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>160.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>163.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>158.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>160.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>151.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>154.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vaidya (Bengal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>District of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Head length</th>
<th>Head breadth</th>
<th>Cephalic index</th>
<th>Nasal height</th>
<th>Nasal breadth</th>
<th>Nasal index</th>
<th>Stature</th>
<th>Sub-caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dinajpur</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>161.4</td>
<td>Râdhiya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hughli</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>172.6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>163.7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hughli</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>179.4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>Vaṅgaja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jessore</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>District of birth</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Head length</td>
<td>Head breadth</td>
<td>Cephalic index</td>
<td>Nasal height</td>
<td>Nasal breadth</td>
<td>Nasal index</td>
<td>Stature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>165.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>173.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>161.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>164.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>161.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>171.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>164.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>166.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>174.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>169.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bhuiṃhār Brāhmaṇ or Bābhān (Bihar).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>District of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Head length</th>
<th>Head breadth</th>
<th>Cephalic index</th>
<th>Nasal height</th>
<th>Nasal breadth</th>
<th>Nasal index</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>70:4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66:6</td>
<td>166:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>77:3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83:3</td>
<td>172:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76:5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68:6</td>
<td>174:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75:2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77:0</td>
<td>171:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Muzaffarpur</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81:3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75:0</td>
<td>169:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75:7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98:6</td>
<td>176:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>77:4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83:3</td>
<td>165:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>77:3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>95:3</td>
<td>163:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>71:6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82:5</td>
<td>176:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>77:1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82:5</td>
<td>174:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73:5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84:2</td>
<td>168:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>74:2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95:0</td>
<td>180:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72:9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76:6</td>
<td>175:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Champaran</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>80:8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75:0</td>
<td>178:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>69:6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84:0</td>
<td>168:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Champaran</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>78:3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82:0</td>
<td>171:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72:9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68:7</td>
<td>165:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>73:6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86:0</td>
<td>169:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>73:4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88:6</td>
<td>170:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Muzaffarpur</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>79:7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86:0</td>
<td>176:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>72:9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86:0</td>
<td>173:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>80:3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71:1</td>
<td>167:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>71:9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75:5</td>
<td>178:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>75:2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93:0</td>
<td>167:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71:1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85:7</td>
<td>168:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhagalpur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>163.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>164.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>168.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>155.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>171.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>158.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>163.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>169.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>160.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>167.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>162.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>169.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>165.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>153.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>155.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>169.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>166.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>173.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>169.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>159.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>174.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>165.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>169.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>171.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>172.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>169.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>156.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>157.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>167.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>170.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>160.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>171.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>160.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>161.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>District of birth.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Head length</td>
<td>Head breadth</td>
<td>Cephalic index</td>
<td>Nasal height</td>
<td>Nasal breadth</td>
<td>Nasal index</td>
<td>Stature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bhagalpur</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71:0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80:4</td>
<td>164:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72:2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79:1</td>
<td>165:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>72:6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86:9</td>
<td>176:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>71:4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88:3</td>
<td>170:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>74:6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79:1</td>
<td>171:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>67:3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71:7</td>
<td>165:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71:0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84:1</td>
<td>164:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX.

**Rajput or Chatri (Bihar).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muzaffarpur</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>175.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>166.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>160.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>170.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Muzaffarpur</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>177.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>179.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>162.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>169.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>174.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>174.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>165.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>168.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>172.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>168.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>161.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>170.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>169.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>170.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>167.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>166.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>170.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>168.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Muzaffarpur</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>169.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>171.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>167.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>183.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>171.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bhagalpur</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>168.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>176.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muzaffarpur</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>172.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>169.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>174.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>166.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>165.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>167.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>172.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bhagalpur</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>161.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>171.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>165.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>162.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>160.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>169.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>161.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>165.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>173.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>175.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>170.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Palamau</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>173.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Arrah</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>174.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>168.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Chapra</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>163.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX.

**Summary of Head Measurements.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of caste and tribe.</th>
<th>Province of birth.</th>
<th><strong>Percentage of Cephalic Indices.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Under 70.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Santals.</td>
<td>Santal Parganas</td>
<td>20·7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Brahmans</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Pāscātya Vaidik Brāhmans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Uttarā Rāḍhiya Kāyasṭhas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Kāyasṭhas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tilla or Taulikas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Vaidyas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Chāsi Kaivartas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Bhūīmhr Brahmans (Bābhan)</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Maithila Brahmans</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Rājputs or Chatis</td>
<td></td>
<td>6·8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Kanaujīya Brahmans</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seriations (Risley).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of caste or tribe.</th>
<th>Province of birth.</th>
<th><strong>Percentage of Cephalic Indices.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Under 70.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Santals</td>
<td>Chota Nagpur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420 Rājputs</td>
<td>Rajputana</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Brahmans</td>
<td>United Provinces</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Brahmans</td>
<td>East Bengal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page 6, line 8, for Šabara read Šavara.

", "", 22, for -ecting read -ecting.

", 9, "", 23, omit Semangs who are now differentiated from the Sakai as a separate and independent type probably most closely connected with the Andamanese (Nigrito).

", 13, "", 25, for reign read rain.

", 19, "", 17, for Atharvanas read Atharvans.

", 22, "", 19, The Višvāmitras avenged themselves by casting Šakti into fire. “Šakti is said in the Jaiminītya Brāhmaṇa to have been the son of Vasiṣṭha, and to have been cast into the fire by the Višvāmitras. According to Śaṅgurūṣija, who appears to follow the Śātyāyaṇaka, the story of Šakti is as follows: Višvāmitra, being defeated in a contest by Šakti, had recourse to Jamadagni, who taught him the Sasarpāri; later he revenged himself on Šakti by having him burnt in the forest. The Brhaddevatā relates the first part of the tale only.” (Vedic Index, II, pp. 348-349.)

", 23, "", 9, for Sudāsa read Sudās.

", "", "", for Paṇjavana read Pijavana.

", 24, "", 8, for Brahman read Brähman.

", 37, "", 15, for Vāhika read Vāhika.

", 38, "", 21, for Ghanntas read Ghanantaś.

", 39, "", 12, for or one read or upon one.

", 40, "", 1, for Aṅga read Aṅga.

", "", "", for Ānarṭṭa read Ānaratta.

", 43, "", "", for representations read representatives.


", line 21, for Kāṇḍāṃb. read Kauśāṃb .

", 49, "", 29, for Brahman read Brähman.

", 53, lines 3-6. According to the Lalita Vistara (Lefmann, p. 21) there was no king in Vaiśāli. “Every one thinks, ‘I am king, I am king”’ (रूक रूक मन्यते | चर राजा चर राजिति). But in the city of Mithilā, the capital of the kingdom of Vidēha, a king named Sumitra reigned (p. 22) at the time of the Buddha’s descent from the Tuṣita heaven.
THE INDO ARYAN RACES.

Page 61, line 18, for Chola read Cola.

Page 97, Garbe's interpretation of Gitā vii. 4-6 is very instructive. "When it is asserted in vii. 4-6 that God has two natures, one a higher spiritual nature, by which the universe is sustained, and a second, a lower and material nature, consisting of all that, according to the Sāṅkhya, belongs to prakṛti or matter, this statement is not to be construed in the sense that a half of the Divine essence is composed of matter; the meaning is rather that matter is not itself independent, following its own blind impulses, but that its evolution is under the control of God; in other words, that God works in matter, and acts through it. This is clearly expressed in other passages of the Bhagavadgitā. God deposits in matter the germ from which development takes place (xiv. 3, 4). He is therefore the father of all creatures, while matter may be compared to the mother's womb." (Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, II, p. 536b).

Pages 96-99, for Bhāgavadgitā read Bhagavadgītā.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS. 273

Page 168, line 27, for Brahman read Brähman.

"177, lines 10-11, for nowhere to be met with read very rare.

"177, "15-17. Mr. Râdhâgovinda Basâk has favoured me with the following note on these plates:—"[These plates were discovered in a village called Dâmodarpur (P. S. Phulbâdi), Dt. Dinâjpur. Plate No. 1 is dated in 124 (G. E.) = 443-44 A.D. of the reign of Kumâragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty, and records the purchase of a plot of land situated in the district (vîṣāya) of Koṭīvarśa in the province (bhukti) of Punḍravardhana by a Brähman named Karpaṭika for the purpose of performing the Agnihotra sacrifice (agnihotrayogâya). Plate No. 2 is dated in 129 (G. E.) = 448-49 A.D. of the reign of the same sovereign, and records the purchase of a plot of land in the same vîṣāya and bhukti by a person (whose name is illegible) for the performance of the five daily sacrifices (paścamahâyajña). Plate No. 3 is of the reign of Budhagupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty whose known dates range from A.D. 476 to 495, and records the purchase of a plot of land by a person named Nâbhaka for establishing Brähmans and Āryas (brâhmâṇâryâṃ) in a village called Caṅḍâgrâma in the same bhukti. Plate No. 4 is of the reign of the same sovereign and records the purchase of a plot of land by a Śreṣṭhīn named Râhpâla for building two temples and two chambers for the two gods, Kokâmu khâsvâmin and Śvetavârâsvâmin. Plate No. 5 is dated in 214 G. E. = 533-34 A.D. of the reign of [Bhânu?] gupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty, and records the purchase of a plot of land by a nobleman (kulaputra) named Amṛtdeva from Ayodhyâ (Āyodhyâ) for the purpose of repairing the temple of Bhagavân Śvetavârâsvâmin. All these plates contain names of officials bearing such surnames as datta, pâla, mitra, nandi, dâsa and deva."]"

"187, line 13, for Mahâsândhîvigrâhi read Mahâsândhîvigrâhi.

"193, "29, for pure-blood read pure-blooded.

"199, lines 13-17. This was first pointed out by Mr. Akṣay Kumâr Maitra in a paper entitled Gaṇḍhârâvi Sandhâyâkaranândi in the Bengali magazine Sâhitya of 1320.

"200, note 4, for Bhûnîyâs read Bhûnîyâs.

"216, lines 11-15. In the Râjasûya, or "inauguration of kings," the king is sharply distinguished from priests. Professor Keith remarks, "This distinction shows that for Vedic India at least the connection of royalty with priestly rank, if it ever had been a motive of the growth of the kingship, had long disappeared before the time of the Saṃhitâs" (quoted in The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1916, p. 623).
Page 221, line 27, for ended e read ended in e.
  " 223, "  10, for Xerxes read Xerexes.
  " 226, "  5, for Śakdvipa read Śakadvipa.
  " 231, "  24, for Mahākechavardhana read Mahākacchavardhana.
  " 235, "  16, for caityamāruhya read caityamāruhya.
  " 241, "  9, for Divīyāvadāna read Divīyāvadāna.
  " 243, note ‡ refers to p. 244, lines 1-6.