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PREFACE

INDIA IN THE TME OF PATAÑJALI in its second edition after a lapse of few years embodies certain new features. The first three chapters of the book have been rewritten completely. The Introductory chapter has not undergone any material change except in language and documentation. The background of the Mahābhāshya, Patañjali's time, the identity of two or more Patañjalis, Patañjali's parentage and birth-place have been considered in detail. The chapter on Political History is made more exhaustive with fuller documentation. The ancestry of the Śrīgas, their dynastic history, events connected with Pushyamitra's reign—the Vidarbha affairs, clash with the Yavanas and horse sacrifices, the supposed invasion of Khāravela—the extent of Pushyamitra's empire, his successors, Kāṇvas, the dynasties of the Gangetic region—Pañchāla, Kauśāmbī, Ayodhyā, Mathurā, kingdom of the Panjáb, independent tribes—Ārjunāyanas, Audumbaras, Kūnindas—and lastly the reference to the Andhras have been considered in greater detail and proper perspective. Notice is taken of a few works and papers which have appeared after the publication of the first edition. The views expressed on many points of political controversy are a little more definitive. Attempt has been made to lay the mosaic of the political history of this period in proper setting. The chapter on Geographical information is not merely an enumeration of geographical names noticed in the Mahābhāshya. It is much more than that. Fuller references are given while settling the identification of the place names. The rest of the chapters are only groomed with occasional touches here and there in diction and language. The bibliography is made up to date.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Patañjali’s Mahābhāshya symbolises the perfection of the discipline in grammar introduced by Pāṇini a few centuries earlier. It envisaged a thorough investigation into the roots of language and the formation of words, and aimed at precision in expression with the employment of terms whose parts are in close harmony with each other. Such a procedure culminated in the profound penetration and perfection of all material relating to the Sanskrit language. The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini which continued to be the basis of grammatical research and standard of usage, was commented upon by the unknown authors of Paribhāṣā or explanations of single

1. Pāṇini’s recognition as a great grammarian is evident from the epithets -āchārya, bhagavān and sukrīt, accorded to him by Kātyāyana (bhagavataḥ Pāṇiner siddham-under VIII.4.68; āchārya=ācharot samjña siddhiḥ under I.1.1.; and by Patañjali pramāṇabhiḥa āchāryaḥ under I.1 1, bhagavataḥ Pāṇiner=āchāryasya under VII.1.1.). According to Goldstucker, Pāṇini was not the inventor of grammatical system preserved in his work though he improved the system of his predecessors, made his own addition to it and availed himself of the technical aid of the old grammarians (Pāṇini and his place in Literature—henceforth Goldstucker-Pāṇini p. 88). It has been suggested that Pāṇini is more a pravaktṛ than the author of the Aṣṭādhyāyī (Parvate: The structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī p. 123 -henceforth Parvate-Aṣṭādhyāyī), but the use of the words in Patañjali’s Mahābhāshya: pramāyatistha, pravunikte, karoti, kriyante, kartā, pathtam, sāstī, āha, etc. are suggestive of his status as the author (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri—Lectures on Patañjali’s Mahābhāshya—henceforth Sastri—Lectures, Vol. I.p.xiii). The date of Pāṇini is uncertain according to Keith (A history of Sanskrit Literature—henceforth Keith HSL-p. 425; See also Keith HOS.XVIII.pp. clxviii ff; Aitareya Āranyaka pp. 21ff; Luders. SBA.1919 p. 744; Liebich—Pāṇini (1891). Kielhorn GN. 1885, pp. 185ff: Wecker Bezz Beitr. XXX, 1ff, 117ff) Prof. Belvarkar claims c700-600 B.C. for him (Systems of Sanskrit Grammar p. 15, R. G. Bhandarkar. JBBRAS.XVI. pp. 346f). According to Dr. V. S. Agrawal, the various dates assigned by scholars to Pāṇini range from the seventh to the fourth century B.C. The majority of scholars are inclined towards the fifth and the fourth century B.C. The view taken in this work is that a date nearer the fifth century B.C. appears more probable on the basis of the available data (India as known to Pāṇini—henceforth—Pāṇini—p. 477).
rules, followed by the Vārttikas (from Vṛtti-explanations) of Kātyāyana, and finally by the Mahābhāshya or great commentary of Patañjali. The last sage associated with the other two and forming the munitrayam or ‘the trinity of sages’, is accorded a divine status in traditional accounts. His importance and that of his magnum opus are enhanced when one takes into account the conditions in which, and the people for whom this work was written. At a time when the sūtras

2. According to Keith, Kātyāyana probably lived in the third century B.C. though no strict proof is possible, and this date really depends on the fact that he apparently did not long precede Patañjali. The impression left by Kātyāyana’s vārttikas is certainly that sometimes, not by any means always, he is attacking or correcting Pāṇini on the score of differences in usage which had arisen between the time of the two, while with Patañjali it seems as if he and Kātyāyana were parted by no great interval of time (HSL. p. 426). According to Goldstücker, Kātyāyana did not mean to justify and to defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them, and he does leave the impression of an admirer or friend of Pāṇini (op. cit. p. 91). Kielhorn worked out the relation between the two on the basis of the vārttikas of Pāṇini’s sūtras, and the comments of Patañjali. From a study of all the 85 āhnikas of the Mahābhāshya, of about 1700 sūtras discussed there, about 450 have no vārttikas. Of the remaining 1250 sūtras more than 700 sūtras are beautifully explained by the Vārttikārā without picking any hole in them. About 10 sūtras are found unnecessary. In the majority of the remaining 250 sūtras only additions and corrections, or more correctly changes in form and meaning are made (quoted by Subrahmanyā Śāstrī: op. cit. pp. xxviii ff). According to Kielhorn (Kātyāyana and Patañjali p. 48), the object of the vārttikas is then no other than this, without bias or prejudice to discuss such objections as might be raised to the rule of Pāṇini’s grammar, and on the other hand to justify Pāṇini by defending him against unfounded criticism, and on the other hand to correct, reject, and add to, the rules laid down by him where defence and justification were considered impossible. Kātyāyana’s birthplace, his merits, and the relationship of the vārttikas to Pāṇini’s sūtras are considered by Subrahmanyā Śāstrī. (op. cit. pp. xxviii ff). Their consideration is not necessary in this work.

3. According to the traditional account given by Rāmabhadra in his Patañjali-charita, he was an incarnation of Śesha, and that accounts for the Mahābhāshya being also known as Phanibhāshya (Phanibhāshita bhāṣyabdheḥ Sabdakaustubha uddhritaḥ—cf Kṣitabhāṭṭa Vaiyākaraṇabhūskarā. Rāmabhadra describes in detail the story of his birth. Goṇikā, the daughter of a muni, gave anghya to Sun-god praying for a son. The
of Pāṇini in the light of Kātyāyana’s vārttikas had created some confusion in the minds of the Sishtas, the well-read Brahmins of Āryāvarta, and Sanskrit was losing its rightful place and popularity, Patañjali undertook the self-imposed task of preserving its chaste character. He conformed with the spirit of the time, and aimed at making the Sishtas appreciate and understand the sūtras of Pāṇini in a scientific manner. In so doing he closely examined the vārttikas of Kātyāyana, his predecessor in a critical spirit.

Śeṣha made an appearance in the form of a sage, and falling from the aṅjali or cavity of Goṇikā, he was known as Patañjali (tavānjalau mahā-bhāga patito ‘ham hitāya te—Patañjalicharita II.8). According to Nāgojībhāţṭa, he is said to have fallen from the aṅjali or cavity of a sage while performing his daily worship in the city of Gonaṛdda. After the fall, he assumed the shape of a boy, and obtaining permission from Goṇikā, his mother he proceeded to the southern coast for the performance of tapas or penance (Gonaṛdḍeśe kasyāchid risher aṅjaleh sandhyā-karaṇasamaye patitā ity aitihyam). The Brihadānanaśa-kalpalatā suggests the fall of Śeṣha, as ordained by Gaṇeśa into the hand of a sage, and divulging the secret of his ascetic form to him (Chakravartty. IHQ.II. p. 262).

4. Rāmabhadra cites a few ślokas in suggesting that the birth of Patañjali was to reprise the vārttikas of Kātyāyana, justify Pāṇini and explain his sutras:

Kātyayanaḥ karkasyāyā praśādaḥ tapasyayā Chandrakalāvataṃsaṁ
tasyathā sūtreṣu padārtha-bodhaḥ praṃvaraṇaṃ Vārttikam ābabandha. I.52
prayuktāya vyākaraṇasya sūtraḥ savārttikāḥ sādhutayā padānām
adugāha gaur laukika-vāditakātma chirāya dugdham tridivam janānām. I.53
śrutva niṇayopari vārttikāṃ sūtraprabandhasya sa sūtrakāraḥ
Kātyayanaḥ grathitāyā akupya kālo hi dhiṁ.react karoti moham I.54
prakāṃpitoṣṭḥam parivartilakṣham pādākramany anchāla bhūmiḥāgam
tamaśramam Pāṇinir ajāgāma Kātyayanas tishṭhati yatra yogi I.55.

One may not agree with Rāmabhadra, especially on the aspersions cast against Kātyāyana, in the light of Kielhorn’s analysis of the vārttikas, but it seems certain that Pāṇini’s sutras needed explanatory notes to make these easily understandable. To achieve this, Patañjali justified his attempt. H. P. Sastri expressed similar views. He contended that Patañjali wrote his Bhāṣya for a language which was fast vanishing, and going out of use. It is a well-known fact that when he wrote, literary vernaculars had grown up in different provinces, and he was legislating for the speech of the Sishtas
According to the late Prof. Kielhorn, it would be wrong to suppose that all the vārttikas of Kātyāyana have been refuted to by Patañjali with a view to supporting Pāṇini. The real task of this great commentator was to bring within the range of discussion those sūtras of Pāṇini which were objected to by Kātyāyana, and his reaction to those criticisms, as well as to others left out by his predecessor. Patañjali, therefore, has not been all through a critic of Kātyāyana, but in some cases he also endorses the views of the Vārttikakāra, and questions Pāṇini on certain matters which escaped the attention of his predecessor. This led Kaiyāta, the commentator on the Mahābhāshya, to lay down the rule that the later the muni, the greater is his authority. It does not, however, undermine the position of his predecessor whom Patañjali has himself venerated. But such an assertion or dictum of Kaiyāta has some value when one traces the progress, or the change in the Sanskrit dialect between the time of Pāṇini and Patañjali. This fact was also noticed by Goldstücker.

only-the well-to-do Brahmins of Āryāvarta. (JBORS. II. pp. 32-33). Patañjali mentions the qualities of the Śiśtras-proficient in some sāstra (kasyaṣcid vidyāyāḥ pāraṅgataḥ, full of contentment (kumbhidhāyah), mānakāraṇah—VI.3.109.)


6. Yathottaram munitrayasya pramāṇyam, comment on I.1.29.

7. Vārttikavachanapramāṇya. II.1.1.p. 371.1 18 (Kielhorn ed.) cf. other references to Varttikakāra I.1.34. p. 93.1.5; III.1.44. p. 53 1.1; III.2.118. p. 121.1.9; VIII.1.1. p. 238.1.9.

8. According to Goldstücker, the position of Patañjali is analogous though not identical. Far from being a commentator on Pāṇini, he could more probably be called an author of Vārttikas. But as he had two predecessors to deal with instead of one—and two predecessors too, one of whom being an adversary of the other—his great commentary undergoes of necessity, the influence of the double task he had to perform, now of criticizing Pāṇini, and then of animadverting upon Kātyāyana. Therefore, inorder to show where he coincided with, or where he differed from, the criticisms of Kātyāyana, he had to write a comment on the vārttikas of the later grammarian, and thus the Mahābhāshya became not only a commentary in the ordinary sense of the word, but also, as the case might be, a critical discussion on the vārttikas of Kātyāyana, while its Ishīṣis, on the otherhand, are original vārttikas on such sūtras of Pāṇini as called for his original remarks—Pāṇini p. 119.
In giving a new setting to the sūtras of Pāṇini, taking into fuller consideration the objections and observations of Kātyāyana, Patañjali availed himself of the opportunity for presenting a picture of India of his time. By way of illustrations he referred to events of importance. In the work itself one also notices the germs of all principles—religious, social, scientific, and moral. This was earlier pointed out by Bhartrihari, the author of Vākyapadiya who wrote a running commentary on the Mahābhāshya, a fact also noticed by I-tsing. He commends this work, bristling with worldly maxims, despite its chequered career in a narrow circle of friends. It is suggested

9. These illustrations and their value would be considered when we discuss the date of Patañjali. The examples in the Mahābhāshya are styled mūrdhābhishikta or consecrations on the head (See Indische studien XIII.315), but as Webber pointed out (HIL p. 225n), without providing the slightest clue to enable in individual cases to decide whether the example actually belonged to this class of mūrdha or not. The stock-illustrations—mūrdhābhishikta udāharana—to which Patañjali also refers (I.1.57. p. 144) were so-called because in the words of Kaiyata, they were accepted in common by all commentators (sarva-vrittis-udāhritatvā). Fortunately Patañjali has cited certain illustrations concerning important personalities and events of national importance which rule out the possibility of their classified as stock-illustrations.

10. II.484-88. The account shows, how this great commentary was written to preserve the continuity of yyākaraṇasmiti. It also suggests that when Patañjali wrote his great commentary, he tried to put in it the essence of all sciences—the germs of all principles. These are helpful in evaluating the work, and in assessing its contribution to the cultural history of India of the time of Patañjali. The ślokas may be quoted here. The last one refers to the decline in the study of this work, and its revival in the south:

pratyena saṁskheparūchîn āpavidyāparigrakān,
samprāpya vaśyākaranaṇām samgrahaṅstam upāgate, II. 484.
kritetha Patañjalinā gurunā tirthadarśinā,
sarvesho nyāśijanā Mahābhāsyāبط nibhandhane, II. 485.
alabdhaṅgadhe gānhirāyād uttāna iva sauṣṭhavat,
tasmin akrītibuddhaṅāṁ naiv-āvasthitā, niśchayah, II. 486.
Vaija-saubhava-Haryyashaṅkā śushkatarāṅgasāribhikā,
āṛṣhe viplāvite grhaṇe samgrahapratikaṅchuke, II. 487.
yah Patañjalisiśyebhhyo bhṛṣaṅkto vyākaraṇāgamanaṁ
kāle sa daśaṅaṅeyosesha grhamatātre vyavasthitah, II. 488.

11. According to this Chinese traveller, there was a commentary on the Vṛitti-sūtra entitled Chūnī, containing 24,000 ślokas, which was a
by scholars like Maxmuller and Webber that the Bhāṣya has undergone manifold vicissitudes of fortune, has been more than once vichchhina, and arranged a fresh, so that the possibility of considerable changes, additions and interpolations cannot be denied. Strictly speaking, therefore, in each individual case it remains a priori uncertain whether the example is to be credited to Patañjali himself, or to those subsequent remodelling of the texts or, reversely, to Patañjali’s predecessors, or even Pāṇini himself.

A critical study of the Mahābhāṣya from a historical viewpoint would not fail to reveal the interest of the Bhāṣyakāra in men and matters of his time, and those preceding him. It would, however, need keen insight to trace this data amidst a mass of grammatical formulae with annotations and explanations. The author of the Mahābhāṣya tried to fit in his knowledge within the framework of this structure. The interest of the reader was uppermost in his mind, and it looks improbable that the Bhāṣyakāra desired to tax their patience with unfamiliar incidents introduced by way of illustrations. It was natural on his part to use contemporary events and personalities wherever necessary. It is in this light that we have to consider that piece of evidence which sheds light on the date of the work and its learned author.

Patañjali’s time: The time of Patañjali and the composition of his work can be ascertained from the data adduced by the work itself, which could be corroborated by the external work of the learned people (Takakasu-translated as ‘A record of the Buddhist religion by I-tsing. p. 178). Bhartrihari’s date is fixed by I-tsing which mentions him forty years earlier from his arrival in India in 691 A.D. viz. c. 651 A.D. His other work Vākyopadīya mainly deals with questions relating to the philosophy of speech’ (Ed. with Punnarāja’s commentary). See also Kielhorn—IA. XII. 226 ff; Pathak, JBBRAS. XVIII.341ff; Weber HIL.225-6 Keith, HSL 429; Dasgupta and De- History of Sanskrit Literature. 669 f.

12. IS. XIII.315; HIL.225n, 226. Kielhorn protested very strongly against this view, that at some time or other the text of the Mahābhāṣya had been lost, that it had to be reconstructed etc’. He would only ‘perhaps allow a break so far as regards its traditional interpretation, and regard the text of the Mahābhāṣya as given in our Mss to be the same as existed about 2000 years ago (IA. IV.108.)
evidence. Scholars in the past threshed out this question suggesting dates ranging from the tenth century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., as the probable time for the Bhāshyakāra. The earliest date suggested by N. Bhasyāchāra in the tenth century B.C. hardly needs any comment, as Patañjali could never have foreseen the reigns of Chandragupta and Pushyamitra, or the invasion of the Yavanas centuries ahead. Aspersions cast against western scholarship in that paper are uncalled for with the weak and puerile nature of the author’s arguments.

The lowest limit placed by Peterson in the fourth century A.D. is based on Patañjali’s reference to Pushpamitra or Pushyamitra, identified by him with Pushpamitras of the Bhitari pillar inscription who were conquered by Skandagupta. He also pointed out I-tsing’s reference to a commentary on Patañjali’s work entitled Chūrṇī. R. G. Bhandarkar controverted Peterson’s theory by pointing out the improbability in his view and the supposed identification in the light of the passage referring to the Mauryas and the Yavanas in the sense in which they have to be understood. This identification also


16. It is by this name that Indrarāja quotes the Mahābhāṣya in his commentary on the Udbhāṭalāṅṅkāra (Das Gupta and De HSL. p. 671).

17. Op. cit. pp. 191 ff; See also Collected works of R. G. Bhandarkar I. p. 157 ff. Bhandarkar questioned several of Peterson’s statements. ‘To speak of Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya as a commentary on the Kāśikā is to speak something that is absurd. The author of the Kāśikā himself tells us that his work is based, among other works on the Bhāṣya which can be no other than the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and there is internal evidence at every step to show that it is based on that work’ (p. 158).
belies Kalhana’s statement about Abhimanyu patronising the study of the Mahābhāṣya. Further, the actual wording in the Bhitari inscription is Pushyamitrāṁ cha jītvā viz. accusative plural and not singular.

Weber discussed the data from the Mahābhāṣya at great length in his paper published in Indische Studien, which can still be studied with benefit and interest. His papers in the Indian Antiquary on the date of Patañjali, however, need

18. Chandrachāryādibhir labdhyā deśam tasmāt tadāgamam pravartitam Mahābhāṣyam svam cha vyākaraṇam kritam I. 176. According to Kalhana, Chandrachārya and others introduced the study of the Mahābhāṣya in Kāśmira in the reign of Abhimanyu. Bhartrihari’s Vākyapadiya confirms it. We are told in that work that Chandrachārya revived the study of the Mahābhāṣya. He does not connect this revival with Abhimanyu. The main portion of the statement is confirmed. At another place in the Rājatarāṅgini, Kalhana refers to king Jayāpiḍa who is said to have reigned from 775-786 A.D., reintroducing the study of the Mahābhāṣya which had ceased to be studied in his realm. (IV.488). In the Kāśmirian chronicle, Hushka and Kanishka immediately precede Abhimanyu, and if such was the case, the composition of the Mahābhāṣya is to be assigned to a date much earlier than the one presumed by Peterson. Keith doubted the date of Abhimanyu, but accepted Bhartrihari’s reference to the long study of the text before his time (c. 650 A.D.) (HSL p. 428). R. G. Bhandarkar laid down the correct principle in regard to such a professedly historical work as the Rājatarāṅgini to accept such statements as are not improbable in themselves and do not go against stronger and more reliable evidence (Collected works. I. p. 165).

19. C.II. P. 52.1.11. The Purāṇas mention a people called Pushyamitras whose rule commenced after the end of the dynasties of the Vindhyakas. According to the Vishnu Purāṇa, as quoted by Wilson (IV. pp. 212-3), Pushyamitrās and Patumitrās, and others to the number of thirteen will rule over Mekala. He also pointed out that it seemed most correct to separate the thirteen sons or families of the Vindhya princes from those Bāhlikas and then from the Pushyamitras and Patumitras who governed Mekala, a country on the Narmadā. The Vāyu Purāṇa groups the two with the rulers of Mekala:

Pushyamitrā bhavisyanti Patumitrās trayodaśa
Mekalāyāṁ nriṇāḥ sapta bhavishyant-ihā saaptatim (Pargiter: Dynasties p. 51).


21. Vol. II. pp. 57 ff; 210 ff. The controversy between R. G. Bhandarkar and Weber was carried at length in the pages of the Indian
careful scrutiny. According to the late Professor, 'when we adduce and criticise the testimonies of the Vākyapadīya and the Rājatarangini as quoted by Goldstücker, the final conclusion at which we arrive at, is that Patañjali lived about 25 after Christ. He put it between the years 5-45 A.D. according to Lassen's reckoning of Abhimanyu's accession, the besieging of Sāketa by Kanishka who was ill-disposed towards the Mādhyamikās in the interest of the Hīnayānas and the composition of the Mahābhāshya. As regards the Pushpamitra reference, he suggested that Patañjali did not live at that time, but the memory of the king was still cherished by the Brāhmaṇas.

Weber seems to have twisted the passage referring to the besieging of Sāketa and Madhyamikā by the Yavanas to suit his line of arguments. He correctly identified Sāketa, but the association of the other word with the school of Buddhism associated with Nāgārjuna is incorrect. His inability to link any anti-Buddhist Yavana ruler with the Sāketa campaign, and further his attempt to foist this enterprise on Kanishka create a difficult situation. The explanation suggested by him, particularly in trying to harmonise many facts at a particular time, is very confusing and his theory is unacceptable at its face value. The other dates suggested by scholars are: Boht-

*Antiquary* on 'the date of Patañjali and the king in whose reign he lived'. Bhandarkar also refuted Peterson's arguments fixing Patañjali's date in the fourth century A.D. (For a complete text of Bhandarkar's papers on the subject, see his *Collected works* Vol. I. pp. 107 ff.

22. Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that the work in its present form does not appear to be much earlier than the Kushāṇa period. He bases his arguments on the reference to the quotations from Mahābhārata and the Harivānśa, the flourishing state of the Kāvya literature, use of metres which are supposed to be of later times, and the reference to the vyūhas of Krishna, and the Śakas. At the close of his arguments he suggests that Patañjali was himself a contemporary of Pushyamitra Śuṅga, but his work, the original Mahābhāshya, was revised and enlarged by early grammarians of his school (IHQ. XV pp. 633 ff). Dr. Sircar is not very sure of his contentions (ibid. p. 638).
lingk (200 B.C.), Maxmuller (200 B.C.), Goldstucker and R. G. Bhandarkar (144-142 B.C.), and Keith (150 B.C.). These scholars based their arguments on the passages relating to the Yavana invasions associated with Demetrius or Menander, the performance of sacrifice at the instance of Pushyamitra, the assembly of Pushyamitra—incidentally in another text the assembly of Chandragupta is also mentioned in this context, and the reference to the gold images disposed of by the Mauryas. These passages and illustrations may now be considered here in proper context.

The most important passage relates to a rule (värttika) laid down by Kātyāyana (värttika 2 on Pāṇini III.2.111) that ‘the imperfect should be used to signify an action not witnessed by the speaker but capable of being witnessed by him and known to people in general. Patañjali in this connection cites two instances: The Yavanas besieged Sāketa (arunad Yavanaḥ Sāketam), and the Yavanas besieged Mādhyamikā (arunad

24. History of Ancient Sanskrit literature p. 244. The late Professor at Oxford was not very certain about the probable date of its composition. He suggested that we would not be very far from wrong in placing the composition of the original grammar and of the supplementary rules of Kātyāyana on the threshold of the third century B.C. At what time the Mahābhāṣya was composed, it would be difficult to say. Further he pointed out that ‘as an experiment we propose to fix the years 600 and 200 B.C. as the limits of that age during which the Brahmanic literature was carried on in the strange style of the Sūtras’.

25. Pāṇini p. 239. He proposed that Patañjali must have written his commentary on the Vārttika to Pāṇini III.2.111 between 140 and 120 B.C., and this is the only date in the ancient literature of India, which ‘in my belief rests on more than mere hypothesis’.

26. IA.I. pp. 299 ff; XVI. pp. 199 ff; Collected works. I. pp. 114. In a more comprehensive paper on ‘the date of Patañjali No. I, being the first reply to Peterson, he concludes’ all the passages and statements harmonise so thoroughly with my hypothesis, and taken collectively, form such a conclusive body of evidence, that I feel myself fully justified in concluding this long reply to Professor Peterson with those words of mine with which he began his attack, “Patañjali’s date, B.C. 150, may now be relied on. (Collected works I. p. 185).

27. HSL. p. 5. In his Sanskrit Drama Keith suggests 140 B.C. as the date of Patañjali with reasonable assurance.
**INTRODUCTION**

**Yavano Mādhyaṃkām**. The siege of Sāketa (Ayodhya) and Mādhyaṃkā (Chittor), and not the school of Mādhyaṃkas as suggested by Weber, must be considered to be the events capable of being witnessed by the speaker Viz. Patañjali himself. The instances pose the question: who were the Yavanas and when did they besiege Sāketa and Mādhyaṃkā?

Reference to the Yavanas advancing as far as the land watered by the Gaṅgā and the Yamuna is noticed in the Yuga-Purāṇa of the Gārgī-Samhitā, and the Mālavikāgnimitram of Kālidāsa mentions the defeat of the Yavana forces at the hands of Vasumitra, grandson of Pushyamitra while he and his forces

29. *tataḥ Sāketam ākramya Pañchāla Mathurā(ś) tathā Yavanāḥ cha suvāṅkṛntāḥ prāpsyanti Kusumadvajāmn.*


Mankad suggests that the final destruction of the great Mauryan empire was the result of the joint attack by the forces of the Pañchala, Māthuras and Yavanas (ibid p. 38). Five kings were put up in charge of the conquered capital who soon fought among themselves and lost the conquered territory (ibid p. 40). The Yavanas disappeared from the scenes of their victory after a short success. Jayaswal had suggested that the Greek king of Patañjali and Khāravela’s time was Demetrius and not Menander, and he quoted the following passage from the Yuga-purāṇa of the Gārgisamhitā:

*Dharmamāṃśita tamāvṛiddhājanam bhokṣhyaṃti nirbhayaḥ*

*Yavanājñā paṇiṣyānati (naśyeraḥ) cha Pārthivāḥ (IBORS. XVI. pp. 127 ff).*

Mankad does not agree with Jayaswal’s reading and finds no reference to Demetrius. He quotes the other two texts—B and C in which the reading is dharmamāṭatayā and dharmabhitatamā respectively. According to Keith (HSL. p. 428), the Yavana king was probably Menander. Sten Konow agreed with Jayaswal’s interpretation (AO. I. p. 27), but Tarn has suggested that at the time of the invasion, Menander was Demetrius’ general, a fact, it would seem better understood by Indian writers of the period than by modern scholars (Greens in Bacteria and India p. 141). At another place he suggests that Menander was governor or Viceroy for Demetrius for all the conquests south-eastward of the Jhelum (ibid. p. 167) Cf. CHI. I. p. 544. We shall discuss this subject at length in the chapter on ‘Political History’.

were following the horse let loose for the Ásvamedha sacrifice
of his grandfather. The performance of sacrifice by Pushyamitra
—not once but twice—is also mentioned in the Ayodhyá in-
scription\(^\text{31}\) of Dhanadeva who was sixth in descent from Pushya-
mitra. The first Suñga monarch also figures in several other
instances cited by Patañjali. In his remark on Pánini III.2.123,
the Bháshyakára\(^\text{32}\) quotes a Várttika of Kátyáyana which en-
joins the use of the present tense lañ to denote an action or under-
taking which has begun but not finished—the examples given
are—‘here we dwell, here we perform as priests the sacrifice
instituted by Pushyamitra (iha vasámah, iha Pushyamitra
yájayámah). The sense of the whole thing is, that when an
action such as that of studying or performing the great sacrifice
spreads over many days, the present tense should be used to
denote it, if the action has begun but not ended, even though
at the time of speaking the speaker may not be actually perform-
ing the action.

This cannot be an imaginary instance. The Bháshyakára
quotes the names of the ruler mentioned above on another
instance. In his comment on the Várttika jítaparyáyavachanas-
yaiva rágády artham under Rule I.1.68 (7)...indicating that
a ‘tapatrusha samása ending with the word sabhá—court is
neuter, provided it is preceded by the word Rájan, or a word
denoting a non-human being, but not when it is compounded
with the name of a particular king, Patañjali cites as an instance
—Pushyamitrásabhá—the assembly of Pushyamitra.\(^\text{33}\)

The name of this ruler is again quoted by the Bháshyakára

31. JBORS. X. p. 203.2 (dvirásvedha yájinaḥ senópateḥ Pushya-
mitrasya).
33. Kielhorn omits Chándraguptasabhá in his edition, although it is
restored in the second edition of his Mahábhásh'ya (1892) p. 177.10-11.
It occurs in four of his MSS and also in the Kášiká. As two instances
of the compounds of the synonyms of Rájan are given, it is natural to
expect two of Rájaviśeśas or particular kings. The question that poses
before us—how could Patañjali be associated with the time of Pushyamitra
in the light of the reference to the other instance? The answer is very
easy. It is the consideration of the cumulative evidence and not the
individual item.
in his comment on the sūtra *hetumati* cha. This sūtra enjoins the use of the affix *nic* after a root, when the operation of a causer, such as command is to be expressed. Here Patañjali cites: Pushyamitra sacrifices (*yajate*), and the sacrificial priests cause him to sacrifice. According to Pāṇini’s rule the order ought to be, Pushyamitra causes (the priests) to sacrifice and the priests (*yājaka*) cause him to perform it (*yājayanti*).

Whatever be the grammatical implications in all the four instances, it is certain that Patañjali drew his illustrations from important contemporary events and personalities to make a deeper impression on the minds of his readers. These are suggestive of consistency in the minds of the Bhāṣyakāra. The Mauryan passage cited by scholars in fixing his time, is only suggestive of the *terminus a quo*. It only limits the period at the upper level. Commenting on the sūtra *Jivikārthe chāpānaye* (V.3.99) suggesting that ‘in the case of a life sustenance, serving an object which is an image (*pratikriti*) the affix *ka* is not used except where the object is saleable, Patañjali here cites as an example the images of Śiva, Skanada, and Viśākha where the rule of affixing *ka* does not apply. The gold coveting Mauryas had caused images of the gods to be sold (*archyāḥ*) but the rule applies only in such cases where these images provide living for the person who exhibits them to householders. Patañjali could not have referred to the Mauryas as gold coveting (*hiranyārthin*), if he had been a respectable Brahmin subject enjoying the patronage of the

34. III.I.26. p. 34.1, 2, 6-7.
35. V.3.99. p. 429. This passage has been interpreted by Goldstücker, Weber and Bhandarkar.
36. The original passage runs as follows: *apanyā ity uchyaite na sidhyati Sivah Skando Viśākha iti, kim kāraṇam. Mauryaṁ hiranyārthibhir archaḥ prakalpitāḥ, bhavet tāsā na syād. yās tu etāḥ pūjārthās tāsu bhavishyati.* V.3.39. p. 429. *Pāṇya* suggests, according to R. G. Bhandarkar, ‘something that has the possibility of being sold and something that is exposed for sale’. The idols of Śiva and etc., which are under worship now possess the possibility of being sold, because idols under worship were sold by the Mauryas. But though they possess the possibility of being sold, they are not actually exposed for sale. Pāṇini’s rule applies to idols of the latter description, and not of the former (collected Essays I. p. 155). The passage, therefore, refers to the sale of idols under actual worship.
Maurya ruler. It seems to have been an event of the past, may be a recent past, of which the memory was fresh in the minds of the people. The ruling Maurya dynasty had ceased to exist by that time.

The internal evidence from the *Mahābhāshya* itself is suggestive of his contemporarily with the Śuṅga monarch Pushyamitra. As regards the composition of the work, particularly that part in which we find references to the invasions of the Yavanas and the performance of sacrifice it must have been done probably at the end of the rule of the Śuṅga Monarch. The nature and number of sacrifices, and the Yavana invasions which are noticed in other sources as well, are matters connected with political history. We propose considering these in detail in the next chapter. Jayaswal noticed the reference to the defeat of the Muriya Rājā at the hands of king Khāravela of Kaliṅga in the famous Hathigumpha inscription. It was proposed by him that Pushyamitra performed another sacrifice to vindicate his position after his humiliation by Khāravela. This point is very controversial and does not suggest Patañjali’s date. We, however, stand on a firmer ground in suggesting that Patañjali was a contemporary of Pushyamitra, and the *Mahābhāshya* was probably composed at a time when the threat of security to the Śuṅga empire had passed away, and the Brahmin monarch stabilised his position and prestige by performing sacrifices.

The external evidence relating to the commentary on the *Mahābhāshya* by Bhartrihari, mentioned by I-tsing and the decay of the text at the hands of logicians named Baiji, Saubhava, and Hāryaksha who sacrificed its importance for extolling logistic principles has nothing to suggest on the date and time of Patañjali. So also we are denied any help on the point under consideration from the reference to the revival

37. J.B.O.R.S. III. pp. 444ff; IV. pp. 384ff. Jayaswal suggested that Pushyamitra was defeated by King Khāravela, evidently after his first sacrifice. The Brahmin Senāpati reestablished his imperial position a second time. He further pointed out that Kālidāsa was referring to the second sacrifice when Pushyamitra had a grandson young enough to lead the forces (ibid X. p. 203).

38. op. cit.
of its study by Chandrachārya and Vasurāta, and the patronage of Abhimanyu. These are only suggestive of the chequered history of the Mahābhāshya, in its later phase.

The text of the Mahābhāshya in its present form remains the best piece of evidence on the date of Patañjali. We do find consistency in the references to men and matters quoted by way of instances or illustrations. The Yavana invasions must have happened in Patañjali’s time, and he seems to have enjoyed the patronage of Pushyamitra whom he quotes several times. His time was sufficiently close to that of the later Mauryas when the memory of the founder of this family was still fresh. It is rather strange that Aśoka’s name does not figure anywhere. For the orthodox Brahmins, this monarch might not have been a personality worth reverence. It may, therefore, be safely concluded that Patañjali was Pushyamitra’s contemporary, who wrote his Mahābhāshya when the political situation had stabilised after the invasions of the Yavanas, and the Śuṅga monarch had performed sacrifice to vindicate his position. He may therefore, be placed in c. 150 B.C. a date suggested much earlier by R. G. Bhandarkar.39

Identity of two more Patañjalis

This question engaged the attention of scholars who, however, failed to agree on the identity of the Bhāshyakāra with the Yogasūtrakāra. Scholars like Liebich40 and Chakravartty41 identify the two, but they are distinguished by Prof. Renou,42 Y. H. Woods,43 and Jacobi.44 The advocates of the identity theory base their arguments on a number of identical and complimentary factors noticed in the two works: the opening with similar aphorisms (atha šabdānuṣāsanam and atha Yogā-

41. IHQ. II. pp. 265ff.
42. ibid XVI. pp. 586ff.
43. Yoga System Translated in HOS.XVII. p. xv.
44. JAOS. XXXI. pp. 25ff.
45. I. 148.
nusāsanam), absence of criticism on the doctrine of Sphoṭa in the Yoga-Sūtra, despite its repeated notice by all schools of Philosophy, and the reference to Yoga in the Mahābhāṣya. They also referred to Bhartrihari’s allusion42 to Yoga-Śāstra purging the mind of all foul effects (yujate Yogam Brahma-\-chāri) I.148) in context with his eulogising the Mahābhāṣya. It is also suggested by way of negative arguments that since the two works deal with altogether different topics, having practically nothing in common, it is difficult to trace parallelism so far as the texts are concerned.

In reply to these arguments, Prof. Renou and others have adduced their views from the grammatical and philosophical standpoints. Grammatical terminology, like, pratyāhāra, upsarga, prataya and vikarma etc. appear in the Yoga-Sūtra with different values. The French Professor expressed surprise at the non-utilisation of the value of cha, va, iti, etc. in this work, and its language points to a development in the sense of analysis. The style and combination are also taken into consideration. Jacobi discussed at length the difference in the philosophical ideas underlying the two works—the latter definitely of a later period in which the original heterodox doctrines are adopted. The allusions to Buddhist doctrines in the Yoga-Sūtra are also suggestive of its later character, sometimes after the fifth century A.D.

Wood translating the Yoga-bhāṣya (c 650-850 A.D.) suggests that the work does not contain any allusion, more or less direct to the theory of the unity of the parts of concrete substances, as set forth in the Mahābhāṣya. The divergent conceptions of the two works, at least in regard to the question of substance’ (dravya) and quality (guna), nullify the identity theory. Jacobi rightly summed up, that, ‘since the author of the Yoga-sūtra does not conform to the grammatical rules taught by the Mahābhāṣya, and because the latter is ignorant of the philosophical views of the former, they cannot be identified but must be two different persons’. Barnett43 also referred to the weakness of the tradition attributing the Sūtra (Yoga) to Patañjali (Bhāshyakāra). This was admit-

ted by S. N. Das-Gupta,\textsuperscript{47} though he did not accept the posterity of the \textit{Yoga-Sūtra} to the \textit{Mahābhāṣkya}, on the basis of the internal evidence, if any.

It may, however, be made clear that two persons cannot be identified for name sake. This might complicate matters. There was another Patañjali, the author of \textit{Nidāna-sūtra},\textsuperscript{48} K. C. Bhatnagar editing this work has quoted the Berlin catalogue and Max-Muller's \textit{Shaṅgurūṣishya} (1187 A.D.) in his comment on Kātyāyana's \textit{Sarvāṇukramaṇi} with a view to showing that the Bhāshyakāra, the Yoga-sūtrakāra, and the author of the \textit{Nidāna-sūtra} were really one person (yogacharyah svayam kartā Yoga-sāstranidānayoh.) There are traditional accounts based on Śivarāma's comment on the \textit{Vāsavadattā},\textsuperscript{49} as well as on \textit{Patañjalicharita}\textsuperscript{50} of Rāmabhadrā, which suggest that Patañjali wrote three works—one on Yoga, the second on grammar, and the third on medicine. The last one is also referred to by Chakrapāṇi\textsuperscript{51} in his commentary on Charaka. But the question is: Are we to rely on these traditions based on works written a thousand years later, or more when Patañjali had acquired a divine status. The \textit{Yuktidīpikā} refers to yet another Patañjali. Under the circumstances the safer course would be to distinguish the Bhāshyakāra from the Sūtrakāra, and not merge their personalities into one.

It may be interesting to point out that in course of time, Patañjali's name like those of the Vedic Risis came to be associated in the formation of the gotras. An inscription from Narendra\textsuperscript{52} of the time of Vikramāditya and the Kadamba

\textsuperscript{47} ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Punjab Sanskrit Series.} p. 27.
\textsuperscript{49} yogenā chittasya pādena vācham malam śārīrasya tu vaidyakena yo 'pākarot tam pravaram muninām Patañjalim pranjalir ānto' smi (Bib Ind. ed. p. 3.)
\textsuperscript{50} sūtrakāya Yogāśatra Vaidyakośastra cha vārttikāni tataḥ Kritvā Patañjalimunih prachāryāmāsa jagadidam trātum V.25.
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Calcutta Sanskrit series} ed. by P. C. Chakravartty p. 32. According to this work, Patañjali did not believe in the existence
ruler Jayakesin II dated in the year 1125 A.D. refers to Patañjali the grammarian (Sabdavidya Patañjaliḥ saḥ) with his qualities imbibed by the ruler. It is more in line with the internal evidence furnished by the Mahābhāshya and the Yoga-sūtra, taking into account the style, subject matter, disparity in language involving grammatical omissions in the other work, to suggest that the authors of the two works were different persons.

Patañjali’s Parentage and birthplace: The evidence on both the counts has to be sought in the Mahābhāshya itself. The traditional accounts, however, suggest his birth in mysterious circumstances. The two terms Gonikāputra15 and Gonardīya are suggestive of his mother’s name, and his association with a place named Goñarda respectively. The former term stands in analogy to Dākshīputra26 by which Pāṇini was called, though Hemachandra in his Abhidhānachintāmāni27 refers to him as Sālāturiya. Gonikāputra and Goñardiya are mentioned by Vātsyāyana28 as authors on dramaturgy, but there is no ground for identifying them with the author of the Mahā-

of ahaṅkāra as a separate category:
uchyate: ahaṅkāra parigrahārthaṁ evam tarhi naivāhaṅkāro
vidyata iti Patañjaliḥ mahatos’mi pratyayarūpavābhūpāgamāt.
This is quoted in relation to the views of the author of the Yuktidīpika that an ancient master of the Sāṅkhya, called Paurika held that Prakriti is not one, but there is an infinite personality of Prakritis, each being attached to a different purusha.

53. Eh. XII. p. 306.
54. I.4.5. p. 336.16.
55. I.1.21 p. 78.2; I.1.29. p. 91.28; I.1.92. p. 76.14; VII.2.101. p. 309.11.
56. sarve sarvapadādeśa Dākshīputra Pāṇini I.1.20. p. 75.13. It might be interesting to suggest that Aśvaghoṣha, a contemporary of Kanishka is called Suvarṇākshīputra in the colophon of his Saundarananda. Gonikā might have been Patañjali’s mother, as suggested by Rāmabhadra (tatra ka’pi daḍriše munikanāy Gonikā iti guṇasindhur anena II.7.
58. Vātsyāyana refers to two writers: Goñikāputra (Kāmasūtra I.5; V.1; VI.48 and Goñardhiya (I.4) who wrote on the subject of treatment of a wife. According to Kielhorn, Gonikāputra and Goñardhiya were not names of Patañjali (IA XV. p. 80 f). R. L. Mitra doubted the identification of Goñikāputra and Goñardhiya in the Mahābhāshya. He suggested
bhāshya. Nāgojībhaṭṭa identified Goṇikāputra with the Bhāshyakāra.\(^{59}\)

According to R. G. Bhandarkar,\(^{60}\) the term Goṇardiya is suggestive of Patañjali being an inhabitant of Gonda in Oudh. He contended that, according to the usual rules of corruption, Sanskrit ṛḍa (ṛ) in the prākrits is corrupted into ḍḍa (ḍ), but sometimes it is also changed ḍḍa (ḍ), and as hasty pronunciation sometimes elides the ṛ, and in the latter stages of the development of Prākrits, one of the similar consonants is rejected, so Goṇarda becomes Goṇḍā. He also cited two passages from the Mahābhāshya testifying to the composition of this work at a place somewhere in between Mathurā and Pātaliputra.\(^{61}\)

Weber presumed\(^{62}\) the ingenuity of the conclusion, no doubt surrounded by very great difficulties, particularly the correct interpretation of the word pūrvam in the passage Mathuryāḥ Pātaliputram pūrvam. According to him, it gave just the opposite direction implying that Pātaliputra was situated between the speaker and Mathurā, and the speaker therefore must have lived to the east of the former. Weber suggested that Patañjali had visited different parts of India, as he was writing the Mahābhāshya. His dwelling place that there was a solitary instance of the use of the honorific Goṇikāputra, as he always prefers the derivative by the use of such particles as jñeyam—‘it should be known’, or ‘kartavyam’—‘it should be done’, and not by naming himself in the third person. He pointed out that there may have been a Goṇardiya and a Goṇikāputra before the time of Vātsyāyana and necessarily long before that of Patañjali and yet there was nothing to prevent him from bearing these aliases. The manner, however, in which these names have been cited leaves no room for the entertainment of such an opinion (JASB.LII.1883, p. 330 ff.)

---

59. Goṇikāputra bhāshyakārai ity āhuh—op. cit.
60. IA. II.1873.p. 70.
61. III.3.136. p. 162.6 Yo’yan aḍhva gataḥ a-pātaliputrāt tasya yad āvaram Sāketād iti—“of the distance or path from Pātaliputra which has been traversed (such a thing was done in) that part of it which is on this side of Sāketa” yo ’yan aḍhva Pātaliputrād gantavyas tasya yatparam Sāketād iti (ibid 1.11) “Of the distance up to Pātaliputra which is to be traversed (something will be done in) that portion which lies on that side of Sāketa.”
62. IS. XIII. p. 314; IA.II. p. 57.
could hardly be ascertained from these passages, and he suggested waiving the matter altogether.

P. C. Chakravartty, however, contended that Patañjali belonged to southern India, and had intimate knowledge of that part, as could be inferred from the Mahābhāṣya itself. According to him, the Bhāshyakāra certainly speaks of the peculiar linguistic characteristics of the Deccan, that is of using words in taddhita suffixes, as for example, laukike and vaidike instead of loke and vede. The references to lakes and ponds, popularly called sarasī in the Deccan is also contended as an evidence pointing in that direction.

It appears that Chakravartty lost sight of the fact that Patañjali, while speaking of the directions, and occasionally the distances also from one part or city to another in Madhyadeśa or Āryāvarta of which he defines even the boundaries, does not notice the exact location of Chōḍa, Kerala, Kaḷera, and Pāṇḍya in the south. That rules out the possibility of his close contact or place of birth in the south. We, no doubt, notice, a rich geographical data in the Mahābhāṣya but that could only imply his knowledge of the country without fixing his place of birth, either in the south or even in the north. It is very likely that he was close to Pataliputra where he was enjoying the patronage of the Śuṅga monarch whom he quotes several times in his work. Precise details regarding Patañjali’s life—his place of birth and his personality—may be wanting, but the Mahābhāṣya itself is the most authoritative piece of evidence regarding his time as a contemporary of Pushyamitra Śuṅga. The Bhāshyakāra closes the list of the great grammarians, save for Bhartrihari. He exposes effectively the discipline in grammar meant for a language, not dead but very much living, although restricted only to the Sishtas, the élite Brāhmmins of Āryāvarta.

63. IHQ II. p. 268.
CHAPTER II

POLITICAL HISTORY

The historical value of Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya lies in its reference to the Yavana invasion and the performance of horse sacrifice by Pushyamitra who is mentioned in a couple of illustrations. The citations convey the impression that the Bhāshyakāra was not unaware of the political happenings of his time. The then history of northern India is, in fact, a record of struggle between the Śuṅga and Yavana monarchs, the former attempting to integrate the loose political fabrics, and the latter to take advantage of the worsening political situation. An account of the Yavans or the Indo-Greek kings is given in the Yuga Purāṇa section of the Gārgī-Saṁhitā in connection with the invasion of Pushpapura (Pātaliputra, the capital of the Mauryas), and some other places in northern India within the Mauryan empire.1 It is, however, uncertain whether the dynastic revolution in Magadha engineered by the Brahmin General preceded the Yavana invasion, or it was an aftermath of the event which brought the Yavanas within the gates of Pātaliputra. They sacked the Mauryan capital, but soon retreated because of the trouble at home.

As the Śuṅgas succeeded the Mauryas, they also paved the way for the Kāṇyas after a rule of 110 years by its ten rulers. A few provincial states owing allegiance to the main

Suṅga line, or as remnants of the Suṅga family also figure in the political history of this period. The Andhras well established in the south-east² were also aspiring for ascendancy in the north, while king Khāravela of Kaliṅga seems to have planned conquests in different directions. To lay the mosaic of political history of this period, roughly from the last quarter of the second century B.C. to the beginning of the first century B.C. is a difficult task due to paucity of evidence, it is nevertheless worth attempting.

Ancestry of the Suṅgas: The foremost question in connection with the history of the Suṅgas relates to their ancestry, and the relation of the first Suṅga monarch with the last Mauryan emperor. The Brahmin origin of the Mauryan General who, according to the Purāṇas⁴ and the

2. Andhra is both a tribal and a territorial name. As a people the Andhras are mentioned as early as the fifth century B.C. They figure along with the Parindas as border peoples in the inscriptions of Aśoka. The earliest reference to the Andhras enabled the scholars to fix their home in the region comprising roughly the present Godāvari, Krishnā, and Guntur districts (Co.HI. p. 296). An inscription on one of the Bhilsa topes (Śānicchi No. 1) records a donation made in the reign of king Śātakaṇḍi (no. 346). The ruler can not be identified, but he must certainly have been an Andhra. The inscription probably belongs to about the middle of the first century B.C (CHI p. 533). According to Rapson, the conquest of E. Malwa marks the north-eastern limit to which the progress of the Andhra power can be traced from the evidence of inscriptions and coins (ibid.).

3. The hero of the Hāthigumpha inscription, king Khāravela of Kaliṅga was the thirteenth king of the Cheta family. It is now admitted that the inscription does not bear any date, but on paleographic grounds it can not be placed earlier than the beginning of the second century B.C. A consideration of the historical events narrated in the inscription might be helpful in narrowing the limits which it would be out of question to place during the hey-day of the Suṅga glory (Co.HI. p. 112). The inroads over the plains of Northern India could only have been possible either immediately before the accession of Pushyamitra or after the collapse of the Suṅga power. For a fuller bibliography on Khāravela see Poussain: L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas etc. pp. 193ff).

4. Pushyamitaras tu senānir uddhryata sa Brāhadratham (Mat 272.27.5; Vāyu 99.337; Brah 111.74.)

Harshcharita of Bāṇa, assassinated his Master, is revealed from several sources. According to Pāṇini, the affix an comes after the Śuṅgas when the sense is a descendant of the family of Bhāradvāja. He also mentions the other form Sauṅgi. This family name occurring in the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa and in the Āsvalāyana Srautasūtra was associated with the ancient priestly families, suggesting that the Śuṅgas were Brahmins. The Divyāvadāna associates the founder of this family with the last Mauryan emperor. According to this work, Sampadi, son of Kuṇāla and grandson of Aśoka, had a son named Vrihaspati whose grandson was Pushyadharman father of Pushyamitra. That would remove Pushyamitra from Aśoka by six generations, covering a period of at least 100-120 years. Actually the Śuṅga monarch was separated from Aśoka by less than fifty years. Further, there is no point in associating Pushyamitra with the Mauryan family when other sources call him a Brahmīn, and the Śuṅgas are mentioned as teachers in Vedic literature. His gotra, however, has been a matter of disputation.

According to Raychaudhuri, the name of the family was Baimbika, as Agnimitra in the Mālavikāgnimitrām calls himself a Baimbika. The Baimbikāyaḥ are mentioned among born' by Cowell and Thomas (translation p. 193). Jayaswal justified this act of the Mauryan General (JBORS.1918. p. 260ff). It is translated in the lexicons as 'not honourable' (Monier Williams Dictionary. p. 28 col. 3). In the context in which Bāṇa enumerates cases of persons who paid for their weaknsses, it is conceivable that the act, however, treacherous, might have been justified in national interest. In the same reference Chandragupta's murder of his own brother Rāmagupta is also mentioned.

6. Vikarṇa-Śuṅgachchhalād Vatsa-Bhāradvājatriskhu. IV.1.117.


8. Bhāradvāj=āgni=ārkkshā Šuṅgāḥ Saiśirayāḥ kataḥ XII, 13.5.


10. IC. III. pp. 739ff.

11. Dākshinīyam nāma bimbosthṛi Baimbikānāma kulavratam ‘Politics indeed O, Bimba-limbed one is the family tradition of the descendants of Bimbaka.' (Act IV. verse 14).
the Kāśyapas. He also notices the reference to the Kāśyapa senānī in the Harivamśa who restored the horse sacrifice. Citing the Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra, the late Professor suggested that as the Baiimbakayas are distinctly included in the pravaras and gotras of the list, Pushyamitra was therefore, a Kāśyapa and not a Bhāradvāja. Raychaudhari further remarked, that the dynastic designation Śuṅga is applied to Pushyamitra and his progeny only in the Purāṇas, and not in other works like the Divyāvadāna, and Mālavikāgnimitra and even in the Harshacharita of Bāṇa which notice the dynastic revolution, involving the overthrow. It is, therefore, proposed that the Purāṇas may have included under the name Śuṅga, two distinct groups of kings viz the line of Pushyamitra which is styled Baimbika by Kālidāsa and the real Śuṅgas who succeeded this line, and are referred to by Bāṇa and in the Bhārhut inscription of Dhanabhūti.

H. A. Shah tried to connect Baimbika with Bindusāra, thus associating the Śuṅga ruler with the Maurya family, but the conjecture lacks possibility despite the traditional account in the Divyāvadāna. H. S. Sāstrī associated the Śuṅgas with those turbulent military spirits who had been driven away from Persia by the Greek conquest of that country. The second half of the name -mitra and that of all the members of the family suggest his Persian origin.

Perusing the data from the different sources, the foreign origin of Pushyamitra is completely ruled out, and so also his relation with the later Mauryas. The word Baimbikas is translated as a ‘gallant lover’, and there is nothing to show that it was a proper name. The question of his identity with Bindusāra or with the Baimbikayas of the Kaśyapa gotra does not arise. In fact Patañjali also refers to Baimbakiḥ, but it is associated with the Śuṅga monarch whom Patañjali

16. IHQ. VIII. p. 739.
quotes several times. It is suggested\(^{18}\) that Dhanadeva of the Ayodhyā inscription who is described as a descendant of the Senāpati (senāpatēk Pushyamitrāsa shasṭhēna) was apparently a Śuṅga. The relation between the Śuṅga Senāpati and the Kośala dynasty founded by Mūladeva is thus traced.

There seems to be a general agreement regarding the Brahmanical ancestry of Śuṅgas, despite the doubt created by the Divyāvadāna tradition. A solitary scholar argued,\(^{19}\) though unconvincingly, that the Śuṅgas were Kshatriyas. The Śuṅga-Bhāradvāja gotra figures in a late record\(^{20}\) and that probably rules out the association of the Śuṅgas with the Kaśyapa gotra as proposed by Raychaudhury.

**Dynastic History:** The Purāṇas furnish more or less a uniform list of Śuṅga rulers along with the length of their reign. Slight variations are, however, noticed. Pargiter considered the variant readings in the Purāṇas, and the following table may be presented.

1. Pushyamitra\(^{21}\) — the Commander-in-chief and the uprooter of Brihadratha 36 years
2. Agnimitra\(^{22}\) — 8 years
3. Vasujyeshṭha\(^{23}\) — 7 years
4. Vasumitra\(^{24}\) — the commander of the forces defeating the Yavanas 10 years
5. Andhraka\(^{25}\) — 2 years
6. Pulinda—\(^{26}\) — 3 years
7. Ghosha\(^{27}\) — 3 years
8. Vajramitra\(^{28}\) — 9 years
9. Bhāgavata\(^{29}\) — 32 years
10. Devabhumi\(^{30}\) — 10 years

Total 120 years

---

18. *Comprehensive History of India* (Co. H.I.) p. 96n.
20. E.V. p. 68. It was suggested by Rapson that the association of the Bhāradvāja with the Vithahavya (Vedic Index II. p. 316 from whom the Vithihotras probably derived their name sheds light on the home of the Śuṅgas in the region of Vidisā (CHI. p. 518).
21. *Pushyamitrās tu Senānīr uddhritya vai Brihadratham kārayishyati vai rājyam samāh shasṭhin sad-aiva tu* (Vāyu 99.337—Ananadāśram ed.). The reading of the *Matsya Purāṇa* varies as regards the length of
These kings are to enjoy this earth for full 112 years (satam pūrṇam daśa dvē cha), though some manuscripts of the Bhāgavata and one of Vishnu mention the total duration as only 110 years. This difference of eight to ten years, might partly be due to counting the fraction in individual reign as one full year. The Pauranic evidence may therefore be accepted and a period of 112 years be assigned to this dynasty of ten rulers. The variant readings in the Purāṇas are also interesting in other ways. The absence of Pushyamitra's name in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, that of Agnimitra in Matsya, Sujyesṭha

his reign (kārayishyaḥ vai rājyam skat-triniśati samā nirāpaḥ) and not sixty years as given in the Vāyu Purāṇa.

22. Agnimitraḥ sutas ch=āśtāu bhavishyanti samānripaḥ). This line is noticed only in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas. The former has Pushpamitra instead of Agnimitra.

23. bhavitāpi Vasuṣyeshṭhaḥ sapta varshaṇi vai nripaḥ (Matsya). The Vāyu has tajjyesṭha (cf. Bhāgavata), but it is Sujyesṭha in the Brahmāṇḍa and Viṣṇu Purāṇas.

24. Vasumitraḥ suto bhāvyo varshaṇi pārthi vah. There is no difference in name or in the length of years. The Matsya has vai tataḥ instead of Pārthi vah.

25. tatōdhrakaḥ samedve tu bhavishyati sutas cha vai (Vāyu). The name of this ruler varies according to different Purāṇas-Antaka (Matsya) Bhadraka (Bhāgavata), Ardraṇa (Viṣṇu). The correct name seems to be Andhraka, given in the Vāyu Purāṇa. All the Purāṇas assign him a reign of only two years.

26. bhavishyati samās tasmāt tisra eva Pūrṇakā (Vāyu). In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa the last letter ka in the name is elided. The correct name is also given in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa.'

27. rājā Ghosha sutras ch=āpi varshaṇi bhavitā trayak (Vāyu). Certain manuscripts quoted by Pargiter mention his name differently—Yomejha, Yomekha or Momegha which might be a misreadings for Ghosha mentioned in the Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu Purāṇas (Ghoshavasu).

28. bhavitā Vajramitraḥ tu samā rājā punar bhavaḥ (Matsya). The name is Vikramitra (Vāyu) or Vajramitra (Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu). The length of reign is 9 years (navaḥ) though the word mentioned is bhavaḥ (Matsya) or punaḥ (Vāyu).

29. dvā-trimaṭat tu samābhāgaḥ tato nripaḥ (Matsya). The Vāyu Purāṇa calls the ninth Śunga ruler Bhāgavata (L. 341) which is supported by the Bhāgavata and the Viṣṇu Purāṇas.

30. bhavishyati sutas āsya Devaḥbhūmi samā daśa (Matsya). According to the Vāyu Purāṇa, the name of the last ruler is Kshema-bhūmi. The Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu, name him Devabhūmi.
for Vasujyeshtha in the Brahmana and Vishnu, Andhraka spelt as Antaka in the Matsya, and Bhadraka and Ardraka in the Bhagavata and Vishnu Puranas respectively. The seventh ruler is called by different names—Yomegha, Yomekha or Momekha. His name is, however, missing in the Matsya Purana. The last Sunga rulers—Vajramitra (Vikramamitra, according to the Bhagavata) and Devabhumi (Kshemabhumi according to the Vayu) do not present much difficulty. The identification of some of the later Sunga rulers with those of the Pabosha records or with the Mitra kings of the Panchala group, as proposed by some scholars would be considered later on in this chapter.

The duration of this dynastic rule varies, though slightly, according to the different Puranas.31 The total length of years, counting the individual reigns comes to 120 years, but according to the Vayu and Matsya Puranas it should be only 112 years (satam purnam dasa dve cha). Some manuscripts of the Bhagavata and one of Vishnu confine the duration to only 110 years. This difference of eight years might be due to counting the fractional as one complete year for the individual reigns, with the result that the total length exceeds the actual one. The Pauranic evidence may, therefore, be accepted, and a total period of 112 years be assigned to this family of ten rulers.

Pushyamitra, The Brähmin Senapati, who slew his master, the last Mauryan Emperor Brihadratha, and reigned in his stead, accomplished his objective through a military coup d'état. According to Bana, Pushyamitra availed himself of a grand review of the army, and therein the Mauryan ruler, weak of intellect (prajñadurbalam)32 was rest of his life. This event

31. Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age p. 31.

32. According to D. C. Sircar (JRAS. 1963 p. 19), prajñādurbalam might be more intelligible than prajñā-durbala meaning 'weak in intelligence' i.e., 'a foolish person'. Although it is difficult to determine the nature of the prajñā or promise, it might imply his earlier promise to defend his capital and his people against the foreigners which he failed to keep up. The result was his unpopularity with his subjects, and that was the reason why Pushyamitra so easily disposed of his master. We have another instance also quoted by Bana, where the king paid for his
happened after the last dynasty had ruled for a period of 137 years (*saptā-trimśa ch-chatam pūrṇam*) according to the Purāṇas. Placing Chandragupta Maurya’s accession in c. 322 B.C. we naturally arrive at c. 185-4 B.C. as the date of Pushyamitra’s accession to power. The succession of Pushyamitra, despite the tremendous nature of his deed, might have been the outcome of the general feeling of dissatisfaction against the last Mauryan rulers in general and Brihadratha in particular. Magadha witnessed the Yavana onslaught, bringing in its train misery to the people, and this probably went unchecked, or was feebly resisted. The vast Mauryan empire of Chandragupta and Asoka which included portions of eastern Afghanistan was overrun by the Yavana forces which were knocking at the doors of Pātaliputra. In illustrating the use of the imperfect tense for events of recent occurrence which the author had not witnessed but was capable of witnessing, Patañjali quotes the illustrations of the Yavana forces besieging life by agreeing to make peace with the foreign invader at any cost (Ref. the case of Rāmagupta. *The Classical Age* pp. 17-18).

33. For the date of Chandragupta Maurya’s accession, see Smith (322 B.C. the event coinciding with the end of Macedonian authority *EHI* p. 124), Thomas (321 B.C. *CHI* p. 471); Hultzsch (320 B.C.) which Fleet had earlier proposed (*CII. Vol. I.* p. xxxv), Raychaudhuri (324 B.C. *IC.II* pp. 560ff; *PHAI* 5th ed. p. 295n). According to the late Calcutta Professor, this date accords with the testimony of Greek writers. The Jain tradition suggests 313 B.C. for his accession. (Bhattasali *JRAS* quoting Charpentier (IA 1914 pp. 119-20). This might refer to his acquisition of Avanti (op. cit. p. 295n). It is assumed that Chandragupta carried on his war of independence during the two years 325-323 B.C. that intervened between the death of Philip, and that of Philip’s master, Alexander. Thus Chandragupta’s accession to sovereignty is dated in 323 B.C. (Co. *Hi.* p. 5) Sten Konow quoting Jacobi, placed Chandragupta’s accession in B.C. 312, and that of Pushyamitra in B.C. 204, while the rule of the latter king is stated to have come to an end in B.C. 174 (AO. I. p. 34).

34. Ref. No. 5. For the atrocities of the Yanavas in the Kāli Age, see Pargiter, *Dynasties* p. 56 and note. They are described as *adharmataḥ, kāmato, durācharāḥ* and are condemned for killing women, children and cattle, and slaughtering one another. (*strī-bālā-go-vadhām kṛtvā hatvā ch=alva parasparām*). The evidence from the Purāṇas is one sided, and very probably biased, but the consequences following any foreign invasion are always disastrous for the local population.
ing Sāketa (araṇṇa-Yavanaḥ Sāketam) and Mādhyaṃkā (araṇṇa-Yavano Mādhyaṃkām). In other words, the memory of the Yavana advance in Āryāvarta was fresh in the mind of the Bhāshyakāra even though he had not actually seen the forces advancing. The evidence from the Mahā-bhāshya is suggestive of the failure of the invasion or siege at both the places. Had the Yavanas succeeded in their attempt, the wording would have been ajayat and not araṇṇa.  

The evidence from the Yuga Purāṇa of the Gārgi-Saimhitā is, however, suggestive of the Yavana forces reaching Pātali.putra, having occupied Sāketa, (the country of) Pañchāla, and (the city of) Mathurā, and seizing it (Kusumdhvaja). The remnant of the Mauryan empire lay prostrate before the Yavana forces. It is rather strange that the contemporary source is silent on the siege or occupation of the Mauryan capital by the Greeks. Probably Patañjali was conscious of his limitations, and so he avoided all references to the siege of Pātaliputra.

It appears that the invasion referred to by Patañjali and in the Yuga-Purāṇa of the Gārgi-Saimhitā was the earlier one, which probably took place during the last days of the Mauryan dynasty. The Yavanas came when the political condition in Northern India was insecure for want of a strong power. Disintegration and disunion only smoothened their way for a wide and successful forays in the Gangetic valley. Internal conditions at home, however, offered obvious obstacles to

35. III.2.111. p. 119.5.
36. Compare the example ajayat Gupto Hūnam for the use of the imperfect in Sanskrit given by Vasuṛātta in his vṛtti (gloss.) on Chandragomin's Chandrayākaraṇa (quoted from Dhruva, op. cit. p. 33n 22).

According to some scholars, it was not the Yavanas who conquered Mathurā and Panchala, and together with the Yavanas attacked Sāketa and proceeded to Kusumdhvaja (identified with Pātaliputra (Narain, op. cit. pp. 82-3; 174; R. C. Majumdar. JNSI.XXII.1960 p. 51). The former suggests that there was only one Greek raid upon Sāketa and Magadha, and that took place during the last years of the reign of Pushyamitra about 150 B.C.
permanent annexation. The result was the return to their homeland with the same speed. According to the Yuga-
 Purāṇa, once again, fierce and terrible civil war among their own people, eventually destructive, was the cause of their
 retreat (Madhyadeṣe'pi Yavana na te sthāsyanti durmadāḥ
teshām=anyo'nyā saṁmardi yuddham paramadāruṇam).

The name of the Yavana ruler who proceeded as far as Pātaliputra, and the duration of the Yavana stay have been matters
 of consideration and speculation to a certain extent. According
to Tarn the Greek sources taken together, ascribe the
 conquest of Northern India to three men: Demetrius, Apollo-
dotus and Menander. He suggests that there were two lines
 of advance, one was of Menander's and the other was shared
 by Demetrius and Apollodotus. Demetrius was responsible
 for the conquest of Sind, while Menander's advance to the
 south-east is both from the Greek and the Indian side.

38. op. cit. 11-42-33. Pushyamitra's name also figures in the same
 reference. Subsequent to the destruction of the Yavanas in that civil
 war seven powerful princes in the country with Śākala as capital would
 take up cudgels against Magadha. Warring with Pushyamitra all these
 kings and their followers would perish in battle (Pushyamitraṇa te sarve
 rājānāh kritavigrahāḥ ksayaṁ yāsyanti yuddhena tat=esāṁ āśrito janah)
 Dhruva op. cit. 11 51-52). It is uncertain if this event connected with
 the clash between the Yavana and the Śungas forces be dated in the latter
 part of Pushyamitra's reign, or these were different episodes of several
 Greek rulers under a suzerain. The line following refers to Pushyamitra's
 rule over the land of the Mādras (tadā Mādr=ākhye deśe Pushyamitra
 prāsāsati) 11.83). If all these episodes were connected with one event
 then the military coup d'état in Magadha synchronised with the Yavana
 invasion, and Pushyamitra succeeded in driving the Yavanas from the
 Indo-Gangetic plain and in this enterprise, the civil war at home was
 a contributory factor. The Śunga empire seems to have extended as far
 as the land of the Mādras. This contention appears to be problematic,
 based on evidence of a dubious character.

39. op. cit. p. 141.

40. According to Tarn (op. cit. p. 142) Demetrius himself was
 responsible for the conquest of Sind. It is suggested that Patañjali
 mentions a town Dattamitri among the Sauvīras, founded by Dattamitri,
 who is named in the Mahābhārata as king of the Yavanas and the
 Sauvīras. He is undoubtedly Demetrius. The existence of this Demetrius
 is confirmed by an inscription (No. 18, Nāsik cave inscription). P. C.
 Bagchi suggested that the story of Krimiśa, the Yaksha, as narrated in
 the Divyāvadāna may contain an allusion to Demetrius's conquest in
Apollo dotus, as quoted by Strabo, mentions that the Greeks conquered more of India than the Macedonians (Alexander) had done, and they became masters of the Indians; they overthrew more peoples than Alexander had done, most of all Menander, some himself and some Demetrios. It is further pointed out by Strabo that those who came after Alexander advanced beyond the Hypanis to the Ganges and Palibothra. Thus, the advance of the Greeks from the Greek and the Indian sources, as far as Pataliputra may be assumed as correct, but the absence of coins of Demetrios beyond the Indus might imply that the Greek advance was hardly a conquest in the ordinary sense of the word. It is suggested by some scholars that the Greek kings were condottiere and their conquests raids.

The main question for consideration is: can the credit India (IHQ. XXII. pp. 81ff). The question of Demetrios’s conquest of Sind has, however, been discussed by several scholars. (R. G. Bhandarkar, Collected works Vol. I. pp. 11ff, 176; D. R. Bhandarkar. I.A. 1911. p. 12: The Age of Imperial Unity p. 107; Tarn: op. cit. pp. 142, 257.558; Raychaudhuri, op. cit. p. 382; Narain: op. cit. p. 39) Johnston proposed that there was no proof for the equation of Dattamitra mentioned in the Mahābhārata with Demetrios. (JRAS. 1939 pp. 217ff; 1940 p. 189), and Tarn withdrew his original conclusions. The passage from the Mahābhārata referring to a Yavanâdhipa and Dattamitra is excluded from the Poona edition, though it figures in the Appendix. Vol. I Appendix I text 88 pp. 927-9.

41. XI.xi.1. McCrindle India in classical literature The original passage runs as follows: ‘The Greeks who occasioned its (Bactria’s) revolt became so powerful by means of its fertility and advantages of the country that they became masters of Ariana and India, according to Apollodotus of Artemita. Their chiefs, particularly Menander (if he really crossed the Hypanis to the east and reached Isamus) conquered more nations than Alexander. These conquests were achieved partly by Menander, partly by Demetrios, son of Euthydemos, king of the Bactrians. They got possession not only of Patalene, but of the kingdom of Sarostus, and Sigerdis which constitute the remainder of the coast. (See also Strabo. XV.1.3—McCrindle ibid. p. 7).

42. XV.1.27. McCrindle. op. cit. p. 32.

43. Narain quotes Marshall’s report suggesting that out of 519 coins discovered in the Taxila excavation, there is only one copper coin with the trident bearing the name of Demetrios (Taxila Vol. II p. 798), which probably belongs to the other Demetrios. There are other places in Gandhâra in which numberless coins of Indo-Greek rulers, even of those
for Yavana advance as fas as Pātaliputra be ascribed to Demetrios or to Menander, or to both? The evidence from the Yuga-Purāṇa has to be accepted as a whole, or it be totally rejected on this point. If we accept that the Yavanas besieged Sāketa and Mādhyamikā, as pointed out by Patañjali, and then proceeded as far as Pātaliputra, as noticed in the Yuga-Purāṇa, then we have also to presume that they retreated with the lightning speed with which they had come, because of trouble at home. Patañjali seems to have ignored the sieging of Pātaliputra, but he is very specific at least on the sieging of Sāketa and Mādhyamikā (arunad), and not their conquest (ajayat). It can rightly be suggested that the Greek advance was in two directions—directly towards Ayodhya and then on to Pātaliputa in the south-east, while the second one was towards Chittor, very probably under different commanders. If the advance towards the east was undertaken by Menander and that too in his capacity as king, there was no point in his sudden retreat because his capital was Sākala (Sialkot) nearer to both the places in northern India. Demetrius had his capital at Euthydemia, founded by his father at Sirkap in Taxila, as suggested by Tarn. When the trouble from Eu克拉底斯 brew up, he had reason to return back with speed. The political condition in homeland, the cause of retreat, favours Demetrius’s claim, leaving aside other factors, to lay siege to cities in northern India, as noticed in the classical and Indian sources. Narain presumes that the lines refer to the mutual feud which resulted in a deadly war between the invaders who participated in the attack on Pātaliputra. This might be a weak excuse for the retreat which no body who probably did not rule there, have been found, but none of Demetrius I (Indo-Greeks p. 31).

45. ibid. p. 247. The Saggala of Arrian (V. 22) and Saggala when Ptolemy (VII.1.46) speaks of Sagala and Euthydemia may denote the same locality, and may be identified with the ancient town of Sākala: (Pāli Sāgala) modern Sialkot. It was proposed by Boyer that the town of Euthydemia was founded by Demetrius to commemorate his father’s memory. This suggestion was accepted by scholars (CHI. I p 446), but rejected by Tarn on both historical and textual grounds (op. cit: pp 247-8. 486-7) see also Co.H.I. p 152.
questions. In earlier instances, as for example, in the retreat of Alexander, and also that of Seleukos, we find the political factor and the trouble at home involving the trial of strength, as the cause of their retreat. Demetrius was definitely earlier than Menander. According to Justin, Eucratides carried on several wars with great spirit, and though much reduced his losses in them, yet when he was besieged by Demetrius, king of the Indians with a garrison of only three hundred soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies, a large force of sixty thousand. The passage does not specifically mention Demetrius as son of Euthydemos, the point considerably stressed by Narain, the epithet King of the Indians, is considered as decisive in his identification with the Great Demetrius. It may be suggested that the invasion noticed by Patañjali, resulting in the siege of Sāketa and Mādhyamikā, and that of Pātāliputra according to the Yuga-Purāṇa of the Gārgī-Samhīlā, was undertaken by Demetrius. There was no permanent conquest and the invaders retreated with an equally swift speed. This event seems to have happened during the last days of the Mauryan dynasty under Brihadratha. Pushyamitra Ṣuṅga, the Commander-in-chief, availed of this opportunity, slew his master, and reigned in his stead. He did not assume the title of the Emperor, but he performed the horse sacrifice which had been

46. op. cit. p. 179.
47. According to Plutarch, the battle with Porus depressed the spirits of the Macedonians and made them very unwilling to advance further into India. Moreover, they were afraid of the Gangardae and the Prasii (Raychaudhuri op. cit. p. 261). Both Justin and Plutarch furnish details regarding Seleukos coming to understanding with Chandragupta, the former proceeding to join the war against Antigonos (ibid. p. 272).
48. Xli.6; Narain, op. cit. p. 34.
49. K. P. Jayaswal restored the letters after Yavanāraja in the Hāthīgumphā inscription of Khāravela. He read the letters as Dimita (JBORS.XIII.2 p. 27) identified by him with Demetrius, which was accepted by Banerji (ibid. p. 221), and Sten Konow (AO.I. p. 27). According to Barua, the inscription contains no statement as to the Greek king Dimita-Demetrius, retracing with his troops and transport to abandon Mathurā. Further there is no reference to Yavanarāja, far from mentioning his name—(Old Brāhmi inscriptions p. xii). Tarn conjectures that the decipherment affords no firm ground to the historian (op. cit. p. 459).
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in abeyance to vindicate his sovereignty. According to the Ayodhyā inscription, Pushyamitra is credited with the performance of two horse sacrifices (Kosalādhīpena dviraśvame-dha-yājināḥ senāpateḥ Pushyamitrasya).\textsuperscript{50} Patañjali also mentions sacrifices being performed for Pushyamitra (iha Pushyamitram yājayāmaḥ).\textsuperscript{51} There could not be a more befitting occasion for the performance of this sacrifice than the retreat of the Yavanas and the Senapati's assumption of power in Magadha. The second sacrifice must be the one referred to in the Mālavikāgnimitram of Kālidāsa, which was to commemorate his victory over the Yavanas.

The Vidarbha Affair: The only reference to this incident is afforded by the drama of Kālidāsa,\textsuperscript{52} written about six hundred years later. Its evidentiary value need not be questioned, and the event described by Kālidāsa appears to be natural in sequence. As Pushyamitra had imprisoned a brother-in-law of Yajñasena who was a sachiva of the late Mauryan emperor at Pātaliputra, he, in turn, put in prison Mādhavasena, the rightful heir to the Vidarbha throne. This happened when the latter was crossing the frontier along with his younger sister Mālavikā who was betrothed to Agnimitra, Pushyamitra's son and Viceroy at Vīdissā. The Śunga prince described in this drama as Rājan, took up cudgels against Yajñasena, flouting the condition imposed by the latter for the simultaneous release of his brother-in-law at Pātaliputra.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{50} EI.XX. p. 54.  
\textsuperscript{51} III.2.123 p. 124.4.  
\textsuperscript{52} Keith, Sanskrit Drama pp. 147ff. It is supposed to be the first dramatic work of Kālidāsa (Keith, JRSA. 1909 pp. 433ff; Bloch, ZDMG LXXIII. 671ff; Konow, Indische Drama p. 59ff). Vidarbha corresponding to modern Berar is referred to in this drama as a new kingdom established not long ago (achirādhishthita) and the king is described as not having taken roots in the heart of his subjects (rājyaḥ satru prakritishu arūḍdha-mudatvāḥ) and so his destruction was easy like a tree which is unsteady, because it has only lately planted (nava samārohaṇa śīthilas tarur īva sukaraḥ samuddhātum (Act I.8). The cause of the trouble is given in the letter written by the Vidarbha king who addresses Agnimitra as his royal brother.  
\textsuperscript{53} Maurya sachivam vimuśīcchati yadi pūjyaḥ samyotam mama śyālaṁ moktā Mādhavasesas tato mayā bandhanāt sadyaḥ (Act I.7). This is suggestion of some matrimonial relation between the Mauryas
He exhibited his power and prestige. The Śuṅga army proceeded as far as Varadā (modern Wardā) and Yajñasena submitted. The kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two rival cousins, the river Varadā forming the boundary between the two parts. This naturally extended the influence of the Śuṅgas to the south of the river Narmadā.

**Clash with the Yavanas and the second sacrifice:** The Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadeva and the evidence from the *Mālavikāgnimitra* point to the performance of the horse sacrifice by the Śuṅga monarch which, according to the earlier evidence was the second one. Patañjali in his comment on and the Vidarbha family, or, as supposed by Raychaudhuri, in the Mauryan Court there were two parties or factions, one headed by the king’s Minister, and the other by his general. The minister’s partisan was appointed governor of Vidarbha, while the general’s son, Agnimitra got the vice-royalty of Vidisā when the General organised the *Coup d’ état* by killing the Mauryan emperor and imprisoning the minister Yajñasena declared his independence and entered into hostile relations with the usurping family (PHAI. p. 236ff.)

54. *dvīdka vibhaktam śriyam udahantu
dhuram rathaśvāv īva saṅgrahitum
tau sthāsyatas te nirapatir nideśe
parasparāvagraha nirvikārau* (Act V, 14).

The release of the Mauryan sachiva was not a condition precedent to the truce, but, as we find later in the drama itself, he was released when the good news about the success of Vasumitra, grandson of Pushyamitra was received by his father Agnimitra and a general amnesty was granted (*yajñasenaśyūlam urākṛitya muchyantām (mochyātām) sarve bandhanstha*) (Act V. p. 101).

55. It was suggested by L. D. Barnett that Yajñasena was a feudatory of the Andhras, but it is clear from the drama that there was no aid given to him from any quarter, so either Barnett’s assumption is wrong, or the Andhra ruler was not in a position to come to his feudatory’s aid. According to Rapson (CHI p. 532) Ujjain was lost to the Andhra monarch Sātakamī I. This assumption is based on the coins of Malwa fabric bearing the name Sāta identified by him with Sātakamī whose coins, however, show the full legend *rañō sīrī śādavāhanas* (JNSI.VII. p. 1). The inscription of queen Nāyanikā does not attribute the conquest of Avanṭi to Sātakamī I. The Jain tradition as preserved by Merutunga counts Pushyamitra amongst the rulers of Avanti and assigns him a reign of 30 years in this region. The Jain gāthās mention Bālamita and Bhānumita as successors of Pushyamitra in Avanti. Thus, an Andhra Śuṅga conflict at this stage is ruled out. (Co.HI pp. 97-98).

56. *op. cit.*
Pāṇini III.2.123, while quoting the Vārttika of Kātyāyana which enjoins the use of lāṭ to denote an action or undertaking which has begun but not finished, quotes as an example here we dwell (iha vasāmah), here we perform the sacrifice instituted by Pushyamitra (iha Pushyamitram Yājayāmah). It is not certain if Patañjali refers to the first or the second horse sacrifice in his comment. Kālidāsa’s reference to the performance of the horse sacrifice is in sequence with the victory of the Śuṅga forces over those of the Yavanas. That this event happened in the last years of Pushyamitra’s reign is evident from the fact that the feat was accomplished by Agnimitra’s son Vasumitra. In his letter the aged father pleads for the removal of distrust and anger in the mind of his son, and asks him to join the festivities along with his two queens. This must be the second Yavana invasion, undertaken this time by Menander. Apollodorus actually refers to two such invasions. Since Menander’s coins have been found as far as Yamunā, and he is better known in Indian

57. op. cit.
58. Strabo XI-516.
59. NC. 1872 p. 159; IA.XXXIII. p. 217.
60. According to A. K. Narain, Tarn’s theory about Menander’s conquest of mid-India has no basis to stand upon, and he doubts whether Menander made any conquest in the east beyond the Jhelum. There was only one invasion of the Greeks, of the nature of a raid in course of which they might have reached Pātaliputra, but there was no conquest (The Indo-Greeks pp. 50ff). See also R. C. Majumdar: JNSI. Vol. XXII. p. 51). Scholars have doubted Cunningham’s suggestion that the battle between the Yavana and the Śuṅga forces, as mentioned by Kālidasa, took place on the bank of Kāli Sindhu, a tributary of the Chambal, but on the Indus itself. (See B. S. Upadhaya, JBHU. 1942 p. 171ff), also Majumdar IHQ. I. p. 264). According to Tarn, the territory of Menander extended upto the Sindh, a tributary of the Chambal, and Vasumitra, who was guarding the horse, came to the south bank of the Sindhu and had a brush with some Yavana cavalry who were patrolling the northern bank (Tarn- op. cit. p. 228). One has to consider the available evidence, not in pieces, but as a collective whole. Menander’s status as a ruler at Sāgala is not denied by any scholar, but the location of his capital is a matter of disputation (Narain: Indo Greeks-Appendix III). According to him, Sāgala of the MilindaPanha and Sākala, the town of the Mādra country are not necessarily identical (p. 172), but it should be Udyāna. The western limit of Pushyamitra’s empire is not certain. The Divyāvadāna records the story of his proceeding to the north-west
history than Demetrius, it is quite likely that with his capital at Sāgala, he may have tried to measure strength with the Śuṅga monarch. The sacrifice mentioned by Kālidāsa in his drama definitely appears to be the second one performed by the Śuṅga monarch Pushyamitra after the defeat of the Yavana forces which appear to be under the command of Menander. Pushyamitra had good grounds to patch up differences with his eldest son Agnimitra, for the victory was achieved by his own son, and the invitation to attend the ceremony along with the queens was in consonance with the desire of the aged father to mend matters with his son.

The supposed invasion of King Khāravela: The Hāthī gumpha inscription has baffled historians for a long time. It is supposed to furnish some information on the retreat of the

as far as Sākala (Sialkot) and even beyond and tormenting the Buddhists. The substance of this story is traced in the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa and the campaign of the Śuṅga ruler in the north-west is taken as an historical fact. (IHQ. XXII. ib. 82ff). This story is not devoid of truth according to Tarn (op. cit. p. 177). In the maze of these conjectures, it is difficult to deny the clash between the two ruling powers; and it is more likely that Menander's forces might have come into clash with those of the Śuṅgas near Kālī Sindhu and were defeated, rather than on the bank of the Sindhu in the heart of the Yavana kingdom, where they were naturally expected to be in a more formidable position. That accounts for the absence of any hoard of Menander's coin east of the Jhelum, but the coins were found as far as Yamunā. (NC. 1872 p. 159; IA. XXXIII. 1907 p. 217).

61. K. P. Jayaswal suggested that Pushyamitra performed the second horse sacrifice to vindicate his position after he had suffered humiliation at the hands of Khāravela (JBORS.X. p. 205). According to Ray Chaudhuri, the two horse sacrifices were performed after the victorious wars with Vidarbha and the Yavanas (PHAI. 3rd ed. p. 267). D. R. Bhandarkar presupposed that the first Aśvamedha sacrifice coincided with the besiege of Sāketa and Mādhyamikā, and the second invasion seems to be adverted to in the Yuga-Puṭraṇa of the Gārgi Saṃhitā (IC.I. p. 279). As regards the second one, he pointed out that after the western most part of the Āryāvarta was seized upon and annexed to the Greek kingdom of Menander, when things had settled down, Pushyamitra, despite the loss of a small territory, celebrated the Aśvamedha yajña which appeared to be the same as referred to by Kālidasa in his Mālavikāgni-mitrāṇā. It was suggested by Dr. Majumdar that the performance of horse sacrifice was to establish his claim to the Magadhan throne both as a de facto and a de jure ruler. (IHQ.I. p. 91). Probably this might be with reference to the first one.
Yavanas, but it definitely refers to the defeat of the king of Magadha. Some scholars have worked out the relations between Pushyamitra and this ruler of Kalinga on the basis of the data from this inscription. The first passage—panamtariya sathi vasa sate rājā Muriya kāle vochchine—was construed by Bhagwan Lal Indraji⁶² to mean the eighth year in which Āsoka conquered Kaliṅga and when this era was possibly founded. It corresponds to B.C. 255 and, therefore, the date in the inscription when Khāravela did certain works in the Udaigiri caves in 165 Maurya or B.C. 165=90 B.C. As this is the thirteenth year of Khāravela’s accession, 103 B.C. be taken as the year of his accession. Bühler,⁶³ adopting Indraji’s views regarding the thirteenth year of Khāravela’s reign corresponding to the 165th year of the Mauryan era, beginning with the coronation of Chandragupta between 322-312 B.C., places Khāravela’s accession between 170 and 160 B.C.

According to Fleet,⁶⁴ the passage nowhere refers to any date. Panamtariya could not mean ‘sixty five’. It represents sanskrit Prajñāptarya, and vochchine or vochchimme could not correspond to sanskrit vichchina but is the well-known Jain technical term Vochchinna=Vyavachchinnāni applied to sacred texts which have been cut off, interrupted or neglected. The use of this term prohibits the reference to any date in the record. This contention of Fleet was endorsed by Lüders⁶⁵ and Charpentier,⁶⁶ but Banerji and Jayaswal⁶⁷ supported Bhagwan Lal Indraji with differences in reading. The last two were also supported by Smith,⁶⁸ Dubrevil⁶⁹ and Aiyar⁷⁰ but opposed by Majumdar⁷¹ and R. P. Chanda⁷² on the ground that Khāravela being a Cheta, could not naturally be expected

⁶³. EI. I. p. 88.
⁶⁵. EI. X Appendix p. 160-1. No. 1345.
⁶⁶. IA. 1914. p. 17 on.
⁶⁷. JBORS III p. 425ff and subsequent references.
⁶⁸. JRAS. 1918 p. 543f; 1919 p. 399.
⁷⁰. IA. 1920 p. 43ff.
⁷¹. IA. 1918 p. 223f; 1919 p. 187f.
to have used the Mauryan era, and that palaeographic considerations point to the first half of the first century B.C. as Khāravelas' date. The sculptural piece of evidence, as pointed out by Marshall, belongs to a considerably late period.

The other passage supposed to furnish some date lined which reads as—Paníchame cha dāni Nandarāja-ti-vasa-sata oghāttitam Tamasuliya vatā panādīṁ nagaram ṭayesayati (.) sata(saha)sehi cha (khānā) pa (yati). The expression ti-vasa-sata may mean 163 years or 300 years after Nandarāja king Nanda. According to Jayaswal, it should mean 300 years, and he placed Khāravela and Pushyamitra three centuries after Nandarāja whom he identified with Nandavardhana. Raychaudhuri objected to this identification on the ground that Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana was a Sāśunāga king and the Sāśunāgis do not appear to have done anything in Kalinga. This Nandarāja should be identified with Mahāpadma or one of his son, as the conqueror of Kalinga. Taking ti-vasa-sata to mean 300 years it is easy to conclude that the rise of Khāravela probably synchronises with the fall of the Śungrā dynasty and the consequent weakening of the Magadhan power.

Barua objected to the identification of Nandarāja in view of the conclusive statements from the Aśokan Rock Edict III—which credits the Mauryan ruler as the first amongst the Indian kings after the death of the Buddha to conquer the unconquered land of Kalinga (avijitaḥ vijiniṁ). He suggested two alternatives:—either identify Nandarāja with Aśoka and assign Khāravela’s accession to the second quarter of the 1st century A.D. by interpreting ti-vasa-sata to mean 300 years; or with Sāśunandhi or yaśonandhi who snatched away Vidisā from the Śungrā dominions at the fall of the Śungrā power, and assign Khāravela’s accession in the second quarter

73. Sten Konow also contended that king Khāravela, who was not Maurya, would not date his epigraph in the Mauryan era, the less so because the rule of the Mauryas ceased by that time. (op. cit. p. 17).
74. CHI.I. p. 624f; 638f.
75. JBORS.XIII. p. 253.
77. op. cit. p. 281.
of the 1st century A.D. interpreting *ti-vasa-sata* in the sense of 103 years.

Neither the identification of the ruler, nor the interpretation of the expression mentioned above, either from the time of Mahāpadma Nanda of from the accession of Chandragupta as 300 or 103 years, make the Kalinga hero the contemporary of Pushyamitra Śunga. The identification of Bahasatimitra-Brihaspatimitra with Pushyamitra rests on the flimsiest ground of Brihaspati being the regent of the Nakshatra or zodiacal asterism Pushyā, also called Tishyā in the constellation cancer or the crab. Further, the palaeography of the Hāthigumpha record points to its late character. A number of letters with thick-headed vertical or serif *ka* with the lower part of the vertical prolonged invariable round *ga*; *chha* of the butterfly type with two loops, and *ta* having in most cases rounded lower part, help us in determining the appropriate age of this record. According to R. P. Chanda,78 the Hāthigumpha inscription is later in date not only than Aśoka’s edicts and the Besnager Guruḍa pillar inscriptions, but is posterior to the Bhārhut Toraṇa Inscription and the Nānāghāṭ inscription of the Andhra king Śīri Śātakarni I.

The evidence from the coins rules out the possibility of identifying Bahasatimitra with Pushyamitra. The coins of the latter have not been found, while those of the former are closely connected, according to Allan, with the coins of Agnimitra (Agimita) and Jyesṭhamitra (Jeṭhamitara). He has pointed79 out that Brihaspatimitra (evidently of this group) is mentioned in the Hāthigumnah inscription, while the epigraphy of the Pabhosā inscription agrees very well with that of Brihaspatimitra II’s coins. It appears probable that the person issuing coins was different from the one defeated by Khāravela; and it is certain that the latter cannot be identified with Pushyamitra. This fact is supported from different stand-points. Even the reading ‘Bahasatimitra’ in the record of Khāravela is impossible. The only certain reading is bahu, and it might not be suggestive of a proper name; and so also

78. IHQ.V. p. 599.
is the reading of the preceding words as māgadhiṇī cha rājahana. The equation Pushyā=Brāhaspati is equally ridiculous.

**Pushyamitra’s empire:** The extent of Pushyamitra’s empire is rather uncertain, since the coins of this Śuṅga ruler have not been found. The Ayodhyā inscription and the evidence from the Mālavikāgnimitram suggest that it definitely extended up to Ayodhyā and Vidisā, probably further west as well. It is proposed⁸⁰ that soon after the defeat of Menander’s advance columns on the Indus, he launched a vigorous attack and pushed on to the banks of the Rāvī. According to the text of the Yuga-Purāṇa as amended by Dhruva,⁸¹ Pushyamitra is said to have waged war against the Greek ruler of Śākala for the sake of beautiful women, and he died fighting. It was suggested by Rapson⁸² that Śākala was wrested by Menander perhaps during Pushyamitra’s life time. The Divyāvadāna refers⁸³ to the Brāhmin Śuṅga marching out with a fourfold army destroying stūpas, burning monasteries and killing monks, as far as Śākala, where he announced a reward of one hundred dinars for killing one bhikshu. This evidence, is, however, partial and uncorroborated, there seems little substance in the story of the Śuṅga monarch’s exhuberance for his ancestral faith at the cost of Buddhism, in view of a number of additions to the beautiful railings at Bhārhut done in this period. It may be suggested that the Śuṅga monarch’s empire extended up to east Punjab, abutting on the dominions of his Greek contemporary. In the south it reached as far as Berar though the actual extent might not have been beyond Vidisā.

**Pushyamitra’s Successors:** The Purāṇas attribute to the founder of this dynasty a reign of 36 years,⁸⁴ and it is now

---

⁸⁰. CoHI. p. 98.
⁸¹. JBOŚ XVI pp. 18ff.
⁸². CHI.I. p. 519.
⁸⁴. Pushyamitra, according to the Vāyu and Brāhmaṇḍa Purāṇas is assigned a rule of 60 years. This might include the first period when he was Mauryan Viceroy at Vidisā, and the second one as the de facto and de jure ruler. (Majumdar IHQ.I. p. 91ff). According to Sten Konow, Pushyamitra ruled for 30 years in Malwa, and 6 years in Magadha. (AO.I, Co.H.I. p. 100n).
generally accepted that it ended in 148 B.C., and he was succeeded by Agnimitra. The *Matsya* and *Vāyu Purāṇas* have instead Vasujyeshṭha as his successor. The two lines from these *Purāṇas* furnish some interesting evidence which was taken into consideration by Jayaswal. According to his hypothesis, Pushyamitra divided his empire into sub-kingdoms, as he interpreted *kārayishati vai rājyam*, and his sons ruled jointly (*Pushyamitra-sutas-ch-ashṭau bhavishyanti samā nripāḥ*). It is further implied that Vasujyeshṭha alias Sujyeshṭha was the eldest. The absence of Agnimitra’s name is conspicuous. It can be conjectured that Pushyamitra had two sons—Vasujyeshṭha and Agnimitra, the former as the elder one was staying in the capital at Pātaliputra as the heir apparent, while Agnimitra was the Viceroy at Vidasā. The fraternal jealousy, so common among the princes, might have been the cause of Agnimitra’s anger which the aged father asks his son to shake off in his letter to him in the *Mālavikāgnimitram*. To compose the differences, Agnimitra’s son Vasumitra was appointed commander of the forces.

It appears probable that after Pushyamitra’s death, his sons Vasujyeshṭha and Agnimitra ruled concurrently, the former with his capital at Pātaliputra and the latter at Vidasā. According to the *Vishnu Purāṇa*, Vasumitra was the son of Sujyeshṭha which might be another name of Vasujyestha, also corroborated by *Vāyu Purāṇa* (though in the *Matsya* it is *tathā* and not *suta*). This contradicts the evidence furnished by the drama of Kālidāsa. That would mean that either we identify Agnimitra with Sujyeshṭha-Vasujyeshṭha, disturbing, of course, the chronological list, or accept the reading of the *Matsya Purāṇa*, distinguishing the two. It would be advisable to presume that the two brothers ruled at the same time, and Vasujyeshṭha probably died issueless, so the nephew succeeded his uncle at Pātaliputra. After his

86. Pargiter noticed another form *kārishyati* in a manuscript, (ME. Jmt. op. cit. p. 31n.6) denoting plain future rather than causative. *Samā* stands for ‘years’ and not ‘equal’, and *ashṭha* evidently means ‘eight’ and not eight sons, as proposed by Jayaswal.
father Agnimitra's death, the two wings of the Śuṅga empire were united under one sovereign—Vasumitra. There is no indication of joint rule, as suggested by Jayaswal. He contended that Suganam rahe in the Bhārhut inscription of Dhanabhūti was suggestive of 'the rule of the Śuṅgas', as it was used in the genitive plural. In the absence of any evidence to warrant this suggestion, the expression appears to be very common, referring probably to the empire of the Śuṅgas. Further, there is no ground for associating Dhanabhūti and his record to Pushyamitra and his times.

Nothing is known about Vasujyeshṭha, but about Agnimitra it is suggested by some scholars that he should be identified with the one whose coins bearing the legend Agnimitrasa in Brāhmī characters of the second century B.C. have been found at various places in Pañchāla. It would be dangerous to associate the Śuṅga rulers of the Pauranic lists with any local rulers of Pañchāla or Kauśāmbi for name sake. It was, however, suggested by Ray chaudhuri that several names could not be-

88. It is suggested that the correct form is Sujyeshṭha, and the variant Vasujyeshṭha is due to the confusion between cha and va which are alike in Gupta script (Co.H.I. p. 100 & n.)

89. Cunningham doubted the identity of the Pañchāla ruler with the Śuṅga monarch, and suggested that he probably belonged to a local dynasty of northern Pañchāla, because he alone agrees with the Pauranic lists and not of others. Secondly, the circulation of his coins was confined within the limits of northern Pañchāla. (Coins of Ancient India, p.xcvi). Rivett Carnac (JASB.1880 pp. 21ff), Jayaswal (JBORS.III. pp. 477), and others suggested that, besides Agnimitra a few more could be identified, as for example, Sujyeshṭha or Vasujyeshṭha with Jeṭhamitra; Ghoshamitra, Bhadraghosha, and Bhūmimitra with the Kānva king of that name. Recently T. P. Bhattacharya also made an attempt to correlate the kings bearing the title Mitra whose coins have been found at various places in Northern India, without adding any new evidence (JBORS.XXXV-1947 pp. 47ff). Numismatics, however, are reluctant to attribute these local coins to Agnimitra (Allan, Cat. coins of Ancient India pp. cxx, cxxi).

90. PHAI. 3rd ed. p.267. Names of two Mitra kings—Bhānumitra and Indramitra are recorded on two rail pillars at Bodh-Gaya as well as on coins discovered at Mathurā and Pañchāla. (CHI.1 p. 526). According to Rapson, Brahmamitra was probably a contemporary of king Indramitra of Ahichattra, for both names are noticed on the railing pillars at Bodh-Gaya, assigned on palaeographic grounds to the earliest part of the first century B.C. (ibid).
identified, but they might have been names of those Śuṅgas who survived the usurpation of Vāsudeva Kāṇva and the remnant of whose power destroyed by the Andhra (bhrityas) and Śisunandi. The title of Rājan accorded to Agnimitra might be an honorific one, or by way of courtesy. On the other hand, it is quite likely that Agnimitra was ruling in his personal capacity, probably with a shadow of allegiance to his father. His arrogance and conceit in dealing with the Vidarbha problem without references to Pātaliputra, and the subsequent release of the Mauryan sachiva, the brother-in-law of Yajñasena might be suggestive of the power and position of Agnimitra in the time of his father.

Vasumitra, described as the son of Agnimitra, comes fourth in the list. He is well-known as the hero of the conquest associated with the second horse sacrifice performed by his grand father. His career is shrouded in mystery, except for the reference to the defeat of the Yavanas at his hands on the banks of the Sindhu in the time of his grand father. He ruled for a period of 10 years and was succeeded by Antaka or Bhadraka according to the Matsya and Bhāgavata Purāṇas respectively. The Vishnu Purāṇa calls him Ardraka or Odruka. He is identified by Jayaswal with Udāka of the Pabbosa record.

91. He is identified with Sumitra of Bāṇa. The name also figures in some MSS of the Purāṇas. The majority of Purāṇa MSS and Kālidāsa have the name Vasumitra. It is taken as a scribal error (Co. H.I. p. 100n). According to Bāṇa this ruler gave himself up to life of ease and pleasure, fond of music and dancing he was killed while enjoying a concert (atidayita-lāsyasya cha śailusū-badhyā madhyāsya mūrdhānam asilatayā mṛṇālantiva alunad—Agnimitrātmajasya sumitrasya Mūladevah.) One MSS from Kashmir gives the name of the assassin as Mitradeva which is taken as a scribal substitute on the analogy of expressions like Gauḍādhira or Magadhârtha, meaning the Mitra=Śuṅga king. This Mūladeva is considered by Jagannath as a predecessor of Dhanadeva of the Ayodhya inscription (Co. H.I. p. 100 n.5).

92. Jayaswal identified (JBORS III p. 474) Ardraka or Ordāka with Udāka mentioned in a Pabhosā inscription (EI II p. 243). The reference to Udāka is made in the other inscription of Ashādhasena (EI II p. 242 n. 1), who caused a cave to be dug in the tenth year of a ruler whose name is not very clear, but is presumed to be Udāka). According to Führer, all letters are doubtful, and if we take the second inscription into consideration, it is Bahasatimitra, who was ruling at Kausāmbī close to the place
a suggestion endorsed by Rapson which lacks plausibility. On the other hand, it is proposed that Andhraka, Pulindaka and Ghosha do not appear to belong to the Śuṅga family, but had crept into the Pauranic text on account of some confusion, and the exclusion of their total reigns of eight years would bring down the total length of the Śuṅga dynasty to 112 years. The first two—Andhraka and Pulindaka—might have been associated with the unrecorded Andhra raid over Pātaliputra and its temporary occupation, while Ghosha might have been from Pañchāla. All the three took advantage of the weakening political situation and the turmoil following the murder of Sumitra identified with Vasumitra.

Vajramitra is suggested to have immediately succeeded Sumitra or Vasumitra, with an unimpressive and uneventful reign of nine years. He was succeeded by Bhāgavata. Two inscriptions, associated with him, or of his time, have been found at Vidiśā. The first one dated in the twelfth year of King Bhāgavata and recorded on a fragment of a stone pillar mentions the setting up of a flag staff in honour of the god Vishnu by one Gautamiputra. The second one from Bes Nagar, about two miles from Bhilsa (Vidiśā) is dated in the fourteenth year of king Bhāgavadra. Bhāgavata—Bhāgavadra of the two records appear to be identical with the ninth Śuṅga ruler Bhāgavata. The second record is important for shedding light on diplomatic relations between the Śuṅga monarch at Vidiśā and the Indo-Greek ruler at Taxila. This Śuṅga ruler had a long reign of 32 years, followed by the last king Devabhūti of this dynasty. Bāna refers to the weakness of this person for women. He

where the cave was excavated. Jayaswal’s identification of this ruler with the fifth Śuṅga monarch is not probable.

93. Barua proposed that Udāka might be a place-name (IHQ. 1930. p. 23). He does not bear any honorific like mahārājādhirāja.

94. Co. HI. p. 161.—It is suggested by Jagannāth that by excluding these three names and their reigns covering 8 years, the total length comes to 112 years. (Śatam-pūrṇaṁ daśa āśe). We have endorsed Pargiter’s views that the partial years are counted as full years, hence the discrepancy.

95. ASIAR—1913-14, p. 190; CHI. pp. 521-2.

lost his life at the hands of the daughter of his female attendant disguised as a queen. The person instrumental in his murder was his own minister Vāsudeva, who ascended the throne and founded a new dynasty of the Kāñvas. According to the Purāṇas\(^7\), the Kāñvas along with whatever was left of the Śuṅga power, (Śuṅgānām chāpi yachchishtam kshapayitvā balam cha), were destroyed by the Andhras. This is suggestive of the rule of the Śuṅgas even after the loss of their hold over Magadha. Details in this connection are, however, wanting.\(^8\)

Thus, ended the Brahmin Śuṅga dynasty after a rule of 112 years sometime in 72-73 B.C.\(^9\) The end was as sudden as that of the dynasty which preceded it, and in more or less similar circumstances. The last rulers of both met their ends at the hands, or at the instigation, of their officers. Weakness whether in handling political situation as a result of foreign invasion, or with women proved very expensive for them. The Brahmin mind worked and succeeded in arranging the coup d'etat in both the instances, while details are recorded by the court poet several centuries later. The Purāṇas, however, hint at the change of the dynasties and their history.

Kāñvas: The Kāñvas, also known as Śuṅgabhṛtyas, are mentioned in the Purāṇas,\(^100\) as the successors of the Śuṅgas. The minister Vāsudeva forcibly overthrew the dissolute Devabhūti, and became the king among the Śuṅgas (Śuṅgeshubhavītā nripaḥ). This dynasty consisted of four rulers—besides the founder who ruled for nine years, his son Bhūmimitra who is assigned fourteen years, and the last two kings Nārāyaṇa and Śuśarman ruling for 12 and 10 years respectively. These

97. The Devabhūti of Bāṇa and Devabhūmi of the Purāṇas are identical. The latter mention the end of the last ruler of this dynasty in similar circumstances. Amātyo Vāsudevas tu bālyād vyaśanāṁ nripam Devabhūmim tathotpātya Śuṅgeshu bhavītā nripaḥ.

98. According to Raychaudhuri, the Andhrabhṛtyas or Sītavāhanas who swept away the remains of the Śuṅga power, probably appointed Śiśunandi to govern the Vīdīśa region (PHAI. pp. 395-6, 5th ed.)

99. The end of this dynasty is placed in 75 B.C. (The Age of Imperial Unity, p. 98) & Smith, c73 B.C. (E.H.I p 215) (cf COHI. p. 102).

100. Like the Śuṅgas, the Kāṇvāyaṇas were also Brahmins, tracing their origin to the Vedic Kāṇva (Vedic Index I. p. 147). For references to the Kāṇvas in the Purāṇas—See (Amt. 272; 32-37; Vayu, 9); Pargiter— Dynasties of the Kal Age p. 33.
remembered as Śuṅgabhṛtyakānvāyaṇa kings are apportioned a total period of 49 years. It is further mentioned that they would have the neighbouring kings in subjection, and rule righteously. (ete praṇata sāmanta bhavishyā dhārmikāścha ye). The extent of the Kāṇva kingdom appears to be much less than that of their predecessor with the Indo-Greeks in the north-west including the Punjab, the States of Pañchāla, Mathurā, Kauśāmbī and Vidiśā in Āryāvarta, and an independent and strong Kaliṅga. The Andhras in the south are described as the successors of the Kāṇvas. Some scholars have tried to link the Kāṇva rulers for name-sake with rulers of Pañchāla and other places whose coins have been found, as for example Bhūmitra, the son of Vāsudeva, with the one whose coins bearing the legend Bhūmitra have been found at several places in Pañchāla,¹⁰¹ and Nārāyaṇa with Vishṇumitra,¹⁰² and Suśarman with the founder of the Parivrājaka dynasty.¹⁰³ The suggestions are least plausible.

*Dynasties of the Gangetic Plain:* With the decline of the Śuṅgas, disintegrating forces seem to have been gained momentum, resulting in the establishment of independent kingdoms, or the assumption of independence by those owing allegiance to the Śuṅga house at Pātaliputra. Coins bring out a uniform set of rulers at Kośala, Pañchāla, Kauśāmbī and Mathurā which appear to be of the period from the first century B.C. to the first century A.D. These coins also bear legends—suggesting the names of the rulers in those regions. Since these are punch-marked, the symbols punched on them vary from region to region, indicative of their independent existence. If these had been issued under the Śuṅgas, one is bound to trace uniform symbols. The conclusion is that these kingdoms were independent of each other, and were immune from any control from Pātaliputra. Their history centres round a few personalities in each case and we might consider these individually.

¹⁰³. ABORI. XIX. p. 83. The chronological gap between the two being too wide, the possibility of their identification is ruled out.
Kośala: The famous Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadeva traces the relation of this ruler with Pushyamitra, (Senāpateḥ Pushyamitrasya śashṭhena) which has been construed to mean sixth in descent from Pushyamitra. The inscription records the building of a sepulchral monument by him in honour of his father king Phalgudeva. It has been suggested on the basis of the evidence from the Haršacarita of Bāṇa, that Mūladeva (Mitradēva) murdered the Śuṅga monarch Sumitra (Vasu- mitra), and since his coins have been found at Ayodhyā, he seems to have declared himself independent of the Śuṅgas. The coins of Mūladeva along with those of his successors form a uniform set with a bull or elephant on the obverse and five or six characteristic symbols. Besides Mūladeva, others whose coins have been found include Vāyudeva, Viśākhadeva and Dhanadeva. The last one is identified with Kauśikīputra Dhana (rest of the name is lost) of the Ayodhyā inscription. He seems to be connected with the Kauśikīputra king Indrāgni-mitra of the Bodh-Gaya Inscription as an elder or a younger brother, and Śivadatta whose coins have been found in Kośala, probably belonged to the house of Mathurā. The next class of coins found there are those of Satyamitra, Āryamitra, Saṅgha-mitra, Vijayamitra, Devavarman and Ajavarman. They had no link with the previous dynasty but they seem to have preceded the Kushāṇa hold over this region, as is evident from the Sahet-Mahet inscription of Kanishka.

Pañchāla: The existence of a Mitra dynasty at Pañchāla is evident from a uniform series of coins found, according to Cunningham, at Ahichchatra, Aonla and Budaon, with their circulation confined only to north Pañchāla. He assigned these

104. op. cit.
105. op. cit. Parab’s ed. p. 199; Cowell & Thomas (Trans.) p. 192.
108. The Bodh-Gayā inscription only records the donation of the Queen of Indrāgni-mitra at the sacred centre. It is not suggestive of his rule in that region although Barua proposed the contrary view (IHQ. 1930, p. 13).
109. EI.VIII. p. 180ff. According to Allan, the reigns of these rulers probably covered the first two centuries A.D.
110. Coins of Ancient India, p. 75.
coins to a local dynasty, since these were rarely found beyond the limits mentioned earlier. While considering the identity of these Pañchāla rulers with the Śuṅgas, he pointed out that the assignment is uncertain, as only one of the coin-names Agnimitra is found in the Pauranic list of the Śuṅgas. This view was not accepted by some scholars who tried to identify several coin-names, besides that of Agnimitra, and Mitra coins were also found at Ayodhya and at Mathurā. According to Rapson, the coins under this heading have usually been attributed to the Śuṅga or Mitra dynasty. He pointed out that the formation of the names which generally end in mitra is similar in either case; and the Śuṅga period inferred from the Purāṇas B.C. 176-66 is that of the style and epigraphy of the coins. He noticed some connection between these coins and the Mitra coins found at Ayodhya.

K. P. Jayaswal and following him several others identified the Pañchāla rulers with the Śuṅga Kāṇva kings. Without going into the merit of Jayaswal’s identification, it may be pointed out that the list of rulers indentified is neither complete from the Pauranic side, nor does it bring out the names of all the Pañchāla rulers. Originally 13 in the list, Brihaspatimitra, Varuṇamitra, Prajașpatimitra and Vanga-pāla are later additions. Agnimitra’s name also appears in the list of rulers whose coins have been found at Kauśāmbī. But the usual three symbols on the obverse of the Pañchāla type are not noticed on the Kauśāmbī coins of this ruler. Are we then to presume that Agnimitra issued two types of

111. Rivett-Carnac—JASB. 1880 pp. 21-23; Jayaswal—JBORS.III (1917) pp. 476ff; Raychaudhuri—PHAI.1923. pp. 211ff; Louis de la Vallé Poussin: L’Inde aux Temps des Mauryas pp. 175-76; See IHQ. VIII. p. 549ff, for all previous references. T. P. Bhattacharya also made an attempt to co-relate the kings bearing the title—Mitra, whose coins have been found in various places of Northern India. He did not adduce any new piece of evidence and the reshuffling of the data could not advance our knowledge on this point. (JBORS.-XXXV-(1949) pp. 47ff.).

113. op. cit. p. 479.
114. JNSI. III. p. 79.
115. ibid.
116. ibid. IV. p. 18.
coins—one for Pañchāla, and another for Kauśāmbī; and curiously not a single coin of this ruler was found at Vidisā, the Provincial seat, or at Pātaliputra, the capital of the Śuṅgas? We might, therefore, agree with Cunningham, whose views were endorsed by Allan, that Pañchāla rulers formed a separate local dynasty, as is evident from a uniform type of symbols found on the coins of all the rulers in this group.

The history of this dynasty is obscure, but its relations with the other families could be traced. It is proposed\textsuperscript{118} that Sonakāyaniputra Vaṅgapāla and his father Tevaniputra Bhāgavata who are both styled kings in the Pabhosa inscription, may have been from Pañchāla, with the former probably as a provincial governor under the Śuṅgas, and he became independent with the decline of the Śuṅga empire. The importance of Pañchāla can be evinced from Patañjali's\textsuperscript{110} reference to its division into two—north and east, with Ahichchatra as the capital of the former. Are we then to presume that the Pañchāla dynasty existed even during the period of the Śuṅgas and continued after their decline? It might have been subservient to Pātaliputra enjoying local autonomy with power to issue coins, but one is not certain for want of evidence.

Kauśāmbī: The kings of Kauśāmbī form a separate group, as is evident from the coins found there, the two Pabhosa records, and the Mora tablet inscription. The characteristic symbols on Kauśāmbī coins are a bull and a tree in railing. Coins bearing the names of the rulers, include those of Brihaspatimitra I, Parvata, Aśvaghoṣha, Brihaspatimitra II, Dhanadeva, Agnimitra and Jeṭhamitra.\textsuperscript{120} As

\textsuperscript{118} CoHI. p. 106.

\textsuperscript{119} I.1.11. etc. I-2-51 etc. According to B.C. Law, the Pañchālas were definitely feudatories to the Śuṅgas. (Memoir ASI. No. 67 p. 9). Patañjali knew of eastern and northern Pañchāla hence it cannot be concluded that during the reign of Agnimitra, the state was, as of old, divided into two parts, each ruled over by a separate ruler (ibid. p. 27). The finding of a coin belonging to Vasusena, identified with Vasumitra, grandson of Pushyamitra, is supposed to point to the suzerainty of the Śuṅgas over northern Pañchāla (JNSI.II. p. 16).

\textsuperscript{120} Allan. \textit{op. cit.} pp. 148ff. The earlier coins of round cast pieces of purely Indian type free from any foreign influence have also been
regards Brihaspatimitra, his identity with Pushyamitra is out of question. An inscribed brick was found at Mora,\textsuperscript{121} seven miles west of Mathurā. It is likely that the two might be identical, thus pointing to matrimonial relations between the royal families of Kauśāmbī and Mathurā. The Pabhosa inscription\textsuperscript{122} mentions another Bahasatimitra whose maternal uncle excavated a cave. This ruler must be Bahaspatimitra or Brihaspatimitra II. The palaeography of the two inscriptions shows some difference.\textsuperscript{123} This, however, points to matrimonial relation between Kauśāmbī and Ahichchatra. Rapson suggested\textsuperscript{124} that king Brihaspatimitra II of Kauśāmbī was presumably a feudatory of the Śuṅga emperor Udāka mentioned in the Pabhosa record, but a feudatory could hardly be expected to issue coins. In the absence of any honorific title, Barua proposed\textsuperscript{125} that it was just a place name. Another point worth consideration is with regard to the identification of Brihaspatimitra of the Kauśāmbī coins with Bahasatimitra of

found, but in the absence of any legend their historical importance is nil. The characteristic symbols of Kauśāmbī coins, common throughout the series, are a bull and a tree in railing.

121. JRAS.1912. p. 120. \textit{Jñaputāye rājabhāryāye Brihasvatimitra (dhi) tu yasa mātāye kāritam.}

122. EI. II. p. 243.

123. The palaeography of the two records shows some difference, which is rather natural, for the Pabhosa record mentions dedication by the uncle, and the Mora one by the daughter, thus pointing to the posterior character of the latter. The palaeographic study, as pointed out by Allan (op. cit. xcvi), shows just the reverse; and one rightly draws the conclusion that the two Brihaspatimitras are not identical. It is further observed that the Brihaspatimitra of the inscribed coin, who may probably be placed in the first century B.C., is different from the one who issued the struck coins (Nos. 16-25 of Allan’s Catalogue) which are fairly common. Apart from the striking differences in the fabric and type, the letters show signs of early character, as for example, the form of \(m\), \(s\) and \(k\). Fixing the chronology on the basis of style and palaeography, Allan places Aśvaghosha (No. 17) and Parvata (Nos. 16-16a) as the earliest rulers of Kauśāmbī. The coins of Brihaspatimitra II, Agnimitra and Yeshṭhamitra form the next group, and are closely related. They may be dated from the end of the second to the first century B.C. Dhanadeva’s coins represent the last stage in the Kauśāmbī group, and he may be placed in the first century A.D.

124. CHI p. 525.

125. IHQ. 1930 p. 23.
the Hāthigumpha inscription, who was defeated by king Khāravela of Kaliṅga. The reading of the inscription on this point is rather doubtful. According to Allan,\textsuperscript{126} the word in question 'bahu (s...) idita' is very probably not a proper name, for the suggested reading of the preceding words as Magadha cha rājānam is extremely improbable philologically as well as palaeographically. The Kauśāmbī ruler belonged to a local dynasty and his realm did not extend to Magadha. So Bahasatimitra or Brihaspatimitra cannot be identified with the one supposed to be mentioned in the Hāthigumpha record.

Coins bearing the names of a few other rulers from Kauśāmbī include those of Jyeshthamitra, Praushṭamitra, Varuṇamitra and Pushpaśri; Āsvaghosha and Pavata or Parvata. Varuṇamitra could be identified with the name-sake of a Kauśāmbī inscription of his son whose name is lost,\textsuperscript{127} while Āsvaghosha's name figures in a short inscription on the piece of Āśokan pillar.\textsuperscript{128} If the two could be identified then Sārnāth formed part of the kingdom of Kauśāmbī. The dates of these rulers are uncertain. They may have belonged to the post Śuṅga-Kāṇva period, when there was no strong centralised power in Northern India.

Mathurā: The classification of Mathurā coins have brought to light two dynasties, namely Hindu rulers whose period probably varied from the end of the third to the middle of the first century B.C., and the Śaka rulers who succeeded the former Hindu kings, and bore the title Kṣatrapa or Mahākṣatrapa. The Hindu kings are, however, distinguished from those with endings in mitra, or in datta. The former category of kings included\textsuperscript{129} Brahmamitra, Dridhamitra, Sūryamitra, Vishnumitra and Gomitra. It is, thus, given the name 'Mitra' dynasty. Details about these rulers are wanting, but they had matrimonial relations with the other

\textsuperscript{126} op. cit. p. xviii.
\textsuperscript{127} (This Varunamitra of the coins is considered to be identical with Gotiputra Varuṇamitra of the Kauśāmbī inscription of his son whose name is lost). Ghosh. IC. I. p. 694-5.
\textsuperscript{128} EI. VIII. pp. 171-72; For coins of Āsvaghosha, see JNSI.VII. p. 14; JBO. XX. p. cx.
\textsuperscript{129} Allan: op. cit. p. cx.
powers. Yaśomati, the daughter of king Brahupatimitra of Kauśambī had married a king of Mathurā. The second dynasty consists of the following kings: Purushadatta, Uttamadatta, Rāmadatta, Śeshadatta and Bhavadatta. Nothing is known about them as well. It is presumed by Rapson that the Mathurā rulers were also feudatories of the Śuṅgas, a view also endorsed by Allan. Their dependent status is, however, warranted by the minting of their coinage. They ruled at a time when the Śuṅga power had vanished.

The Saka Kshatrapa series include two groups of rulers—the first one consisting of Kshatrapa Śivaghosha, Śivadatta, Hagāmasha, and Hagāna, and the second one includes the Mahākshatrapa, Rājuvula (Rājula) and his son Šoçāsa with the same title whose several inscriptions have been found. Mathurā was conquered by the Sakas about 75 B.C. and remained under foreign rule for more than a couple of centuries. According to Allan, the coins of Hindu kings of

130. Jayaswal described some of them as Nāgas, with little evidence to support his contention (History of India (AD 150-350) p. 12-13.
131. CHI. pp. 525-6.
132. op. cit. p. cxiii.
133. Cf. the Mathurā Lion Capital (CII II(i) pp. 30ff. the Amohini tablet (EI II p. 199. no. 2); and the Jail mound inscriptions (ASR III p. 30). The Morā well inscription (Lüder’s Mathurā Inscriptions No. 113 p. 154) clearly prove that Šoçāsa was the son of Rājuvula—only the title, however, figures in the record. His name is mutilated. This is also confirmed by their coins. Those of Rājuvula have been found in the region from the Sultanpur district upto Nur mahal in the Jullundhar doab, and from Padhan between Etah and Shikohabad, and Sāṅkisā in the Farrukhabad district of the Uttar Pradesh. (Allan—Op. cit. p. CXV). According to Marshall, stratification of finds at Taxila suggest that this ruler belonged to the beginning of the Christian era (ASI. An. Rep. 1914-15 p. 27).

134. Tarn has referred to the suzerainty of Menander over Mathurā (op. cit. pp. 227, 229), very probably on the discovery of Menander’s coins in mint condition from that place. This piece of evidence does not warrant his assertion. The Saka conquest of Mathurā may be dated in the last quarter of the first century A.D. (Co.H.I. p. 108). Patañjali refers to the Sakas and Yavanas living in Aryan settlements, though outside Āryāvarta. D. R. Bhandarkar proposed (IC-I. p. 275) that the Sakas, like the Yavanas, had established their power, if not in Āryāvarta proper, then certainly in North-West India by that time.
135. op. cit. cxvi.
Mathurā cover the period from the beginning of the second to the middle of the first century B.C. The first group of Śaka Kshatrapas consisting of Sivadatta and Hagāmasha may be placed about 60-40 B.C. Some of them might be contemporaries at Mathurā, while Rājuvula ruled further north. He may be put in between the period 40-20 B.C. and Śoḍāsa in B.C. 20-10 or a little later.

Punjab: It has been suggested that Punjab was included in the empire of Pushyamitra Śuṅga but was lost to the Greeks under his successors. This is based on the account in the Divyāvadāna, and the identification of the Sindhu in the Mālavikāgnimitram with the great Indus seems to confirm it. It cannot, however, be denied that Menander's occupation of Sākala or Sialkot was a great challenge to the Śuṅga rule in the Punjab, and this event may have happened any time in the last days of Pushyamitra, or in the time of his successors. The line of Euthydemos in east Punjab, and that of Eucretides in the west figure prominently in the political history of northern India during the first two centuries before the Christian era. It has been presumed by Tarn, that Menander was governor or Viceroy for Demetrius of all the conquests south-eastward of the river Jhelum, and he assumed the title of king himself probably after the death of his overlord. The death of Demetrius and Apollodotus, and the return of Eucretides to Bactria, left him complete master of the position in India. The matrimonial alliance between him and Agathocleia, who later on acted as the regent of their son Strato I, confirmed Menander's claim to the throne.

136. Pushyamitra's attempt to destroy the famous monastery at Kukkuṭāgrāma at Pātaliputra being foiled by divine roar, he marched at the head of a strong army on a mission of destroying stūpas and monasteries and killing Buddhist monks. At Sākala he is said to have announced a reward of one hundred dinaras for killing one monk. The general persecution of the Buddhists seems to be ruled out in view of the setting up of Buddhist monuments at Bhārhut and Sanchi. It is likely that Pushyamitra's patronage of the Brāhmīns, and the revival of Brahmanical sacrifices might have alienated the sympathies and goodwill of the Buddhists. The extension of the Śuṅga arms as far as Punjab may be acceptable, although the occupation of the land of five rivers might have been a temporary phase. (For reference see No. 60).

137. op. cit. p. 167.
According to Przyluski,\textsuperscript{138} Menander’s empire extended from Mathurā in the east to Barygaza (Broach) in the south-west. This claim seems to have been based on the finds of coins and may not be acceptable in full, but it cannot be denied that this Indo-Greek ruler had carved out a substantial kingdom in north-west India. The names of his successors can be enumerated, since their coins have been found, namely Agathoclia, the mother and regent ruling on behalf of Strato I, the latter as an independent ruler, and later on ruling conjointly with his grandson Strato II whose date is fixed by Tarn in 100 B.C.\textsuperscript{139} The encroachments of the other Indo-Greek house to the west made Menander’s successors uncomfortable. Coins of Agathoclia and Strato, and others of Strato alone, and sometimes found restruck with the type of Heliodcles\textsuperscript{140} bearing the reverse type ‘victory’ suggest that the former gave way to the latter.

Eucratides, the hero of the other house, is supposed to have deposed Demetrius in 175 B.C., invaded the countries to the south of the Hindukush, and wrested from Demetrius and the princes of his house their dominions in the Kabul valley in Ariana (Arachosia and Aria) and in North-West India sometime before 162 B.C.\textsuperscript{141} Deprived of his possessions in Ariana by Mittradates I, he was slain shortly afterwards by his son Heliodcles in c.155 B.C. The history of this house can also be traced in coins. Its members ceased to rule in Bactria and they had to be satisfied with their Indian possessions only. Antialkidias of this family, whose name appears in the Besnagar record,\textsuperscript{142} established relations with the Śuṅga king at Vidiśā by sending his ambassador Heliodorus. This inscription is helpful in fixing the probable date of this Greek

\footnotesize{138. L’\textit{Legende de Emperor Aśoka} p. 167.  
139. op. cit. p. 226.  
141. This date has been fixed by Tarn. According to him, in about seven years Eucratides had disposed of at least four Euthydemid kings. It must have looked as though he would exterminate the race altogether, which may have been his intention; to him they were just rebels. (op. cit. p. 216).  
142. Luder’s List No. 669.}
ruler of Taxila. Evidence from the coins is suggestive of the Yavanas paving the way for the Sakas after the reign of Archebius.\textsuperscript{143} The Taxila copper plate inscription\textsuperscript{144} refers to the conquest of the city by the Saka king Maues who was reigning there in the year 78, probably of the era of 58-7 B.C.\textsuperscript{145} The Saka conquest dealt a blow to the rule of the Greeks.

Some of the Tribes: Among the tribes of political importance in that period whose coins have also been found, may be mentioned the Yaudheyas, the Ārjunāyanas, the Audumbaras, the Kuṇindas and the Agastyas. Some of these are also mentioned by Patañjali. The Yaudheyas were the most important one with their country between the Sutlej and the Yamunā. They are mentioned by Pānini, and along with the Trigartas\textsuperscript{146} (according to Scholiast) are referred to as forming an ‘Āyuddha jīvī Saṅgha’ or a tribal republican organization depending mainly on arms. Unfortunately, Patañjali does not mention them. The finds of the Yaudheya coins from various sites\textsuperscript{147} could suggest the extent of their territory, while the reference to their defeat at the hands of Rudradāman,\textsuperscript{148} evidently point to their existence as a political power in the second century A.D. According to Allan,\textsuperscript{149}

143. CHI p. 559.
144. CII. II(i) pp. 23ff.
145. The question of the old era in which most of the Pre-Kushāna Kharoshthi records are dated, received the attention of several scholars. Sten Konow worked it out on the basis of intercalary months mentioned in some records, and kept on changing his views on this point (See JIH-XII-1933 p. 25; C.I.I. II(1) p. lxxv. and in Vogel’s Volume. Lohuizen-de-Leeuw noting the changes in Konow’s views (The Scythian period pp. 18ff), however, suggested 136 B.C. For other views on this point, see Comprehensive History of India, pp. 195-96).
146. IV.I.178. The two are also mentioned together in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā XXXII.7) and the Brihatsamhitā (XIV.25; XVI.20).
147. According to Cunningham, the coins were found all over the country (i.e. the Punjab) as far as Delhi and Ludhiana, (ASR.XIV. p. 140). Two large finds were made between Delhi and Karnal (Coins of Ancient India p. 76). They were also found plentifully in the country to the westward of the Jumna, (ASR. II. p. 14), in Depalpur, Satgarha, Ajudhan, Kahrar, and Multan, and to the eastward in Bhatner, Athor, Sirsa, Hansi, Panipat and Sonepat (AGI p. 245).
148. EI.VIII pp. 36ff.
149. op. cit. p. ciii.
the coins of the Yaudheyas fall into three periods—classes 1, 2 and 5 of the second and first centuries B.C. indicate a period of independence from the fall of the Mauryas to the coming of the Kushāṇas to power.

The Ārjunāyanas are placed according to the Brihatsamhitā along with the Yaudheyas in the Northern division of India. They are not mentioned by Pāṇini or Patañjali. Their existence is also confirmed by the coins bearing the name Ārjunāyana known in several varieties. The legend Ārjunāyanānāṁjaya—‘victory of the Ārjunāyānas’ is similar to the one on the coins of the Yaudheyas. The palaeography of the coin legends suggests a date about 100 B.C. The land of the Ārjunāyanas probably lay within the triangle Delhi-Jaipur-Agra.

Audumbaras: The Audumbaras issued several types of coins, the earliest ones were found in large number at Imphal in the Kangra district of the Punjab. They are free from foreign influence. The names of four kings occur on these pieces—Śivadāsa, Rudradāsa, Mahādeva and Dhanaghosha. Mahādeva occurs also as a regal title on these coins. A silver coin with the additional title, Bhāgavata suggests the existence of Mahādeva as a ruler rather than a title. The Epigraphy of the letters points to the first century B.C. as their period. A rare coin of Dhanaghosha is modelled on the Graeco-Indian hemidrachm, and may be dated in the middle of the first century B.C. Other coins, probably also of the Audumbaras inscribed in Brāhmī and Kharoshṭhī reveal the names of some kings ending in mitra. These are Āryamitra (Ajamita), Mahīmitra, Bhānumitra, and Mahābhūtimitra. From the find spots of their coins, the Audumbaras are located in the area formed by the eastern part of modern Kangra, Gurdaspur and Hoshiarpur districts between the upper Sutlej and Ravi.

Kuṇindas: The coins of the Kuṇindas fall into two main groups, one issued about the end of the first century B.C.,

150. XIV.25; IA.XXXII. p. 173.
151. Allan. op. cit. pp. lxxxiii ff.
152. Ibid.
and the other about three centuries later.\footnote{154} The former bears the name of Amoghabhūti while the latter one is anonymous with the title of Śiva only. It is suggested\footnote{155} that Amoghabhūti was an Indian chief who founded a short-lived kingdom at the close of the period of Greek dominion in the Punjab in the last half of the first century A.D., which was swept away by the Sakas. According to Cunningham,\footnote{156} the Kuṇinda coins were found mainly between Ambala and Saharanpur. They probably occupied a narrow strip of land at the foot of the Sivalik hills between the Yamuna and the Sutlej and the territory between the upper courses of the Beas and Sutlej.\footnote{157}

There might have been a few more minor states like that of the Agastyas\footnote{158} adjacent to the Yaudheya republic of Rohtak and situated to the west of it. The name of the ruling tribe as given on the coins is Agacha (Skt Agastya). Disintegration of the Śunga empire facilitated the emergence of small powers, scattered here and there, as independent kingdoms.

The Andhras: According to the Purāṇas, after the Śungabhṛityakāṇvāyana, the earth was to pass on to the Andhras.\footnote{159} The Andhra Simukha with his fellow tribesmen, the servants of Suṣarman, will assail the Kāṇvāyana and destroy the remains of the Śunga power, and obtain this earth. The Andhras, also known as Śatavāhanas\footnote{160} in records, endured

\footnote{154} Allan: op. cit. p. cl.
\footnote{155} ibid. p. clI. K. P. Jayaswal supposed it to be an official title, taking the coins to be anonymous. (Hindu Polity p. 82n). This is not acceptable since the word for king occurs not once but twice in it. (Allan: ibid).
\footnote{156} CAI. p. 71.
\footnote{157} Allan. op. cit. ciI.
\footnote{158} Co.Ś.H.I. p. 111 (CCAI. p. civii; Barnett: BSOS X; IHQ.XVII p. 198; JNSI p. 51).
\footnote{159} Kāṇvāyanāṁ tato bhṛityāḥ Śuṣamāṇāḥ, tam Śuṅgāṇāṁ chaiva yach chhesnām kshapitvā tu baliyāsah, Siśukhoṇḍhiraḥ sajātyāḥ prāpsya-ṃmām vasundhārām, traya-vimśat samā rājā Simukas tu bhavishyati. Pargiter: DKA. pp. 38 & 71.
\footnote{160} Sukhantkar and Raychaudhuri question Andhra affinities of the Śatavāhanas. The latter proposed that the Purāṇas were redacted at a time when the Śatavāhanas were ruling over the Andhradesa mistakenly
for an unbroken maximum period of 460 years according to the Matsya, and a minimum of 300 years, according to the Vishnu Purana. The starting point of this dynasty, working on the contemporaneity and double defeat of Satakarni mentioned in the Junar inscription at the beginning of Siva Siri-Pulumavi’s seven year reign is placed about 235 B.C.¹⁶¹ This date would not be in conformity with the Pauranic evidence recalling the murder of the last Kanya ruler by the first Andhra king which took place in c 28 B.C. Barnett suggested¹⁶² that after the death of Asoka, the Mauryan empire rapidly declined and the neighbouring rulers were left free to indulge in their ambitious designs and enlarging their boundaries.

called the Andhras (PHAI. pp. 403ff). But the last three ruled not only Andhradesa but also parts of Western Deccan. (Co. H.I p. 298n). The original home of the Andhras has been a subject of disputation among scholars. Srinivas Aiyangar suggested (IA.1913. pp. 276ff) that the Andhras were associated with the Telgu country only at a later date, as they are assigned to the Vindhyas region in the Aitareya Bråhmaṇa, in the inscriptions of Asoka, as well as in the Harshacharita. The finds of the early Andhra coins in the western part of India, and a reference to them in the inscription of Khåravela point to their rule in the south-west, rather than in the Andhra region. Sukhatankar editing an inscription of Siri-Pulumavi, king of the Såtavåhanas, identified a place called Såtavåhamåhåra with one of the same name occurring in the Hira-Hadagalli copper plate inscription, though in a slightly altered form (Såtahamrattha), and assigned Bellary district, as the original home of Såtavåhanas (EI.XIV. p. 153). Raychaudhuri further suggested that the Andhra was probably meant for the Såtavåhana kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and remained a purely Andhra power, governing the territory at the north of the river Krishna (Op. cit.) Barnett located the original home of the Andhras in the Telingana district along the eastern coast between the deltas of the rivers Godavari and Krishnå together with as much of the Circars as they could hold against the rival kingdoms of Kalinga in the north. (CHI. p. 599). It appears probable that the exact limit of their territory probably varied from time to time and so also their capital.

¹⁶¹ Co.H.I p. 295. According to Bose, the beginning of the Andhra rule may be fixed near about 230 B.C. which would be the time of Simukha making Andhras the contemporaries of the later Mauryas, the Sungas and the Kånyas. In suggesting this early date, he doubts the truth of the Pauranic reference to the murder of the last Kånya ruler by the first Andhra King which took place in c 28 B.C.

¹⁶² op. cit.
Among these was a certain person Simukha, who within the last quarter of the third century B.C. established the powerful Sātavāhana or Sātakarni dynasty which ruled over the Telugu country for five centuries.

The epigraphic records which might be considered here are the Hāthigumpha inscription of King Khāravela, 163 the Nānāghāt inscription of Nāyanidī, 164 and Sāñchi record of Rājan Siri-Sātakaṇi. 165 The date of the record of Khāravela on palaeographic grounds has to be brought down to the first century B.C. That would place the Sātakaṇi of this record whom Khāravela ignored as a contemporary strong power in the first century B.C. The Sātakaṇi of the Sāñchi record was identified by Cunningham with the third Andhra king. The date and character of this inscription as well as of others on the Sāñchi gateway, are almost identical with those of the Nānāghāt inscriptions. Perusing the Pauranic evidence, 166 we find in the description of the dynasties of Vidisā, that after the destruction of the Śuṅgas, Sisunandi, his younger brother Nandiyasas and three others would become rulers there. His daughter's son Śiśukha became king of Purikā (at some unspecified time). The name Śiśukha may have been wrongly spelt for Simukha, the founder of the Andhra dynasty. If the two could be identified, one might agree with Raychaudhuri 167 that after overthrowing the Śuṅgas, Simukha annexed Purikā and placed Vidisā under his maternal relations. This conjecture agrees with the date of the beginning of the Andhra rule. The defeated Śuṅga prince may have been Viśvamitra of the Besnagar seal. 168 Śiśunandi mentioned in the list may be identified with Rājan Śvāmin Śivanandi whose seal was found at Pawaya. The history of the Andhras need not be considered here as it is outside the purview of our study.

A complete picture of the political condition — taking into account the period and rule of the Śuṅgas-Kāṇvas, the Indo-

163. op. cit.
164. Luder's List No. 1114.
165. EI. II. p. 88.
166. DKA. p. 49.
Greeks and certain minor states in northern India, the Meghavāhana ruler Khāravela of Kaliṅga and lastly, the early Andhras, is just portrayed in proper perspective. Factors responsible for the disintegration of the Mauryan empire within less than fifty years after the death of the Aśoka, the attempt of Pushyamitra Śuṅga to integrate the loose political fabrics; the expanding tide of the Greeks—no doubt checked in the time of the Brāhmin senāpati, and the ambitious attitude of Khārvela of Kaliṅga who comes much later in the first century B.C., rather than in the last quarter of the second century B.C. as a contemporary of Pushyamitra, are all taken into proper consideration. The evidence relating to this period is rather scanty, and, as the late Professor Rapson suggested more than forty years back, in our attempt to reconstruct the mosaic of ancient Indian history from the few pieces which have as yet been found, we can do little more than define the limits of possible hypothesis in this instance. The position, despite the passage of time, has not much improved. We have still to wait for adequate material ere we properly reconstruct a detailed history of Northern India from the second century B.C. to the beginning of the Christian era.
CHAPTER III

GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

The Geographical information from the Mahābhāskya may not be as exhaustive as we find in the Ashtādhyāyī, it is nevertheless copious enough to give a general idea of the country and its people as known to Patañjali. The Bhāshyakāra mostly refers to places in the Āryavārtta, with its well-defined boundaries, but he does not seem to be ignorant of the settlements of the Yavanas, the Janapadas of the North-west — those of Gandhāra, Kamboja and Kaśmīra, the kingdoms in the South of the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas and Keralas, and the more familiar ones in the East — Aṅga, Magadha, Kaliṅga and Prāgdeśa. The land of the Pañchanadas, Sindhu, Sauvīra, and Saurāśtra are also mentioned in the Mahābhāshya. He verifies a good many names mentioned in the Gaṇapāṭha, and also adduces additional details wherever necessary. The Chāturārthika

1. II.4.10. pp. 4-5. The Yavana country is also mentioned in the Vārttika on Pāṇini. IV.1.175. It is difficult to determine the exact situation of the Yavana country (Bhandarkar: Carmichael Lectures. 1921. p. 26; Raychaudhuri. PHAI, 4th ed. p. 253). It appears that it (the Yavana country) had never a uniform country. The Pre-Alexander (better Ionian) colony was also a Yavana one. In Patañjali’s time the Yavanas had come closer to the land of the Śishṭhas. Living in Aryan villages and hamlets outside Āryavarta, they were not ostracized and they enjoyed the privilege of using a plate without polluting it. (Kielhorn—ed. I. p. 475). The Yavanas are mentioned in Aśokan inscriptions. (RE.XIII).

2. This evidently shows that Patañjali’s geographical horizon was not necessarily confined to mid-India—the land of the ēlite Brahmīns in whom he was definitely interested. These would be considered with fuller references later on in this chapter.

3. The value of Patañjali’s Mahābhāskya—as a supplement to the information from Pāṇini’s work—is evinced from the following stray pieces of evidence. The Bhāshyakāra provides the full list of the member states in the Sālva Janapada (IV.1.168. p. 269), the names of Janapadas referred to under IV.1.172—which points to the use of affix nya after the word ‘kuru’ and a word beginning with na, when these words denote a country, being the name of a kshatriya tribe also. (Kielhorn II p. 269). He also provides the correct reading of the five names in the Rājanyādi group—Vasati, Devayāta, Bailavavana, Ambarishaputra, and Ātmakameya. (IV.2.52. p. 282).
Sūtras—IV.2.67-70 of Pāṇini which explain the significance of names of places where a thing was found, or the place itself was founded by such and such a person or community, or if it was the dwelling place of such and such a person, and lastly the location of the place as nearer to a known object, are considered by Patañjali. He does not comment in detail on the Nivāsa and Abhijana sūtras⁴ formulated by Pāṇini which suggest that the first word in construction should signify a dwelling place, or where some one’s ancestors lived; certain other sūtras of Pāṇini (IV.2.130-45) mentioning geographical names also did not engage his attention. This deficiency is partly made up by the Bhāshyakāra’s reference to the ethnic distribution of particular areas under the Vishaya-sūtra (Vishayodeśe),⁵ and by preserving the broad division of the Janapadas⁶ as suggested by Pāṇini—namely, Janapadas under monarchy (ekarāja) and tribes organized as āyuddha-jīvi saṅgha. In this connection, the classification of place names based on linguistic principles, earlier made by Pāṇini, is retained by Patañjali.

Conception of the country: Patañjali, no doubt, refers to the Udichya and Pṛachya divisions of the country with a number of janapadas associated with those parts, but he is more particular about Āryāvarta, the land of the Śishṭhas. Its boundaries, as given by him, cover the region south of the Himalayas, east of Ādarsa, and west of Kālakavana.⁷ The southern limit, Pāriyātra,⁸ according to earlier investigations,⁹

5. IV.2.52. p. 282.
7. II.4.10 p. 475. Prag=adarsāt pratyak kālakavanād dakshinena himavatam attayena pāriyātram. The position of Kālakavana is fairly certain. According to Dey, it should be identified with the Rajmahal hills in the province of Bihar (Geographical Dictionary p. 84). According to Chakladhar, like other points, the one marking the eastern limits of Āryāvarta, would correspond to the eastern point of Manu’s Madhyadeśa viz. Prayāga (IHQ.IV. p. 93). He identifies Kālakavana with the Kālakārāma of the Buddhist texts (Ang. Nikāya ii.24) representing the out-skirt of Sāketa, and regards the Āryāvarta of Vasishṭha and Baudhāyana as exactly conterminous with the Madhyadeśa of Manu.
8. According to Pargiter, this is the western portion of the modern Vindhya Range, west of Bhopal (Mārkondaśya Purāṇa (Trans.) p. 286n).
is the western part of the Vindhyā range extending from the source of the Chambal to the Gulf of Cambay, but R. G. Bhandarkar took it to be that portion of the Vindhyān range from which the rivers Chambal and Betwa take their rise. The Bhāsyakāra’s definition of its eastern and western limits meets with some difference in the Smritis of Manu, Vasishṭha and Baudhāyana. Ādāra, the western limit, is supposed to be identical with Adarśana or Vinaśana which the Kāśikā takes in the sense of a janapada. Vasishṭha has referred to the limits of Āryāvarta both according to his views and that of others. He confines it to the east of the region where the river Sarasvatī disappears, the west of the Black forest (Kālakavana), to the north of Pāripātra, and to the south of the Himalaya. Bühler has compared the boundaries of Āryāvarta, as suggested by the Smritikāra with those mentioned by Patañjali.

Patañjali’s Geographical vision, however, extends much beyond Āryāvarta—both in the west and in the east. References to far off places in the north-west, such as Bālkha (Bāhla-yana),14 Kamboja,15 Kaśmīra26 and Gandhāra;17 Āṅga, Vaṅga18 and Kaliṅga19 in the east and Paṇḍya, Chōḍa, Kaḷera and Kerala20 in the south—not traced in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, are suggestive of his broader perspective. Western India was also known to him, as he refers to Sindhu and Sauvīra.21 The Bhāṣyakāra might not have visited places at considerable

Cunningham traced its survival in the Pathar range lying between the rivers Chambal and Banas (ASR.VI. p. 1 & map; XIV. p. 151).

11. IV.2.124 p. 381 (Benares Ed.) Adarśakaḥ janapādāvadheḥ khaṭāpi.
12. I.8.
13. SBE.XIV. p. 2.
17. IV.2.52 p. 283.10.
18. IV.1.170 p. 299.16-17.
20. IV.1.175. p. 270.3.
distance from his native place. Particular mention might be made of the term sarasi, used by him to denote lakes in the Deccan. He has not, however, referred to the shape of the country and its contour.

**Physical Geography**: The study of this aspect of geography is confined to mountains, rivers, and forests. There are many references in the Mahābhāshya to Himavat Parvat. One also finds his comment on the glacier Himānī and the melting of snow (himaśratha), noticed earlier by Pāṇini as well. The Bhāshyakāra also refers to a low land in the sense of a valley (upatyakā) and a table land (adhyayakā) in different comments. The mountains, besides Himavat, traced in the Mahābhāshya, are Pāriyatra and Krauñcha. The former is mentioned as indicative of the southern boundary of Āryāvarta. The context in which Krauñcha figures in the Mahābhāshya, shows that it is used for a bird (Pakṣī)—the son of a curlew after the affix an in forming the patronymic from krauñcha. The formations of the names of the mountains are not noticed in the Mahābhāshya, nor is the important sūtra (IV-3-91), referring to the settlements of the hill tribe commented upon by Patañjali.

The Bhāshyakāra does not refer to many forests. There are references only to Khāndava and Bailavavana which are not noticed by Pāṇini. The former, according to the Mahābhārata was situated on a river called Aśvarathā, while the

22. I.1.19. p. 73.5.
23. I.1.57. p. 150. 23; I.1.72, p. 184: 20 etc.
24. IV.1.49 p. 20.15.
26. IV.1.49; IV.4.29.
27. VII.3.45. p. 325.5.
28. III.4.10. p. 475.3. For a note on it see No. 7.
29. IV.1.120. p. 258.12; Krauñcha also denoted a part of the Himālaya range, situated in the eastern part of the chain to the north of Assam. According to the Vyu Purāṇa, it is said to have been split by Kārttikeya (72.47).
30. VIII.1.4. p. 364.23.
31. II.1.1. p. 3.13.
Padma Purāṇa locates it near the banks of Yamunā with Indraprastha as part of it.

Rivers: The rivers of the extreme north west part of ancient India including Afghanistan are not noticed by Patañjali, as for example he does not mention the river Suvāstu, mentioned earlier by Panini. In his comment on the sūtra Oraṇ, illustrating the use of the affix an after a stem ending in u or ū in the sense of chāturāṭhika sūtras, the Bhāṣyakāra mentions by way of illustration, Maṣakāvatī and Udumbarāvatī, Ikshumati and Drumatī. Maṣakāvatī seems to have given name to Massaga or Massaka, flowing past that city with its warlike people who had a rough deal from Alexander. Dey identified it with Mazaga or Massanagar twenty-four miles from Bajaur on the river Swat in the Yusufzai country. Earlier Rennel had identified it with the Massaga of Alexander's historians. The Kāśikā mentions this river along with Udumbarāvatī, in comment on the sūtra nadyām matup, which enjoins the adding of the affix matup (mat and vat) when the name of a river is to be designated by something found near it. Udumbara was associated with the Audumbaras—whose coins have been found in the Kangra district. It may be identified with a small tributary joining the river Beas near Gurdaspur. Ikshumati was noted for the sugar canes grown near its bank. It has been identified with a tributary of the Ganges, referred to as oxymagus by Arrian and oxymatis by Megasthenes. It is now known as Ikhan (also Kālindī) flowing through the Farrukhabad district. The last in the series Drumatī cannot be identified.

33. Uttara chap. 64.
34. IV.2.77.
35. IV.2.71. p. 287.15.
37. ibid.
38. IV.2.86—other references in the Kāśikā are Udumbaravatī, Vīrnāvatī, Pushkarāvatī, Ikshumati and Drumatī.
40. Imperial Gazetteer of India—Atlas Vol. XXVI.
41. McCrindle—Ancient India in Megasthenes & Arrian—note on oxymagus cf. my India in Classical Greek Writings p. 48n.
42. Agarwal—India as known to Pāṇini (henceforth-Agarwala-Pāṇini. 2nd ed. p. 44).
Patañjali refers to Pañchananda which is to be taken in the sense of the country of five rivers (*pañchānāṁ nadināṁ samāhāraḥ pañchanadam*), but he mentions only *Sutudrī*, a tributary of the river Indus (Sindhu) along with Gangā, Yamunā and Sarasvatī. Other rivers noticed by Bhāshyakāra are Ikshumatī and Drumatī, *Yavamatī*, Dāvikā, Gomati and Rathaspā. Ikshumatī is noted for sugar cane plants growing near its bed. Dey identified it with the river Kālī. Dāvikā is mentioned earlier by Pāṇini and Patañjali associates a particular kind of rice growing near its bank. It was called *Dāvikā kulāḥ sālayah*. It was identified with Pargiter with the river Deeg, a tributary of the Rāvī on its right bank, but according to B. C. Law citing *Vishnudharmottara* (I.161.153 and *Nilamata Purānas*, this river flowed through the Mādura country. Rathaspā is mentioned earlier in the *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa* and in the ‘Adi Parva’ of the *Mahābhārata*. It is one of the seven sacred rivers between the Sarasvatī and Gandakī, and is identified by Dey with the river Rāptī in Avadhā. Gomati might be that tributary of the river Ganges which passes through Lucknow.

**Political Geography:** Patañjali seems to be more exhaus-

43. IV.1.88 p. 239.5.6.
44. I.2.32 p. 209.10.
45. I.1.1. p. 427.29.
46. IV.2.71 p. 287.16.
47. V.2.94 p. 394.6.
48. VII.3.1 p. 316.4.
50. VII.1.157. p. 96.17.
51. GD. p. 77.
52. VII.3.9. p. 316.4.
55. Caland, *Extracts* 204.
56. Ch. 170. L. 6455.
57. op. cit. p. 168. According to V. S. Agrawala, it was a river in Pañchāla and the name may correspond to Rhodopha, mentioned by Greek writers as marking an important stage on the royal road. (Although it is called a town, but the mention of the stages generally between two well-known rivers, as Jhelum and Beas, Sutlej and Yamunā suggests its having been the name of a river (Megasthenes. Frag. LVI; quoted in op. cit. p. 47).
tive than Pāṇini in his reference to the political divisions and the list of the Janapadas. He refers to kingdoms in the north-west, and those in the south. The latter do not figure in the Ashtādhyāyī. The Janapadas were homogenous political, cultural and geographical units, known from early times. Many such janapadas mentioned in early Buddhist work, and existing in the time of the Buddha continue to figure in this period. Politically some of these lost their existence, as for example the Bhāshyakāra refers to Kāśi and Kośala besides Magadha and Janapadas in the Āryāvarta, but these must have formed part of the Śunga empire. The reference, therefore, is to their geographical importance. We propose considering these Janapadas in order of their location from north-west to east, and then those in the south.

Kambuja: This Janapada, in the extreme north-west is referred to both by Pāṇini⁵⁸ and Patañjali.⁵⁹ The term is applied to the king of the country as well to the Kshatriya tribe settled in that Janapada. As a people, the Kambojas are mentioned by Yāska in his Nirukta.⁶⁰ Their connection with the Mādras, probably the Uttara Mādras, is speculated from the reference to Kamboja Aupamanyava, pupil of Madragāra.⁶¹ The location of this Janapada and its capital has been a subject of speculation. Ray Chaudhuri suggested⁶² that the Kamboja Janapada lay in the region of Rajauri or Rajpur with its boundary extending as far as Kafristan in the west. The Mahābhārata mentions⁶³ a place called Rājapura as the home of the Kambojas.

Kaśmīra: Its existence as a separate political unit is evident from the Mahābhāṣya⁶⁴ mentioning the queen of Kaśmīra (Kaśmīra rājī). Its exact boundaries cannot be

---

⁵⁸. IV.1.175.  
⁶⁰. II.2. Yāska notes the peculiarity of Kamboja speech. According to Kauṭīlya the country of the Kambojas was noted for a particular breed of horses. "(Trans. p. 148).  
⁶². PFAI (3rd ed.) p. 105.  
⁶³. VII. Chap. 4.19. According to Rhys-Davids, its capital was Kamboja (Buddhist India) which has been identified by Moti Chand with Darwaz in the Pāmir Badakshan region (JUPHS. XVI. (11) pp. 38-46.)  
defined which seem to have varied in different periods. According to a Jātaka, it was included in the kingdom of Gāndhāra.

Gāndhāra: Patañjali mentions Gāndhāra, and not the other form Ganadhāra. The people of this region Gāndhāra, are mentioned even in the period of the Rigveda. According to Zimmer, their settlement was on the south bank of the Kubhā up to its confluence with the Indus, and to a certain extent to the east of the Indus itself. Pāṇini mentions both the Vedic form Gāndhārī as the name of the Janapada and its people. There is no reference to its capital Takshaśila.

Kekaya: The word Kaikeya suggests the people of the Kekaya Janapada. They were famous during the period of the Epics, and their territory, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, lay beyond the river Vīdisā (Beas), and extended up to the borders of ancient Gandhāra.

Sālva: This Janapada was both ancient and vast. Its people are mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. A later reference from the Mahābhārata suggests their association with the Kuru-Paṅchālas on the banks of the Yamunā. Pāṇini mentions Sālva (VI.2.135), Sālveya (IV.1.169), and Sālāvayaya (IV.1.173) as three distinct Janapada units of a monarchical character. The latter two must have bifurcated from the parent one which alone Patañjali mentions. The

65. No. 406. Another Jātaka, however, denies it (III.365). Kaśmīra’s geographical position in the Uttarapatha remains unassailed. Rājaśekhara places it in that region (Kāvyamimāṃsā p. 8). It comprised the districts of Peshawar and Rawalpindi.

66. IV.2.52. p. 282.10.
69. IV.1.109.
70. I.1.57 p. 149.8.
71. Mah. II.48, 13; Cunningham identified the capital of the Kekayadeśa with Girjak or Jalalpur on the Jhelum (Ancient Geography of India (AGI.) p. 188). Rājaśekhara places the Kekaya country in the northern division along with the Śakas, Hūṇas, Kambojas, Vāhlikas and others.

72. Patañjali—IV.2.133 p. 300.10. Sālva is mentioned in pair with Matsya, in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (1-29) and also in the Mahābhārata (Bhāishmaparva 10.3).
73. X.4.1.10.
74. VI. Chap. 9.346.
Kāśikā\textsuperscript{75} includes the Udumbaras and the Bodhas, referred to by Patañjali and belonging to the Kshatriya gotra, in the Sālva group. According to Pargiter,\textsuperscript{76} the Sālveysas, originally connected with the Sālvas, are to be placed to the west of the Aravali hills.

**Udumbara & Bodha:** Both are mentioned together by Patañjali.\textsuperscript{77} The former can easily be identified with the Audumbaras whose coins, found in the Kangra and Hoshiarpur districts settle their territory.\textsuperscript{78} Udumbarāvatī is mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra\textsuperscript{79} which seems to have flowed through their country, and hence was so named. The Bodha country might have been somewhere in east Punjab adjoining that of the Udumbara.

**Dārvya:** This term is also suggestive of the king as well as of the son of the country Dārvya.\textsuperscript{80} It is compounded with Abhisāra in the *Mahābhārata*,\textsuperscript{81} and, according to Aurel Stein,\textsuperscript{82} included the tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Jhelum and the Chenab. According to some scholars, it roughly corresponded to the Poonch and Naoshera districts.\textsuperscript{83} Pargiter associated\textsuperscript{84} them with the Trigartas, and Daradas and other tribes in the north-east Punjab.

**Vasāta:** Patañjali mentions\textsuperscript{85} this Janapada in close association with Gandhāra and Śivi, thereby suggesting its contiguity to these two states. The *Mahābhārata*\textsuperscript{86} refers to the king of Vasātis who was killed by Abhimanyu. McCrindle on the authority of Hemachandra’s *Abhidhāna Chintāmaṇi* placed it between the Indus and the Jhelum.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{75} p. 136. (Patañjali’s reference to the Bodhas—II.4.58 p. 489.3).
\textsuperscript{76} JRAS. 1908 p. 325.
\textsuperscript{77} II.4.58 p. 489.3-4.
\textsuperscript{78} Allan—op. cit. p. lxxxiii.
\textsuperscript{79} op. cit.
\textsuperscript{80} IV.1.170 p. 269.17.
\textsuperscript{81} VII.93.43.
\textsuperscript{82} Rājatarāṅgini-I. p. 32. II. p. 432.
\textsuperscript{83} B.C. Law—*Historical Geography* (HG. p. 74).
\textsuperscript{84} *Mark. Pur.* (Trans.) p. 324; Lassen placed the Dārvas between the Indus and Jhelum in the north-west of Kashmir (ibid).
\textsuperscript{85} IV.2.52 p. 282.17.
\textsuperscript{86} VII.49.1934.
\textsuperscript{87} *The Invasion of Alexander the Great* p. 150n. Agarwala identi-
Sindhu-Sauvîra: These two are generally associated together. Sindhu is the name of the famous river Indus, and it is also the appellation of a political unit. Earlier it was also the name of the satrapy of the Achaemenian emperor Darius. It comprised the upper Indus. Sauvira is mentioned by Pânîini. According to Rapson, the two parts of the compound are often used separately, as names having nearly the same meaning, representing the modern province of Sindh.

Vâhîka: It is distinguished by Patañjali from Vâhîka-grâma, though the latter is included in the Vâhîka country. It may be identified with Bâhîka, referred to in earlier literature, denoting the people of Punjab and the Indus. The Bâhîkas, synonymous with Vâhîkas, were different from the Vâhlîkas or Vâlîkas, and, according to the Karnaparva of the Mahâbhârata, they lived between the Sutlej and the Indus, with their capital at Sâkala. Patañjali mentions Sakala as a Vâhîka-grâma.


88. VII.1.39. p. 257.2. They are mentioned together in inscriptions (El. VIII. p. 36) and literature (Mhb. VI.9.L. 361).

89. CH1. I. p. 334.

90. IV.1.148. The Sûtrakâra also gives a valuable social history of the region, the home of many gotras. He mentions Sarkara or Sarkara (modern Sukkar) as a town (IV.2.83).

91. Ancient India p. 168. Johnston in a note on ‘Demetrius in Sindh’ pointed out that it was quite clear from Kauṭilya’s Arthasastra (ii. 30, 32-3) that Sindhu and Sauvira were different countries. They occupied much of the Indus valley from the sea-coast upwards. Their separate and distinctive character is evident from the Junaghar inscription of Rudradâman. According to a Jâtaka (III. p. 280), Roruka or Roruva, identified with modern Rori or Alor was the capital of this Janapada.

92. IV.2.104. p. 293.20.

93. Sata. Brâh. I.7.38; Pânini mentions Udîhya towns among the Vâhîka country (IV.2.117). He also mentions the Vâhîka sanîgas (V.3.114) — some dominated by Brâhmañas as ruling caste (Gopâlavas), others by Râjânyas, and called Rajanaka (IV.2.53).

94. VIII. chap. 43. 20.30.

95. IV.1.185. p. 236.20, 22. They are also equated with Jarttikâs.
Madra: This Janapada, according to the *Mahābhārata*, was included in the Vāhika country with its territory centering round Sakala or Sialkot, and the surrounding region between the Rāvī and the Chenab or between the Jhelum and the Rāvī. They seem to have occupied the central portion of the Punjab. The Mādras were an ancient kshatriya tribe and were associated with the Yaudheyas, as is evident from the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. Unfortunately their coins have not been found so far.

Uśīnara: The country of the Uśīnaras formed part of the Vāhikadeśa. It is mentioned earlier by Pāṇini. Regarded as northerners, they are placed in the north-west, but there is no reason to shift them farther west than the middle country.

Śibi: The Śibi country, called Saivaḥ in the *Mahābhāṣya*, was a fairly old Janapada. Its people are mentioned in the *Rigveda* along with other minor tribes, and are noticed by Pāṇini and also by Alexander’s historians. The latter locate these people between the Indus and the Akesines. According to Vogel, Sibipur mentioned in a Shorkot inscription must be the site of their capital.

and Āraṭṭas (*Karna Parva* 44.2032-2033). Pāṇini mentions Vāhika villages and those situated in Uśīnara (IV.2.117-8) which, according to Pargiter, were confined to the Punjab (*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 119).

96. VIII. chap. 45. L.2079.
98. Cunningham—AGI (1871) p. 185.
99. CII. III.
100. II.4.19. p. 477.15.—According to the *Kāśikā* commentary—
Uśīnareshu ye Vāhikagrāmak p. 320.
101. II.4.20; IV.2.118.
102. The *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* regards them as northerners (I.1). See Macdonell & Keith—*Vedic Index* I, p. 103.
103 IV.2.52 p. 282.11.
104. VII.18.7.
105. IV.2.109.
107. ElXX. p. 16. According to a Jātaka, (Fausboll. IV. p. 401), Ariṭṭhapura was the capital of the Śivi kingdom. Ptolemy refers to Aristobothra in the north of Punjab. It is identified with Dvārāvatī (Dey—*GD*, p. 11).
Ambashta: It is mentioned earlier by Pāṇini;\textsuperscript{108} Patañjali mentions it\textsuperscript{109} with reference to the sūtra IV.1.70 as the name of a Janapada under a monarchical government. As a tribe, the Ambashthas can be traced in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.\textsuperscript{110} They figure in the Mahābhārata along with the Śvis, Kshudrakas and Mālavikas who sided with the Kurus. Their position in the social scheme need not be considered here. They are identical with the Abastanoï, Sambastai, Sabaracae or Sabagrae of Alexander's historians\textsuperscript{112} with their territory in the lower Akesines (Asikní) river.

Trigarta: This term\textsuperscript{113} means 'the land watered by the three rivers', very probably the rivers Rāvi, Beas and Sutlej. Their country had formed an Ayuddha-jivī saṅgha or a confederation of six states — known as Trigarta-shashṭha, according to Pāṇini,\textsuperscript{114} and they were living mainly on arms. They are mentioned as allies of the Kurus in the Mahābhārata,\textsuperscript{115} but ultimately paying homage to Yudhishtira. According to the Abhidhāna-Chintāmani,\textsuperscript{116} the Trigarta country is identified with Jalandhara (Jālandharās-Trigarttāh syuḥ), but it is brought in close proximity with Kaśmira in the Rājalavāginī.\textsuperscript{117} Considered as a mountain tribe in the Purāṇas,\textsuperscript{118} Cunningham identified\textsuperscript{119} their country with the Kangra valley, situated near Jalandhar between the mountains of Chamba.

108. VIII.3.97.
110. VIII.21.3.
111. VI. chap. 20, p. 750. They are located in the north west in this work which describes them as a kingship.
112. Invasion of Alexander (Mc-Crindle)—p. 155. Later geographers like Ptolemy, place the Ambastai, probably identical with the Ambashthas to the east of the country of the Paropamisadai Geography (Sastri's ed.) pp. 311-2.
113. VIII.1.15. p. 367-4.
114. V.3.116. According to Agarwala, the central position of Trigarta formed by the valley of the Beas was named Kulīta, mentioned twice in the Gaṇapātha as Kuluna (IV.2.133; IX.3.93) and known as Kulu.
115. VI. chap. 123, p. 754.
116. IV.24.
117. V.144.
118. Märk. 57.57; Matsya—114.56.
119. ASR. XIV. p. 116.
and the upper course of the Beas. It may be located between the Rāvi and the Sutlej with its capital near Jalandhar.

Pāraskara: Patañjali treats it as a country (Pāraskara-radeśaḥ) and it might correspond with Thara Pārakara, one of the biggest districts in Sindh.

Brāhmaṇaka: It is also called a Janapada by the Bhāshyakāra (Brāhmaṇako nāma janapadaḥ). It might as well be the name of a tribe corresponding to the Brachmanoi of Arrian. Their country is distinguished by Patañjali with that of the Vrishalas (Vrishaladeśa), the latter probably indicating the country of the Sodrai, mentioned by the Greek historians. Cunningham identified the country of the Brāhmaṇaka with Brahmanabad in Sindh.

Jihnavā: Patañjali mentions it as a janapada (Jihnavo nāma janapadaḥ) along with the Ikshvāka one in the same reference. The Brihat Samhitā mentions Ikshvāku as a warrior tribe. The identification of the former is uncertain while the latter is considered to be the same as Kośala.

Janapadas of the Āryāvarta: Āryāvarta, the land of the élite Brāhmaṇas, the centre of activity — political and religious, engaged the special attention of the Bhāshyakāra. He refers to a number of kingdoms in this part of Bhāratavarsha. The

---

120. VI.1.57 p. 96-16. It is mentioned in the gaṇa Pāraskara prabhriti (Pāṇini—VI.1.157.).
121. Dey: GD. p. 149. It once denoted the whole of the south-eastern part of Sindh upto the coast of the Great Rann of Kachchha or Kachchha of Irna.
122. IV.2.104, p. 298.21.
123. Indika VI.16. The significance of the name is brought out by the Kāśikā describing it as the land of the Brāhmaṇas who were Ayuddha-jīvis. The Greeks call them Brachmanoi and are located in middle Sind.
125. McCrindle: op. cit. p. 292. This might correspond to Saudrāṇa, included in the Aishukāri group in the Ashtādhyāyi, according to the Kāśikā (p. 305).
126. op. cit. (Śastrī ed.) p. 691. It is noticed in the Kāvyamimāṃsā as Brāhmaṇavāḥ Janapada (p. 94).
127. IV.2.104, p. 298.12, 14.
128. V.75.
Kuru, Pañchāla, (Uttara and Pūrva), Kośala and Kāśi have past history and their location is settled. The Kuru country extended from Kurukshetra up to the river Gaṅgā with its capital at Hastināpura mentioned in the Mahābhā- shya. The Pañchālas, divided into the north and the eastern ones, date back to Vedic times. The story of the division of the kingdom is given in the Mahābhārata. The south Pañchāla included the territory to the east and south-east of the Kurus and the Sūrasenas, while the north one comprised the districts lying east of the river Gaṅgā and north-west of Avadha. According to Cunningham, the extent of the great kingdom of Pañchāla was confined within the Himalaya and the river Chambal. The Bhāshyakāra does not mention their respective capitals, but he does mention Ahichchatra along with Kānyakubja, and Śāmkīṣa which was at a distance of four yojanas from Gavīdhumata—identified with Kudarkot in the Etah district of the Uttar Pradesh.

Kosla and Kāśī mentioned by Pāṇini are also noticed in the Mahābhāshya. The capital of the former, Sāketa is mentioned by Patañjali. He also refers to Vārāṇasī, as capital of Kāśī which was situated on the river Gaṅgā (anugaṅgāṁ vārāṇasī).

Magadha is mentioned as a monarchical state (Magadhānām Rājan). It included the territory to the south of the Gaṅgā, corresponding to modern south Bihar with Pātaliputra.

130. I.4.51 p. 336.5.
132. IV.1.54, p. 223.13.
133. II.1.16, p. 380.
135. Ādiparva, chap. 140. The division was made upon the defeat of Drupada at the hands of Droṇa. According to a Jātaka story the capital of north Pañchāla was founded by a Cheti prince.
137. AG. (Śāstri ed.) p. 360.
139. II.3.28, p. 455.17.
140. El. I. p. 129.
141. IV.1.171.
143. Ibid.
144. II.1.2 p. 375.8.
as its capital, situated on the river Son (anusonomous Patali-putram).\textsuperscript{145}

\textit{Videha}\textsuperscript{146} and \textit{Vriji}:\textsuperscript{147} Patañjali mentions them separately although in earlier times the two were politically knit together.\textsuperscript{148} The Vrijis, like the Kurus, had the government of a family (Kuru gārhapatam Vriji gārhapatam), but the Videhans are mentioned separately in the list of Kshatriyas.

\textit{Aṅga and Vaṅga}:\textsuperscript{149} These two are bracketed together. The former was well-known as a small janapada with its capital at Champā, comprising the present districts of Bhagalpur and Monghyr.\textsuperscript{150} Vaṅga corresponds to western and central Bengal, and, according to Pargiter,\textsuperscript{151} it must have comprised the modern districts of Murshidabad, Nadia, Jessore, parts of Rajshahi, Pabna and Faridkot.

\textit{Pūndra and Suhma}: Patañjali associates\textsuperscript{152} the two with the Vaṅga janapada. The Pūndras alone are mentioned in the \textit{Aitareya Brāhmaṇa}\textsuperscript{153} and in the sūtras.\textsuperscript{154} The reference to the Pūndravardhana bhukti in the Damodarpur copperplate inscriptions\textsuperscript{155} has facilitated its location. As regards, Suhma, Dey,\textsuperscript{156} citing Nilakanṭha's commentary on the \textit{Mahābhārata}, identified with Rādhā, comprising the districts of Hoogly and Burdwan.

145. II.1.16 p. 380.18.
146. IV.1.168 p. 268.22.
147. VI.2.42 p. 126.4.
148. Rhys Davids: \textit{Buddhist India} p. 25. The Lichchavis of Vaiśālī and the Videhans were the most important among the eight confederate clans collectively known as the Vajjins.
149. IV.1.170. p. 269.16-17.
150. Law: \textit{Geography of Early Buddhism} p. 6.
151. JASB. 1895 p. 85.
152. IV.2.52 p. 282.8.
153. VII.18.
155. EI-XV. pp. 138 ff. Pargiter distinguished Pūndra from Pauṇḍra, the former comprising the districts of Malda, a portion of Purnea to the east of the river Kosi and parts of Dinajpur and Rajshahi districts (JASB. 1895, p. 85). It is mentioned in the \textit{Māhābhārata} I.4221; II.584 and also by Rājaśekhara (Kāv. p. 9).
156. GD: p. 195. This janapada is mentioned in the \textit{Purāṇas} (Kali, chap. 14; Matsya : chap. 113), and seems to have been named after Sūmha, a son of Bali (\textit{Vishnu}, Pt IV, chap. 18).
**Kalinga**: Cunningham defined its position as lying between Godāvari in the south-west and the Gaoliya branch of the Irāvatī river in the north-west. Rapson placed this janapada between the Mahādī and the Godāvari. The *Mahābhārata* includes Orissa in it with the northern boundary of this janapada extending as far as Vaitaranī. In the Purānas, Utkala or Orissa forms a separate unit.

**Prāgdeśa**: There is a reference to this janapada. It seems identical with Prāgjyotisha which figures prominently in ancient Indian literature. It may be identified with the whole of Assam proper along with north Bengal as far as Rangpur and Cooch Behar.

**Avanti-Kunti**: The two are associated together by the Bhāshyakāra. The former represented the country of which Ujjain was the capital. Kunti was probably a neighbouring janapada. It is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.

**Surāśṭra**: According to the *Kāśikā*, Kunti and Surāśṭra were in close proximity to each other. Pāṇini also refers to the compound names Kunti-Surāśṭra. Surāśṭra corresponds with the Syrastrene of Ptolemy, and is identified with the Peninsula of Kathiawar or Gujrat. This janapada was definitely outside Āryāvarta.

157. III.2.115. p. 120.26.
158. AG. p. 117.
159. *Ancient India*, p. 164.
162. VII.1.96. p. 274.17.
164. IC.111. p. 732.
165. The two figure as janapada names ending in short i and implied in sūtra IV.1.171. (See also IV.1.14 p. 206.4).
166. The *Mahābhārata* speaks of Kunti as the region through which the Āśva Nadi flowed (*Vana*. chap. 308.7). It is identified as a tributary of the Chambal (Dey. op. cit. p. 109). Agarwal identifies this janapada with the region of Kontwar in the former Gwalior state (Madhya Pradesh) (op. cit. p. 62).
167. P. 548.
168. VI.2.37.
169. Dey: op. cit. p. 183. Rājaśekhara mentions it in the list of western countries (*Paśchādeśa*) p. 94.
Vidarbha: It was an important kingdom in that period with a past history, which subsequently acknowledged the suzerainty of Agnimitra. The *Māhabhārata* describes it as an ancient and renowned kingdom in the Deccan with Kuṇḍina (kaṇḍinīyapura—modern Amraoti) on the banks of the Varadā as its capital. According to Pargiter, it comprised the valley of the Payoshini, modern Pūrṇā and the middle portion of Tāpti, and corresponded to the western part of Berar and the valley country west of that. Cunningham included Bhopal and Bhilsa to the north of the Narmadā in this kingdom.

Southern Janapadas: Patañjali seems to be in the know of kingdoms in the south which were in existence in the time of Aśoka. These include Choḍa, Kaḷēra Kerala, and Pāṇḍya. Choḍa or Chola, corresponding to Coromandal coast, was bounded in the north by the river Pennar, in the south by Panākini river to the west by Coorg and included the territory of Tanjore from Nellore to Puḍukkoṭṭa. The Kerala were on the Malabar coast, comprising, besides Malabar, Travancore and Kanara terminating at Cape Comorin in the south. The Pāṇḍyas occupied the Tinne-velly and Madura districts.

170. Patañjali—IV.1.68 p. 268.22. The Vidarbhas were an ancient people, and their country is mentioned in the *Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa* (II.440).

171. III. chap. 60. L. 2290.
174. IV.1.175 p. 270. 3-4.
176. Pargiter—op. cit. 332; See also *Mahābhārata* III. 1988; The Chola kingdom (Chola-mañḍalam) had its capital at Uraiyur near Trichinopoly.

177. Pargiter—ibid. cf. *Harivamśa* 782, 12838; Kerala or Malabar separated from Tuluya (‽ = Satiyaputra) by the Chandragiri river, and extending to Cape Comorin, was also known as Chera. Its most ancient capital was Vanji, Vanchi or Karur (Tirukkarur) about 28 miles ENE of Cochin (Smith—Aśoka—Indian Reprint p. 157n).

178. Dey. op. cit. p. 247; cf. *Mahābhārata*. II.1174. Its most ancient capital was the port of Korkai (Smith—op. cit. p. 174n). The three traditional kingdoms were well-known. In the Purāṇas too they are mentioned together (*Mārk. 57.45; Matsya. V.46*).
The location of the Kañderas is doubtful, though their association with the other kingdoms in the south can hardly be denied.

Besides these janapadas, a few other names are also mentioned by Patañjali, some of which could be identified. These include Daśārṇa\(^{179}\) — not specified as a janapada. It is mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa and in the Purāṇas\(^{180}\) and is grouped with the Mālavas, Utkalas and Mekhalas in the Vindhyan tract. Its capital was Vīdisā (modern Bhilsa) on the Vetravatī (Betwa) according to Kālidāsa.\(^{181}\)

**Towns and Villages:** The Bhāshyakāra also refers to big cities (nagara) villages (grama) and stations of herdsmen (ghosha). He also refers to bigger village units — like the vāhikagrāma and udichyagrāma.\(^{182}\) These might be bigger geographical units. The place endings of names of cities and villages, as one finds in Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyi are not traced in the Mahābhāshya. Only a few important towns figure in his work — the most important ones being — Takshaśilā,\(^{183}\) Mathurā,\(^{184}\) Pātaliputra,\(^{185}\) Sāmkāśya,\(^{186}\) Sāketa,\(^{187}\) Vāraṇasi,\(^{188}\) Kauśāmbi,\(^{189}\) Hastināpura,\(^{190}\) Gavīdhumata,\(^{191}\) Ahichchatra and Kānyakubja.\(^{192}\) Cities of western India noticed by

\(^{179}\) VI.1.89. p. 69.

\(^{180}\) Kishkindhyā 41.8-10; Matsya. chap. 114.

\(^{181}\) Meghadūta I. 23.24. This Daśārṇa might be different from the one mentioned in earlier series. B. C. Law distinguishes the two identifying the earlier one with the Dosarene of the Periplus (Ancient Indian Tribes p. 375). According to Wilson, eastern or south-eastern Daśārṇa formed part of the Chattisgarh district in the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradesh), including the old native state of Patna (Vīshnū Purāṇa. II. p. 260).

\(^{182}\) IV.2.104. p. 293.9.

\(^{183}\) I.3.10. p. 268. 12.

\(^{184}\) II.4.7. p. 474.

\(^{185}\) Ibid.


\(^{188}\) II.1.16. p. 380.18.

\(^{189}\) II.1.1. p. 371.12.

\(^{190}\) II.1.16. p. 380.18. It is 22 miles north-east of Meerut and to the south-west of Bijnor on the right bank of Gaṅgā.

\(^{191}\) II.3.28 p. 456.4. It was 4 yojanas from Sāmkāśya, and is identified with Kudarkot in the Etah district.

\(^{192}\) IV.1.79. p. 233.7.
him include Ujjayinī, Māhishmati,193 Nāsikya194 and Kāñchi-pura in the south.195 A few unidentified places include Alambusha,196 Śaurya197 and Ashṭaka.198

It is really difficult to identify the villages mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra. These included Ārata, Kastīra, Dāsarūpya, Sauśika,199 Patañaprashtha, Nandipura, Kaukudīvāha.200 Those in the north (udichyagrāma) included—Chañarūpya, Māñirūpya, Śivapura, Vāḍajavakarsīya, Nilinaka and Aulāka.201 The endings of place names were based on usage and custom. Commenting on the distinction between the terms grāma and pura, Patañjali suggests that these should not be settled by rules of grammar but by local usage (tatrāti ninbandho na lābhak).202 He also mentions a few unattached villages like Ketavatā203 and Tisrikā,204 while in some cases he gives additional details like Nandipura as a Vāhikagrama,205 or Ikshumatī both eastern and western (pūrva, aparā).206 People coming from the same village were known to each other as samānagrāmika.

Patañjali sometimes refers to distances and directions as any one with a fair knowledge of geography would do. In the case of distance from Ujjayinī to Māhishmati he refers to the speed in covering it (Ujjayinyāḥ prasthito Māhishyamākṣyāṁ sūryodgamanam sambhavāyate sūryam udgamayati).

A study of the geographical data from the Mahābhāshya, is indicative of Patañjali’s familiarity with Āryāvarta. The janapadas mentioned by him are mostly those located in the north. He also mentions a few important ones from the south

193. III.1.26. p. 35.10. On the right bank of the Narmadā, 40 miles to the south of Indore.
194. VI.1.63 p. 42.4.
195. IV.2.104. p. 298.4.
197. I.1.57. p. 150.23.
198. 10.2.104. p. 298.24.
199. ibid. p. 293.4.
200. ibid. p 298.
201. ibid. p. 293.
203. II.4.7. p. 474.10.
205. IV.2.104. p. 298.
206. VI.1.85. p. 62.
and those in western and eastern India. The Bhāshyakāra also notices a few cities and some villages including those in the Vāhikadeśa. His work may not be as comprehensive as the Ashtādhyāyī, it is nevertheless a fruitful source of study for the geographical information conveyed by it.
CHAPTER IV
SOCIAL LIFE

Patañjali presents, on the whole, a faithful picture of the contemporary social life of his time. The influx of foreigners, their assimilation into the social scheme, and the relaxation of caste rules owing to mixed unions, did not take the Bhāshyakāra by surprise. Noticing the unorthodox trend, he probably left the need to preserve purity in Brāhmaṇas so that they could justify their high social standing both by birth, and by intellectual eminence. This motive was mainly responsible for his monumental work in which he stresses, in the ‘Introduction’, the necessity of a good grounding in grammar for the Śishtas. Grammar is the key to learning and enlightenment and, thus, the best preservative of the moral and cultural integrity of the Śishtas. A close study of the Mahābhāṣya from the cultural standpoint unfolds interesting details about social life: as for example, Division of society into groups, Family life, Food, Household effects, Dress and Ornaments, Marriage and Position of Women, Pastime and Recreations, Social evils, Festivals, and other miscellaneous subjects of interest. The inferences drawn from the data may be inconclusive for want of corroboration, except occasionally from the Bāhrut and Śanchi sculptures but the correctness of the facts derived from this literary work may be accepted. Here it is worth while considering the Smritis, particularly that of Manu, with a view to assessing the position of some social groups, mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya. Such a sociological study claims priority.

Division of Society:

Society was, no doubt, divided into the usual four classes, but mixed marriages, whether among the higher or lower groups, had resulted in the creation of some new castes. A complete list of progeny from such mixed unions is not given in the Mahābhāṣya. Some terms used by the Bhāshyakāra in this connection are also traced in the Manusmṛiti, and the Mahābhārata. Bright in facial complexion (gaurā), pure in conduct (suchyāchāra), of a reddish brown colour (piṅgala)
and with red hair, possibly dyed (kapilakēsa), the Brāhmaṇas were noted for the qualities which befitted them to perform suitable karmas (tapas śrutam cha yoniś chety etad Brāhma-
ynaḥkārakam). Taking food while walking (gachchhan bhak-
shyati), and voiding in a standing posture were undignified
actions for them (a-Brāhmaṇo vam vas tishiḥan mūtrayati).
In the social organism, they occupied the foremost place (lokē
mishām Brāhmaṇam pūrvam ānayeti vah sarva pūrvah sa
āniyate). Where a Brāhmaṇa failed in his literary and spir-
tual attainments, birth alone entitled him a place in his social
group (tapahaṣrutābhhyām vo hino jātibrāhmaṇa eva saḥ).
Such persons had degraded themselves by adopting low
professions, as for instance, the Brāhmaṇas cleaving wood (kāš-
ṭhabhid Brāhmaṇaḥ).

The warrior class (Kshatriyas—Senānikula), Vaiśyas
and Śudras enjoyed the usual position in society, but members
of some other groups presented a strange phenomenon. These
included: Vrishalas, Varuḍas, Ugras, Nishādas, Chaṇḍā-
las and Mritapas. Some of these are also mentioned in
the Vedic literature, like the Vrishala, Chaṇḍāla and
Nishāda. The form Vrishala was used for a social outcast,
but later on it implied an irreligious person (adhārmika), as
for example, in the Mudrārākshasa, Chandragupta is called
a Vrishala. The Chaṇḍāla and Nishāda are supposed to be

1. II.2.6 p. 411.18.
2. ibid. 16.17.
3. ibid. 22.
4. VI.2.36 p. 125.25.
5. V.1.115 p. 363.15.
7. I. 1.39 p. 97.16.
8. I. 1.7 p. 59.18.
10. IV. 1.14 p.257.15.
12. II.4.10 p. 475.6.
13. ibid.
14. RV. X.34.11; cf. Nirukta, III 16.
15. Vaj Sam. XXX. 21; Tait Brah, III. 4.17, 1, etc.
16. Tait Sam. IV.5, 4, 2; Vaj Sam. XVI. 27 etc.
Non-Aryans representing tribal bodies, but the two terms later on denoted despised castes whose members were engaged in very low professions. Manu named the off-spring from the union between a Śudra father and a Brāhmaṇi mother a Chāṇḍāla (sūdrād āyogavah kshattā cha adhamo nri-nām) but where the father was a Brāhmaṇa and mother a Śudra the progeny was called Pārasava (nīshādaḥ Śudra kanyāyām yah Pārasava uchyate). The terms Varuṇa and Ugra are used for off-spring from mixed marriages. The former belonged to one of the seven low castes called antyaja whose occupation, according to Manu’s commentator Kullūka, was splitting canes (veṇor bhedanena yo jīvati burūḍa iti). The Ugra traced his origin to a Kshatriya father and a Śudra mother (kshatriyāch chchudrākanyāyām) and was noted for his cruel disposition and rude conduct (krūravihāravān). The Mritapa belonged to that class of persons who looked after dead bodies, and collected deadmen’s clothes or executed criminals. In the Rāmāyaṇa, he is called smasānādīkārin, the lord of the cremation ground. Persons belonging to these groups had an inferior position in the social setting, partly for their professions, and partly, for their lineage. The Sakas and Yavanas, living in Āryan villages and hamlets outside Āryanvarta were not ostracized, and they enjoyed the privilege of using a plate without polluting it. From Patañjali’s comment on the Śūtra Śudrānām anirvasitānām one gets the impression that foreigners were being gradually assimilated in Indian society without merging their separate entity.

Family circle:

The family (kula) formed the smaller unit and its members looked after the collective interest rather than the indivi-

20. X.8.
22. Ṭān. X.9.
23. Mḥb. XIII. 2583.
26. II.4.10 p. 475.
27. I.1.51 p. 128.9.
dual one for mutual welfare. In this connection, it may be interesting to assess the status of the existing members and that of the new entrants in the family group. The families were high and noble, like those of the regal class (Rājakula, Rājapatrī, Rajaduhitā), or of a degraded nature (daushkulyam). There were certain families named after the teacher, or the preceptor, as for instance, Gārgyakulam, Vaidakulam, Āṅgakulam, Kārishagandhyāpatikulam, and a few more named after the position or the designation of the person, such as Grāmanikulam or Senānikulam. The members of this unit constituted blood kindred with varying status, as the eldest, second, and the youngest, when there were more than one son (bahushu putreshu etad upapannam bhavaty ayam me jyeshtaḥ putro 'yam me madhyamo 'yam me kanīyān iti). The family group included brother and his son (bhrātushputra), and a number of other relations (bahavo 'bhīsambandhāḥ) but the circle was not confined to marital relations only (arthā yamā maukhāḥ śrauvās cha). The Grihapati with his bhāryā or patnī, both terms being synonymous, looked after the domestic interest. The son was supposed to be the remover of sorrow (Sokāpanudah putro jātah), and his birth in the family was hailed with joy. The nāmakarman ceremony took place on the tenth day after the birth of the child (daśamya uttarakālam putrasya jātasya nāma bhidadhīt). The daughter’s son (daunhitra) and grandson (pautra), were fairly important persons in a family. The relations on the in-law’s side included the parents-in-law (śvasura śvasru). The ma-
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ternal and paternal aunts (mātrishvasā pitrishvasā), the maternal uncle and aunt (his wife) (mātula-mātulāni or mātuli), the grandparents on the father’s and the mother’s side (pitāmaha pitāmahi; mātāmaha mātāmahi) were other Yavena relations. The Mahābhāshya does not add other relations to the family group. The reference to the maternal uncle (mātula), Āśāḥhasena in the Pabhosa record indicates the broad nature of the family circle. The members of at least three generations, pitāmaha, pitā and pautra in direct line belonged to the family group, as one notices in the comment relating to the Yuvasamjñā.

Food:

The evidence adduced by Patañjali on the subject of ‘Food and Drinks’, is exhaustive, with vegetarian and non-vegetarian items, solid and liquid food, arrangements for meals, milk preparations, sweets, wines, and fruits, and even dinner etiquette rules. Fasts were undertaken for some set purposes, like the one for propitiating the Sun (Ādityavrata). In the Mahānāmnāivrata, verses of that name were recited. During the period of fasting, people lived on water (ab-bhaksha) and sometimes even without it (vāyu bhaksha). The word bhojya denoted food fit for eating (bhakshya), whether solid (kharavishada) or liquid (drava); but at one place in the Mahābhāshya its use is restricted to solid food alone, as for instance, in the illustration (guḍena samsrishtā guḍasamsrishtāh guḍasamsrishtāh dhānā guḍadhānāh). A study of the data would suggest the taste of the people, and their favourite dishes.

(a) Types of food — Vegetarian: A vegetarian was known as sākabhojin and he had to depend exclusively on grains and vegetables for his staple food, though there was a
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48. I. 1.1 p. 6.23.
49. II. 1.35 p. 387.9.
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wider choice of alternatives. These included śāli [51] (a rice of ten varieties), hāyana [52] (a sort of red rice), yava [53] (barley), and shashṭika [54] (another kind of rice ripening in sixty days). Some other cereals were yavāni [55] (ptychotis ajowan), a kind of inferior barley, gavidhuka [56] boiled with rice (gavidhuka yavāgu), and with barley (gavidhukaśakāyāh) [57] in preparing gruel, and tila [58] (sesamum indicum). The auxiliary edibles, popularly known as pulses, included: mudga, rājamāsha, [59] and māsha, [60] a kind of pulse having red marks with black and grey spots. Certain stuff known as saṁskritam could be taken without any further preparation or dressing (saṁskritam hi nāma tad bhavati vat tad eva apakrishya abhy-ava-hriyate, like, groats grounded on stone (dārśadaḥ saktava iti), but barley pounded in a mortar needed extra cooking before it could be eaten (na cha yāvaka ulūkhalād eva apakrishya abhyavahriyate 'vasavam randhanādini pratikshyāṇī). [61] The dressing of substances was done through different processes: miśrikaraṇa, the act of mixing, seasoning an ingredient; vyañ- jana—the use of anything in cooking or preparing food; and using sauce and condiment. Failure to do so rendered the food tasteless. The two sūtras of Pāṇini Annena vyañjanam and Bhak- sheṇa miśrikaraṇam, considered together by Patañjalī [62] give some information regarding the process of dressing articles of food before they could be served on the table. Dadhi-curd was used for sprinkling (dadhyupasiktā), [63] and tamarind sauce (taittidi- kām) [64] gave flavour. Palāla-ground sesamum, sūpa-pulse juice, and śāka-vegetables were mixed with other substances. Only
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mūlaka\textsuperscript{35} and alābū,\textsuperscript{66} the fruit of the bottle gourd mentioned in the Mahābhāshya, are placed in the list of vegetables in the Arthaśāstra,\textsuperscript{67} and the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana.\textsuperscript{68}

The favourite vegetarian food was boiled rice, called odana,\textsuperscript{69} also known as bhakta,\textsuperscript{70} which was sometimes cooked with meat (māṁsādana).\textsuperscript{71} It was much relished, and Patañjali metaphorically compares the heap of rice served on a plate to the mountain Vindhya (Vindhyo vardhitakam iti).\textsuperscript{72} This staple food dating back to the Vedic times,\textsuperscript{73} continued to be popular in the later period as well.\textsuperscript{74} Yavāgu or rice gruel was a liquid substance, possibly licked with the fingers of the hand (vilepi) or mixed with water and then drunk (peya). It is associated with payas milk, and sūpa meant for Brāhmaṇas (brāhmaṇarṭkā yavāgu iti).\textsuperscript{75} The Kāśikā mentions yavāgu of a thin variety (alpanā yavāgūr ushnika ity uchyate),\textsuperscript{76} and another a scaldy one (nakhampacchā yavāgu).\textsuperscript{77} In earlier literature\textsuperscript{78} it is referred to as a barley gruel, but it also denoted weak decoctions of other kinds of Jartila and Gavidhuka.\textsuperscript{79} Sūpa, or thin curry, dressed with salt (lavanah sūpha),\textsuperscript{80} was a good combination with boiled rice (iha cha bahur odanah bahuh sūpa iti).\textsuperscript{81} A pea-soup was also prepared (kālāya sūpa)\textsuperscript{82}.

The vegetarian menu included several other items, some of which were meant for breakfast, or afternoon nourishment,
such as *krisara*<sup>83</sup> a mixture of sesamum and rice, with a few peas and spices added to it, and *saktu*<sup>84</sup> groats mixed with molasses or *dadhi*. Sweets and sweet cakes included: *sashkuli*<sup>85</sup> made of ground rice, sugar and sesamum and cooked in oil; *pūpa*<sup>86</sup> or *apūpa*<sup>87</sup> mixed with ghee (*ghritavānt*), or made of rice and barley; *pishtapindi*<sup>88</sup>—a flour cake, and *palāla*<sup>89</sup> a kind of sweetmeat made of *gudā*, sesamum and sugar, and cooked. The substances used in making sweet preparations were *madhu*<sup>90</sup> or honey, *gudā*<sup>91</sup> molasses produced from sugar cane juice, and *sarkara*<sup>92</sup> or crystal sugar. The sweet balls popularly known as *modaka*<sup>93</sup> were relished by children. Certain cold drinks soothed the wearied people in summer, as for example, *gudodaka*<sup>94</sup>, a thin liquid substance, being a mixture of water and molasses. *Payas*-milk, and whey (*mathitam*) were available from shopkeepers known as *māthitika*.<sup>95</sup> *Huviyamgavīna*<sup>96</sup> was clarified butter prepared from last day’s milk.

(b) *Non-vegetarian*: The non-vegetarians seem to have enjoyed both types of food, as there were some restrictions imposed by custom regarding the slaughter of animals. Patañjali mentions that five five-nailed animals could be taken (*pañcha panchanakhā bhakshyā*) but not others (*anyē bhakshyāḥ*). The wild boar and the wild cock could be eaten, but not those from the village itself (*abhakshyō grāmyakukkuṭo ’bhakshyō grāmyasūkara*).<sup>97</sup> A town born boar or cock also enjoyed this privilege (*nagaro ’pi na bhak-*)

---
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shyate). A glutton, fond of flesh, was known as māmsāšīlaḥ. There is a reference to deer being sacrificed for preparing meat rice (māmsauḍanāya vyāharati mrigaḥ). Raw flesh was known as kravya and that of sheep was called avermāmsām. The meat with a thick membrane or omentum (pravapāni māmsāni) was probably relished. One who had tasted the flesh of śāraṇga bird was called śarangajagādhi. Onions (palāṇdu) were, probably, included in the non-vegetarian menu, but in literature their use is forbidden for the Kshatriyas. The fish eater was required to remove scales and small bones before eating it (ṣakalakaṇṭakān utsvijati).

(c) Fruits and Drinks: In a lavish menu, items of dessert and sweet wines were not left out. The fruits included: Bimba (momordica monadelpha) to which the lips of women are compared by poets; dādima—pomegranate; mriddvikā, a kind of vine having reddish grapes, and kuvalī, the fruit of jujube tree. These are only a few fruits mentioned in the Mahābhārata, but there were certainly other fruits as well. Different kinds of drinks—soft and alcoholic—were enjoyed by the people. In the case of a Brāhmaṇi, religious penalty was attached to drinking, and one so doing incurred the risk of being deprived of the company of her husband in the next world (vā Brāhmaṇi surāpi bhavati nainām devāḥ patiloke nayanti). Its use, however, was not unknown in a Brāhmaṇa family. The Bhāṣyakāra mentions the following types
of alcoholic drinks: surā\textsuperscript{113} which was distilled from molasses, and a spirituous liquor made of rice called prasannā which often had oily substance in its (bahu-tailam prasannā),\textsuperscript{114} and śundā, a spirituous liquor,\textsuperscript{115} though the term also denoted a tavern where it was available, and its seller was known as śundāra.\textsuperscript{116} One fond of it was called saunḍa.\textsuperscript{117} Āsūtī,\textsuperscript{118} a brew mixture mentioned earlier by Pāṇini, was a religious drink prepared by the priest known as Āsūtivala.\textsuperscript{119} Flavour was sometimes given to these alcoholic preparations by mixing onion juice (ayam palāṇḍunā surām pibet).\textsuperscript{120} Drinking to the lees was not unknown, and there is a reference to drinking a complete jar (ghaṭimādhamaḥ), and through a pipe made of reed (nāḍimādhamaḥ).\textsuperscript{121}

Dinner Etiquette:

Certain conventional dinner rules were observed in higher circles with a view to maintaining the dignity of social relations. These included table manners, and those relating to the extending and acceptance of invitations to dinner. The servers were not expected to partake while the guests were eating (Brāhmaṇā bhojyantāṁ, mātharakauṇḍinyau parivevishṭam iti na idāniṁ tav bhuṇjate.)\textsuperscript{122} Invitations were generally extended to members of one’s caste (anyo ‘nyam ime Brāhmaṇa kule bhojayataḥ).\textsuperscript{123} Certain Brāhmaṇas, known as śrāddhahbojin, accepted invitations to partake obsequial food; but those who avoided such invitations were called a-śrāddhahboji Brāhmaṇaḥ.\textsuperscript{124} There were two kinds of invitations -nimanaṇa and āmantraṇa. The former was extended
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in offering *havya*—oblation to gods, and *kavya*—oblation to manes food. It was obligatory to accept it *(evaṁ tarhi yan niyogataḥ kartavyam tān nimantram)*, as its refusal entailed sin *(brāhmaṇena siddham bhujyatām ity ukte dharmah pṛatyākhyātuh.)* Ajmanraṇa was only a friendly invitation without any obligation attached to it. A common meal was called *samāsa* which probably implied taking food on the same table, or in the same row on the floor, but in different plates. In certain customary feasts, the choice was limited to a particular item, as for example, the *vaṭaka* cakes were eaten on the *vaṭakinī Paunamāsī* day.

**Household Effects:**

These included several utensils used in cooking, as well as those laid on the dinner table, and others, needed for ordinary household comforts. Pataṅjali mentions a smaller water jar *ghaṭikā*—a still smaller vessel, popularly known as student’s water pot, and *kumbha*—another type of water storing vessel. The last one was big enough to store grain which could last for some time. One doing so was known as *kumbhidhānya (yasya kumbhyāṁ eva dhānyam sa kumbhidhānyah)*. Other vessels included: *kuṇḍa*—which was bowl shaped, as illustrated by Fergusson in his work showing a woman holding a bowl in her left hand, and a *ghaṭa*—covered with a glass in her right hand; and *sthāli*—a big earthen dish or pan, now known as *thāli*. There is a reference to *sthalipīṭhara,* probably a wooden stool on which the plate was placed. *Ukhā,* a boiler or cauldron, is noted by Pataṅ-
jali

by way of comparison. There were also special jars for storing ghee (ghritaghata) and oil (tailaghata).

Sarāva

was a small shallow dish or cup which is mentioned in earlier literature, as a measure of corn, and chāru was particularly used in preparing oblation of the same name. Some of the vessels, like those for storing water, oil or ghee, were earthen; but copper or bronze ones were not unknown. These were used for taking rice and ghee, as well as milk. That reminds one of the famous story of an old woman asking for a boon from Indra (bahukshiraghritam odanam kāmasyapātryām bhuñjiraññiti).

Some of these utensils—a bowl, plate or platter and a water vessel—are also noticed in the Bharhut sculptures.

Other household effects included: soft chair (mañchika), a bed-stead (khatyā), and lamps (pradīpa) of two kinds a standing one with a heavy base to keep it steady, and a hanging one, as shown in the Bharhut sculptures. The chairs with back and arms, or plain ones like ordinary stools, were different from those used by the noble class. The bedstead was a simple oblong frame supported on four legs, called khatyāpāda by Patañjali with club feet, exactly like the common bedstead of the present day.

Housing Arrangements:

The information supplied by Mahābhāshya on this topic is meagre, but the Bharhut illustrations are helpful in this matter. The dwelling houses were of one stereotyped pat-
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tern, consisting of a long room with a pointed or semi-cylindrical domed roof, and a small opening for air and light on each side. B. M. Barua suggested that the home of the common people was a mud-walled hut, provided with doors and small windows, and the same pattern was used for the market shops. The abodes of hermits and ascetics were mere huts, with roofs thatched with straw and the four sides tapered to a point marked by a pinnacle. The best illustration of such huts is provided by the one fenced with a bamboo palisade, and adorned with a somewhat ornamental pinnacle. Patañjali mentions gavākṣhā or round window, and aṭṭālika or tower. The compound aṭṭālika-bandham has been used by him to illustrate the formation of those towers. The plastering (kuṭṭimā) of the floor had not changed the simplicity of the houses which were in striking contrast, at least in size, with the palaces of which only one specimen (vaijayanta prāśāda) is seen in the sculptures. It is a three-storied building divided into three perpendicular portions with an open pillar hall in the basement, and three arched openings on each section. Further details are wanting, and there is no reference to the plastering of walls (kaṭalēpana), partitions (bhitti), separate apartments for ladies (antāhpara), and the painting of the house (varṇitā), as one finds in the Sanskrit Buddhist literature of a later period. The Bhāshyakāra is silent about the material used in the construction of houses. Megasthenes mentions the beautiful wooden palace of the Mauryas, but the monuments of this period suggest a change from wood to stone or bricks, which may have imposed some limitations on the size and types of houses. This may be the main reason
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for a single pattern of houses, as one finds in the Bhārhat sculptures.

Dress and Ornaments:

Evidence relating to these items is available from several sources—the Mahābhāshya, Bhārhat sculptures and the terracotta figurines of that period which have been found at many places in Northern India. The use of clothes was primarily to cover the body (śāṭakān āchchhādayāmaḥ). The lower garment was called upasamvyāna corresponding to modern dhotī—loin cloth—which was generally white in colour (śukla vastra). The upper cloth for covering shoulders was called pata. Its white colour (pataḥ śuklaḥ) made it distinct from the red turban (lohito uṣhṇishah) which was the common dress of a priest (lohitoshnisha ritvijah pracharanti). Patañjali also refers to the use of cotton (kārpāsa) and wool (urṇā). The sewing of clothes was done through a sharp needle (ṭikshṇayā sūchyā sīvyan). The use of tunics was known even in earlier times, and the Bhārhat sculptures have a single figure of a soldier dressed in tunic with long sleeves covering the mid thigh. It is tied in two places by a cord with two tassels, and across the stomach by a double looped bow. The dhotī, as usual, covers the loins and thighs, reaching below the knees with the ends hanging down to the ground in front in a series of extremely stiff and formal folds. Boots were also used. Patañjali refers to leather shoes (ūpānah charmā), as well as wooden sandals (ūpānah dāru). They are also noticed in the solitary figure of a soldier at Bhārhat, reaching up to the legs and fastened by a cord with two tassels.
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The lay devotees are bare-footed, as it is against the custom of the country to put on shoes in places of worship.

The dress of ladies consisted of a skirt, generally white in colour (śukla śāṭī). There is no reference to the covering of the upper part, but one can hardly doubt the use of paṭa. The upper parts of the figures of Yakshiṅīs Chandā and Chūlakokā are shown naked in sculptures, but in the case of the former ‘there are perceptible marks of the folds or creases’, as Cunningham pointed out, ‘of a light muslin wrapper under the right breast’. He thought it probable that an upper garment of a light material was intended to be shown by the sculptor, but its folds were purposely avoided with a view to displaying different types of necklaces, collars and girdles. The head was covered by elaborately worked veils, of which specimens can be noticed in the Yakshiṅī figures at Bhārhat. The sculptor found it rather difficult to show the wrapping of the veil which covers the shoulders down to the waist, and the parallel creases, seen under the right breast, are probably intended to show that the Chaddar upper covering, was wrapped round the body. Strabo also mentions embroidered garments, interwoven with gold.

The dyeing of clothes was very common. Pataṅjali refers to the blue (nīla), yellow (pīta), green (harit), and brown red (kāṣhāya) colours. Red was very popular, and the turban cloth was dyed in that colour. The substance used for dyeing was known as sakala, a kind of black pigment, but clay or slime (kardama) was well-known. A taste for the combination of colours is apparent from a reference to the white amidst the red (dvaya raktaya vastrayor madhye śuklam vastram tadgunaṁ upa-labhyate).

(b) Ornaments:

Pataṅjali mentions four kinds of ornaments which could
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be made out of a lump of gold without disturbing the substance, (ākritir anyā cha anyā cha bhavati dravyam punas tad eva). These are rūchaka, kaṭaka, svastika, and kuṇḍala. Probably rūchaka was a kind of gold ornament or necklace, while kaṭaka was a bracelet of gold or shell. The svastika and kuṇḍala were a triangular piece and an ear-ring respectively. Besides these ornaments, a few more noticed in the Bhārāhut sculptures can be listed. Ornaments were not confined to ladies only; men also used a few. Ear-rings, necklaces, armlets and bracelets were put on by both, but forehead pieces like latikā or the fastened leaf, long collars, garlands, zones or girdles and anklets were exclusively meant for ladies. The svastika of Patañjali was a triangular crest jewel. The earrings, popularly known as karnikā or kuṇḍala, were of different types, as shown by Cunningham. The attached pendants were given separate names, such as bell pendant, now called jhumkā in Hindi. The Buddhist triratna was very popular. Necklace corresponding to rūchaka of Patañjali, now called hara, could be a short (kaṇṭhābhūshā), or a long one (lalāntikā), reaching as far as the breasts. The triratna figures prominently in it. Armlets, used uniformly, were bands of gold with precious stones embedded in them. They are now known as bāju, and are used by ladies alone. Bracelets, corresponding to kaṭaka of the Mahābhāṣya, had succession of strings and beads, either square or round in shape and their number varied. Girdles were exclusively meant for ladies and there are some good specimens of this ornament in the Bhārāhut sculptures. Some of these have small bunches or bells sounding with the gait of the lady. Anklets and finger rings were minor ornaments. The former were either of spiral coils, or of consecutive circles of gold pieces one over the other, the upper and the lower ones being ornamented.

These ornaments had something more than their decora-
tive value; they harmonised with the beauty of the body. Their use further depended on the taste of the person. The tendency to put on too many ornaments was common among ladies; for men it was merely an attempt to show off.

Hair Arrangement:

The arrangement of hair was not so simple, as may appear, with a parting line in the middle simanta and the mass of hair gathered together at the back and plaits into one or two long rolls hanging down as low as the waist, or twisted and tied into a large knot at the back (keśānāṁ samāhāraś chūḍasya keśachūḍah), 183 There are also references to shaven headed persons (munḍa), those with twisted hair (jatī), or keeping a tuft or lock of hair on the crown of the head (ṣikhi). 184 The cutting of hair was also known (keśānvapatī), 185 and some also shaved their moustache (keśaśmasrūvatātī). 186 Patañjali refers to tanukesyaḥ striyah—meaning ‘ladies with delicate hair,’ or ‘keeping bob-wig’ which one hardly finds in the sculptures of that period. The figure at Bharhut and Sāṇchī, however, show different methods of arranging the hair. In the first type, the loose hair is allowed to fall at the back, and then the end is looped and knotted, 188 or it is arranged in a top knot when the lady has a head dress. 189 In the third type, the falling hair down the back is divided into two halves, and that, too, further into tassels, and then plaited. 190 Men generally kept long hair tied in a top-knot around which the folds of the turban were arranged. 191 The fashion of keeping plaits hair by the ladies, coiled round the head in a top knot, is also observed in sculptures 192
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some cases the hair is fastened by an ornament.\textsuperscript{193} The ascetics, as usual, have long hair worn round the crown in a cone like fashion, or simply let loose, with their wavy beards.\textsuperscript{194} Curly locks touching the neck are favourite with musicians, charioteers and soldiers.\textsuperscript{195}

A terracotta figurine of the Śunga period, now in the Indian Institute Museum at Oxford,\textsuperscript{166} is notable for its ornamental elaboration, and coiffure arrangement. The head dress of this figure is most attractive. The hair seems to be enclosed in a close fitting bonnet (or fillet) bordered from four rows of beads and terminating in two flower tassels. On each side of the bonnet are two turban like roles of cloth, each bound with a belt and highly ornate. The left one, slightly bigger is made up of five vertical stripes with strings of beads at regular intervals; but the right one is embellished with six rows of flower ornament between which are strings of beads. There are five emblems stuck into the right side.

The arranging of hair needed oil, comb and mirror, while collyrihm sticks, unguent vases, and pots were required for the make up of the face. Patañjali mentions chandana—sandal, gandha—perfume, and añjana or black pigment\textsuperscript{197} applied to the eye lashes. There is no reference to the method of preparing cosmetics and their proper application. A few centuries later, Ásvaghośha refers to the pounding of ointments, and the application of chandana paste with the help of a stick (pattrāṅguli),\textsuperscript{198} which is also seen in a toilet scene depicted on a door jamb belonging to the Kushāna period.\textsuperscript{199} Probably the same thing was done in this period as well. The use of comb was not unknown to the Indians, even at the time of the Mohenjo-daro civilisation, and a very fine ivory comb, rectangular in shape with teeth on both the sides, was found by Mackay at the western end of the long lane.\textsuperscript{200}
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Face Decoration:

Cunningham noticed\textsuperscript{201} certain designs, probably tattooed, on the face of female figures, as for example, the sun and the moon and several types of flowers. An āṅkuśa or goad like mark is observed on the cheeks of a female bust figured, and the goddess Sirimā has a single star or flower on her left cheek bone. There are certain other figures which are more ornamented. These include one with a small bird or triśūla above each breast, another on the upper arm, an āṅkuśa or goad with two straight lines and a small flower on each cheekbone, besides two elaborate cheek ornaments. A third figure has the cheekbones decorated with the sun and the moon, and each cheek is covered with a dense mass of small ornaments. Cunningham contended on the basis of these marks that the Bhār hut culture should be associated with an aboriginal tribe called Kols. This is rather a far-fetched explanation. The Bhār hut culture is unconnected with that region and, secondly, it furnishes evidence of an advanced social organism. Tattooing is fairly common in India, and at one time it was encouraged even amongst high class ladies. In these figures, facial decorations were only of a temporary character, associated with the paint on the face.

Marriage and Position of Women:

A lawfully wedded wife is called bhāryā in the Mahābhāṣṭya (pāṇigrihitābhāryā),\textsuperscript{202} but a synonymous term ādhā\textsuperscript{203} is also mentioned. In another reference the former term is used for a kṣatriyā married lady (bhāryā nāma-kṣatriyā),\textsuperscript{204} but the appellation is too common, and its use cannot be restricted to denote ladies of any particular caste. Sometimes co-wives were also addressed as bhāryās (katibha-vato bhāryā iti),\textsuperscript{205} which might suggest polygamy, but it was practised only under exceptional circumstances in Indian

\textsuperscript{201} op. cit. p. 39.
\textsuperscript{202} IV.1.52. p. 22.17.
\textsuperscript{203} I.1.1 p. 42.16.
\textsuperscript{204} III.1.112 p. 85.12.
\textsuperscript{205} II.2.25 p. 427.10.
society. The girls sometime had their choice in matrimony which was rather popular in the Regal class. Patañjali refers here to such a Brāhmaṇī girl (kharur iyam Brāhmaṇī)\textsuperscript{206} This may have been an exceptional case because marriages were generally arranged by parents who took into consideration the gotra and family of the other party. Sagotra marriage was not permissible, and one finds references to marital alliances between different gotras; the Atri with Bhāradvāja (Atribhārdvājikā), Vasishtha and Kaśyapa (Vasishṭhakāśyapikā), Bhrigu and Amgirāśa (Bhrigvaṁgirasikā), Garga Bhārgava (Gargabhārgavikā) and Kutsa and Kuśika (Kutsakuśikā)\textsuperscript{207} Despite the care taken by the parents to preserve purity and chastity through arranged marriages, there were occasional lapses, and the Bhāshyakāra refers to ladies who were not attached to any particular paramour, but were friendly with many (naṭānām striyo ramgām gatā yo yaḥ prichchhati kasya yūyam kasya yūyam iti tam tam tava tava ity āhuh)\textsuperscript{208} Patañjali also refers to unchaste girls (udariṇikanyā)\textsuperscript{209} and her off-spring was called kānīna\textsuperscript{210}.

After marriage the parties had certain conjugal rights and obligations towards each other. The relations between the husband and the wife were like the twisting of the rope (pāṇi sargyā rajjuk)\textsuperscript{211} and the wife clung to her lord in that spirit. Association with a woman during her periods was tabooed, and it was supposed that a woman drinking with one, who was in courses, got herself in menstrua (ya kharveṇa pibati tasyai kharvasisro rātriḥ tasyā iti prāpte)\textsuperscript{212} The Mahābhārata and the Manusmriti have refrained a lady in courses even from looking at deities\textsuperscript{213} A pregnant lady (garbhībhāryā), and one having delivered the child (prasūtabhāryā)\textsuperscript{214} or sūtikā\textsuperscript{215}.
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needed special care. Though there is no reference to a sūtikā-griha, the place of child’s delivery, one can hardly question the special arrangements which had to be made for that purpose. Ladies had freedom of movement, and there is no reference to the observance of parda. They enjoyed the respect of their family members. Marshall refers\textsuperscript{216} to the politeness of Indian manners in giving precedence to ladies over men in the Sāñchi gateway sculptures, especially in scenes of worship.

**Pastime and Recreations:**

The types and spheres of recreations varied, according to the sex and taste of the person, but there were some which were universally enjoyed. Patañjali mentions three terms which are more or less synonymous — samāja, samāsa and samavāya\textsuperscript{217} meaning ‘festive gathering’. Numerous items of entertainment, like music, dancing and acting figured there. Patañjali refers to the staging of the play of Kārīsa and his slaughter and that of the binding of Bali. (ye tāvad ete sōbhānīkā nīmaite pratyaksham Kaṁsaṁ ghatayanti pratyaksham cha Balim bandhayanti iti).\textsuperscript{218} In these performances, besides the show, the speech of the narrator and dialogues were equally enjoyed. yadārambhakā raṅgam gachchhanti naṭasya sroṣhayāmograntikasya sroṣhyāma iti).\textsuperscript{219} The actor used different types of head dresses (sarvakeśin naṭāḥ).\textsuperscript{220} The producer connected with the stage was known as sōbhānikā\textsuperscript{221} (saubhika), a term which according to the Mahāvastu,\textsuperscript{222} denoted a magician. It is just possible that there was a display of magic on the stage, as the later work Divyāvadāna\textsuperscript{223} actually mentions three kinds of magic performances (manojava, stambhani and śikki).

Dancing was also practised with the movements of steps

---
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in a rhythmical manner, and the hands expressing themes through gestures. The art seems to be confined to ladies alone. Patañjali refers to female dancers (śārtākikā), and the Bhārhat sculptures show only ladies dancing. Five dancing scenes representing, probably, different forms are noticed. These include a wife wanting to please her husband, the accomplished nymphs and courtesans dancing to the accompaniment of vocal and instrumental music, a Nāga maiden dancing on the lifted hood of a Nāga rāja maintaining rhythm with wavy motions of his body, and lastly, dancing by a Nāga rāja. The references, quoted above, suggest the practice of dramatic art in both ways—dancing and acting. Keith places Nāṭāsāstra in the third century A.D., but Pāṇini’s reference to the Naṭa-sūtras testify to the practice of some form of dancing and acting even in his time. Patañjali refers in a simile to a peacock dancing towards his beloved (priyāṁ mayūraṁ pratinamritaṁ yadvat tvanī naravara narmitīshi hrisṭah). There is also a reference to troupe dancers or actors (śailālino naṭah), who are noticed in an inscription of the Kushāṇa period (śailālakas). It is not certain if there were particular families of actors, or mobile companies visiting different places during his period.

Playing on vocal or instrumental music as a pastime was common. Certain gestures and postures in the Bhārhat sculptures suggest vocal music. Patañjali mentions some musical instruments drum (mridaṅga), conch (saṅkha), flute (tiṅava) and another instrument of the guitar type (vīnā) having seven strings. One proficient in playing on mridaṅga was known as mārdanika (mridaṅga vādanam śilpam anyā mārdanikah), whom Pāṇini calls maḍḍuka. It is explained
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in the Kāśika as maḍḍukāvādanam śilpam asya maḍḍukah),234 A tabor player is called jharjhara. Pīṭhara235 was a kind of 'saucepan for making musical sounds. Most of these instruments can be seen in the Bhārhut sculptures, and some were known even in Vedic times. The Aitareya Āranyakā236 enumerates the parts of a viṇā—head or neck (śiras), cavity (udara), sounding board (ambhāna), string (tantra) and plectrum (vādana). There are quite a few scenes in the Bhārhut sculptures displaying these instruments. A harp of seven strings is being played in the bas-relief of the Indraśālaguhā, and the Audabhūta jātaka scenes,237 and a drum, two harps and a pair of cymbals can be seen in the famous dancing apasaras scene,238 while a stringed viṇā in the hand of Pañchaśikha, the famous harper of Indra, is very conspicuous in another relief.239 Two kinds of drums—a smaller one beaten by the fingers, and a bigger one suspended from the neck and requiring drum sticks—are noticed in the heavenly dancing scenes.240 An Indian pipe, probably tūnava, is also traced with a pair of cymbals.241 The two kinds of drums were known as mridaṅga and kinkiṇi.242

Wrestling, walking and fire display were other items of recreations. The wrestling ground (śālā) attracted wrestlers (malla)243 but walking after meals (bhuktvā vrajati),244 might have been a good exercise for old men. Display of fireworks (alāta chakram)245 was more enjoyed by children, but dice playing was a favourite pastime for elders, especially those who could afford to stake. Gamblers were known as akshadyū; and those playing with stakes of gold were called hiranyadū.246
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Rogues or cheats in this game were common (akshadhūrta). Dice-playing has been a favourite pastime since the Vedic times, and continued to attract patrons, despite its consequences in all ages. Patañjali also notices another game called śalākā in which an unlucky throw was known as śalākā- pari in contrast to akshapari in the game of dice.

Social Evils:

Lack of enterprise and the desire to grow with very little effort (iha hi sarve manushyā alpena yatena mahato 'rthān ākāṅkshanti), generally prompted people to adopt underhand and foul means. There were evils like begging (dhanārtham bhikshāmahe) or striving for women (dārārtham ghaṭāmahe). The beggar was not satisfied with the first alms, but was anxious to accumulate (bhikshuko 'yam dvitiyam bhikshām āsādyam pārvām na jahāti samchayāya pravartate). Cheats (pārśvakāh) were anxious to secure money, but there were other social parasites like the abductor of women (strīkītava) or slayer of young boys (kumāra ghaṭin). The seducer even went to the extent of causing abortion (bhrūṇa-hatyā) with a view to hide his sins. These evils were not confined to men alone; women were equally responsible, may be, indirectly in certain cases. The prostitutes had their group at a conspicuous place (ganikām samūho gānīkām). It is needless to shed light on this institution which has had a long history. Garrulous people (mukhara) were not encouraged in society.
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Miscellaneous Items of Social Interest:

There are certain other items of social interest which refer to social etiquette or conventions, as for example, one should not bow to the ladies in return (abhivāde strīvan mā), or hands should be washed after touching fallen hair and nails (loma nakham sprishtvā saucham kartavyam iti), and the daily needs of the body should be attended first (purusho 'yam prātar utthāya yāny asya prati śarīram kāryāṇi tāni tāvat karoti). These are minor matters which have hardly any value, except for a little interest.

We have noticed the social life of the period under study in all its aspects. The division of society into the usual groups, and the creation of new castes, with the different names given to offspring from mixed marriages, received first attention. Patañjali was aware of this social phenomenon which was not new to that period. He was, however, anxious to preserve the purity of the Brāhmaṇas, who, despite their families, continued to enjoy their position by birth in Hindu society. A few castes, especially the mixed ones, had some special functions attached to them. Family was a homogenous unit, consisting of blood relations, and the authority of the head was recognized. The standard of living can very well be judged by the data on food, dress and ornaments. We discussed these topics in detail. The household effects included domestic utensils needed for food preparation, and furniture. We also considered the problem of marriage, and the position of women, as noticed in the Mahā-bhāskya. The ladies seem to have enjoyed considerable freedom, as noticed in the sculptures. Pastime and recreations were many and universally enjoyed, such as theatrical performances accompanied with dancing and music. Different kinds of musical instruments, mentioned by Patañjali, are also noticed in the sculptures. The indoor recreations included the game of dice which was probably meant for old and rich people, who had time and money to spend in stakes. Social evils in a
progressive society were not unknown. The evidence, on the whole, suggests an advanced social organism with full opportunities for relaxation and entertainments, and despite some social evils, the people in general were religious in outlook.
CHAPTER V

ECONOMIC LIFE

The information furnished by the Mahābhāshya about the economic life of the people is copious. People seem to have been prosperous, their demands ever increasing, with a fair amount of planning in economic enterprise. There is, however, no reference to guilds, or union of persons with identical interests, but Patañjali mentions a good many economic professions. Land was, of course, the primary source of livelihood, but people were interested in other types of avocations as well. Perilous journeys—inland and overseas—were undertaken by traders pointing to the wide and varied sphere covered by the economic activities of the people. Several types of coins served as the medium of exchange and proper weights and measures ensured fuller satisfaction to the buyer. In this connection, it is interesting to mention the means of communication and transportation, with particular reference to the types of carriages, caravans, and other vehicles mentioned in the Mahābhāshya.

Professions:

The economic occupations may be classified as follows: those relating to the artisan class, workers in metal, masons and architects, domestic servants, cooks and confectioners, wild professions, manual labourers and low professions. These exclude those relating to land, and merchandise which have to be considered separately.

(a) Artisan class: Patañjali refers to give types of artisans in a village, popularly known as Pañchakāruki,¹ who, according to Uddyota, were kulāla—potter, karmāra—an artificer or blacksmith, vardhakin—carpenter, nāpita—barber, and rajaka, known as washerman. They are also noticed separately in the Mahābhāshya. The potter, whose profession dates back to the Vedic times,² made different kinds of pots out of a lump of clay (piṇḍakrigity upamrdiya ghaṭikā kriyante³—‘anayor

mritipinda'yar gha'tam kurvii). He was also known as kumbhakara or mahakumbhakara with a bigger establishment. Pots were available in his house called kumbhakarakulam (gha'tena karya may karishyan kumbhakarakulam gatvii). Kar-ma-ra was a mechanic, though the term sometimes suggested a blacksmith with an old standing. Pata'njali distinguishes the two, and he mentions ayaskara and lohakara separately. They are classed as silpin who received daily wages, unlike the dasakarmakara working on food and clothing only (bhaktam chelam cha). The carpenter is specified by the term vardhakin, different from takshan, whose job—takshakarman is mentioned by Pata'njali. This profession also dates back to the Vedic period. The kautataksha of Pani'ni's Ash'tadhyayii, unlike the vardhakin, worked at home on his own account and not for a village or corporation. His position is explained in the Kasi'ka (svatantra'h karmajivi na kasyachit pratibaddha ity artha'h). Napita, the village barber, and rajaka, the washerman, were indispensable in the economic life of the village. It is probable that the latter was also dyeing clothes (ra'jhayati vastrapii).

(b) Workers in Metal: These included goldsmiths, popularly known as suvarnakara who could make different kinds of ornaments out of a lump of gold (suvarnam kayachid akritya yuktam pindo bhavati). This profession seems to be in a flourishing condition in that period, as we find profuse use of ornaments in sculptures. The blacksmith, known as
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lohakāra, or ayasakāra, is mentioned separately by Patañjali. He was engaged in making things of domestic use, like needles used for sewing clothes (tīkshṇayā sūchyā sīvyan); and arms (tīkṣhṇena paraśunā vṛiṣchan). There is no reference to silversmith or rajatakāra, and coppersmith (tāmra-kuṭṭa) in the Mahābhāṣya but their existence in the economic life need not be questioned.

(c) Masons and Architects: To this profession belonged the nagarkāra, or the city architect who probably supervised the construction of buildings, or actually took part in laying bricks, as one finds in the Jetavana monastery scene in Bhārhut sculptures, where the foundation is filled with golden pieces. Patañjali also refers to the kūpa-khānaka, or well-digger, bestrewed with dust in the process of digging and removing earth (kūpakhānako kūpam khanam yadyapi mrida pāṁśubhiś cha avakīrṇo bhavati).

(d) Domestic servants: These were generally engaged by rich people and included dāsakarmakāra who was engaged on food and clothing (dāsakarmakāra namaite' pi svabhūtyartham eva pravartante bhaktam chelam cha lapsyāmahe). Kimkarā was a female servant, probably required for household work. Some others were needed for domestic purposes, as for example, dvārapāld—porter, chattradhāra—canopy-holder, bhāravāha—a carrier or porter, ghaṭagrāha—the water bearer or carrier, and bhrāśṭraminīgha—the frier or cook, who sometimes kept his own shop, and provided fried things.

(e) Cooks and Confectioners: These included the frier, working in his independent capacity and selling fried barley (bharuja) or grain. The confectioners sold articles of daily consumption with reference to drinks and cakes. The māthi-
tika—selling whey (mathitam pañyam asya māthitika),28 and apūpika29—dealing in baked cakes or pastries called sashkuli, and maudakika30 in sweet could be particularised in this group. These professions were not identical. According to the Mahāvastu,31 the sweet-meat dealers (modakārākāḥ) and curd makers (dādhikāḥ) had separate guilds (śrenī). Certain other professions, connected with food, were those of grinders of food grain (saktukīra), and winnowers of grain (taṇḍulīka).32 The former is only indirectly referred to in the Mahābhāshya,33 but the profession was very important and had a guild of its own in later times.34

(f) Wild professions: Though not actually wild in nature, this group included professions like those of fishermen (nishāda),35 also called kaivarta or ferrymen (nishādo mārgavam sūte dāsam navakarma jīvinam);36 fowlers (śākunika)37 and certain others—śākulika) mātsyika mainika and śāphārika38—all meaning fishermen. The mainika was so called, because he was engaged in catching fishes (mīnāṁ hanti mainikāḥ). These professions are noticed in earlier39 and later literature.40

(g) Low Professions: The low professions, included those of the mat maker who fastened together through string, wooden pegs and straw (saṁnaddham rajjukilaka pūlapānim),41 weaver (tavtuvāya) who could make cloth from threads (asya sūtrasya sāṭakam vayeti),42 and hair weaver (vālavāya).43 Another
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term sāṃmātra,\textsuperscript{44} meaning ‘a measurer’s son’, appears to be of an administrative nature having nothing to do with any economic profession.

It is difficult to make a cut and dried classification of the economic professions. There were certainly many more than are actually mentioned in the \textit{Mahābhāṣyā}. One can hardly deny that some of these had their guilds or corporate organisations which existed in earlier times and are also traced in later literature.\textsuperscript{45}

\textit{Agriculture and Husbandry:}

Agricultural process has hardly undergone any change, despite political changes through the ages. The data furnished by the \textit{Mahābhāṣyā} might not suggest innovations, but some interesting details are worth mentioning, as for instance, different types of land, method of sowing, agricultural implements, seeds and crops, grain storage and other miscellaneous items. Husbandry, allied to agriculture, may also be considered here.

\textit{(a) Agricultural holdings:} The arable land was called \textit{kṣetra},\textsuperscript{46} an old Vedic term pointing to the existence of individual fields, carefully measured off, and fit for cultivation.\textsuperscript{47} Another word, mentioned by Patañjali is \textit{kedāra},\textsuperscript{48} noticed earlier in the \textit{Ashtādhyāyī}\textsuperscript{49} which was a field under water, as suggested by Manu.\textsuperscript{50} The Śūtrakāra distinguishes barren land (\textit{ūshara}) from pasture land (\textit{gocara})\textsuperscript{51} but Patañjali has mentioned only the latter one. The area brought under cultivation was known as \textit{halyā} or \textit{śityā}.\textsuperscript{52} The ordinary cultivator or agriculturist was called \textit{lāṅgalagraha}.\textsuperscript{53} The Bhāshya-
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kāra also refers to the general desire for good fields (sukshe-triyā). 54 The Mahābhāshya also mentions the employment of agricultural labour, which enabled the cultivator to relax himself, and do only supervision work (ekānte tūshţim. āsīna uchyate pańchabhir halaiḥ krishati iti). 55

(b) Preparation and methods of sowing: Before the actual sowing of the seed, the field was properly ploughed. This was done through oxen, which were also used in carts (gotaro 'yam yaḥ śakaṭam vahati śirām cha). 56 The plough was called śira. The stumps in the ground were weeded out by a hoe, known as stambaghna. 57 It was necessary to remove the weeds (triṇa), thorns and stones, before the actual ploughing of the land. The required number of ploughs depended on the fertility of the land, and its dimensions; the maximum noticed in the Mahābhāshya is five (pańchabhir halaiḥ). After the ploughing of the land, the next stage was the sowing of the seeds, which naturally varied according to crops and seasons. Pāṇini refers to different types of fields according to crops, as for example, a barley field was called yavayam (yavānām bhava-nām kshetram yavyam), that of beans (māshyam), and sesamum (tilyam). 58 Patañjali does not distinguish them. As regards the required quantity of seeds for sowing, the Kāśikā refers to prāsthikam, draṇikam and khārikam fields, that is, those requiring one prastha droṇa or khāri weights of seed; but according to Patañjali, there were fields requiring a hundred khāri (khāraṣatika) or a thousand worth of seeds (khāra-sahasrika). 59 Sesamum (tila) and beans (māsha) were mixed together in the process of sowing (tilaiḥ saha māśāṁ vapati iti). 60 It was also customary to sow seeds on an auspicious day (āśvayujī Paurnamāsi), 61 though this fact is not mentioned in the Mahābhāshya.

54. VII.1.39 p. 256.24.
55. III.1.26 p. 33.22.
56. V.3.35 p. 413.17.
57. III.3.83 p. 151.8.
58. V.2.3.4, Kāśikā p. 405.
59. V.1.45 p. 389
60. V.1.58 p. 353.23.
61. II.3.19 p. 452.23.
After the sowing of the seeds, periodical supply of water was required for the fields. This was done through canals *śālāyārtham kulyāh Pranīyante*), as it was not unusual to expect drought in that village (*vigataḥ sechakā asmād grūmād visechako grāmaḥ*). The crop was expected to be good, if there was adequate rainfall (*devaśched vrishṭo nishpannah śālayāh*).

**Ripening and Reaping:**

Some crops ripened early, but others took time. Beans ripened quickly (*pachelimā māshāḥ*), but another type took sixty days (*mudgā api shashṭirātreṇa pachyante*). The standing crop also needed protection from animals, as well as from robbers. Danger was apprehended for the barley crop from deer (*na cha mrigāḥ santīti yavā nopyante*), and so there was the need for an observer (*chāvaka*). A shadow figure, made of straw (*chanchabhirūpāḥ*), was placed in the field to frighten crows and birds, causing destruction to crops. Other dangers were from mole (*ākhu*), locust (*śalabha*) and hawk (*śyena*). When the crop was ready, reaping or cutting (*lavana*) with a sickle (*dātra*) was the next step. The reaper was called *lavaka* probably an agricultural labourer employed on terms which are not mentioned, but, probably, receiving about 1/16 of the produce as his share. The over-ripened grain, requiring immediate attention is alluded to in the Pāṇinian rule III.1.125 by the word *lavya*. Patañjali mentions *avaśya-lāvyam* and *avaśyapāvyam*, probably, in a different sense. Reaping and mowing seem to be connected. After the cutting
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of the standing crop, the produce was stored on the threshing floor (*khalā*) for being mowed, which was followed by another process called *nispāva.* A winnowing fan (*śūrpa*) was used by the winnower (*taṇḍulika*) who might have been an agricultural labourer, employed for the purpose of separating the grain from the chaff. Farmers kept their threshing floors close by in mutual interest.

**Storing:**

The grain was separated from the chaff, and stored in a granary, called *koshṭha* or *kuśala.* Both Pāṇini and Patañjali mention these agricultural operations with little difference in expression. The latter, in his comment on the *tishṭhadgvaḍī* sūtra, refers to *khaleyavam khalebusam lūnayavam lūyamānayavam pūtayavam pūyamanayavam.* In sequence of time, during the performance of these operations, *lūnayavam* should come first, and the compound indicates the time when barley was reaped, or was in the process of being reaped (*lūyamānayavam*). The second compound, mentioned as first, suggests the storing of the barley crop, or barley straw (*khalebusam*, on the threshing floor; and lastly the separation of the corn from the straw already done, or in the process of being done (*pūtayavam pūyamanayavam*).

Grain was stored in jars, and a person, so doing for a specific period, was called *kumbhīdhānya.* A good crop was an indication of the prosperous time ahead which could be found out from a single grain of rice (*eko vṛihīk sampannah subhikṣham karoti*). Certain crops were associated with definite parts of the country, as for example, barley was particularly grown in the lands of Uśīnara and Madra (*Uśīnaravanmadreshu yavah* and Magadha was famous for *sāli* or rice (*tān eva
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śālin bhuṇjāmahe ye magadheshu).  

Other Crops:

Besides barley, rice, pulses, and sesameum, which may be called krishṭapachyā—ripening in arable land, there were other crops depending exclusively on nature without human enterprise (akrishṭapachyā).  The latter class, probably, included nīvāra—wild rice which is not mentioned by Patañjali, but is referred to by Aśvaghosha, as the only food for ascetics. Sugar cane (ikṣhu), cotton (kārpāsa) flax (umā), and hemp (bhaṅga) were also grown.

Husbandry:

This economic undertaking is associated with land. The person, rearing or in charge of cattle, was known as gopa or gopāla in the Vedic period. These terms indicate that only cows were reared for milking purpose. The Mahābhāshya provides details regarding different kinds of cows, the method of controlling them when they were out for grazing, and their śālās or stables. Gopālaka and gavālava, probably synonymous, are mentioned by Patañjali. One possessing brindled cows was known as chitrāgu, and the owner of mottled ones was called sabaṅgula. Paśupālikā or gopālikā are the two words suggesting women tending cows. The keeper controlled them through a staff (goyūtham danda praghaṭitaṁ sarvam samāṁ ghosham gachchhatī). There are also references to cow stable (gogoshṭham gavāṁ sthānam), and sheep stable.
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A flock of sheep was known as *avikaṭa*, and the owner was required to pay tribute or tax consisting of a ram to the king which was called *avikaṭorana*.\(^{96}\) *Gomanḍala*\(^{97}\) is used to denote the herd of cows, and *goprapadniyam*\(^{98}\) indicated the time of their returning home. Patañjali mentions *gopa* as a special *jāti*\(^{100}\) or class. There is no reference to the time of milking cows, nor to the duties of the *gopa* who was expected to look after the scattered cows, and to prevent them from trespassing upon cornfields, as are noticed by Aśvaghosa.\(^{100}\)

**Merchandise:**

This aspect of economic life necessitates consideration of the data relating to the sale of goods, trade stipulations, if any, vendible commodities, earnest money and consideration, shops and markets import and export of trade, sale of prohibited articles and medium of exchange and barter. The general rule of conduct in business transactions is suggested by the word *vyavahāra*\(^{101}\) signifying a contract, but it is better to take its usage in a general sense. *Paṇya*\(^{102}\) is the proper word for a vendible article. The market place was called *āpana*,\(^{103}\) and the dealer was known as *ā-panika*.\(^{104}\) Generally the merchants were named after the things exposed by them for sale, as for instance, a perfume seller was called *sugandhāpanika*. Pāṇini mentions traders, deriving their professional designations from the places visited by them (*gantavyapanyam vānija*).\(^{105}\) Another word, probably suggesting a market place, is *saṁvāha*.\(^{106}\) Since it is associated with *grāma, bhosha* and *nagara*,

---
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one is not very sure about its correct meaning. The business men had shops, facing the main street, as appears from an indirect reference (atha yadā anena rathyāyām taudulodakam drishtah).\textsuperscript{107} There was a closer link between the village and the town for commercial purposes (loke 'dhikrito 'sau grāme 'dhikrito 'sau nagara iti uchyaate yo yatra vyāpāram gachchati).\textsuperscript{108}

*Trade Stipulations:*

The display of an article made it vendible (*krayya*).\textsuperscript{109} The standard of quality was also ensured, as for example, a woollen blanket conformed to the set standard (*panyakambala*).\textsuperscript{110} Negotiations necessary between the vendor and the vendee were called *panitavyah*;\textsuperscript{111} and the price, fixed in terms of coins or other things, actually fluctuated with the demand and supply, as well as with the quality of the thing. The *Mahabhaśhya* mentions the sale of rice (*dhānya*) for two *dronas* (*dvidroṇena dhānyam kriṇāti*), cattle for five *dronas* (*pañchakena paśūn kriṇāti*), and rice again for two gold pieces (*dvidroṇena hiranyena dhānyam kriṇāti*).\textsuperscript{112} Things were also sold by weight, as suggested by the word *dvisūrpam*, that is, containing two *śūrpa*s, or winnowing baskets with reference to purchases (*dvabhyaṁ śūrpaṁ kriṇām dvisūrpam*).\textsuperscript{113} A transaction was completed (*satyāpayati*)\textsuperscript{114} with the payment of the earnest money (*satyaṁkāra*)\textsuperscript{115} to the seller. There is no reference to the inspection of goods in the *Mahabhaśhya*, as we notice in a later work.\textsuperscript{116} Probably it was a formal affair, preceding the opening of negotiations which were arranged through a middle man. His share is hinted by the word *vasna*,
used in Vedic literature\(^{117}\) in the sense of ‘price paid for any-
thing’, or ‘its value’, or ‘the thing as an object of purchase’ or
‘ware’. Its implication is considered by Pāṇini in three Sūtras
which suggest ‘value’ or ‘sale price realised’, as its meaning.
In the first Sūtra vasnakrayavikrayāṭthan,\(^{118}\) vasnīka is dis-
tinguished from krayika or vikrayika; the former, according to
the Kāśikā,\(^{110}\) depended on vasna for his living (vasnena
jivati). It appears that vasnīka was, probably, a broker or an
agent, who brought about the deal between the vendor and
the vendee; and, when the sale price was realised, he was
entitled to his share which varied according to the proceeds
of the sale. The presence of the third party in a transaction
ensured security to the seller for his money, and to the buyer
for the quality of goods purchased.

‘Arthicles of Trade:

Vendible articles were many including the imported ones.
Besides his own produce, the vendor also displayed for sale
other things connected with his trade. It would mean a long
list to enumerate them, but the important ones excluding the
food products may be mentioned here, as for instance, fabrics
of silk (kausāya),\(^{120}\) wool (ūrṇa),\(^{121}\) flax (uṃā), hemp
(bhaṅga),\(^{122}\) cotton (kārpāṣa),\(^{123}\) cloth (vastra),\(^{124}\) blankets
of a set standard (pañya kambala),\(^{125}\) white woollen garment
(pāṇḍu kambala),\(^{126}\) deer skin (ajina),\(^{127}\) dye stuff (rāga),\(^{128}\)
and sandals and shoes (aupānahyam dāruaupānahyam
charma).\(^{129}\) Other vendible things ( needed for professional or
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domestic use were: iron chains for binding (śriṅkhalā),130 agricultural implements, like, sickle (dātra)131 and pottery utensils for storing ghee which were available at the house of the potter.132 Intoxicating drings were sold in bars (śunḍā),133 and articles of perfumery (gandha)134 and garland (mālā)135 were available either in shops or on streets from vendors. Weights (māna) and measures (parimāṇ),136 vehicles of communication like cart (śaṅka), chariot (ratha), and boat (nau)137 were also vendible. Even gold images did not escape the greed of the Mauryas, who were anxious to get money out of them, despite their sacred character, as noticed in Patañjali’s comment on the sūtra Jivikārthe chāpanye (Mauryair hiranyārthibhir archā prakalpitaḥ).138 Such a thing might have been done under exceptional circumstances, but one can hardly deny that payments had to be made for gold images. Even now idols can be purchased, but once they are set up in a temple their sacred character cannot be violated, and a Brāhmaṇa would prefer to starve rather than part with his idol. Patañjali has not commented on the sūtra Gantavya-
panyam vānije (VI.2.13) which is illustrated in the Kāśikā by merchants dealing in cows and bulls (govānijāḥ) and horse (aśva vānijāḥ).139 Ornaments and musical instruments were probably made to order, and some were probably displayed in the shop windows. The sale of certain articles was prohibited, as for example, beef could not be sold, nor was the sale of sesameum allowed, but that of mustard oil was permitted (yathā tārhi tailam na vikr̥tavayam māmsam na vikr̥tavayam iti vy-
apavriktas cha na vikriyate ‘vy apavriktam cha gāvaś cha sarshapāś cha vigr̥iyante).140
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Exchange and Barter:

An organised planning in the economic field could only be possible through a medium of exchange, so that people could have complete satisfaction in their requirements. In certain cases barter was also possible, as in the rural economy, where one product was exchanged for another. The thing given in change was called nimāna,\textsuperscript{141} and one received for it, nimeya.\textsuperscript{142} Commenting on the sūtra-Saṁkhya-guṇasya nimāne mavaṭ (V-2-47), which refers to the affixing of mavaṭ to numericals standing for the value of some part of a thing denoting another thing, Patañjali refers to the guiding principle in all barter transactions, namely, the invariable nature of the ratio. The valuation was determined on the basis of one portion of nimeya (the thing to be brought) with several portions of nimāna (the thing to be given in exchange). It is inapplicable in the case of dvau yavānāṁ traya udaśvit iti,\textsuperscript{143} nor can the ratio apply to fractions, but only to an integral number, as for example, its inapplicability in the illustration—dvau bhāgau yavānāṁ adhyadha udaśvitah.\textsuperscript{144} The comparative value of the thing has to be taken into consideration for the application of the mavaṭ affix, like, dvimayā yavā udaśvitah\textsuperscript{145} which suggests that the exchange value of udaśvit was twice as much as that of a yava. The mavaṭ affix also indicates time or fold—as dvimayā,\textsuperscript{146} sometimes qualifying the nimāna and sometimes the nimeya.

Barter transactions at that time were not confined to ordinary things of human need, but the principle extended even to bigger transactions. Both Pāṇini and Patañjali, have referred to vasanaṁ and kambalām\textsuperscript{147} pointing to the loan for a cloth of standard size, or that for a blanket of standard quality. The transactions relating to purchase and sale of animals were also arranged through barter, as for instance,
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Indian In the Time of Patanjali

pañchabhīr gobhiḥ krītah pañchayuh. One also finds a curious illustration of the purchase of a chariot for five kroṣh-krītaiḥ rathīḥ pañchakroṣhtībhī rathirī rītī). It is difficult to assess the value of a female jackal, unless the word kroṣhitī meant something valuable to be given in barter for a chariot. There are also references to measures of capacity which, when used in barter, had affixes denoting quantity, as for example, dvī-sūrpa or tri-sūrpa. Patañjali refers to three persons in a transaction—the person who gives, the other who takes, and the third who watches the transaction (tribhiḥ sākshād drish-tam bhavati yaś cha dadāti yasmai cha diyate yaś cha upadrashṭā).

Coinage:

The comment on the Ārhiya section refers to different types of coins. Most of these were in use in that period, and some could trace their origin to the Vedic times. The need for coins of different denominations and metals was to meet the economic pressure. Those mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya include: nishka, śatamāna, suvarṇa, śāna, kārṣṭāpana with its lower denominations—ardha or half, pāda—a quarter, māsha with still lower denominations—ardhamāsha, kākini and ardha-kākini; and rūpa which may have been a coin or a figure or symbol stamped on a coin. The value of nishka, a gold coin with a long history, was never uniform. It equalled a dināra, of 32 small or 16 large rattis, or a kārsha or suvarṇa of 16 māshas, or a pala of 4 or 5 suvarṇas, or a large pala or dināra, variously reckoned at 108 or 150 suvarṇas or māshas or 16 drammas. It was also a weight of silver of 4 suvarṇas.
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Patanjali uses the word *naishkika* in the sense of deserving a *nishka*, as for instance, one deserving a hundred was called *satikah* and a thousand *sahasraḥ*. The individual wealth was also reckoned in terms of this coin (*na hi nishkadhanaḥ satanishkadhanena spardhate*). The quarter, known as *pādanishka* is also mentioned in the *Mahābhāshya*.

The next coin *śatamāna* is noticed by Patanjali in his comment on the *sūtra vibhāsha kārashā paṇasahāsrābhīyām*, which refers to the optional elision of *luk* after the words *kārshaṇa* and *sahasra*. *Suvarna* and *śatamāna* are also added when they are preceded by *adhyardha*, or they are members of a *dvīgu* compound: like, *adhyardhasatamānam*, *dvīsatamānam*. The metal or value of this coin is not known, but, according to Manu, it was a denomination of silver (*śatamānas tu rajataḥ*). The position of *suvarna*, mentioned in the same context, is equally doubtful. It was a coin, as well as a denomination of weight equal to 80 guṇjas or 146 grains, according to Kauṭilya; and required an additional *kākiṇī* (one fourth *masha*), metal, to be added to it, as against loss in manufacture. In the time of Manu, a *suvarna* was one-fourth of a *nishka* (*chatuḥ suvarṇako nishko vijñeyas tu pramāṇataḥ*). A coin of lower denomination in ratio to *śatamāna* was *śāna* which, according to the evidence of the *Mahābhāshya*, was 1/8 of the latter (*astaḥ śānaḥ śatamānam vahanti*). It appears that *nishka* and *suvarna* were gold coins, while *śatamāna* and *śāna* were probably of silver, as suggested by Manu. The copper coins in circulation were of different denominations.

*Kārshaṇa* was the most popular coin of different values. It was, probably, the standard money and its denominational value was implied in phrases like *śatena krītāṁ satyam śataka-
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śatam iti\textsuperscript{164} and aikādaśam śatasahasram iti.\textsuperscript{165} According to Manu, was synonymous with pāna (kārshāpanas tu vijñeyas tāmrikaḥ kārshikāḥ pānaḥ).\textsuperscript{166} Its other name is prati or pratika, meaning ‘purchased of a kārshāpana’ (kārshāpanīkaḥ kārshāpanīki pratikaḥ pratikī).\textsuperscript{167} The metal of this coin was not only copper, as mentioned by Manu, but it could also be of silver,\textsuperscript{168} or black metal (iron or lead).\textsuperscript{169} Its value or weight differed according to the nature of the metal (if of gold 16 māshas, silver 16 pānas; and copper 80 raktikas or 176 grains).\textsuperscript{170} Numismatics use this term to denote Punch-marked coins. Its lower denominations were—ardha krshāpana,\textsuperscript{171} and pāda,\textsuperscript{172} the quarter one which was distinct from a pāda-nishka.\textsuperscript{173} Kauṭilya\textsuperscript{174} also mentions a token coin—asha-bhāga—1/8 of a kārshāpana in value. Cunningham suggested\textsuperscript{175} that the tail-end of the kārshāpana coins was limited to half and quarter size only.

Māsha, as a parimāṇa or weight,\textsuperscript{176} is distinguished from the type of pulse known by that name, and it is associated with aksha and pāda, the two other words denoting measures. Kauṭilya has classed\textsuperscript{177} it as a copper coin, being 1/16 of a kārshāpana in value, with its lower denominations—ardhamāsha which is also noticed in the Jātakas.\textsuperscript{178} There were still lower denominations like kākiṇī and ardha-kākiṇī. The latter is not directly referred to in the Mahābhāshya, but its use can be inferred from the reference to adhyardhakākākiṇikam,\textsuperscript{179} that is, one and
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a half kākiṇī. Rhys-Davids suggested\textsuperscript{180} that the monetary value of a kākanikā may be guessed at being 1/8 of a kahāpana, as it occurs in a descending order where each succeeding coin marks half the value of the preceding one, that is, kahāpana, aḍgha, pāda, māsaka, kākanikā, followed by mudhā ‘for nothing’. It appears that these lower denominations were both coins and weights.

The finds of silver and copper punch-marked coins have testified to the use of these coins, and the correctness of their weight as recorded in literature; but the total absence of gold coins is a strange phenomenon. These silver and copper coins are classified by Allan,\textsuperscript{181} and class 2 coins of his catalogue are 1/2 kārshāpana of an Indian standard, the usual weight varying between 25 and 26 grains; but those of class 3, presumably from a different part of India, are 2-3 grains higher than coins belonging to the preceding class. A single and double kārshāpana coins, belonging to class IV type are not generalized for want of adequate specimens. The quarter kārshāpanas, known as pādika, are of a heavier standard weighing 14.4 and 14.9 grains, a slightly above Cunningham’s theoretical pādika of 14.4 grains. He contended that the greater majority of silver coins of Ancient India were full kārshāpanas, halves and quarters being much rarer. Very small square coins (class 9), weighing from 2-3 grains are 1/16 kārshāpanas or krishanālas. Allan found it difficult to generalize on the basis of their weights, as they are not struck or cast so carefully, and secondly because of their depreciation in course of time; but attempt was made in this direction by Durga Prasad.\textsuperscript{182} According to his contention, kārshāpanas weighed 80 rattis or 144 grains, but silver kārshāpanas, of equal value namely 32 rattis of weight were also minted, and called raupya-kārshāpana. He also noticed two varieties of copper kārsh panas which are rare; and ardhas, pādas, trimśakas, dvimāshakas and māshakas of copper and silver were in his own cabinet.
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Vimśatika and trimśatika, mentioned by Patañjali, can also be placed in this group. It is contended that the two words refer to different types of coins—the former being of 100 rattis of copper and 40 rattis of silver; and the latter weighing 60 rattis. The evidence from the Mahābhāskya is cited to show that in times past, sixteen māshas made one kārshāpana, and sixteen palas (phalas) made one māshaśamvatyaḥ (purākalpa etad āsit shoḍaśamāśāḥ kārshāpanāṃ shoḍaśa palāś cha māsha samvatyaḥ). The implication meant that a teacher was considering a paṇa of sixteen māshas as absolute and was probably acquainted with a kārshāpana of twenty māshas in some locality. It was, therefore, suggested that the 16 māshaka, as well as the 20 māshaka kārshāpanas were in circulation at the same time. This suggestion cannot be accepted unless sufficient coins of these denominations are available to form a sound opinion on this matter.

Rūpa: The Sūtra Rūpādāhatāprasamsayoryāp, meaning the affix yap comes in the sense of a matupa after the word rūpa when āhata stamping and praśamsā—praise, are denoted, possibly refers to another type of coin. At another place Patañjali mentions rūpatarka examining a kārshāpana (paśyati rūpatarkaḥ kārshāpaṇam). It seems that he was the same as (rūpadarśaka of Kautilya’s Arthaśāstra, but D. R. Bhandarkar, citing Mahāsopina Jātaka suggested that the word indicated the coin which was the subject of examination, though its exact denomination is unknown. This word should be differentiated from rūpya, which, as an adjective, may mean any type of coin with a figure (rūpa) stamped on it. In fact, according to the Kāśikā, dināra, kedara and karshāpana had symbols impressed on them by means of striking a punch, and this process was called āhata (ahatatam rūpaṃ asya rūpyo rūpyaḥ kedāraḥ rūpyam kārshāpaṇam). It is doubtful if the
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gold coins were stamped, because the Punch marked coins are
confined to silver and copper alone, and this type of coin, accord-
ing to Allan,191 was the sole silver currency of a certain period.
It may, however, be assumed that rūpa was another type of
coin, the metal being unknown, while rūpaya denoted the stamp-
ing of the punches on coins.

Weights and Measures:

In the Mahābhāshya there are many references to different
kinds of weights and measures, which were, probably, in use in
that period. According to Patañjali, the weights never varied
one way or the other (dronaḥ khāryadhakam iti naiva dhike
bhavanti na nyīne).192 They were uniformly used, as for in-
stance, oil and ghee could be weighed in khāri, as well as in
drona (tailam ghritam iti khāryām api bhavanti dроме 'pi).193
The weights included: ādhaka, drona and khārī in ascending
order, besides a few minor ones. The former was 1⁄4 of a drona,
equivalent to 16 kuṭāvas or nearly 7 lbs.—10 ozs. in weight.
Drona was four times in weight to the ādhaka, but khārī was
a measure of grain = 16 dronas or about 3 bushels. Grain
weighing one khārī was enough for being sown in a limited plot
of land.

Other weights mentioned are: pala, māsha,194 kārshā-
pana,195 kuṭava,196 and śūrpa.197 Their weights and relations to
one another are mentioned in the Arthaśāstra,198 and in the
Manu199 and Yājñavaikya200 Smritis. According to Manu, five
krishnālas or raktikas made one māsha (bean) and sixteen of
these made one suvarṇa; four suvarṇas were equivalent to a
pala or nishka and 10 pālas made a dharaṇa of gold. The above
ratio was applied to gold and copper only. For silver, 2 krishnas or raktikas = 1 māsha; 16 māshas = 1 dharaṇa or purāṇa, and 10 dharaṇas = 1 satamāna (pala). A kārsha of copper was a kārshāpaṇa or pana. The weights have been analysed by several scholars, on the basis of these original sources. According to these, a māsha weighed about 17 grains, the silver kārshāpaṇa was equivalent to 16 pana or 1280 kowories, but the copper one equalled 80 raktikas or about 176 grains.

Kuḍava and śūrpa were other denominations of weight. The former was a measure of grain, or of wood or of iron etc. equivalent to ¼ of a prastha. It is described as a measure of capacity also, containing 12 prakritis or handfuls in a vessel four fingers wide and as many deep. This weight is noticed in the Mahābhārata, as well as in Sanskrit Buddhist literature. Śūrpa was a measure of two dronas. Patañjali mentions adhyārdha śūrpa, which shows that there was room for a fractional weight also. Patañjali has also referred to tailamātra and ghritamātra suggesting special pots for measuring ghee and oil, but their capacity is unknown.

Measurements: These refer to time and space, and include aksha, pāda, aratni, prādeśa, vitasti and dishti. The Arthaśāstra of Kautūlya and Manusmṛiti furnish detailed information on these as well. Aksha was equivalent to 104 aṅgulas, pāda was 12 or 15 fingers in breadth or ½- or 2/7 of a prakrama and it is noticed in the Sātpatha Brāhmaṇa also. Aratni was a cubit of the middle length from the elbow.
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to the tip of the middle length. Prādeśa was a measure of 12 aṅgulas and it covered the span of the thumb and forefinger.\textsuperscript{213} Vitasti was a particular measure of length, defined either as a long span between the external thumb and the little finger, or as the distance between the wrist and the tip of the fingers, said to be 12 aṅgulas or about 9 inches. It was also a Vedic measure mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Grihya Sūtra.\textsuperscript{214}

We have already referred to different types of weights mentioned by Kauṭilya and Manu. They have noticed several kinds of measurements and their proportions to one another. According to Kauṭilya,\textsuperscript{215} 12 aṅgulas equalled 1 vitasti; 2 vitastis = 1 aratni; 192 aṅgulas = 1 daṇḍa, 10 daṇḍas = 1 raju; and 2 rajjus = 1 parideśa. Patañjali also refers to raju\textsuperscript{216} or rope, and yojana\textsuperscript{217} which, according to Kauṭilya, equalled 4 kroṣas.

Labour:

It is another economic phenomenon which needs consideration. Patañjali refers to a labourer working on five, six or ten coins (paṇchakamāsikaḥ, shaṭkamāsikaḥ and daśakamāsikaḥ),\textsuperscript{218} probably kārśāpāṇa a month. There is another reference to a servant working until the cow, promised as his wages, was given to him. He was known as āgavīnaḥ karmakāraḥ.\textsuperscript{219} Sometimes the labourers worked in a team, and the physical incapacity of one did not stand in the way (yo ’yam durbalah san balavadbhih saja bhāram vahati).\textsuperscript{220} Clever workers were known as ushnaka and lazy ones were called sītaka (yaḥ sītam karoti sa sītako yo yoshṇam karoti sa uṣhnakaḥ).\textsuperscript{221} Unfortunately, there is no reference to labour problems, like, the
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unwillingness on the part of employers to give more to the employees, and extra or double wages, or forced labour, which we find in later Buddhist literature. 222

Communications:

Facilities for transport, means of communications, particularly the types of carriages, and travelling in company, are other interesting items of economic life. In early times there were lines of communication connecting the North with the South-West, from Sāvatthī (Śrāvastī) to Paitthāna, with halting places at Ujjēnī, Gonaḍḍha, Vidisā, Kośāmbī and Sāketa; and from North to the South-East, Sāvatthī (Śrāvastī) to Rājagaha (Rāja-giri); and from East to West on which route boats plied for hire. 223 Traders undertook long inland trips from Videha to Gandhāra, and from Magadha to Sovīra; from Bharukachcha round the coast to Burma; and from Banaras down the river to its mouth, and then on to Burma; and also from Champā to the same destination. 224 With this much of information as the background, it is not surprising to find in the Mahābhāshya references to lines of communication connecting different centres in Madhyadeśa. We have also referred to certain other phenomenon pointing to the distance between Ujjayinī and Māhiṣmatī. Patañjali refers to the movement of people, from one village to another and enquiring the way (grāmāntaram gamishyāmi panthānam me bhavān upadi-satu iti). 225 The travellers also trod on forest roads (kāntāra pathika), as well as on water and land (vāripathika, sthalapathika). 226 Streets for carriage drive were called rathyā. 227 An agreeable traveller in company was pathipriya, 228 and generally travelling was done in caravans—ṣakaṭasārtha 229 with a
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view to avoiding risks which were inevitable when travelling alone. Even then sometimes the caravan lost its way, or was decoyed by robbers. These facts are not mentioned by Patañjali, but they are noticed in later literature.\(^{230}\) Going in a carriage was very common (rathikān upalisthāte).\(^{231}\) Horses, camels, and even asses were used in carts (āśvaratham aushṭra-ratham and gardabharatham).\(^{232}\) People also used a she-elephant (ārohayati hastī sthalam manushyān).\(^{223}\)

**Banking:**

Credit was playing an important part in the economic life. The money lender was known as prayojaka.\(^{234}\) Interest, paid over and above the principal, was called vṛiddhi. Patañjali mentions pañchavridāhi,\(^{235}\) probably five per cent interest. According to Vāsishṭha Dharmaśāstra, quoted by Manu,\(^{236}\) the rate of interest was 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent. It is, however, uncertain if the one mentioned by Patañjali, is monthly or yearly. Interesting data on banking are furnished by the later Buddhist literature,\(^{237}\) which refers to the negotiator of a loan (Insādhaka) for the borrower (Ināgāhaka), the harassment of debt (Inajṭā), and release from it (Inamokkhā), which we also notice in the Jātakas.\(^{238}\) The Saddharma Puṇḍarīka\(^{239}\) calls money lending (yogaprayoga), and interest (prayoga). There is no other reference in the Mahābhāshya to banking details.

We have discussed particularly all the aspects of economic life in detail, the professions of the pañcha-kāruki, the five village artisans kulāla, karmāra, vardhakin, nāpita and rajaka, with their separate functions; workers in metal, especially goldsmiths, and blacksmiths; masons and architects; domestic ser-

---
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vants, cooks and confectioners; and certain wild professions, like, those of the fowler and the fisherman; and some low professions. The subject relating to agriculture and husbandry is considered in detail with reference to the division of holdings, preparations and methods of sowing, which varied according to seasons and crops; and the amount of seed needed. Ripening, reaping and threshing followed in the usual course, and the use of agricultural labour was a necessity, especially in big holdings. Grain was stored in big jars. In this connection we also mentioned different crops. Husbandry or the profession of cattle rearing was closely associated with land, and cows and sheep were reared. Merchandise being a comprehensive subject, we considered the position of the vendor and the vendee, trade stipulations and negotiations in a transaction and the role of the broker. We also mentioned articles of trade, noticed in the Mahābhāshya. Such a developed economic life necessarily involved exchange, barter and the intensive use of coinage. A good many types of coins, mentioned in the Mahābhāshya, can be identified with the Punch-marked coins, because their weights agree. Weights and measures are also noticed. Lastly, we referred to means of communication, and banking, with reference to the position of the creditor and the rate of interest charged by him. The data present a true picture of the economic life in that period.
CHAPTER VI

EDUCATIONAL LIFE

The evidence afforded by the Mahābhāshya, on this aspect of India life is equally important and interesting. In the Preamble to his work, Patañjali mentions in detail the objects underlying the study of grammar which are the protection of the Vedas, and the utilization of learning in various ways. The aims of study for seeking the truth, and acquiring knowledge of different subjects, methods employed—both deductive and inductive, place and time of study, relations between the preceptor and the pupil, unworthy students and harsh teachers, types of educational institutions named after the teachers, writing, female education, and other miscellaneous subjects are mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra either in comments or by way of illustrations. The material, provided by this work, is comprehensive enough for us to form an estimate of the then prevailing system. Patañjali has presented the picture correctly, since he did not fail to mention the shortcomings as well. Here it may be interesting to find Patañjali’s reference to the grammatical accuracy in the popular sphere, as one notices in the typical illustration in his gloss to Vārttika on II.4.56. It describes a dialogue between a grammarian and a coachman, and the latter points to the correctness of a grammatical formation. This may be a solitary instance, because the Bhāshyakāra wrote his work for the Sishtas at a time when grammatical studies were being neglected, and there was the need for explaining and illuminating the sutras of Pāṇini.

Objects of Study:

Patañjali devotes a good portion of the first Pāda, in the first Āhnikika of the first Chapter of the Mahābhāshya, to the study of grammar, and its necessity, but he also makes certain remarks on the objects of study. No doubt, grammatical study was necessary for the protection of the Vedas (rakshārthaṁ vedānāṁ adhyaeyāṁ vyākaraṇāṁ),¹ but it was also helpful in
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other spheres, as for example, in grasping the etymology of words, their formations, inflections and modifications (viparitānmayitum). It was obligatory for a Brāhmaṇa to study grammar as one of the six members of Vedic studies (Brāhmaṇena nishkāraṇo dharmaḥ shaḍaṅgo vedo ‘dheyeyojñeya iti’), with a view to avoiding the use of corrupt words (dusktāṇśab-dān mā prayukshmahity adhyeyam vyākaraṇam). The other reasons enumerated for this study are: for proper case endings of the Prayāja hymns (savikbhatikāḥ śakyāḥ kartum), it being compulsory for sacrificial priests (ā-ritvijīnāḥ syām), and finally for communion with God (mahatā devena naḥ sāmyam yathā syāt). It is also suggested that as the words of the Vedas, if studied systematically, bear fruit, so he, who uses the words grammatically obtains religious felicity (yathā vedāśabdā niyamapūrvam adhītaḥ phalavanto bhavanty evam yah śāstra pūrvam śabdān prayuṅkte so ‘bhuvdayena yuyjyata iti’). The objects underlying the study of śabdāmuśāsana—the grammar are: preservation (rakṣā), adaptation to circumstances (ūha), doctrine (āgama), quick understanding (laghu), and the removal of confusion or doubts (asamdeha).

This study was also made from the utilitarian (laukika) point of view, namely, to prepare a Brāhmaṇa boy for properly discharging his duties in places where required. The ultimate end of all was to seek the highest knowledge, as one finds in the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad. According to the Bhāshyakāra, knowledge could be perfected by receiving instruction (āgamakāla), assimilation (svādhyāya), teaching (pravachana), and lastly, by practice (vyāvahāra). This shows that mere study with the teacher was not enough, but perfection needed constant study, and in different circumstances. It
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was also necessary for householders to acquire learning to be able to win a position in society. Thus, a pupil running away from his teacher’s place without fulfilling his terms of residence was looked down upon as *khaṭvārūḍha*, an iniquitous person who wished to use a bedstead during his period of studentship. After completing his education, the student had a bath and finally sought the permission of his preceptor to enter the life of a householder (*adhitya snātva gurubhir anujñatena khaṭvāro-ḍhavyā*). It is clear that education was a necessity, and its ideal was not merely to seek the ultimate truth by attaining knowledge, but also to equip oneself for faithfully living the life of a householder.

**Subjects of Study:**

Some of the subjects were particularly meant for the Brāhmaṇas, a few for the Kshatriyas, but others could be studied universally by the *dvijas*. A Brāhmaṇa boy was expected to study and read Dharma, six Aṅgas and Vedas without any special occasion (*brāhmaṇena nishkāraṇo dharmaḥ shaḍaṅgo vedo ‘dhyeyo jñeyo iti*), but the principal subject was grammar (*pradhānaṁ cha shaṭsvaṅgeshu vyākaraṇam*). Patañjali refers to the ancient custom amongst Brāhmaṇas of studying grammar after the time of “the sacrament of the holy thread” (*purākalpa etat āsīt saṁskārotāra-kālam Brāhmaṇaḥ vyākaraṇaṁ sva adhitaye*). The instruction in Vedic words was imparted to them only when they could understand the places of utterance, and internal and external efforts (involved in the production of sound), and articulated sounds (*tebhyaḥ tatra sthānakaraṇāmu pradānaṇjayebhyo vaidikāḥ śabdā upaḍisyante tad adyate na tathā vedam adhitya iva vartitā vaktāro bhavanti*). Later on, the position was somewhat changed and the study of grammar was considered redundant (*anarthakaṁ vyākaraṇaṁ iti*), with the result that the Āchārya (Pāṇini) had to write his work with a view to stress its need, (*tebhya evam viprati-
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A study of the Vedas included all the four, with six Aṅgas, and their mystical (secret) treatises, śākhās of Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda with its thousand paths (chatvāro vedaḥ saṅghah sarahasya bahudhā vibhinnā ekaśatam adhvaryuśākhāḥ sahasravartmā sāmaveda), the sacred traditions of the Bāhrvichas (ekavinśatidhā bāhy-richyam) the Atharvaveda with nine branches (navadhātharvano veda), treatises on dialogues, or the science of logic (vākovākyam), Epics, historical legends (itiḥāsa), Purāṇas and the science of medicine (vaidyakam). In another reference, Patañjali also refers to texts, handed down by repetition from the Atharvaveda (atharvaṇa āmnāyaḥ). There are also references to a work called Saṅgraha, Metrics (Chandah śāstra) and Dharmasāstra. The study of Astrology was made with measurements, and there are references to kāla—time, and muhūrta—a particular division of time (sakāśtham jyotisham adhīte—sakālaṃ samuhūrtam). A comparative study of all doctrines (sarvatāntra) is also mentioned. Patañjali refers to Brāhmaṇīs studying kāśakitsna doctrine and were accordingly known kāśakitsnim adhīte kāsakritsna Brāhmaṇī. In the same way, students reading Suśanottara and Vāsavadattā were called Suśanottarikā and Vāsavadattika, but one doubts if the reading of these stories could confer a different class of studentship. It could only imply that there was room for non-serious studies as well. In this comment on the śūtra Chhandobrāhmaṇāni cha tadviṃsḥayāṇī), meaning that the affix denoting the ‘announcer’ has the force of ‘one who studies’ or ‘one who knows’ when added to a Veda—Text or Brāhmaṇas; and a prokta affix could only be added to a Veda or a Brāhmaṇa, when an adheyeti or vedeti affix follows it;
Patañjali mentions the study of the Vedas, as announced by Kroda, Kaṅkata, Muda, Pippalāda; the Kalpa texts announced by Kaśyapa or Kuśika, and other subjects. Paṅgi was also read, along with the old Kalpas of Kāsyapins, Kauśikins and Āruṇāparāji, as suggested by Maxmuller, and old Sūtras including those of the Pārāsarins, Sailālins, Karmandins and Krāśvins.

Besides popular studies including narratives (ākhyāyika), historical legends, Purāṇas and tales like those of Yava-kṛita, Priyaṅgu, Yayāti, Vāsavadattā and Sumanottarā, there was, probably, some training in other subjects, like Vāyasavidyā—the science of augury from observing crows, chiromancy etc. (aṅgavidyā), and the science of animals (golakshana—aśvalakshana). Kshātra vidyā, Dhārmavidyā. Juristic studies and Traṇīvidyā were not neglected, and Patañjali also refers to training given in archery (dhanushi śikshate). It is interesting to learn that a person belonging to a higher caste, even though degraded, was entitled to the study of the Vedas (Yadi tariḥ niśtānam apy evaṃ jātiyakāni bhavanti śrottriyaṁ chhando 'dhite).

Despite the study of other subjects, the importance of grammar was immense, and Patañjali contemptuously refers to a bad grammarian (vaiyākaranaṇapāsa). This fact is also evident from the growth of grammatical literature between the time of Pāṇini and Patañjali. The latter refers to four land marks in the history of grammar, represented by the schools of the four Āchāryas: Apiśala, Pāṇini, Vyādi and Gautama, probably in chronological order. He also mentions the grammarians of the following schools—Bhāradvājiya, Saunāga,

29. ibid. 2.
30. ibid. 6.
32. III.1.122 p. 87.8.
34. VI.2.36 p. 125.12.
35. I.1.20 p. 73.26
36. II.2.18 p. 416.15.
Kuṇaravāḍava and Sauryabhāgavata. All the schools lay emphasis on grammatical studies preceding initiation into the Vedas.

Place and Time of Study:

These varied according to the circumstances and nature of studies. Patañjali refers to gurukula or the ‘teacher’s house’, where the pupils were always under the canopy of the preceptor to protect them (gurūnā śishyas chhatravachchādyah śishyenā cha gurus chhatravat paripālyah). Yājñavalkya also enjoins a naishṭhika Brāhmaṇa—a celibate all his life, to live with his Āchārya, and in the absence of the latter with his son, or wife, or even fire. The Bhāshyakāra also refers to an unsteady pupil—known as tīrthakāka who, like a crow, wandered from teacher to teacher (yo gurukulam gatvā na chiramtiṣṭhāti sa uchyate tīrthakāka iti). There are references to pupils coming from teacher’s place (aupādhyāyakam or āchāryakam) which may imply that they were residing with him. The boarders were known as ante-vāsin, and the teacher, providing lodging, was called ante-guru. Patañjali also refers to dāṇḍamāṇavaka—staff pupils belonging to different schools, as for example, Kāṇva-dāṇḍa-māṇavakaḥ and Dākshā-dāṇḍa-māṇavakaḥ, who were probably day scholars. Dāṇḍa or staff was the common mark of pupilage, indicating the school to which the pupils belonged. Sometimes this mark of pupilage was associated with a particular region, as for instance, Pañchāla-māṇava-kāḥ. It was, really the name and fame of the teacher that attracted students from different places. A teacher, approached from a distance of a hundred yojanas, was known as yaujana.
śatiko guru (yojanaśatād abhigamanam arhati). There is no information on the question of fees, but it was charged in some form; and in certain cases, probably, paid in advance. Sometimes it was the maternal uncle (mātulaka) who imparted instructions to the nephew (upādhyāyasya sishyo mātulasya bhāgineya).

The time of study differed according to the age, and circumstances. The initiation started early in spring (vasanto 'dhyayananam), as is the practice even now in India, but in the light of the Kāśikā it can be suggested that Patañjali was referring to the study of literature dealing with Vasanta (vāsantikah). As a rule, students studied in the day time, but there are references to studious ones working at night as well (imakābhyaṁ chhātrābhyaṁ rātrir aẖītā aẖhyāṁ ahar apy adhītam). The Bhāshyakāra also mentions a student studying in a quiet place at night after protecting the light from the wind (tathā-kārisho 'gnir nivāta ekānte suprajvalito 'dhyayananam prayojayati). Light was produced by burning dried cow-dung (kārīsha) and it was necessary to sit in a quiet corner, lest the strong wind might cause fire in the hut. Though there are many references to lambs in the Mahābāshya, the pupils had, perhaps, no money to pay for the oil.

Methods of Study:

The methods, too, varied according to the subjects, as for example, the rote one was most suitable in Vedic studies. Pāṇini, in his Sūtra Śrotriyaṁś chhando'adhīte, has referred to the Śrotriyas, called Brāhmaṇas in the Kāśikā, who learnt by heart the Chhandas or Vedas. In this connection, Patañjali
mentions reading aloud *uchchārādhiyaṇa niśchārādhiyaṇa*). This was done according to the prescribed rules (*upayukta maṇavakā ity uchyante va ete niyamapūrvakam adhitavanto bhavanti*).  

The Āchārya taught his pupils in a friendly way *(tad āchāryaḥ suhridaybhūtvāny āchashate)*. As pointed out by Patañjali, the Vedic scholar recited verses beginning with *sām*, a term expressing auspiciousness, in order of Sections *(prapāṭhaka)* after uttering the sacred syllable *Om (om ity uktvā vrīltāntasah sām ity evamādiḥ sabdān paṭhanti)*. From this, one gets the impression that the Vedic scholars were grown up and had a firm grounding in grammar which, in Patañjali’s time, preceded Vedic studies. This enabled them to follow with ease the Vedic recensions in the light of the preceptor’s comments rather than exclusively committing verses to memory without properly understanding them. The earlier method, however, was not discouraged. Recitation, popularly known as *nipāṭha*, was done in company (*vyatipāṭha*). Doubts if any, were removed by the commentary or interpretation of the teacher (*vyākhyānato viśeshapratipattir na hi samdehād alakṣaṇam iti nityaparyāyavāchino grahaṇam iti vyākhyāsyāmāḥ*). The ruling or explanation, given by the teacher, was binding *(āchāryapravrīttir jñāpayati)*.

It is interesting to find emphasis laid on pronunciation and recitation *(vadāvada)*. Those reading clearly were called *sādhuvadhyāyin*, but others, rather slow, were known as *v lambhi-tādhyāyin*. There were some reciting with a sweet voice, like an Indian cuckoo *(kokilābhivyāhāri)*. Patañjali also mentions the preceptor slapping the young pupil for wrong pronunciation *(ya udātte kartavye ‘nudāttam karoti khaṇḍikopā-*)
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A khandika upādhyāya taught only those pupils who learnt section by section, and, it seems, he had to manage with comparatively young boys who could be slapped but not the older ones who were taught in a friendly manner.

There is no reference to examination in texts, but it is probably implied in the two sūtras of Pāṇini—Karmādhyayane vrittam and Bahvachpūrvapadāt əhach. The two sūtras explain the use of the affix əhak in the sense of this is his act occurring in study, after a word in the first case in construction, if such word is an action (karma) which occurred (vrittam) in study (adhhyayana); or according to the next sūtra, in the sense of ‘this is whose act occurring in study after a compound having a polysyllabic word as a prior member.’ Explaining this further, the Kāśika classifies students on the basis of errors, committed in recitation at the time of the examination (yasya adhyayane niyuktasya parikshākāle paṭhatoḥ), as for instance, aikanyika, committing only one mistake; dvaiyanyika two mistakes; and traιyanyika three mistakes. But there were some who committed twelve mistakes (dvādaśānyika); and it needed a good many recitations to avoid lapses in pronunciation. The other sūtra—Samkhyāyāh samjñāṣaṃghasūtrādhyayanesaḥ, referring to the affixes under V.1.182, connoting a word which signified a numeral in the sense of ‘this is its measure’, when the word, so formed, means ‘a name, multitude, a book, or a fixed way and method of study’, mentions the number of times a subject was studied, as for example, five times (adhyayane paṃchako ‘dhiṭaḥ). This point is not stressed by Patañjali.

In another Sūtra tad adhte tad Veda, which refers to the use of the affix an after a word, denoting ‘some subject of study’, in the sense of ‘who has studied that’ or ‘who under-
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stands that', the Bhāṣhyakāra in his gloss has clarified it by pointing out that adhīte refers to studies depending on memory—where the rote system was adopted. He calls such a pupil sampāṭham paṭhāti\(^{73}\) viz. one who simply commits the texts to memory without understanding the meaning. The other way was by grasping the contents, rather than letters in recitation (kaśchich cha vetti na cha sampāṭham paṭhāti). It is, therefore, clear that there was room for proper thinking and understanding, commended earlier by Yāśka\(^{74}\) in his Nirukta, who compared cramming like dry logs of wood on an extinguished fire which can never illuminate.

Relations between the Preceptor and the Pupil:

The relations between the two were cordial, but failings on both sides were not wanting. The academic relations, more filial in nature, commenced when the preceptor, seriously upholding the sanctity of learning, started his instructions with Kuśa grass in his hand, and at an auspicious moment facing the east. The pupil was required to acquire the affection of his teacher for his own welfare, both in this world and in the life after (ye tāvad ete guru—suśrushavo nāma te ṛpi svabhūtyartham eva pravarantane pāralaūkikam cha. no bhavishyati iha cha nah prīto guruṛ adhyāpayishyati iti).\(^{75}\) The Smritis also enjoin upon the pupil to show reverence towards his preceptor. According to Yājñavalkya,\(^{76}\) he should serve or worship the preceptor for the sake of learning, and be attentive, while Manu has prescribed\(^{77}\) service to the teacher, both as a student obedient to him, and even after the period of studentship. At another place, Patañjali refers to a pupil living in the village for the sake of his preceptor and his learning (grāme gurunimattam vasāmah—adhyayamanimittam vasāma iti).\(^{78}\)

---
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With begging bowl in his hands, the pupil went out on rounds (kamaṇḍalu pāṇim chhātram uḍrākshi iti), to the householders for food and other necessities (upādhyāyasya sishyo yājyakulāni gatvāgrāsanādini labhate). According to Yājñavalkya, the pupil presented his alms to the preceptor (labdham tasmai nivedayet). Some undesirables also stayed with the teacher. Patañjali refers to such pupils, studying the work of Pāṇini for the sake of securing boiled rice (odanapāṇiniyāḥ), but the Rauḍhiyas were desirous of getting ghee (ghrita-rauḍhiyāh), and the Chārāṇyās stayed for blankets (kambala chārāṇyāyāḥ). These may have been the nicknames of those respective schools, but there were cases of students with little desire for learning, and they occasionally played truant. They tried to avoid their presence, but, when noticed by the teacher, they were discomfited (katham upādhyāyād antardhatta iti paśyaty ayam yadi mām upādhyāyāḥ paśyati dhruvam prekṣhnam upā lambho veti). Such a thing was discouraged. The pupil with a smile looked beautiful (hasanam chhātrasya śobhanam). Yājñavalkya prescribes the following qualities in a student who should be taught according to Dharma: He should be grateful, non-hating, intelligent, pure, healthy, non-envious, honest, energetic, kindred, and should either impart knowledge or make a present of money. These qualities seemed necessary for a better understanding between the Preceptor and the Pupil.

In cases of students committing errors, or for wilful default, the teacher exercised his authority of punishing him for the welfare of the latter: (sāmrītaih pāṇibhir ghnanti guravo na viṣhokshitāḥlāḍanāśrāyino doshās tāḍanāśrāyino guṇāḥ). Sometimes the teacher was harsh and was known as dārunā-
dhyāpaka, but a well-disposed one was called śobhano'dhyāpaka.\textsuperscript{87} An excellent or superior teacher was designated kāśṭhādhyāpaka.\textsuperscript{88} The pupils were also known according to their talents and disposition, as for example, a fiery boy (agnimāṇavaka),\textsuperscript{89} a talkative one (śabdakārya ayam māṇavaka),\textsuperscript{90} and a wicked pupil (māṇavaka jatilakābhirūpa), in contrast to a harsh teacher (jatilakādhyāpaka).\textsuperscript{91} These may be extreme cases, but generally the teacher was friendly and well-disposed towards his pupils. Despite the offering of equal opportunities, the results varied according to the intelligence of the pupils (sāmānam īhamānānām adhīyānānāṁ cha kechid arthair yujyante 'pare na').\textsuperscript{92}

The Mahābhāshya also refers to the wife of the teacher (upādhyāyi)\textsuperscript{93} or (upādhyāyanī),\textsuperscript{94} but there is no reference to the relation that existed between her and the pupil. As a member of the family, the pupil was expected to pay her equal reverence. Patañjali does not mention the qualities necessary in a teacher and his pupil as we find in the Mīlinda pañha,\textsuperscript{95} nor is there any reference to hardships connected with student’s life which, too, are mentioned in Buddhist literature.\textsuperscript{96} He has classed the teachers into: Āchārya,\textsuperscript{97} Guru,\textsuperscript{98} Sikṣhaka\textsuperscript{99} and Upādhyāya.\textsuperscript{100} Though they appear to be synonymous there was, according to the Smriti literature, some difference in their respective functions. Yājñavalkya\textsuperscript{101} distinguishes the two
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terms, *Guru* and *Achārya*; the former performed all the ceremonies even before the birth of the child till his initiation, but the latter initiated him into Vedic studies after performing the *Upanayana* ceremony. The position of the *Upādhyāya* was different. According to the *Yājñavalkya smṛiti*,¹⁰² he taught only a portion (*khaṇḍa*), but, as *Manu*¹⁰³ suggests, for his livelihood (*vṛttyartham*). The status of the *Sikshaka* appears to be analogous. The pupils were both day scholars, and boarders (*antevāsin*). It may now be interesting to notice the types of schools named after the teachers, and the pupils who upheld the traditions of their respective schools.

**Different schools—named after the teachers—Gotras and Charanas:**

The pupils were known after the teachers to whom they were attached. According to Pāṇini's sūtra: *āchāryoparasjana's chāntevasī* (VI.2.36)—when a scholar is named by an epithet, derived from the name of his teacher, that name is an *āchāryoparasajana*. In this class, Patañjali mentions the *dvanda* compound *Āpiśalapāṇinīya vyādiyagautamīyah*¹⁰⁴—meaning the students belonging to the schools of *Āpiśalā* and Pāṇini and Vyādi and Gautamā. At another place, he refers to the relation of schools with gotras, as for example, in *asti no gārgaiḥ sambandah—asti no vatsaiḥ sambandha iti*.¹⁰⁵ Both, Pāṇini and Patañjali, have mentioned a number of gotras which appear to have been based on Vedic mantras, religious traditions and sacrificial customs associated with a particular sage and later on adopted by all his followers. Patriarchal hegemony was recognized, and the head of the gotra was the connecting link with those having physical and spiritual ties. Different names in the succeeding pedigrees are also traced in the *Mahābhāshya*¹⁰⁶ as for instance: Garga, his son Gārgi, grandson Gārgyai and the great grandsons called Gārgyāyanas.
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Charana:

This term, occurring in the compound charanasambandha, has the sense of nivasa (charanasambandhena nivasaralakshanam). Here Patañjali quotes three charanas dwelling in the east (trayaḥ prāchyaḥ), three in the west (traya udīchyaḥ), and three in the middle (trayo mādhyaṁah). The position of the Charanas, often considered as synonymous with the Sākhās (cf. Nirukta—Sarvacharanaṇam explained by Sarvasākhānam, I.17), engaged the attention of Maxmuller who explained the difference between these two terms, as well as with the Parishad, which is also mentioned by Patañjali. According to the late Professor, Sākhā signified the various editions, or, more properly, the various traditions, that branched off from each of the three original branches of the Veda. In the latter sense, despite its similarity with Charana, there was an important difference, as we notice sākhāṁ adhīte but never charaṇam adhīte, and still less Parishadāṁ adhīte. Sākhā, originally meant a literary work, and that Charana did not. The use of the term Sākhā sometimes in the sense of Charana was due to the fact that the former did not exist as written books, but only in traditions of the Charanas; each member of the latter representing, what should be called, the copy of a book. In a passage from Jagaddhara’s commentary on Mālātimādhvā, Charana is said to mean a number of men who are pledged to the reading of a certain sākhā of the Veda, and who have in this manner become one body (Charaṇaśabdāḥ sākhāviśeshādyayonaparaiṅkātāpanna—janasaṁghavāchi). He also referred to Pāṇini mentioning Charanas, as constituting a multitude—that is comprising a number of followers (Charanebhyoḥ dharmavat—saṁśārthāḥ). In a vārttika on IV.1.63, even women are mentioned, as belonging to a Charana, as for example, Kāthi was the wife or daughter of a Brāhmaṇa who belonged to the Charana or read the sākhas of the Kaṭhas.

107. IV.2.138 p. 301.5.
110. Max Müller: op. cit.
111. IV.2.46.
A Śākhā—a portion of the śruti, could not properly include law 
books, but the followers of certain Śākhās could, in course of 
time, adopt a code of law binding on their Charaṇa only, which 
naturally, went after the name of their group. Thus Kāṭhakam 
could be used not only for the sacred traditions, but also for 
the laws of the Kāṭhas. According to Patañjali, these sacred 
traditions were known as Āmnāya, as for instance, the doc-
trines and traditions, associated with the school of Kāṭha 
were described as Kāṭhakam (kāṭhanam dharma ā-mnāyo va 
kāṭhakam). Others mentioned in this context are: Kāka-
ṇaṇa, Maudakam and Paippalādakam. Even the Prāti-
śākhya were named according to Charaṇas, and they were 
the exclusive property of the readers of certain Śākhās, more 
than even the Kuladharmas or family laws. New Charaṇas, 
in later times, were also founded on sacred texts peculiar to 
themselves.

As regards the position of a Parishad, although every 
prātiśākhya could be called a Pārishada (cf. Pāṇ. IV. 3.123), 
viz. a work belonging to a Parishad, not every Pārhada could 
be called a Pratisākhya except those which contained the rules 
of pronunciation for a popular śākhā or text of the Vedic hymns, 
studied and taught in certain Parishads. The Brihadāraṇyaka 
Upanishad refers to Svetaketu’s visit to the Parishad of the 
Pañcālas.

With this explanation of the terms, serving as the back-
ground for a proper understanding, we may refer to the actual 
references to such schools in the Mahābhāṣyā. The main 
grammatical schools were those of Apiśali, Pāṇini, Vyādi, 
Śākalya, Kuparavāḍa, Sauvāṣya and Śāka-
tāyana. Amongst the Vedic schools were those of the Black 
Yajurveda (Kāṭhakam), and Kāḷapakam which were very
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popular in different villages (grāme grāme Kāṭhakam Kālāpakam cha prochyate),\textsuperscript{122} the school of Varatantu (Vāratanta- viyāḥ) and that of Tittiri (Taittirīyaḥ)\textsuperscript{123} from the Black Yajurveda, and Paippalādaka,\textsuperscript{124} a recension of the Atharvaveda.

Other schools, mentioned by Patañjali, including those of a specialized nature, were Yājñikas, Bahlvicas, Aukthikas and Mīmāṁsakas.\textsuperscript{125} The first one consisted of those who were well-up in rituals, but they were equally proficient in grammar as Patañjali calls them vaiyākaraṇas. The members of the second school were familiar with the Rigveda and could represent in sacrificial economics. The Aukthikas studied the Uktas—a kind of recitation, or certain verses, forming a subdivision of the Śāstras, recited in contra-distinction to the Sāman verses which are sung, and Yajñas, or muttered sacrificial formulas.\textsuperscript{126} The last school was noted for its members following the Mīmāṁsā principles. According to Max-Müller,\textsuperscript{127} the Brāhmaṇas cared for the divine authority of the Śrūtis and implicitly manifested the doctrines of the Rishis in their original simplicity and purity. In philosophical discussions, they allowed the greatest possible freedom. At first only three philosophical systems were admitted as orthodox, the two Mīmāṁsās and Nyāya, but their number was soon raised to six so as include the Vaiśeṣika, Sāmkhya and Yoga-schools. Keith suggested\textsuperscript{128} that from Medhātithi onwards, use is made of Mīmāṁsā principles to overcome legal difficulties which arose from the recognition in the law schools of many conflicting texts as all having authority, just as the Vedic texts, before the compilers of the Mīmāṁsā presented innumerable difficulties.

There were certain other schools, based on gotras or teachers, like those of Upagu—a pupil of that school was known
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as Aupagaviya, and a young girl was called Aupagavī, māṅavikā, Kapinjali, and Kaulini; their pupils were respectively called Kapinjalah and Kaulināḥ. There were some other schools of Kāṇvyāyana (Kāṇvāyana) the descendants of Kāṇva; the pupils of this school were known as Kāṇvyāyānīyah. The Sālaṅkah belonged to the school of Sālaṅki, and the other ones were: Bhāradvājīyah, Sākalah, Audameghāḥ (audamedhyāyāschhātṛā audameghāḥ), Audulomi, Gārgiyā, Vātsiyāḥ and Kāśyapāḥ associated with their respective gotras. The Kraudāḥ traced their descent from Kruḍa. There are also references to Kauśikināḥ and Pārśarīnāḥ. Patañjali mentions several other schools as well—Taumburavināḥ Hāridravināḥ, Arunināḥ, Śādyāyanināḥ and Bhālavināḥ, Māṭharāḥ and Paṅgalakāṇvāḥ. Sometimes the pupils studied at their father-in-law’s house, and they were known as śvāśureryūnaḥ chātrāḥ śvāsurāḥ.

Some professional schools are also noticed by Patañjali, as for instance, those of actors (śailālin), and players on instruments (mārdāngika). The references to musical instruments and play-acting in the Mahābhāshya definitely suggest the existence of such schools which imparted instructions in
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play-acting and playing on instruments. On this point, Kautūlya has also referred to the arrangements for higher teaching for the production of great teachers. There were also schools or teachers imparting instructions in military subjects (kṣhāṭravidyā), or practical training in the use of sword (āśvair yuddham), and cavalry (āśvair yuddham). It is not certain if the provision was made for teaching subjects like, Chiromancy (āṅgavidyā), and understanding the signs of crows (vāyasavidyā), cows and horses (golakshana-aśva-lakshana); or in Itihāsa—historical legends, Purāṇas, counting and accounting (pariṇāmanā). There was room for elementary study (varnapāṭha), though there is no reference to the young teacher, popularly known as dārakāchārya in later literature.

Fees and Period of Study:

There is no reference to the fees paid to the teacher, either in a lump sum, or by part payment, though at one place Patañjali cites the gift of cows to the teacher (upādhyāya gām dadāti iti). The question of fees does not seem to be important. The diffusion of learning had no mercenary motive. It was the duty of the householders to meet the requirements of the Preceptor and his family, as well as his pupils, but the Upādhyāya, whom Patañjali calls Khandikopādhyāya, in the light of Manusmṛiti, did charge for imparting instructions in only a portion of the Veda, or their Angas. The day scholars were expected to pay fees in cash, or in kind, so that the teacher could maintain himself and his family. The study of a portion, according to the Yājñavalkya-smṛiti, was also fruitful. There is no reference to the period of study, but, as suggested by Yājñavalkya, for each Veda the Brahmacharya
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should be for twelve years or five or, as some say, till they are completely acquired. Manu suggests that a student, who has studied in due order the three Vedas, or two, or even one only without breaking the rules of studentship, shall enter the order of householder. Patañjali looks with contempt upon those entering domestic life without completing the period of study. It seems that there was some prescribed period of study, though the actual number of years are not mentioned.

Writing:

Despite insistence on the rote method, writing was in use, and the Greek script is mentioned in the Mahābhāshya (Yāvanānīlīpi). It is later on referred to as one of the 64 scripts in which the Sākyan prince Gautama was proficient. The Mahāvastu has also mentioned Yāvanī, besides other scripts—Pushkaraśāri, Kharoshti, (Kharoshthi), Brāhmi, Kūṭali, Saktinīlīpi, Lekhālīlīpi and Mudrālīlīpi or seal writing. It is certain that Greek, Kharoshthi and Brāhmi were popular scripts in that period, though the use of the former two was confined to North-West India.

Female Education:

The Mahābhāshya refers to Upādhyāya, Upādhyāyi and Upādhyāyanī. The last word is translated by Monier Williams as 'the wife of a teacher' while the former two, probably, denoted a female teacher (upetyādhiyate tasyā upādhyāyī upādhyāya). Patañjali also refers to a young girl of the Aupagavi school (Aupagavi māṇavikā) and a Brāhmaṇī studying Kāśakritsnī doctrines (Kāśakritsnīm adhīte Kāśakritsnā Brāhmaṇī). There are two other terms
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in the *Mahābhāshya Sāktikī* and *Yāṣṭikī*—both, being synonymous, meaning ‘female lance or spear-holder’. It is rather doubtful that women received military education, although individual cases might not be ruled out. References from the Vedic literature suggest initiation of girls for education before marriage. The eminence of Ghosha and Lopamudrā is evidence from the *Rig-Veda*, and in the *Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*, there is a ritual for the benefit of a person, anxious for the birth of a daughter, who could distinguish herself as a scholar in due course. Even the deeper problems of philosophy were probed into by women like Maitreyī and Gārgi, though such a thing was getting unpopular with the passage of time. According to Megasthenes, the Brāhmaṇaṇas did not communicate knowledge of their philosophy to their wives, lest they leave home. Manu permits the *upanayana* of girls, provided the Vedic mantras for the occasion are not recited.

In the light of these observations, it is not surprising to notice Patañjali’s reference to female education. In the *Mahāvastu* there are references to female education—that of a banker’s daughter being brought up as an ascetic and competent enough to discuss sastras, and another girl who belonged to the artizan class but was talented.

Lastly, the Bhāshyakāra refers to a handsome dark-complexioned person who was conversant with every branch of learning, and was known as *diṭṭha*. This reference may suggest that there was scope for learning even for non-Aryans who were dark-complexioned, as Patañjali is very particular about the complexion of the Brāhmaṇaṇas which he specifically notices in the *Mahābhāshya*.
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Assemblies:

Patañjali uses the term Parishat (Parishad) for denoting learning bodies. Earlier Pāṇini refers to the use of the affix nya after the word Parishad in the sense of ‘who assembles there (Parishadonyah bhavati sama vayān sāmavaiti ity etasmin vishaye).’ Its constitution is referred to by Yaśa-valkya, who suggests that four persons, who knew the Vedas and the Dharmas, or only the three sciences, constituted, a Parishad. “What it says is Dharma, or that which even one person, who is best among the knowers of spiritual sciences, declares.” It appears that the institution of Parishad regulated the academic activities of different groups, or schools, and served as a means for the development and propagation of learning. The Gobhila Grihya Sūtra mentions a teacher with his Parishad.

We have taken into account the educational system in the time of Patañjali in all its aspects. The objects of study, with particular reference to grammar in the Preamble to his work—were many, but the ultimate aim was to seek the highest knowledge. It could be made perfect, not only at the time of receiving instruction, but also through assimilation, teaching and application. The continuous study at different periods made an enthusiastic student proficient in the understanding and interpretation of Vedic mantras at appropriate occasions. The subjects of study, besides grammar which preceded Vedic studies, were the four Vedas with six Aṅgas, their mysteries, a hundred Sākhās of the Yajur-Veda, and the Śāma-Veda with its thousand paths, treatises on dialogues, or the science of logic, Epics, Purāṇas and Medicine. Other studies included Saṃgraha, Metrics, Dharmaśāstra, Astrology, and a comparative study of all doctrines (sarva-tantra), and popular subjects like the tales of Sumanottara and Vāsavadatta. The Smritis, Chiromancy, and the Science of animals are also mentioned. The place and time of study varied, though it was generally

174. IV.4.44. Kāśikā p. 364.  
175. I.9.  
176. III.2.40.
the home of the teacher, where the over-zealous pupils studied by the light of the cowdung fire in a quiet corner at night. There were also day scholars, and others who had partial instructions. The method of study was the rote system, but there was scope for discussion and interpretation for a proper understanding of the texts. Emphasis was laid on pronunciation, and, probably, there were examinations in recitations. The relations between the Preceptor and his pupils were very cordial—each side bearing his responsibility, but there were occasional lapses, like the student running away due to the harshness of the teacher. The Bhāṣyakāra mentions the names of different schools, and refers to fees and period of study. Only the Khaṇḍika teachers charged for their instructions; others seem to be doing that freely, depending on the householders who met their requirements, and whatever the parting student paid as gurudakshiṇā on the completion of his education. Different types of scripts, female education, and the probable scope of study for non-Āryans, and the Parishads or assemblies are also traced in the Mahābhāṣya. The reference to the Yavanāni or the Greek script is not surprising, since Patañjali refers to the settlements of the Yavanas. In the light of the above study of the educational life in that period, it may be suggested that education was planned on the ancient model which laid stress on proper understanding and interpretation, without completely giving up cramming which was necessary in certain cases.
CHAPTER VII

RELIGIOUS CONDITION

India in the time of Patañjali witnessed the revival of Vedic sacrifices, as is evident from the references, in the Mahābhāṣya, and the Ayodhyā inscription regarding two horse sacrifices performed by Pushyamitra Śuṅga. The period was equally notable for the evolution of the Vishnu-Vāsudeva cult which had originated earlier. These religious factors did not interfere with the Śramaṇa religions—Buddhism and Jainism. The famous stūpas at Bhārhut and Sāñchi, the former with its railing and toraṇas, and the latter with the railing alone, testify to the unhampered activities of the Buddhists who created endowments in that period. It is, however, supposed on the basis of the evidence from the Divyāvadāna,¹ that the Śuṅga monarch tried to undo the work done by Aśoka for Buddhism with a view to rising in the esteem of the Brāhmaṇaṇas. This is a short-sighted view. The Brahmanical Śuṅga Emperor was well-known for his horse sacrifices, rather than for his attempt to destroy Buddhism. There is nothing to support the presumption of Bagchi² that the Greek invasion was inspired by the anti-Buddhist attitude of this monarch. It is unlikely that Pushyamitra would have permitted these Buddhist dedications if he was an antagonist. The Hāthīgumpha inscription of King Khāravela of Kaliṅga reveals the prosperity of Jainism in Kaliṅga. In that period the ascetic religious orders also flourished, some of which are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya. In this connection, it is interesting to study some of the inscriptions which corroborate the evidence furnished by the Mahābhāṣya on this subject, with particular reference to the Bhāgavata cult. With this short introductory background, we may consider different aspects of religious life and conditions in that period.

1. P. 433.4.
Revival of Vedic Sacrifices:

In the preamble to his work, the Bhāshyakāra, while stressing the need for the study of grammar, also refers to the study of Yājñika Śāstra (Yājñikāḥ śāstreṇa anuvīdadhate). It is well-known that Aśoka had discouraged sacrifices of animals, but they were revived, and perhaps with greater enthusiasm, in the time of Pushyamitra. Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya quotes references to sacrifices, performed by this Brahmanical ruler (iha Pushyamitrāṇaḥ yājayāmaḥ, Pushyamitro yajate yājakā yājayantītī). This is supported by the Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadaya which records the performance of two Aśvamedha sacrifices by Pushyamitra (dvirāsvamedha yājinaḥ senapateḥ Pushyamitrasya) and the Mālavikāgānimitra of Kālidāsa. The Mahābhāṣya also refers to different types of sacrifices: Agnisṭoma, Rājasūya, Vājapeya, and the domestic ones—Pākayajna or Pañchayajña—accessories needed in such sacrifices, their duration and fruits that accrued from their performances, and lastly, the priests required for them, who received handsome dakshinās. Though the material, furnished by the Mahābhāṣya on this point, is not as exhaustive as one finds in the Ashtadhyāyī, it is nevertheless enough to suggest the revival of such sacrifices in that period. Patañjali refers to persons unqualified for this purpose (yājñika pāsa), and he also mentions the amount of dakshina, the sacrificial fee given to the Brāhmaṇas—sometimes the gelded bull (mahānirashṭo daksina diyate), but occasionally the same cow passed on a thousand times (sahasra-kritvo dattvā tayā sarve te sahasradakshināṁ sampannāḥ). This may be an exaggeration but it is not unusual for a Brāhmaṇa to dispose of the cow which he has received from
his yajamāna, and the same is purchased again for that purpose.

Types of Vedic Sacrifices:

Patañjali mentions Agniṣṭoma, Rājasūya and Vājapeya, besides the domestic sacrifices. The first one is mentioned several times\(^{11}\) and the merits accruing from its performance are also enumerated. This sacrifice is an ancient one mentioned in the Atharvaveda,\(^{12}\) and in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.\(^{13}\) As the simplest and the most common of soma-sacrifice, it required the immolation of single goat, a he-goat to Agni and the chanting of twelve stotras, viz. the Bahish-Pavamāna and four Ājya stotras at the morning sacrifice; the Mādhyamādina pavamāna and four prishiḥstotras at the mid-day service; the Tritiya or Ārbhava—pavamāna, and the Agniṣṭoma sāman at the evening service. The last named chant gave its name to the sacrifice which is often explained as the Agniṣṭoma saṃsthās kratuḥ or the sacrifice concluding with Agni's praise.\(^{14}\) The Mahābhāṣya does not mention changes, if any, made in the sacrifice of the animal. Its time of performance, left vague in earlier texts, in unaccounted for by Patañjali. Keith doubted the views expressed by Hillebrandt, that it was the spring festival, celebrated at the new or full moon, which marked the beginning of the year, when a nectar of the gods was offered to them in the shape of King Soma.\(^{15}\) It would be out of place to describe here in detail this Vedic ritual which seems to have been suspended till it was revived again.

The Royal Consecration ceremony, known as the Rāja-sūyayajñā, and in the three Samhitas of Black Yajurveda, as powers on the new King. Abhishechanīya, as the name of a rite included in the Rājasūya, is mentioned in the White Yajurveda, and in the three Samhitas of Black Yajurveda, as well as in several Brāhmaṇas, and the Śrauta ritual of all the

11. IV. 3.66 p. 312.4, 7; III. 4. p. 168.15 etc.
12. IX. 9.2; XI. 9.7.
16. V. 3.66 p. 312.4, 8, 12.
four Vedas. The last book of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa has abhisheka itself for its main topic. The details of the inauguration ceremony, as described in the Sanskrit literature, may be out of place here, but, according to Goldstucker,¹⁷ the Vaidika ceremony had undergone various modifications, and the inauguration ceremony at the Pauranic period had but little affinity with the Vaidika rite. F. W. Thomas suggested¹⁸ that there were also special causes at work, such as the neglect of the old Śrauta rituals, or the necessity of providing new forms for rulers who were without title to Kshatriya rites. Patañjali does not mention the details of his sacrificial rite which was certainly performed with the consecration of the Brahmanical Sunga ruler. A distinction is drawn between the Rājasūya, an elaborate ritual prescribed for Kshatriya King desirous of paramountcy, and Abhisheka which was a necessary act of State including priestly rites. The Rājasūya, on the other hand, was an optional religious rite, undertaken with a set object and included a ceremony of consecration. It displayed many popular elements in character with the great nobles and office-bearers playing an important part.

The Vājapeya, referred to by the Bhāshyakāra,¹⁹ is mentioned in the Atharvaveda²⁰ and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,²¹ and is fully described in the Śrauta ritual of all the Vedas. The object, and the persons entitled to perform it, have been discussed by earlier authorities. According to the Āsvalāyana Grihyasthātra,²² it was performed by one desiring supremacy (ādhipatyakāma), the Sāmkhāyana gives, instead, one desiring abundance of food (annādyā) and the Lātyāyana requires it for one promoted by brāhmaṇas and kings (yām brāhmaṇā rājānas cha pūraskuruītan sa vājapeyena yajet). According to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa²³ the rite originated with Indra and Brihaspati, who with the aid of Savitri won Prajāpati.

19. IV. 3.66 p. 312.5, 8, 12.
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The reasonable solution, as suggested by Eggeling and Hillebrandt\textsuperscript{24} is that Vājapeya was originally general for all ranks which severally had more special rites, the Rājasūya, Brihaspatisava, Sthapatisava, Grāmanīsava etc. etc. The features of the Vājapeya itself seems to point to the conclusion of Weber that it was originally a popular celebration of victory or promotion.

In the Mahābhāshya, Agnishṭoma is associated with Brāhmaṇas (tathā vede khalu api vasante Brāhmaṇo ‘gnishṭoma-madibhiḥ kratubhir yajet.\textsuperscript{25} A bit of confusion, however, seems to have arisen regarding its curious position. Some texts place it above the Rā jusūya, suggesting that the former conferred paramountcy, while the latter aimed only at kingship. Others make the Vājapeya appropriate for a paramount lord, and the Rājasūya for a universal monarch like Varuṇa.\textsuperscript{26} Keith suggested\textsuperscript{27} a simple solution by making the Vājapeya a rite which was performed by the King before the Rājasūya, and by the Brāhmaṇa before the Brihaspatisava, a festival celebrated on his appointment as a royal Purohita.

Next in order is the Aśvamedha sacrifice which was actually performed by a Śunga monarch. Patañjali mentions it separately in three different references.\textsuperscript{28} He also refers to Aśvayūpa, the post to which the sacrificial horse was tied with its wooden ring at the top. It is evident that the horse-sacrifice was not in letters, but an accomplished fact in this period. It is probable that Patañjali may have joined in any of the two horse sacrifices as a priest.

Yūpas:

Patañjali also refers to Yūpas in a number of references,\textsuperscript{29} which were set up for binding the sacrificial animal. He has also mentioned the material of their make—dāru or vaibhītaka

\textsuperscript{24} E.R.E. Vol. I. p. 21 ff and ref.
\textsuperscript{25} VI. 1.84 p. 57.21.
\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Vedic Index, Vol. II p. 256 and ref.
\textsuperscript{28} I. 4.9 p. 315.9; III. 1.85 p. 64.22; VII. 1.39 p. 256.14.
\textsuperscript{29} I. 1.1 p. 38.17; II. 1.36 p. 390.9 etc.
(Terminalia Bellerica)—(yūpāya daru—vaibhīlako—yūpah).

These Yūpas were associated with Vedic sacrifices, and detailed instructions regarding their shape and size are given in literature. Thus, in the case of the Vājapeya sacrifice, its height should be 17 cubits, but in others it varied from five to fifteen cubits. Its octagonal shape is fancifully compared in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa to the eight syllables of each line of the Gāyatrī metre. The stem was never straight, but curved both at the top and at the centre; and at a distance of two to eight inches from the top of the post was a ring or kataka technically called chashāla, which is mentioned by the Bhāshyakūra. Wooden Yūpas have not been found so far, but numerous stone Yūpas have been discovered in Northern India, the earliest being of the time of the Kushāṇa ruler Vāsishtaka. It is interesting to find in the Grihya Sūtra and Dharma Sūtra literature sentiments contrary to the setting up of these Yūpas. Thus, Vasishṭha, Baudhāyana, Vishnu, and Aśvalāyana declared that the very touch of a Yūpa was as polluting as that of a funeral pyre, or a woman in her courses. These views were, probably, not endorsed, as we find reference to the Yūpas, and the actual performance of horse sacrifices in the time of Patañjali.

Domestic Sacrifices:

There are also references to domestic sacrifices, like, Pākayajña or Pañcha-mahā-yajña. The former, according to the Aśvalāyana Grihya Sūtra was of three kinds—the hutas viz. the sacrifices offered over the fire; over something that is
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not the fire—prahutas; and the feeding of the Brāhmaṇas
(trayāḥ pākayajña hutā agnau iyamānā anagnau prahutā
brāhmaṇabhojane brāhmaṇihutāḥ). Manu mentions four
forms of this domestic sacrifice (ye pākayajñas chatvārovidhi-
yajñasamanvitāḥ).

According to the Āpastamba Grihya Sūtra, it denoted ceremonies connected with worldly life, but
Max Müller suggested that the general name of the sacrifices, performed according to the Grihya Sūtras, was Pākayajña, where Pāka symbolised either ‘small’ or ‘good’. Gautama men-
tions seven kinds of Pākyajñas viz. the Ashtaka Parvāna (offered on the new and full moon days), the funeral oblations, Śrāvanī, Āgrahāyani, Chaitrī and Āśvayuji. These are not
mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra, but they are described in de-
tail in the Āśvalāyana, Gobhila and Pāraskara Grihya
Sūtras. One finds references to Ashtaka and Āgrahāyani but they are used in different senses.

The performance of the Pañcha-mahāyajña was incumbent
on every householder (sarveṣa cha gṛihasthena pañchamahā-
yajñā nirvartyā). These, according to the Smritikāras, were:
sacrifice offered to the Brahman (adhyāpanam brahmayajña),
the offering of water (tarpāṇa) to the manes (pitriyajñas tu
tarpayam), the burnt oblation—the sacrifice offered to the
gods (homāḥ prahuto), the Bali offering to the Bhūtas (bhav-
tiko bali), and the hospitable reception of guests, the offering
to men (nriyajño tilhitpūjanam). The oblations to Devas is
alluded to in the expression (sāyamprātar homa chārupuro-
dāsāṁ nirvapati), but more information is available in rela-
tion to manes. Besides the *havya* and *kavya* oblations, offered to gods and *pitrās* respectively, it was necessary to perform *śrāddhā*, and the person dining on that particular day was called *śrāddhi* or *śrāddhika* (*Śrāddham anena bhuktam*). This is done even now for propitiating the manes, and for one’s spiritual welfare. The wife joined her husband in the performance of sacrifices, and was entitled to an equal share of the fruits (*patnīsaṁyoga iti yatṛa yajñasaṁyogah*), but this privilege was not accorded to a *śūdra* lady, despite her legal status (*evam api tushajakasya patnīti na sidhyati*). Patañjali does not mention the penance for the non-performance of such sacrifices, but, according to Manu, such a person lives not though he breathes (*na nirvapati pañchānām uchchhvasan na sajīvati*).

_Turāyaṇa_ was another kind of sacrifice mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra (*yas turāyaṇena yajate sa taurāyaṇika ity uchyate*). It was one of the forms of the new full moon offerings which would extend to a year in duration. The _Sāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa_ mentions _Turāyaṇa_ as a _yajña_ performed for the attainment of heaven (*sa esha svargakāmasya yajñah*).

_Soma Drinking:_

There is no reference in the _Mahābhāṣya_ to other kinds of Vedic sacrifices, like, _Jyotishṭoma_ or _Āyushṭoma_ which are mentioned by Pāṇini and were performed for obtaining longevity. Soma drinking was known, as Patañjali refers to _kunda-pāyya_ at which ewers or pitchers were used. The other form was called _sančhaya_ which required the stocking or accumulation of Soma. It is mentioned in the same sūtra of Pāṇini,
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but is ignored by the Bhāshyakāra. He, however, refers to the drinking of Soma according to the Yājñika school, which conferred this privilege on that person alone in whose family no one had suffered social degradation during the preceding three generations. (evam hi yājñikāḥ paṭhanti-daśapurushā nākam yasya grihe śūdrā na vidyan sa somam pibed iti).\(^{63}\) According to Manu, the economic prosperity of the individual weighed in his claim to drink Soma, that is, he possessed food, enough to last for three years or more, with which to maintain his dependents (yasya trai vārshikam bhaktam paryāptam bhṛityavatātaye adhikam vā api vidyet sa somam pātmum arhati).\(^{64}\) If the Soma was drunk with a stock less than the prescribed one (svaḷpiyasi dravye yaḥ), the labour was wasted (na tasya āpnoti tat phalam).\(^{65}\)

**Minor Sacrifices:**

There were certain minor sacrifices, like, navayajña\(^{66}\) and chālurmāṣya.\(^{67}\) The former, according to Gobhila,\(^{68}\) was an offering of the first fruits of the harvest; and a mass of boiled rice grains with milk, sacred to Indra and Agni, was prepared. The latter represented three sacrifices performed at the beginning of the three seasons of four months, each viz. Vaiśvadevam, Varuṇapraghāṣaḥ and Sākamedhaḥ.\(^{69}\) These coincided with the beginning of three seasons on the full moon days of the month of Phālguna, Āshāḍha and Kārttika.\(^{70}\) There are also references to certain other rites, as for instance, Sthāṭpāka,\(^{71}\) Chāru,\(^{72}\) Puroḍāsa\(^{73}\) and Kapāla,\(^{74}\) which may be considered in detail later on.

---
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Priests, Accessories and Duration of sacrifices:

The beginning of a Vedic sacrifice was preceded by the recitation of sacred mantras, popularly called Svasti\text{vāchana}, which was followed by Punyāha vāchana, recited for wishing an auspicious day, while Sānti vāchana\textsuperscript{75} averted an evil. The Bhāshyakāra actually refers to a mantra recited in a sacrifice—
asravantim āruhemā svastaye.\textsuperscript{76} The principal ceremony was known as Prayāja.\textsuperscript{77} Its performer was called Ritvij\textsuperscript{78} and the sacrificer was known as Yajamāna.\textsuperscript{79} The Adhvaryu\textsuperscript{80} priest, distinct from the Hotri\textsuperscript{81} and Udgātri,\textsuperscript{82} had to perform numerous functions, like measuring the ground, building the altar, preparing sacrificial vessels, fetching wood and water, lighting the fire and finally bringing the animal to the sacrificial post and immolating it. While engaged in these duties, the hymns of the Yajurveda had to be repeated by him.\textsuperscript{83} Neshtō (Neshtri)—the other priest, mentioned in the Vedic literature,\textsuperscript{84} was engaged in the ritual of the Soma sacrifice; as one of the chief officiating priests, he led forward the wife of the sacrificer, and prepared the surā. The priests connected with the Rigveda sacrifices and mentioned by Patañjali, are: Hotā (Hotri), and Potā (Potri).\textsuperscript{85} The functions of the former are clearly defined in the Rigveda,\textsuperscript{86} his chief duty being the recitation of the Sāstras. The latter, too, was one of the priests mentioned in the Rigveda, and in the Brāhmaṇas.\textsuperscript{87} It is presumed by its derivation from the root pu—to purify, that he was engaged in the purification of Soma, and he actually sang
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RELIGIOUS CONDITION

Soma hymns. Oldenburg’s suggestion⁸⁸ that he ceased in later literature to be a priest of any importance, save a mere name, may be true. Patañjali compares the two terms without further comments. The other priests mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra are: Praśāṣṭā (Praśāstri) and Pratihartā (Pratihartri)⁹⁰ and Āgniḍha.⁹¹ Their functions are not defined, but in earlier times Praśāstri appeared as Hotri’s assistant⁹¹ while Pratihartri was attached to the Udgātri, as we find in the Sāṅkhītas and the Brāhmaṇas.⁹² The last one was connected with the Atharvaveda confining himself to the kindling of fire, as his designation suggests. There is, however, no reference in the Mahābhāṣya to the requisitioning of their services in actual sacrifices.

The accessories to a sacrifice included, firstly, the special area with a place for recitation (stuti—bhūmi) and the avas-kara,⁹³ a pit for throwing refuse which are not mentioned by the Bhāshyākāra. The kuśa⁹⁴ grass, also called Pavitra in the Kāśikā,⁹⁵ was used in sacrifices. In the Soma sacrifice, the Pūtikā grass (pūtikatīra) was substituted though Soma had not become obsolete (Veda ‘pi somasya sthāne pūtikatīrinā ny abhisūnyād ity uchyate na cha tatra somo bhūtapūrvo bhavati).⁹⁶ Patañjali comments on the Śūtra relating to the irregular formation of the word ‘dvamāvas’ in the sense of ‘secret’, and when it expresses a limit, a separation, employing in a sacrificial vessel (yajñapātra), and manifestation,⁹⁷ but does not refer to that part relating to sacrificial cups which are accessories in a Vedic sacrifice. The oblation material was known as sāmnāyya,⁹⁸ a substance mixed with clarified
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butter and offered as a burnt offering. It was especially an offering of the Agnihotris, consisting of milk taken from a cow on the evening of the new moon mixed on the next day with other milk, and offered with clarified butter. The oblations were prepared or offered in five cups or bowls (pañ-chakapāla) or in ten (dašakapāla). The Vedas were constructed for sacrificial purpose, but there is no reference to the material used in preparing these altars which needed special class of bricks, as mentioned by Pāṇini (tadvān āsāṁ upadhāno mantra itishṭakāsu luk ca mātoḥ). The fire was kindled by the priest, followed by offering oblations with the recitation of mantras (tathā aṅgau kapālāny adhīṣṭīya abhi-mantrayate).

The important part in such sacrifices was the recitation of the mantras for involving Vedic deities. There was an injunction against the use of the apa-śabdas in yajñas (yajñe punah karmanī nāpabḥāsante). A bad sacrificer was called yājñikapāsa. The mantras differed according to the nature of sacrifices. Patañjali refers to the Rājasūya mantras, as well as to those meant for the Agnishṭoma and Vājapeya sacrifices (agnishtome bhavo mano ṛgishtomah-rājasūyaḥ vājapeyaḥ). The technical word juhoti is used for those sacrificial ceremonies to which the root hu and not yaj is applied. The adaptable nature of the Vedic mantras, with reference to case endings not provided for, may suggest that Patañjali had first hand information for sacrificial ceremonies (na sarvair lingair na cha sarvābhīr vibhaktibhīr vede mantrā nigaditāḥ.). The other technical words udgrābha and nigrābha are used in the sense of ‘the uplifting’ and ‘falling’ of ārūk (udgrābhaḥ nigrābha iti imau ‘śabdu’ chhandasi vaktav-
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yau srug udyamānanipātanayor arthayoḥ. It is equally interesting to notice the reference to the Śāmidheni mantras becoming seventeen in number by the threefold repetition of the first and the last hymns (saptadaśa śāmidhenyo bhavaniti triḥ prathamām anvāha trir uttamām ity āvrittītaḥ saptadaśatvam bhavati). He also comments on the Sūtra ye yajña-karmaṇī, giving special accentuation to the vowel of ye forming part of the sentence ‘ye yajāmahe’ which was to be uttered with circumflex accent (phuta) only, during the process of the sacrifice (ye yajāmahe śabdo brūhyādīshu upasainkhreyayaḥ). The muttering of the mantras generally accompanied the burning of yajñasamidh, as is done even now (bhrīsam japati brāhmaṇaḥ bhrīsam samidho daḥatīty eva).

The duration of sacrifices, fruits accruing from them, the daksinā given to the Brāhmaṇas, and the latter’s relation with the yajamāna are some other minor points worth consideration. The Bhāshyakāra has referred to the yajñas lasting for a hundred, or even a thousand years, (dīrgha satrāṇi vārshaṣatikāni vārshasahaṣṭrikāni cha); but they were no longer in practice, and only heard of in ritualistic portion of the Vedic literature (na cha adyatve kaścid api vyavaharati kevalam rishi sampradāyo dharma iti kriyā yājnikāḥ śāstreṇa anuvidhate). There were others lasting for four months (chaturshu māsesu bhavāni chāturmāsyāni yajñāḥ). The Pānchamahāyajni was to be performed every day. As regards the fruits of a sacrifice, the performer of an Agniśṭoma was supposed to be free from rebirth (kuto nu khalv etad agniśṭoma yājity etad upapadat bhavīyati na puṇar jānīte). The sacrificial fee—daksinā, however, varied. Patañjali refers to a gelded bull as daksinā (mahānirāśto daksinā diyate). The relations between the priests and the yajamānas were of
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a cordial nature, known as śrauyasambandha,¹¹⁷ that is, relationship through śruvā or ladle which was placed on a par with others emanating from money (artha), blood (yauna) and education (maukha).

Vedic Gods:

The list of Vedic deities, noticed in the Mahābhāshya is not as comprehensive as we find in the Ashtādhyāyī, and this is an indication of the swing towards popular divinities, especially, those connected with the cult of bhakti or devotion. A few Vedic ones are also noticed, like, Indra, Śakra, Puruhūta, and Puramānḍara, which were, no doubt, different names of one god (bahavo hi śabdā ekarthā bhavanti).¹¹⁸ The principal Vedic deities noticed are: Agni,¹¹⁹ Vāyu,¹²⁰ Sūrya,¹²¹ Rudra (Paśunā Ruḍram yajate),¹²² Prajāpati (esha vai saptadasāk-sharaś chhandasyaḥ prajāpatir yajñam anuvihitaḥ).¹²³ Marut (agnir vā ito vrishtim īṭe maruto 'mutas chyāvayantīti'),¹²⁴ Apāmnāpri, mentioned by Pāṇini also in the same Sūtra (aponaptrapāmnaptribhyām gah), Varuṇa, Vāyu and Āditya (Indras tvashṭa varuṇo vāyur āditya),¹²⁵ and Vishnū,¹²⁶ who enjoyed a high position amongst the votaries of the Bhāgavata cult. There are also references to dual divinities, like Mitra and Varuṇa (Mitravarṇau ijjamānaḥ),¹²⁷ Dyau and Prithivi (Dyāvāprithivī)¹²⁸ Agni and Soma (Agni-Soma)¹²⁹ and Vāyu-Varuṇa (Vāyu-Varuṇam).¹³⁰

¹¹⁷ I. 1.49 p. 119.21.
¹¹⁸ I. 2.45 p. 220.1.
¹¹⁹ I. 1.1 p. 1.5.
¹²² I. 4.32 p. 331.3.
¹²³ IV. 4.140 p. 335.8.
¹²⁴ I. 3.1 p. 256.13.
¹²⁵ II. 2.29 p. 431.5.
¹²⁶ VI. 1.36 p. 30.18.
¹²⁷ VI. 1.108 p. 82.2.
¹²⁹ VIII. 3.82 p. 445.19.
¹³⁰ VI. 3.42 p. 158.3.
Post-Vedic Deities:

These include some Vedic ones as well whose worship was continued in that period. A few names are synonymous. Indra with his other names, mentioned earlier, is praised a number of times for his killing the demon Vritra and is styled Vritrahan. Shiv and Vishnu were very popular with separate cults. The former is given other names like, Bhava, Sarva, Girisa (girau āte Giriśal), Mahadeva (Kakudodośani yāchate Mahādevaḥ), and Trayambaka (Trayambakam yajāmahe). These are some of the eight names of Shiv mentioned in the Atharvaveda. Skanda (Kārttikeya) is also mentioned in association with Viśakha. Patañjali seems to mention the synonyms of certain deities in the expression—Brahmaprajāpati Sivavaisravanau Skandavīśakhau. Krishna also figures prominently. The deities were supposed to possess infinite wisdom (devājñātum arhanti). The gods of constellations—the sun and the moon were also venerated and the emergence of the Kaliyuga (kalirdevatāsya kāleya's charuk) and the fight between the Devas and Asuras (devāsuram—rākshasasuram) was well-known. One also finds certain particular popular features like, emphasis on charity which entitled one to a place in heaven (yo bhavatām odanam dāsya sa svargain lokam gamishyati). There is a reference to gods, called
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Nilimpā classed as supernatural beings (*nilimpānāma devāḥ*). The images of these deities were worshipped by the people.

Certain female divinities mentioned are: Lakṣmi, wife of Viṣṇu; and Suparnī. Patañjali, commenting on II.2.34, has also noticed, or probably composed a verse in which it is stated that certain musical instruments were played in a gathering in the temple of Dhanapati, Rāma and Keśava (*mṛidaṅga saṅkhā tuṇavāḥ prithvaiḥ nandanti saṁsadi prā-sūde dhanapatirāmākeśavāṁ*). Rāma and Keśava are rightly identified with Balarāma and Krishṇa and it is clear from this reference that there were festive gatherings at that time in their temples.

Images:

Pāṇini mentions the term *Pratikrīti*, meaning portraits, but Patañjali uses the word *archā* denoting images. The famous *sūtra jivihārthe chāpye*, which has been the subject of so much discussion is helpful on this point. These images were not saleable (*apaṇya*), but were kept in temples for the purpose of worship (*yās ty etāḥ sampratipūjārhas tāsu bhavishyati*), serving, incidentally, as means of livelihood to their owners. The comment on this sūtra questions the validity of the dropping of *ka* in such forms as, *Śivaḥ, Skandaḥ* and *Viśākhah*, since the Mauryas, desirous of obtaining gold, sold objects of worship (*Mauryair hiranyārthibhir archāḥ prakalpitaḥ*). It is important for two reasons: firstly, it testifies to the worship of these divinities in that period, and secondly, it refers to the metal used for making these images. Kautilya has also referred to the installation of the images of Śiva and Vaiśravaṇa in temples (*Śivavaśravanaṅāvivīśrāṅdārghirāṁ cha purāmadhye kārayet*). The Gaṇapāṭhā cites this compound.
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Skandaviśākhau along with Brahmmaprajāpati, and Śivavaśra-
vanau. According to the Bhāshyakāra, these gods were
not mentioned in pairs in Vedic literature, but only in loka
(vartamāne punar dvandvagrahaṇasya elat prayojanam loka-
vedayor yo dvandvas tatra yathā syāt na cha vede sahanirvāpā
nirdishṭah). The cult of the Yakshas and Nāgas, with their female
counterparts, whose statues have been found, is another phase
in the study of popular divinities in that period. It is natural
to presume that devotion or bhakti played an important part
in the setting up of these images. As regards the antiquity
of Skanda and Viśākha, they seem to be earlier than the time
of Patañjali. According to D. R. Bhandarkar, Skanda,
Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsena were in olden days names
of four different gods. He based his contention on the reference
to Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsena with separate
figures on the coins of Huvishka, and Amarsimha’s allusion
to only one of the four names in each of the four lines of his
two verses relating to Kārttikeya. R. G. Bhandarkar had
suggested that the three names represented only one deity on
Huvishka’s coins. The distinct individuality of the two divi-
nities seems clear from the reference in the Mahābhāshya,
though the evidence is considered inconclusive by those who
attach importance to the absence of Viśākha’s name, as a deity,
in early or later literature.

Bhakti—Bhāgavata cult:

The feeling of devotion or attachment to a particular
deity, recognising others as manifestations of the same, was
not new to this period. Its existence can be traced in earlier
literature. Pāṇini seems to refer to it in his reference to
Vāsudeva and Arjuna in the sūtra—Vāsudevārjunābhīyāṁ
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It is clear, as suggested in the Kāśikā, that Vāsudeva mentioned in this sūtra was not a Kshatriya name but that of Krishna, and the person attached to him was known as Vāsudevakā (Vāsudevobhaktir asya Vāsudevakāḥ)\textsuperscript{159} The propitiation of deities is implied in another sūtra of Pāṇini which refers to the morphology of names, as Varuṇadatta and Āryamadatta; the ending datta denoted a benediction from a god, or a higher power of which the personal name became a symbolic expression (kārakādattasrūtayor—evāsisi)\textsuperscript{160} It is, therefore, presumed that the Bhakti cult dates back, at least, to the time of the Śutrakāra. R. G. Bhandarkar had suggested\textsuperscript{161} two religious movements during the period of intellectual ferment: the one in the east, which believed in self-abnegation and a course of strict moral conduct; and the other connected with the Śatvatas in western India which attached importance to devotion in a supreme God. The Nārāyanīya section of the Mahābhārata traces the evolution of the second course. The supreme God is named Hari whose worship is not completely free from religious sacrifices. The next stage is marked by the association of Vāsudeva with his son, grandson, and brother, who became objects of veneration presiding over certain psychological categories, or as persons created by Him for the purpose. Patañjali has given interesting information on this point. Vāsudeva and Bāladeva are classed by him\textsuperscript{162} as derivatives from Vrishṇi names in the sense of sons of Vāsudeva and Baladeva.

It is contended that the Śatvatas of the Mahābhārata was another name of the Vrishṇi race to which Vāsudeva, Śaṅkarshaṇa and Aniruddha belonged. The religion of the Śatvatas, associated with Vāsudeva in the Mahābhārata, culminated in the time of Patañjali when other members, connected with Vāsudeva, were also revered. The life and activities of the supreme lord became objects of exhibition to the people in different ways. Patañjali, besides mentioning the
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names of Krishna and Janārdana, the synonyms of Vāsudeva, also referred to the festive gatherings in the temples of Keśava (Vāsudeva) and Rāma (Balarāma). The reference to Vāsudeva-bhaktas, the staging of Bali-bandha—connected with Vishnu, and the slaying of Kaṁsa by Krishṇa himself, are some of the additional proofs of the growing spirit of devotion to the Lord who was addressed by different names. There is a reference to the Vyūha of Krishna and his acolytes (Janār-dhanas tv ātmachaturtha eva), meaning ‘Janārdhana, whose self is the fourth in a constituent group’. The Vedic god Vishṇu, later a synonym of Vāsudeva, is compounded with Indra in one reference, and with Agni in another. This need not mislead us in presuming distinct personalities of Vishṇu, Vāsudeva and Krishna. It is true that Vishnu, as a Vedic deity, was frequently invoked, though not placed in the foremost rank; but in the post-Vedic period he assumed the supreme place condescending to become incarnate for the emancipation of human beings. It may, therefore, be suggested that one stream of religious thought emanated from Vishnu, the Vedic god; the other from Vāsudeva, the historic personality associated at first with the Sātvatas and these two, mingling with another merging with Nārāyana, the cosmic and philosophic god, gave rise to the cult of Vishnu-Vāsudeva Bhaktism. The identification of Vāsudeva and Krishṇa with Vishṇu is established, and Keith referred to it long ago. The evidence from the epigraphic and archaeological sources, is also helpful in assessing the nature and flourishing state of this cult which attracted even foreigners.

Amongst the epigraphic records of this period, the most important one is the Besnagar pillar inscription, which mentions the setting up of the Garuḍa column (garuḍadhvaja) of Vāsudeva, the god of gods (devadeva) by Heliodorus, a Bhāga-vata, son of Dion and an inhabitant of Taxila who came as
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Greek Ambassador from King Antialkidas to Kāśīputra King Bhāgabhadra. A fragment of the shaft of another octagonal column, evidently from Besnagar, and found in a narrow street at Bhiilsa, bears a Brāhmī inscription in one line recording the erection of the Garuḍa column of the excellent temple of the Bhāgavat (Bhagavatāḥ prāśadō) by Gautamīputra, a Bhāgavata. These two records from Besnagar are Vaishṇavite in character, since Garuḍa appears as the Vāhana of Vishṇu. According to the Mahābhārata, Garuḍa, in return for boons granted to him by Vishṇu, himself offered a boon to him who made the bird his vehicle.

The next inscription is the Ghasundi stone slab found about 4 miles north-east of Nāgari in the Udaipur State (Rajasthan). It is engraved in Brāhmī characters of the second century B.C., and records the erection of a stone enclosure of worship for Bhāgavat Samkarshana and Vāsudeva, within the enclosure of Nārāyaṇa, by Bhāgavata Gajāyana, son of Parāsari. The Nārāyaṇavata, or the enclosure of the Lord, denotes the compound of a temple or place of worship, while Pūjaśilā-prākāra stands for Bhāgavat Samkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva, evidently referring to a smaller stone enclosure, probably, round the images representing Samkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva within the Nārāyaṇavata. The cosmic philosophic god Nārāyaṇa, whose name is not traced in the Mahābhāshya, thus, completes the triveni or the three streams of thought mingling together to form the cult of Vaishṇavism.

Now, as regards the relation of Samkarshaṇa with Vāsudeva, the Nanaghat cave inscription mentions them as the descendants of the moon (Chamda-Chandra) along with Dhamma (Dharma), Ida (Indra) and the guardians of the four cardinal points: Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera, and Vāsudeva. R. P. Chanda, quoting the Nārāyaṇiya section of the Mahābhārata, and Sānkara’s commentary on the Vedānta-Sūtras
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suggested that these two of the forms (Vyūhas) were worshipped by the Pañcharātras or Bhāgavatas. The Vyūhās were Vāsudeva, or the highest self Saṃkarśana, or the individual soul, Pradyumna or the mind (manas), and Aniruddha or the principle of egoism (ahamkāra) in descending order; and according to the orthodox view, the highest Brahman called Vāsudeva abides in a four fold form, or reveals itself by dividing its four-fold as the four vyūhas. In all these expositions, Vāsudeva is mentioned first, followed by Saṃkarśana. In this inscription the order is reversed, and it is presumed that in those days Saṃkarśana was popularly recognised as a divinity equalling Vāsudeva in rank. Kauṭilya also mentions this god. R. P. Chanda, therefore, suggested two forms of Vāsudevism—the worship of Vāsudeva, as ‘the god of gods’, and also as a god second to Saṃkarśana, in the second century B.C. thereby, indicating that the basic cult originated at a much earlier period.

Another record is the Mora stone slab inscription of the time Mahākshatrapa Rājuvula. Though it is placed about the early part of the first century A.D., its importance lies here in the second line beginning with—Bhāgavatā (vri) (sh) na Pañchavīrānām pratīmā. If Bhāgavatā Vrishṇena is construed as Bhāgavato vrishṇeḥ as suggested by Chanda, then it may refer to the setting up of an image of the blessed or the divine Vrishṇi, that is Krishna-Vāsudeva, who belonged to the Vrishṇi branch of the Yādava race (Vrishṇinām Vāsudevo ‘smi). A Mathurā inscription of the time of the great Kshatrapa Soḍāsa, son of Rājuvula, also refers to the shrine of the Bhāgavat Vāsudeva (Bhāgavato Vāsudevasya mahāsthāna).

Now the association of Vāsudeva with Baladeva and the Vrishṇis is also noted by Patañjali (Vāsudevah—Bāladevah—
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nyasya sa eva—viśvakseno nāma vrishnīs tasmād ubhayāṁ prāṇopoti).179 On the basis of the literary, epigraphic and archaeological sources, the following conclusions may be drawn—Firstly, the Bhāgavata cult is not new to this period, but dates back, at least, to the time of Pāṇini. Secondly, Vishṇu, the Vedic deity, was identified with Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa and Krīṣṇa, a general name Vāsudeva—Bhāgavata cult denoted Vaishnāvim. Thirdly, both Balarāma and Vāsudeva, who were historical personalities associated with the Vrishṇis, had attained divine status, with their images consecrated in temples where there were festive gatherings. Fourthly, the Vyūhas of Vāsudeva also found a place in the divine pantheon. It is clear that Saṃkarshaṇa enjoyed a divine position along with Vāsudeva or Vishṇu. Thus, what was supposed to be a localized religious stream of thought, gradually expanded in eastern and southern directions. This cult, a synthesis of different religious thoughts, also attracted foreigners.

Śaivism:

There are two references in the Mahābhāṣya which suggest a separate cult of the Śaivas, the devotees of Śiva: Śiva bhāgavata180 and Śiva-vaiśravaṇau.181 The first refers to the devotees of Śiva who carried an iron lance, as the emblem of that deity (yo 'yaḥśūlenā anvīchāḥhati sa āyaḥ śūlikah kim chātaḥ śiva bhāgavate prāṇopoti). It is suggested182 that, despite the inapplicability of the word āyaḥ Śūlika in its literal sense to Śiva-bhāgavata, the meaning ‘one who took recourse to extreme harsh or rash measures to seek an end, which could be secured by milder methods’, alludes to the existence of this cult, whose members used an iron spear as a distinctive mark. One, however, feels that the two classes of Śiva devotees have to be distinguished—the Āyaḥ Śūlikas carried an iron trident or triśula and practised penance and other dhūlta rites; but there were lay devotees who propitiated the benign deity
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According to Kern,\textsuperscript{217} in the three centuries which elapsed between the death of Aśoka and the rein of Kanishka, Buddhism was steadily on the increase in the North, flourishing in the domains of the Bactrian Greeks. The chronology based on literary documents being confused, it is unsafe to deduce any historical fact from traditions. It is a pity that, except for the clear-cut evidence regarding the active state of Buddhism from the monuments and the epigraphic sources, literary proof is wanting.

\textit{Jainism:}

The Ḥāthigumpha inscription,\textsuperscript{218} and a few others from Mathurā record dedications for Jainism. The invocation of the formulae (\textit{Namo arihantānām namo Savasiddhānām}), the contents of the Kaliṅga record, and other old Brāhmi inscriptions\textsuperscript{219} disclose the activity of this religious order. It enjoyed the patronage of King Khāravela and other donors. Inscription No. 11 of Khāravela’s chief queen records that the cave commemorating her name was cut for the sake of Kaliṅga recluses of Arhata persuasion (\textit{Arhanta pasādānām Kalingānām Sama-nānām}). During the thirteen years of Khāravela’s reign, some 117 caves were excavated on the Kumāri hill to serve as resting places for the Arhats, or Jains residing there (\textit{Arhato parinivāsato hi kāya nisīdiyaya}).\textsuperscript{220} Besides Kaliṅga, Mathurā was also an important centre of Jainism. Amongst the inscriptions, found and edited by Bühler, the earliest one has been assigned by him to the middle of the second century B.C., because of its exceedingly archaic characters and its language—pure Prākrit of the Pāli type. This inscription\textsuperscript{221} records dedication of an ornamental arch for the temple, the gift of the lay hearer Uttaradāsaka (Uttaradāsaka), son of Vachchhī (Vatsī), mother and disciple of the ascetic Mahārakhita (Mahārakhshita). The Amohini tablet inscription, dated in the year 42 of the time of Mahākshatrapa Śoḍāsa is another Jain record of about
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15 B.C. or 15 A.D. Lüders, while discussing the era of the Mahārāja and Rājātirāja, considered the Girdharpur and Lucknow Museum inscriptions of the years 270 and 292 (or 299) respectively. He presumed that the donors were Parthians who had immigrated to Mathurā during the rule of the Kshatrapas, and, despite their joining the Jain fold they upheld the traditions of their native country. It is an important phase of Jainism which suggests the assimilation of foreigners in their religious order.

**Lokāyatas or Materialists:**

The Lokāyatas were not unknown in that period. Patañjali refers to Bhāguri as a famous exponent of this school who provided specimens of the Lokāyata doctrine according to his views (vārnikā Bhāguri Lokāyatasya), or way of life (vārtikā Bhāguri lokāyatasya). The name of the founder of this school—Chārvāka is not mentioned by the Bhāshyakāra, but his philosophy was well-known. According to a legend in the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, Brihaspati taught demons false knowledge of which the reward lasts only so long as the pleasure exists, in order to hasten their destruction. In the Uktādīgaṇa of the Ashtādhyāyī, a teacher and a pupil of this doctrine are called Lokāyatika. The system is referred to in the Arthasaśstra (saṃvaraṇamātram hi trayī lokayātrāvida iti), and much earlier in a Jātaka. A short account of this system is also given in the Prabodhachandrodaya. In the Sarvadarśanasamgraha, a very late work, the system is examined from the Vedantist standpoint, and Mādhava looks upon their philosophy as the lowest of all, but not to be ignored.

We have taken into account the religious condition of India during the time of Patañjali in all its aspects. One can hardly deny that with the advent of the Brahmanical Śunga ruler to power, there was a revival of Vedic sacrifices with
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by Yaksha and Yakshi figures on the balustrade of the Bhārhut stūpa. In case the donors were interested in Pauranic worship, as suggested by Bühler, then how are they associated with Buddhist dedications? Did Buddha have a place in the Brahmanical pantheon, or was he adored by the worshippers of the demi-gods, or did the people believe in eclecticism? The answer to the questions is quite simple. It is probable that the donors were all Buddhists, and the use of these affixes is not a sure proof of the existence of these cults; but one may take a broader view and presume that the ordinary people in that period were anxious to obtain merit from whatever quarter, and through whatever process it was available. Therefore, these donors did not hesitate to make endowments for Buddhism, because they thought that by so doing they could acquire merit in the next world. This catholic outlook of a Hindu, even at present, prompts him to visit the Bodh-Gaya temple and give dakshina when he visits Gaya for performing Pitri oblations.

People also worshipped the lower order of divine beings—the Yakshas and the Nāgas—for fear of their destructive powers, and with a desire to obtain boons from them. This is evident from numerous statues of such demi-gods which have been found with inscriptions recorded on them, and their figures carved on the Bhārhut gateway and those at Sāñchī. According to Coomaraswamy, Yaksha worship was a bhakti cult, with images, temples, altars and offerings, and as the greater deities of all, from a popular point of view, be regarded as Yakshas', we may safely recognize in the worship of the latter (together with Nāgas and goddesses) the natural source of the Bhakti cult, common to the whole sectarian development, which was taking place before the beginning of the Kushāṇa period. This shows that the people at that time were not sectarian in their outlook. The Hindu Ethics enjoins every householder certain moral and spiritual obligations, and stress is laid on 'sṛddhā' and tyāga—faith and a spirit of sacrifice, classed holder as dharmaniymas (dharmaṇya niyam dharmaniyanah—
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dharmārtho vā niyamo dharmaniyamaḥ), meaning a restriction on oneself for the sake of religious merit as its result, or with religious merit as its object. The popular belief in ethical and moral responsibilities was deep-rooted in the masses.

Buddhism:

Popular religion of which the fabric was woven out of cults and traces, as pointed out by John Marshall, did not leave Buddhism unaffected. The sculptures at Bhārhut and Sāñchi furnish numerous illustrations of sacred objects and divinities, drawn from the ancient religions of the people. Names might have changed, but the cults remained immutable. Such cults were taken over by Buddhism from the popular religion of the masses, and for the masses. The icon of the Buddha had not yet come into existence, but the relic worship had acquired a significant and important place in the Buddhist form of worship. As parts of the body of the Lord, they served to create in the mind of the devotee a feeling of personal devotion and allegiance. Besides the Tathāgata, some of his important disciples like Sāriputra and Moggallaṇa, also claimed the privilege of their relics being enshrined in stūpas. This stage, probably, reached in the Śungha Period. As regards the anti-Buddhist attitude of the first Śungha monarch, J. Marshall hinted at the probable destruction of the earlier Sāñchi Stūpa by this ruler, but we would like to leave the matter open without any comment. It is, however, clear that Buddhism was not inactive in this period. In an inscription on the railing of the Sañchī Stūpa, there is a reference to āchariya-kula—a technical expression meaning ‘a Buddhist school’, and annācharyakula—‘the other school’. It refers to an injunction against the removal of any property from Kākanāda to a non-Theravādin community, thereby suggesting that another school, probably of the Mahāsanghikas, had established itself at Sāñchi in the first century B.C. The conservative school of the Theravādins became apprehensive of the dismemberment of their sacred edifice.
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tridāṇḍin Parivrājaka, mentioned by Paṇaṭjāli, may be taken as an Ājivika in the general sense. It is probable that the Bhāṣyakāra, while referring to the Parivrājakas as identical with Maskarins, had in mind the system of the Ājivikas who had lately received benefactions of caves at Nāgārjunī from Emperor Dasaratha of the Mauryan dynasty. They are not noticed separately. The group also included female ascetics (Saṅkarā nāmaparivrājakā).

The Daṇḍins, with a single staff, formed a separate group dating back to the period of Brāhmaṇas, and are mentioned by Paṇini and Maṇu as well. Maṇu actually describes their appearance. The Daśītikas (dīṣṭam ity asya matir daśītikah), mentioned in analogy to the other two terms—āstiṃ and nāstiṃ, probably belonged to the school of Makkhali which repudiated karmāṇa as the means of attaining one’s end.

The Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas had separate orders, in constant opposition to the other (yeshāṁ cha virodha ity asya avakāśaḥ). The term śramaṇa included all non-Brahmanical orders. The earliest reference to this clear-cut division is given by Megasthenes, who mentions Brachmanes or the Brāhmaṇas and Garmanes viz. Śramaṇas. The distinction is maintained in Aśokan inscriptions as well. According to the Udāna, there were various sects of Śramaṇas and Brāhmaṇas—followers of different Dīṭṭhis, that is, systems of Darśanas, and having separate organisations (ṣambhulā nānādīṭṭhiyā samanabrāhmaṇā-paribbājakā savātthāṃ paṇḍāya pavisanti nānādīṭṭhiḥkā nānākhantikā nānāruchikā nānādīṭṭhiṃśayanissita). The

197. III. 2.14 p. 100.6.
198. V. 2.94 p. 393.19.
199. Sai, Brähk. XIII. 4.2.15.
200. V. 2.115.
201. VI. 52. Kliptakēśa-nakha-Smaśruḥ pāṭri daṇḍi kusumbhavōn vichareṇa niyato nityam sarvabhūtāny api dayan.
203. II. 4.12 p. 476.9.
204. Frag. XLI—Strabo XV. i. 59.
205. P.T.S. 1885 p. 66.
two classes of ascetics, called Parivrājakas, or the wandering class, have been mentioned in the Buddhist literature under two main headings—the Brāhmaṇas and the Aṇātītthiyas. It seems that the word śramaṇa, mentioned by Patañjali, denoted ascetic orders distinct from those of the Brāhmaṇas, though its use may have been restricted to Buddhists alone during certain times. The Bhāṣyakāra has not mentioned śramanī—Pāli samanī—the female ascetics who are referred to in the Samyutta Nikāya. The practice of initiating ladies was forbidden, except at the Vānaprastha stage along with their husbands (stṛiyām cha pravrajayataḥ), but things were different in the Śramaṇa orders—both Buddhist and Jains.

Popular Religious Beliefs:

The keynote of Indian religious belief has been the emphasis laid on the spiritual and moral side of human life, resulting in people’s anxiety to perform good deeds. This spirit prompted them to create dedications for some sacred purpose. The endowments at Bhārhat, and on the railing at Sāñchī, which were made in this period, are exclusively Buddhist; but one finds a peculiar phenomenon which was first pointed out by Bühler, and later considered afresh by John Marshall. Bühler referred to the existence of Pauranic worship at the time when these records were inscribed. If name could be suggestive of the religious beliefs then those like Arhadatta, Dharmarakhita, Bodhi, and Saṅgharakhita are Buddhist; Agideva and Viśvadeva relate to ancient Vedic worship. Vaiśnavism and Saivism seem evident from such names like, Nāga, Nāgila and Nāgadatta; Vinhuka and Opedadatta; and Nādiguta, Samikā and Sivanandi respectively. J. Marshall points to the Yaksha cult, evidently on the basis of names such as, Yakhadāsi, Yakhadina, Yakhi and Yakhila. The presence of these folk cults in the second century B.C., is proved

206. Ang. I. 65, 240; Dig. III. 115.
207. I. 333 cf. also Jat. V. 424, Vin. IV. 235.
through their offerings. A sentence in the comment on the sūtra *Jīvakārthe chāpāntye* refers to the *archā* or image of Śiva which was placed in front for the purpose of worship (*yāṣ tu etāḥ samprati pūjārthās tāsu bhavishyati*).\(^{183}\) Linga worship had not come into form by that time. Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha were adored by many people, and their images were a source of living to their keepers. The evidence, advanced by the *Atharva Sīrāsa Upanishad* and the *Nārāyaṇīya* section of the *Mahābhārata*, on the position of Śiva as a divinity and the different branches or offshoots of Śaivism is valuable. The former designates him as a *Bhāgavat*, while the latter refers to *Pāṣuṭapata*, as one of the five schools of religious doctrines which had revelations from Śiva-Srīkaṇṭha. This school, according to R. G. Bhandarkar,\(^{184}\) rose about the second century B.C., but it is not mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*. One can hardly deny that Śaivism, as a separate cult, existed earlier than the time of Patañjali in the light of Megasthenes’ reference\(^{185}\) to the cults of Dionysus and Heracles, and the evidence furnished by the *Mahābhārata* on this point, but it is difficult to suggest the different schools into which it had branched off in that period. To be more precise, it may be proposed that the votaries of Śiva included those who took recourse to harsh and rash measures for seeking their end, as well as ordinary lay worshippers who believed in propitiation through devotion.

**Ascetic Orders:**

Groups of wandering mendicants, or those living in solitary meditation were not unknown. Patañjali tries to explain their philosophy which upheld inaction, and their creed was different from that of the Brāhmaṇa or Śramaṇa religious groups. The practice of asceticism served to reveal supreme wisdom (*tapas tāpasaṃ sedhayati*).\(^{186}\) The ascetics were noted for their matted hair (*jaṭā*),\(^{187}\) beard (*śmaśru*), and the use of a

\(^{183}\) V. 3.99 p. 429.4.


\(^{185}\) CHL. Vol. I, p. 408.

\(^{186}\) VI. 1.49 p. 38.7.

\(^{187}\) VI. 1.48 p. 37.20.
water-pot (*kamandalu*). The staffs (*daṇḍa*) varied according to the groups—as for instance, the *Parivrājaka* had three staves (*triviṣṭabdhakaham drishtvā parivrājaka iti*), but a *Daṇḍin* had a single *kṣatra*. The *Parivrājakas* are also mentioned by Pāṇini in his sūtra—*Maskaramaskarīnau Venuparivrājakayoh*. This ascetic order included a Maskarin, and it is suggested by Patañjali in his comment that a Maskarin Pari-

The identification of Maskarins with the Ājīvikas is fairly certain, and it is confirmed by the fact that Gosāla, the last of the leaders, is called Makkhali—the Pāli form of Sanskrit Maskarin in Pāli literature. A late work, quoted by D. R. Bhandarkar, also suggests the identity of the Ājīvikas with the Maskarins, and it is proposed on the basis of the reference to the word *sikkhī* of the *Bhāṭṭikāvya*, agreeing with the *uttuṅgajāta* of the *Jānakiharaṇa*, that an Ājīvika was really a *tridāṇḍī*, and not an *ekadāṇḍī*, as supposed by Utpala. The
as a model, certain rules of etiquette and social conduct, like voiding at a distance from one's house,\textsuperscript{10} abstinence from drink for a Brāhmanī,\textsuperscript{20} greeting a lady,\textsuperscript{21} and a youth taking airs before an old man,\textsuperscript{22} which are noticed in the Smrīti texts, though with slight variations.

Regarding the definition of Āryāvarta, with particular reference to its boundaries, there seems unanimity of expression between Baudhāyana and Patañjali, except that Baudhāyana substitutes the word Vīnaśana for Ādarsā. According to Vasisthā, Āryāvarta was the region between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, where the black antelope roamed about in ‘spiritual pre-eminence.’ Patañjali has not mentioned this fact, which, according to the commentary of Viśvarūpa on Yājñavalkya Smrīti (1-2) was ‘sacrifice assuming that form while wandering over the earth, followed by Dharma in its wanderings.’ The absence of this tradition in the Mahābhāshya, in connection with the limits of Āryāvarta, is an important fact which cannot be overlooked, as it is noted by the other two—Baudhāyana and Vasisthā.


(ii) etasmin āryanīvīśe ye Brāhmaṇāḥ kumbhidhānya alolupa agrihyamānakaranaḥ kimchid antareṇa kasyāśchid vidyāyāḥ pāragas tatra bhavantaḥ śiśṭāḥ. Ibid. 8-11.

(b) śiśṭa khālu vigatamatsarāḥ nirahāṅkārāḥ kumbhidhānya alolupa dambhadarpalobhamohakrodha vivarjitāḥ. Baudhā. 1.5. pāramaprayagato yeshāṁ vedāḥ sarapibhirmaneh te śiśṭā brāhmaṇā jñeyāḥ śrutiprātyakṣaḥ—hetavah. Vas. VI. 43.


22. ārūdhvāmi prāṇāḥ ky utkrāmanti yūnāḥ sthavira śyati pratyutthānābhivādāhyāṁ puno tāḥ prātipadāya iti. Mah. VI. 1.84. p. 58.8-9.
A Sishta, according to Baudhāyana, was expected to be free from envy and pride, keeping only as much as was measured by a kumbhi, immune from greed and hypocrisy, annoyance, covetousness, delusion and anger. He studied the Vedas according to the prescribed method together with the appendages, that is, Itihāsa and Purāṇa, and knew how to draw inferences. The definition of the Sishtas in the Mahābhāshya corresponds exactly to that of Baudhāyana, while that of Vasishtha is general, since it defines the Sishtas as those whose mind was free from desires. There appears to be close affinity in the conception, despite slight variations in words.

A third parallelism refers to voiding at a distance from one’s house, washing one’s feet at a distance and niti, as for example, the advice to remain at a distance from robbers, as well as from an angry teacher. In this connection it may be interesting to quote another passage tabooing voiding while standing, and taking food while walking (abrāhmaṇo 'yam tishṭhan mūtryati abrāhmaṇo 'yam yo gachchhan bhakshya-yati). As regards the first point, Manu, Āpastamba, Gautama, and Yājñavalkya have all condemned voiding near one’s house, but urinating, while standing, is disapproved in the Atharvaeda as well. On the second point, no Smriti parallelism can be traced.

The next one relates to the drinking of wine by a Brāhmaṇi who, for her act, is not entitled to the company of her lord in the next world. Vasishtha has also mentioned it, but he is more strict and deprives her of her accumulated puṇyas or spiritual gains. According to the Āśvalāyana Grihya sūtra, surā, and the scum of boiled rice in addition (to the piṇḍas)

23. II. 2.6 p. 411.22.
24. dūrād āvasathān mūtram dūrāt pādāvasechanam IV. 151.
25. ārāc ch’a āvasathān mūtraprishe kuryād dakshino m disam dakshināparām vā. Āp. I. 11.31.2.
27. dūrād uchchhishta viṇāmūtrapādāmbhasi samutsrijet. I. 154.
28. VII. 107.1.
29. Yā brāhmaṇi cha surāpi na tām devāh patilokam nayanti itiavai sā charati kṣinapuṇyāpsu lug bhavti śūktikā vā—XXI. 11.
30. II. 5.5.
Patañjali, quoting this verse from the *Rigveda*, further elucidates it in his comment. As a well-dressed wife desiring her husband’s company, presents gently her person (to him), so speech reveals itself to one learned in speech (a grammarian). This verse is equally important from the metaphorical point of view which one also notices in another verse, quoted by the Bhāshyakāra from the *Rigveda*. “When the wise create speech through wisdom winnowing (sieving) it as (men winnow) barley with a sieve, then friends know friendship; good fortune is placed upon their word.” The wise men, as explained by Patañjali, in their purified speech, sieve out corrupt words. From these verses, quoted in full, one draws the conclusion that Patañjali was not only well-grounded in the Vedas, but he fully utilized his Vedic knowledge in the service of grammar, and tried to explain the mysterious meaning of some of the verses, quoted by him, in terms of grammatical values.

The influence of the later Vedic literature does not appear to be much on the *Mahābhāṣyā*. Patañjali no doubt quotes the Vedic recensions which is nothing unusual for a scholar like him. He also refers to the *Yājñavalkya* and *Saulabha Brāhmaṇas* (*Yājñavalkyāṇī Brāhmaṇāṇī—Saulabhaṇī*). They were not early texts because of the inapplicability of the sūtra—Chando brāhmaṇāṇi cha tadvishayāṇi (IV. 2.66) which suggests that the affixes denoting the announcer, when added to the Chandas and the Brāhmaṇas express that relation only in the case of the two Brāhmaṇas stated above (*Yājñavaikyādibhyāḥ pratisheḍho vaktavyāḥ*). The reference to different works in the Sūtra literature, like the Vārttika-Sūtra, *Samgraha-Sūtra* and *Kalpa-Sūtra* in the *Mahābhāṣyā* only implies his familiarity with these works as with many *Kalpas*,—Parāśara,

11. *saktum iva sitāunā punanto yatra dhīrā manasā vāchāṃ akṛata atrā sakhyāḥ sakhyāṃ jānate bhadraishaṇ lakshmīr nihitādhi vāchi.*
   *Mah. I. 1.1 p. 4. 10-11; R.V. X. 71-2.*


13. IV. 2.60 p. 284.4.

Kaśyapa, Paṇīgi, Kuśika and Mahāvārttika, which have been mentioned earlier.

Patañjali and Smriti Literature:

There are, however, a few passages in the Mahābhāṣya which can also be traced in the Dharma sūtras and the Smritis. According to P. C. Chakravartty, Patañjali has given unmistakeable proof of his respectable knowledge of the Dharma sāstras current in his time and numerous references to the Smriti texts indicate that he made a careful study of Dharma sūtras, such as those of Baudhāyana, Āpastamba and Gotama. He sometimes quotes verbatim passages from the texts, and sometimes gives the substance.” On the other hand, A. Ghosh has pointed out that there is hardly any passage in the Mahābhāṣya from which we can definitely say that Patañjali borrowed from any of our present texts. His reference to the Vishnu Smriti is very meagre and casual, and we can be certain that he shows no acquaintance with that text. Of the rest, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Vasishṭha and Manu, nothing can be said except with the greatest difference. We may, however, consider the subject afresh taking into consideration the probable parallel references. It is just possible that there might have been a common source. The passages supposed to have been taken from these texts relate to the definitions of Āryāvarta, Sishtas whose custom and behaviour is to be followed

15. IHQ. Vol. II. pp. 276 ff.
16. ibid., Vol. XI. pp. 77 ff.
17. (a) kaḥ punar Āryāvartah—Prāg ādarsāt pratyak kālakavanād dakshīṇena himavantam uttareṇa Pāriyātram.
(b) Prāg adarṣanāt pratyak kālakavānād dakshīṇena himavantam udak pāriyātram etad Āryāvarta tasmin cha āchāras so pramāṇam. Baud. I. 2.10.
(c) (i) Āryāvartah Prāg ādarsāt pratyak kālakavanād udak-pāriyātrād dakshīṇena himavatāt uttareṇa cha vindhāyasya. Vas. I. 8-9.
The most important is the one which Sāyaṇa, in conformity with the opinion of Yāska and others, applies to Agni, identified either with Yajña or with Āditya. “Four are his horns, three are the feet that bear him; his heads are two, his hands are seven in number. Round with a triple bond the steer roars loudly; the Mighty God hath entered into mortals.” Mahīdhara’s explanation of the verse differs from that of Sāyaṇa, and the four horns are priests, or nouns, verbs, prepositions and the indeclinables; the three feet are the Vedas, or the first, second and third persons, or the past, present, and future tenses; the two heads are two sacrifices, or the agent and the object; the seven hands are the metres or the cases of the noun; and the three bonds are the three daily sacrifices, or the singular, dual and plural numbers. A little modification can be suggested in the grammatical interpretation, as probably presumed by Patañjali, namely, the two heads represent two kinds of words—eternal (nitya) and resultant (kārya) which are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya. “Bound in three parts” i.e. bound in three places, namely, chest, throat and head, Vṛshabha (the Bull), (comes from the root vṛsha—to shower—to fulfil desire), vṛoraviti—or makes sound. The Great God, entering the mortals is the Sabda-Brahman. This raises the question of the doctrine of sphota which finally identifies sound with Brahman itself. This is not the solitary verse from the Rigveda which has been quoted to stress the need for the study of grammar, but there is another interesting one which is taken from the Rigveda. It is a praise to the glorious god Varuṇa, across whose palate the seven rivers keep pouring as a fair-flowing (streams) into an abyss. According to

2. chatvāri śringā trayo asya pādā due śirṣe saśtahastāso asya tridhā baddho vṛishabho vṛoraviti maho devo muryām aviveśeti
   Mah. I. 1.1 p. 3.15 = R.V. IV. 58.
   Vāj. Sam. 17.91; Mait. Sam. I. 6.29, 87.17.


4. I. 1.1 p. 6.27; IV. 4.1 p. 329.4.

5. sudeva asī Varuṇa yasya te saśta sindhavaḥ anuṣkharanti kūkudam surmyam suśhirām iva.
   Mah. I. 1.1 p. 4.27-28; R.V. VIII. 69.12.
Sāyana's\textsuperscript{6} metaphysical explanation of the last words—Sūryyāṁ sushirāṁ īva—they are quoted as applied by the grammarians to enforce the need for studying grammar, the seven rivers being taken to mean the seven declensional affixes. These two verses are quoted by Patañjali in his 'Introduction' with a view to impressing on the minds of his readers that the study of grammar was absolutely necessary. He has all along stressed this fact; and it is considered as efficacious as the performance of a sacrifice. The stamp of Vedic sanctity was supposed to enhance the value of the subject matter of study, which could enable a person to have union with the Great God; and shine in truth (śobhanām īrmin sushirāṁ agnir antāḥ).\textsuperscript{7}

Explaning the division of words—viz., the division of speech into four, three of which are not manifested, he has quoted another verse\textsuperscript{8} from the Rigveda. 'Speech hath been measured out in four divisions, the Brāhmaṇas who have understanding know them. Three kept in close concealment cause no motion; of speech, men speak only the fourth division. According to Sāyana, the Brāhmaṇas here are those acquainted with Sabda-brahman. The explanation of this mystical piece is different; and according to the grammatical interpretation of chatvāri vākparimitā padāni—the four parts of speech are noun, verb, prepositions and participles.\textsuperscript{9}

The fourth form of speech (chatvāri) is explained, according to some one else (uta thāḥ) as—"one (man) indeed seeing speech has not seen her; another (man) hearing her has not heard her; but to another she delivers her person as a loving wife well-attired presents herself to her husband."\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} Ref. Wilson—op. cit. Vol. V. p. 126, n.2.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Mah. p. 5.2.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Chatvāri vākparimitā padāni tāṇi vidur brāhmaṇa ye manishinah guhā triṇī nihitā neṅgayanti turiyam vācho manushyā vadanti. Mah. I. 1.1 p. 3.24-25; R.V. I. 164, 45; A.V. IX. 10.27.
\item \textsuperscript{10} uta thyā paśyāna daḍaśa vācham uta tvāḥ śriyvan na śrīmoy enām uta ty asmai tanvāmi vi sasre jāyevā pātya uṣati suvāsah. Mah. I. 1.1 p. 4. 2-3; R.V. X. 71-4.
\end{itemize}
greater enthusiasm, and the emperor himself performed two horse sacrifices. If the statement of Patañjali relating to the performance of sacrifice for Pushymitra be taken at its face value, then the Bhāshyakāra probably officiated as a priest in any one of these two sacrifices. The other Vedic Yajñas were: Agnishţoma, Rājasūya, Vājapeya, and the Yūpa in which the sacrificial pillars of wood were set up. The householder had to perform the Pañcha-mahāyajña, and the Śrāddhas for the manes. The Vedic sacrifices, varying in duration and involving many accessories, were costly and complicated for ordinary people who were satisfied with devotion through propitiation. The Bhakti cult—confined to Vishṇu-Vāsudeva, and Śiva was not new. The former was more popular and there were festive gatherings, as well as dramatic performances showing the life and activities of the Lord in his previous incarnations. The epigraphic and archaeological pieces of evidence corroborate the popularity of this cult. The ascetic orders of the Parivrājakas, and the Maskarins, evidently Ājīvikas; the Daṇḍins and the Daishṭi, and those of the Brāhmanas and Śramaṇas, and the presence of the materialists—the Lokāyatikas, show an interesting aspect of religious life. People had not shaken off the worship of the demi-gods—the Yakshas and Nāgas with their female counterparts for fear and faith in them. An interesting study is the moral and ethical side of religious life, which manifested itself in the creation of dedications for Buddhism, though the names of the donors suggest a different faith. Buddhism and Jainism were not inactive, and the latter seems to be more liberal in its attitude towards outsiders, if the two inscriptions, quoted by Lüders, have any socio-religious value.
CHAPTER VIII

LITERATURE

The importance of the Mahābhāshya lies in its attempts to elucidate with comments the sūtras of Pāṇini taking into consideration the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana as well as in the information it provides on the literature known to Patañjali, his use of the earlier data, and the ornate metres in poetry with a few new ones. The Bhāshyakāra was himself well-versed in the Vedic, Sūtra and the Smrīti literatures; and one can trace parallelism in his work. There are references to characters from the Epics, the Purāṇas, Poetics or Kāvya with systematic use of metres, ornamentation (alaṃkāra), drama and dramatic literature, and popular fiction, known as ākhyāna. The grammarian also presents philosophical data in his work, and other topics, not mentioned in the previous chapters, as for example, Medicine, Polity and Administration, Natural Science, including Biology. It is natural to presume from these references that there was some literature on these subjects with which Patañjali was familiar. As a literary piece, the Mahābhāshya presents a style of its own, which has little room for ornamentation, and a clear comprehension is attainable with a patient study of the work. In this chapter, we propose considering these aspects in detail.

Vedic Literature and the Mahābhāshya:

Besides a number of verses, given in parts in the Mahābhāshya which are quoted from the Vedic literature, Patañjali actually mentions five verses in full which are taken from the Rigveda and are also adduced in later Vedic literature.

1. Cf. (i) jārābhiḥ pārphāritu—II.1.1 p. 363.25 = R.V.X. 106.6;
   (ii) ojāyamānāṁ yo'him jagāhāna—III. 1.11 p. 21.4 =
   (iv) nābhā prithivyā nihito dāvidyutat—V. 4.47; p. 437.11 = A.V. VII. 621.
are offered to the wives (of the ancestors). Prof. Kane suggests that women drank, perhaps secretly, liquor even when their husbands, owing to the force of public opinion, had given up the practice. All the authorities have denied all kinds of intoxicants to Brāhmaṇas in all stages of life.

One passage has an exact corresponding reference in the Manu Smriti. ‘For the vital airs of a young man mount upwards to leave his body when an elder approaches; but by rising to meet him and saluting he recovers them.” Manu has stressed on constantly paying reverence to the aged.

These are the parallel passages, noticed in the Mahābhāṣyā, as well as in the Smritis. There are certain other matters mentioned by Bhāshyakāra, and the opinion expressed on them is identical with the injunctions or sanctions of the Smritis on those items; as for instance, the reference to the killing of a Brāhmaṇa, even though not knowing it, and drinking wine with the consequent fall from one’s caste (yo hy ajānana vai brāhmaṇam hanyāt surāṁ vā pibet so ’pi manye patitaḥ syāt).

The murder of a Brāhmaṇa is mentioned as a mahāpātaka—a great sin by Vasishṭha and Viṣṇu. These minor items include injunction against eating forbidden food, or the sale of beef, and customary regulations, salutation and other matters of every day life which, in substance, though not in the same words, can be traced in Smitis.

The views expressed by the two scholars are of a divergent nature, and it may be going too far to enter into minute details. One can hardly deny that Patañjali knew at least some of the older Dharma sūtras, otherwise he could not have quoted certain matters of customary or day to day interest which have nothing to do with grammar. On some points, there may have been a common source for both the Bhāshyakāra and the

32. Gaut. II. 25; Ap. Dham. 1.5 17.21; Manu. XI. 94. A Brāhmaṇi who transgresses the law, is denied access to the region of her husband, and is doomed to be born a slut, or a cow, or a vulture.
33. Mah. VI. 1.84 p. 58.8-9. Manu. II. 120.
34. I. 1.1 p. 2.26.
35. I. 20
36. XXXV. 1.
Smritikāras. While the influence of the Dharma śāstras on the Mahābhāṣya—amounting to the borrowing of material in substance and language, might be practically negligible, one can hardly deny that Patañjali was in the know of the then literature dealing with the laws of Dharma. As regards the period of the Dharma śāstras according to M. M. Kane, those of Gautama, Baudhāyana and Apastamba certainly belong to the period between 600 to 300 B.C.; and in the second century B.C., they had attained a position of supreme authority regulating the conduct of men.

The Mahābhāṣya and the Epics and the Purāṇas:

Patañjali distinguishes the legends (Itihāsa) and Purāṇas clearly. (vākovākyam itihāsaḥ purāṇam). Itihāsa included the epics, and Patañjali was familiar with the oldest specimens. Pāṇini seems to have known the story of the Mahābhārata in its earlier recension, as he has mentioned certain important characters of the story of Vāsudeva and Arjuna. Patañjali also refers to the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, including Gāndhārī and Kuntī and Vṛishṇī, the Brāhmaṇa senāpati Droṇa and his son Aśvatthāman. He mentions the stories of Yāvakritika and Yāyātika which are fully narrated in the Mahābhārata. The reference to Viśvāmitra and his attainment of Rishihood (Viśvāmitras tapas tepe nārishiḥ syām iti) is also taken from the Mahābhārata. The popular legend of Kaśyapa Prajāpati with his two wives—Dītī and Adītī, who gave birth to demons and gods respectively, noticed in the

38. I. 1.1 p. 9.22.
39. IV. 3.98.
40. IV. 1. 114 p. 257; VIII. 1.15 p 371.1.
41. IV. 2. 130 p. 300. 1; III. 3.130 p. 157.10.
42. IV. 1. 14 p. 206.4.
43. IV. 2. 130 p. 300.7.
44. IV. 1. 85 p. 237.2.
45. III. 2.122 p. 122.21.
46. IV. 2.60 p. 284.8.
47. Vana, chap. 135, 8; Udyo. chap. 120-2.
Mahābhāṣya,\(^49\) can be traced in the Mahābhārata.\(^50\) The story of Śuka, son of Vyāsa who had imbibed all knowledge, while still in the womb of his mother, is also mentioned by Patañjali (vaiyāsaki śukaḥ).\(^51\) There are also allusions to Nārada and Parvata,\(^52\) the two celestial sages, and the anecdote of King Āmbarīsha (Āmbarīshapuraka).\(^53\) Other illustrations, noticed by the Bhāshyakāra and probably taken from the Mahābhārata, are those of Ahalyā\(^54\) and Indra, Divodāsa,\(^55\) and Satyabhāmā,\(^56\) the consort of Krīşṇa. Patañjali also mentions Kuru fighting righteously (dharmena sma kuravo yudhyante).\(^57\) The incidents and characters from the Rāmāyaṇa, quoted in the Mahābhāṣya are few. Special reference may be made of Rāvaṇi (son of Rāvaṇa),\(^58\) Indrajit, the army of the monkeys (vānara sainya)\(^59\) the liberation of Ahalyā, referred to earlier, and the cave Kishkindhyā\(^60\) (mentioned in the definition of Āryāvarta), and names of certain rishis like Vasishṭha, Jābāli,\(^61\) Viśvāmitra and Auddālaki.\(^62\)

The relation of the Mahābhāṣya to the Purāṇas may be traced in parallel references, both in expression and in substance. Since the Purāṇas are characterized by such accounts as relate to cosmogony, different yugas, dynasties of Kings, and other extraneous matters like fables and superstitions, it may be interesting to find out data relating to such topics in the Mahābhāṣya. The Bhāshyakāra does cite certain information of a metrological and astronomical nature, as for example, his reference to the colours in the sky denoting atmos-

\(^{49}\) I. 1.72 p. 185.10.
\(^{50}\) I. 64.2480.
\(^{51}\) IV. 1.97 p. 253.5; Muh. XIII. 84-85.
\(^{52}\) VIII. 1.15 p. 371.1.
\(^{53}\) IV. 2.52 p. 282.16.
\(^{54}\) II. 2.62 p. 466.15.
\(^{55}\) VI. 2.91 p. 132.9.
\(^{56}\) I. 1.45 p. 111.24.
\(^{57}\) III. 2.120 p. 122.21.
\(^{58}\) I. 1.57 p. 144.20.
\(^{59}\) I. 3.25 p. 281.9.
\(^{60}\) II 4.10 p. 475.4.
\(^{61}\) II. 4.58 p. 489.6.
\(^{62}\) II. 4.66 p. 493.16.
pheric results—brownish for wind, red for lightning, yellow prognosticating a good harvest, and white an indication for famine, and an allusion to a mirage (mrigatrishnāvat) or the cities of the gandharvas (gandharvanagarāṇī). It is difficult to see in these references any parallelism. The earliest of the Purāṇas is supposed to be the Vāyu which is expressly named in Mahābhārata and its supplement, the Harivamśa. A study of the cultural data from the Vāyu Purāṇa has recently been made, and the material is classified under archaic survivals, ancient materials, and accretions. In the second class the writer has placed the material aligning with the early Dharma Śāstras, the early Buddhist and Jain canonical literature, the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, Manu Smriti and the earlier portion of the Mahābhārata. Comparing the information of a social nature, in the Vāyu Purāṇa, meat eating is regarded as a characteristic of the Paisāchas, but in the Mahābhāskya, only the flesh of five five-nailed animals is to be taken; other meat could not be taken. Drinking is also condemned as a sin, as a surāpi is looked down upon as a great sinner. It is stated that in the Kali age (even) women will be fond of wine and similar vices. Traces of such common links can be noticed because Hindu life has not changed so much from its original phase; but exact parallel wordings are not to be found. It is not improbable that Patañjali, while referring to compound, Itiḥāsa-Purāṇa, had some such work in mind, which might probably have been the Vāyu Purāṇa; but one is not certain on this point. Winternitz has pointed out that there certainly existed an ancient Purāṇa under his name (Vāyu). We may be right in inferring its existence and Patañjali’s knowledge of this Purāṇa, but such parallel references, as we find in the case of Vedic and Smriti passages, are wanting here.

64. IV. 1-3. p. 196.21.
66. p. 69; 63.2517.
67. 82.367.
68. 58.43.
Patañjali and the Kāvya Literature:

Patañjali quotes a number of passages written in the Kāvya-style and actually refers to a Kāvya by Vararuchi (Vārarucham kāvyam), who is identified by some with the Vārttikakāra Kātyāyana. Fragments of verses of ornate form, which may have been either his own composition, or taken from some earlier source are also noticed in the Mahābhāshya. The Bhāshyakāra alludes to the poetic license in the expression — chhandovat kavyaḥ kurvanti, and actually mentions a chhandahśāstra. In the light of these references, we may consider the extent to which Patañjali utilized Kāvya poetry in his comments. This study might reveal the poetic talents of the Bhāshyakāra who, possibly, composed some verses himself, and secondly, it would suggest the existence of Kāvya poetry and literature in his time. Patañjali could not possibly have set his hand to the poetic verses in his commentary without an adequate knowledge of the rules of metrical composition. If he probably borrowed from some other source, then the existence of the Kāvya literature earlier than Patañjali cannot be questioned. We may suggest that the Bhāshyakāra was conscious of the canons and characteristics of the Kāvya poetry in both its themes and its ornamentation. Despite the fact that there is no room for such poetry in a work on grammar, one notices flashes in the form of fragmentary verses in the Mahābhāshya, likely to stimulate the reader in the difficult task of following the commentary.

70. IV. 3.101 p. 315.18.
71. Ref. T. Gaṇapati Sāstri—Vāraucha Saṅgraha—preface p. 1. This manuscript, edited in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (No. 33), only about two centuries old, has a running commentary by Dīpaprabhā who has quoted Bhartṛhari, Kālyāṇa, Jinendra and Haradatta, but no author posterior to him. Vararuchi has been extolled by the commentator to a position of great eminence, equal to that of the Sūtrakāra in respect of freedom of language, and would appear to identify him with Vararuchi, otherwise known as Kātyāyana, the author of the Vārttikas. Gaṇapati Sāstri, however, places him in the time of Vīkramāditya.
72. I. 4.3 p. 313.5.
73. I. 2.32 p. 208.19.
From Patañjali’s reference it is clear that from its very
dawn, love is established as one of the dominant themes of
Kāvyā poetry. The widely diffused Kāvyā manner and its
prevailing love interest permeates even the domain of gram-
mar; and we notice references like, varatanu sampravadanti
kukkuṭāḥ⁷⁴—"Oh fair-limbed one, the cocks unite to pro-
claim." The illustration is given by Patañjali for the inappli-
cability of the sūtra—vyaktavācham samuchchhārane, in the
case of birds or lower animals who are incapable of making
articulate speech, even though they make a chorus of noise.
The other reference of a rather erotic nature is priyāṁ mayūraḥ
pratināṁritī ti yad-yat tvam nara-varanar nritişhi hriṣṭaḥ⁷⁵—
‘the peacock dances towards his beloved’; and another—
ā-vanāntād odakāntāt priyam pānthaṁ anuvrajed iti.⁷⁶ ‘Let
her follow the wanderer she loveth to the ends of the woods
to the ends of water.’ There is a parallel reference from the
Rigveda, quoted earlier, which can also be mentioned here. It
compares speech to a loving wife, well-attired presenting herself
to her husband (jāyeva patya uṣāti suvāsāḥ).⁷⁷ The introd-
tion of this love element may have been due to Patañjali’s
desire to interest his reader. Love poetry is very common in
Sanskrit literature.

The Bhāshyakāra uses epic or panegyric poetry, pathos,
gnomicism, and niti relating to political wisdom in maxims.
The first aspect is seen in addresses like prathate tvayā patimati
prithivī—‘the earth with three as a Lord is celebrated as wide’,
and in jaghāna Kaṁsaṁ kila Vāsudevaḥ⁷⁹—’Vāsudeva slew
Kaṁsa,’ and in other reference—asidvitiyo ’nusāra Pāṇḍa-
vam⁸⁰ ‘with sword as mate he attacked Pandu’s son’. These
references are supposed to refer to anecdotes of the past from
which Patañjali took only fragmentary verses to illustrate his
commentary. These are important for their epic character, and
the reference to works from which they are taken.

⁷⁴. I. 3.48 p. 283.3.
⁷⁵. VII. 3.87 p. 338.23.
⁷⁷. I. 1.1 p. 44.2-3; RV. X. 7.14.
⁷⁸. IV. 1.32 p. 213.17.
⁷⁹. III. 1.111 p. 119.7.
⁸⁰. II. 2.24 p. 426.8.
Pathos or deep sentiment is expressed in verses, like

\[
yasmin daśa sahasrāṇi putre jāte gavāṁ dadau
brāhmaṇe bhavyah priyākhyebhyah so 'yam uṇchhena āvati^{81}
\]

‘One on whose birth ten thousand kine were given to the Brahmanašas who announced the good tidings, now lives on gleaning.’ This verse seems to refer to some anecdote. Gnomic poetry is noticed in verses like,

\[
tapaḥ śrutiṁ cha yoniś chety etad brāhmaṇaḥkārakam^{82}
tapaḥ śrutābhyaṁ yo hino jātibrāhmaṇa eva saḥ
\]

‘Asceticism, learning, birth, these make the Brāhmaṇa; he who lacks asceticism and learning is a Brāhmaṇa by birth alone.’ The same idea is also expressed in another verse :

\[
trīṇi yasya avadātāni vidyā yoniś cha karma cha
etach chhivam vijānīhi brāhmaṇāgrasya lakṣaṇam iti^{83}
\]

Necessity knows no law—and nothing seems right to a hungry man—(bubhukṣitam na pratibhāti kimchit).^{84} In another passage he condemns an adulterer who commits sin with his teacher’s wife (dhvamsate guru alpagaḥ).^{85} An interesting maxim regarding the education of children relates to the harshness of the teacher which is for the good of the pupil.—

\[
sāmritaḥ pāṇībhir ghnanti guruva na vishokshitaiḥ^{86}
lādaṇāśrayino doshaḥ tādaṇāśrayino guṇāḥ
\]

‘Fraught with life, not with poison, the blows that teachers give; vice grows by indulgence, virtue prospers by reproof’. In one passage, possibly taken from the Mahābhārata, emphasis is laid on the factor playing an important part in life—destruction is inevitable for all in course of time (kālaḥ pachati bhūtāni

83. IV. 1.48 p. 220.8-9.
84. II. 3.2 p. 444.11.
85. III. 2.48 p. 1.3.15; cf. Manu. XI. 103.4.
86. VIII. 1.8 p. 367.1. 12-13.
kālaḥ samkarati praśāh. The character of a drunkard; never wearied of his drink, is compared to the inevitability of death in a verse:

ahār ahār nayamāno gām aśvam pruṣhamaṁ paśum
vaivasvato na tripyati surayā īva durmadā
d
‘Though day by day he takes his toll in cattle, horses, men, and beasts, Vivasvan’s son is never tired of, as a drunkard is never wearied of his wine’. There is another maxim which suggests political wisdom—kṣhema subḥikshe kritisamchayāni pūrāṇī rājīnāṁ vinayanti kopam, citadels well-stored in peace and abundance calm the wrath of kings.

Kielhorn has mentioned in all 260 verses, including those, written in different metres—the ordinary Āryā, about 40 verses; portions of an Āryā two; Gīti—one verse and a half; the ordinary Sloka—about 165 verses, three quarters of a verse, half-verses; and quarter verses Vaktra with half a verse; Vidyumātā with a quarter verse; Samānī, Indravajrā, Upajūti, Dodhaka, Śālinī, Vanśasthā, Toṭaka, Jagatī and irregular Trishṭubh or Jagatī verses. Keith also referred to speciments of such ornate metres as the Mālatī, the Praharshinī, the Pramitāksharā, and the Vasantatilaka, besides the normal Sloka and Trishṭubh. He suggested that the new metres lead us into a different sphere from the Vedic metres, and striking light on this development is afforded by the metre of the Kārikās, mostly, if not all, written probably by the predecessors of Patañjali, which deal with disputed points of grammar. ‘The richness and elaboration of metre, in striking contrast to the comparative freedom of Vedic and Epic literature, must certainly have arisen from poetical use; it can not have been invented for grammatical memorial verses, for which a simple metre might better suffice.’ In the light of the commentator's views Kielhorn has suggested that some of the verses in the Mahābhāṣṭya are by Kātyāyana, and others

88. II. 2.29 p. 431.3-4.
89. V. 4.68 p. 438.9.
by another author of Vārttikas; but these commentators also assign some verses to the Bhāshyakāra. 92.

It appears from Kielhorn's remarks, that a good many of the verses in question, either in fragments or in full, have been taken by Patañjali from some earlier works between the time of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, so that the Bhāshyakāra quietly borrowed them without acknowledging the source. He borrowed from older works which were in verse, and we should regard these books as the source of those verses to which he appended an occasional remark only, 93 or the meaning of which he merely indicated in a general way. 94 We should, however, like to take a broad view proposing that the Kāvya literature was known in the time of Patañjali, which should not be disputed in view of the reference to the Vararuchi Kāvya in the Mahābhāshya. As regards, Kielhorn's contention, it would be idle to deny the authorship of the Sloka Vārttikas to Patañjali, and to condemn him as a plagiarist would exhibit a narrow view. His wide reading and balanced outlook, anxious to make his commentary understandable to the śisṭas, not only with illustrations, but even with a change from prose to poetic verses, was a good method adopted by the Bhāshyakāra. Some half or quarter verses and maxims may have been taken from earlier works, as he borrowed from

92. 'When the term Sloka Vārttikakāra is opposed to the term Vārttikakāra (or Vākyakāra), as has been done by Kaiyata on Vol. III, p. 189 or by Bhartṛhari on Vol. I. p. 36,' writes Kielhorn, 'both of course denote different persons; and in such a case it was hardly necessary for Nāgojībhaṭṭa to tell us that the Vārttikakāra (or Vākyakāra) is Kātyāyana, and the Sloka Vārttikakāra another'; he suggests that the verses which have been explained in the Mahābhāshya do not belong to Kātyāyana, but have been borrowed or quoted by Patañjali from other works. There is every reason to believe that these works were composed after the Vārttikas. Though they were written in verse, their aim was the same, which Patañjali had in view when writing his own work, to elucidate, correct and improve on the Vārttikas, and to discuss matters connected with individual rules of Pāṇini, or with the system of Pāṇini's grammar, that had not been touched upon by Kātyāyana. (Ref. I.A. Vol. XV. p. 229).

93. I. 1.38 p. 96.1-5; III. 2.188 p. 137.4-7.
the Vedic literature, but the Śloka Vārttikas appear to be his own composition, for which he was well equipped by reason of his literary talents. 95 Kielhorn has mentioned 165 ordinary Ślokas, which were very probably written by the Bhāshyakāra. As regards the use of new metres, distinct from the Vedic ones, they may have been in use earlier than the time of Patañjali in the Kāvyas, unknown to us, or some may have been his own creations.

Patañjali and Popular Literature

The Bhāshyakāra was aware of the popular literature dealing with tales taken from the Epics, or of an independent nature, which were current in that period. He refers to tales about Yavakṛita, Priyaṅgu and Yayāti, 96 and has furnished names of three Ākhyāyikās, namely Vāsavadattā, Sumanottarā and Bhīmārathi. 97 The two general terms used are—Ākhyāna and Ākhyāyikā—the former is traced in the Vedic literature 98 as well, and, though the latter occurs only once in the late Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, its significance is doubtful. According to Keith, the story is naturally related in prose, but the moral is fixed in the memory by being put in verse form. Later on stanzas were inserted in the narrative itself which are not maxims, but, like the label, refer definitely to the tale itself, and, thus, we achieve the use of Ākhyāna or narrative verses. The Ākhyāyikā, apart from merely formal requirements, was a serious composition generally dealing with facts of experience and having an autobiographical, traditional or semi-historical interest; and it was distinct from a kathā which

95. Peterson, in a paper on 'Pāṇini, Poet and Grammarian', suggested on the basis of his reading of Vallabhadeva’s Subhāśitāvalī, who ascribes certain verses to Pāṇini, that “Pāṇini is not the only name which is connected by Indian tradition with the two muses of Grammar and Poetry. What is true of Pāṇini is true of his two commentators, Kātyāyana or Vararuci, and Patañjali.” (JRAS. 1911. p. 321).
96. IV. 2.60 p. 284.8.
97. IV. 3.87 p. 313.22.
was essentially a fictitious narrative. The stories of Vāsavadatta and Sumanottarā seem to be very popular in that period. The heroine of the first story was the wife of King Udayana of Vatsa to whom she offered herself against the wishes of her father Pradyota. The name is also given to the heroine of Subandhu’s novel who is represented to have been betrothed by her father to Pushpaketu, but was carried away by Kandarpaketu. The second one is a very late story. The Ākhyānas of Yavakrīta and Yayāti are related in the Mahābhārata. There are a few interesting stories and anecdotes which are also noticed in the Mahābhāshya. The one under the title Vriddhakumāri is narrated by Patañjali. A virgin in her advanced age was told by Indra to ask for a boon. She entreated him to grant her such a boon so that her sons might eat rice with milk and butter in a brass-made utensil. By a single boon she managed to secure all she desired—a husband, sons, cows and rice. This applied to a sentence having a variety of meaning.

The bird fables are also quoted by the Bhāshyakāra—as for example, Kākatāliyam—which expression stands for the manner of the crow and the palm fruit—meaning sudden death as in the fable of the fruit of the palm falling unexpectedly at the moment of the alighting of a crow and killing it (kāka gantanam iva tālapatanam iva), and ajakripāniyam—the maxim of the she-goat and the sword. It is founded on the story of a goat being suddenly killed by accidental contact with a sword. Both these stories are used to illustrate a surprising event happening altogether by chance. Another story, quoted by Patañjali, corresponds to a Buddhist Jātaka tale. Under 1.3.25 (upān mantrakarane) Patañjali gives as an instance of the first vārttika ādityam upatishthate—he adores the sun; and he quotes the instance of a monkey who apes the adoration of the sun in a crowd (or army) of

100. III. 135. 10701-35; I. 75. 3126-28.
101. IV. 2.3 p. 388.10f.
monkeys (paśya vānarasainye 'smin yad arkaṃ upatikṣṭhate). The illustration may be compared to the Adichchupaṭṭhānaṅajālaka). In this connection it is equally interesting to notice certain maxims of a popular nature, and it is probable that they were taken from the literature dealing with the subject, though some may have been used in conversation. Some of them are traced in later Sanskrit works. The maxims of the well-digger — kūpakhāna-kanyāyāh, something on which a crow is perched — kākādhikaraṇanyāyāh, the rice in the cooking pot — sthālipulākanyāyāh, meaning that the condition of the whole class is inferred from that of a pot; a mongoose standing on hot ground — avataptenakulasthitam, used in the sense of a fickle person, also known as tīrhakāka, or the crow at a centre of pilgrimage, are notable. Some of these may have originated from the Mahābhāshya itself, as for example, men do not refrain from setting the cooking pots on fire because there are beggars (who may ask for the contents) nor do they abstain from sowing barley because there are wild animals (na hi bhikshukāḥ santi iti sthāyo nādhiśriyānte na cha mrigāḥ santi iti yavā no-pyanti).

A few more may be quoted here, as for instance—an iguana creeping along does not on that account become a snake, (na hi godhā sarpaṇṭi sarpanād ahir bhavati), or curd and cucumber are fever personified (dadhitrapusam pratyaksap javarāḥ) and water in a bed of reeds is a disease of the feet (naḍvalodakam pāدارogaḥ).

105. J. II. 72.3.
106. I. 1.1 p. 11.7.
107. I. 1.26 pp. 84-85.
108. I. 4.23 p. 325.23.
109. II. 1.47 p. 397.17.
110. II. 1.42 p. 397.7.
112. I. 39 p. 99.25; IV.1.1 p.194.17 etc.,
113. I. 1.23 p. 82.3.
114. I. 1.59 p. 156.8.
115. Ibid. 9.
Patañjali and Drama:

The existence of drama in its true form in the time of Patañjali has engaged the attention of many scholars.\(^{116}\) Patañjali, commenting on the Vārṭīka of Kātyāyana, explaining the use of the present in the phrases cited, when the events described lie in the distant past, has mentioned two examples, that of the slaying of Kañsa and the binding of Bali. Since the passage has been a subject of great discussion, it may be quoted here in full: ye tāvad ete sōbhanikā nāmaite pratyakshaṁ Kaṁsaṁ ghātyanti pratyaksham cha Balim bandhayanti iti. Chitreshu katham? chitreshu apy udgārṇā nipatītāś cha prahārā drisyante Kaṁsakarshanyaś cha granthikeshu katham yatṛa śabdagaḍumātram lakṣyate? te 'pi hi teṣhām utpattiprabhṛtyā vināśād riddhir vyāchakshāṇāh sato buddhivishayaṁ prakāṣayanti. ātaś cha sato vyāmiśrā hi drisyante. kechit Kaṁsabhaktā bhavanti kechid Vāsudevabhaktāḥ varṇāṇyatvam khalu api pashyanti: kechid raktamukkā bhavanti kechid kālasmukkāḥ.\(^{117}\) Vārṭīka 6 makes it certain that the sense of the verb must involve the idea of description (tad āchāṣṭa iti), and so it justifies the use of the causative. Now, there could be three possible ways, as suggested by scholars of describing the scenes of the past: by showing them actually on the stage, or by painting scenes on the canvas and the audience could observe the depicting of the blows rained on Kañsa, or the binding of Bali; or by the Saubhikas explaining to the audience by shadow figures. The second and the third explanations seem to be inconsistent with the meaning which Patañjali intended to convey. The word pratyakshaṁ is important in this respect. Hillebrandt’s presumption\(^{118}\) that the Saubhikas carried round pictures which they explained, or Lüders’ assumption\(^{119}\) that a painter explained to an audience the picture he had painted, are contrary to the sense we get from this passage. There can


\(^{117}\) III. 1.26 p. 36.

\(^{118}\) op. cit.

\(^{119}\) op. cit.
be no doubt that the Śaubhikas related the two stories by action and not by presentation in pictures or in words.

The other expression śabdagaḍumātram lakṣhyate, is considered by Keith to be painfully obscure, since gaḍu bears no recognized meaning which fits the passage. It cannot be equated with grantha, as presumed by Lüders, nor can it inflect on “Patañjali the sin of verbiage, since śabdamātram would yield the requisite sense; as observed by Hillebrandt”. The use of colouring, red and black is equally important and it is presumed that the Granthikas formed two parties whose diverse colours marked their nature as supporters of Kaṇśa or Vāsudeva. Keith suggested that the development of the epic recitation depicted by Patañjali is in itself, as Professor Levi has shown, the most obvious prelude to the growth of the true drama, and the parallel of the dithyramb is too clear to admit of denial.” He explained the passage of Patañjali, interpreted in the light of the Vārttika in a simple and plain sense—the slaying of Kaṇśa and the binding of Bali lie in the distinct past, but one may say Kaṇśam ghātayati or Balim bandhayati, “he describes the slaying of Kaṇśa, the binding of Bali of the painter whose vivid art brings the scene before our eyes, and the same expressions, in the plural are applicable to the Śaubhikas, who present in dumb show the scenes, and the Granthikas, who recite, dividing themselves into two parties distinguished by their colour”. It is therefore clear that there was union of action of the Śaubhikas to the recitation of the Granthikas which gives the full dramatic form, but Keith doubted whether by Patañjali’s time drama had actually evolved, and the Śaubhikas and Granthikas represent older stages in the development still existing independently, or the process of evolution was incomplete.

Now, it appears that scholars have not taken into consideration the other evidence provided by the Bhāshyakāra, nor have they viewed it from indigenous dramatic perspective. Patañjali quotes references to the naṭas or actors—naṭasya

120. op. cit.
121. op. cit.
śrīnoti,123 agāśin naṭah124 naṭasyabhuktam125 and sarvakesi naṭah.126 One important passage—ātas cha upayogo yadā ārambhakaṁ raṅgam gachchhanti naṭasya śroshyāmo granthikasya śroshyāma iti,127 clearly suggests that recitations were made both by the naṭas and the granthikas, and the expression ārambhaka points to the commencement of an action which awakens an interest in the progress of the principal plot. It is clear that this refers to the sūtradhāra who first enters the stage and suggests to the audience the name of the drama which is to be staged. In another reference, Patañjali mentions naṭabhāryā who had to please many people on the stage (naṭānāṁ striyo raṅgam gataṁ yo yāḥ prichchhati kasya yūyam kasya yūyam iti tam tam tava tava ity āhuh).128 A male also played the female’s part and was known as bhrukuṁsa.129 In the light of these references, is it at all doubtful that drama in its true form, and dramatic literature were unknown in the time of Patañjali? Even Pāṇini refers to naṭasūtras,130 the texts for naṭas. Keith was not in a position to establish the meaning of naṭa which, according to him, might mean no more than a pantomime.131

Patañjali and Philosophical Data:

Patañjali tried to raise grammar to the standard of philosophy by introducing logical principles, such as the reference to the eternity of Ṣabda, the exposition of the doctrine of Sphoṭa, and the application of the principle of Agreement and Difference, or Positive and Negative propositions (anvaya vyatireka).132 As regards the first aspect, the Bhāṣyakāra mentions the names of two eminent grammarians, namely
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Vyādi and Vājapyāyana, the former being the author of a big treatise called Saṁgraha, and spoken of by the Bhāṣya-kāra as authoritative (Saṁgraha etatprādhānyena). He also develops the theme of the externality of Šabda by which he meant Sphoṭa — the eternal and imperceptible element of sounds and words and the real vehicle of the idea which bursts or flashes on the mind when the sound is uttered (dhvanīḥ sphoṭas cha Šabdānām dhvanis tu khalu lakṣhyate-alpo mahāmś cha keshānchid ubhayaṁ tat svabhāvataḥ). Explaining the relation of a word to sense as eternal (nityo hy arthavatām arthair abhisambandhaḥ), he seems to have come into close touch with the Māṁsakas; who are noticed in the Mahābhāṣya though he does not mention the name of Jaimini. He is also supposed to have reproduced the Sāṅkhya doctrine, while enumerating the six causes that often prevent us from comprehending things that really exist (shaṛdbhiḥ prākāraḥ śatām bhāvānām anupalabdhir bhavati). These are: extreme distance, extreme proximity, intervention of other things, obscurity due to darkness, weakness of visual organs, and extreme carelessness.

The Vedantic philosophy is not noticed in the Mahābhāṣya but one finds words like Brahma, Akṣara and Brahma-vādin. An important matter from the philosophical standpoint is the conception of the non-duality of soul, and he mentions the individual soul (ātman) and the supreme soul (paramātman), as well as the physical and internal soul (śarīrātman and antarātman). The internal soul performs those actions whereby the physical soul feels pain or pleasure (śarīrātmā tat karma karoti yena antarātmā sukhaduḥṣkhe 'nubhavati'). It appears that the two souls not only exist but
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are active in actions, which is against the Vedantic system of philosophy. In his commentary Kāyastha thoroughly explains the difference of souls and not the agency and objectivity of one and the same soul.\textsuperscript{142} Another point worth noting is Patañjali’s reference to the Pramāṇas (instruments of correct knowledge), which, according to the Nyāyasūtra,\textsuperscript{143} are Perception, Inference, Analogy and Sabda. Patañjali refers to them with the single exception of Analogy (upamiti) in different passages. It is difficult to say if he was aware of Gautama. As pointed out in the comment on this, the Chārvākas admit only one means viz. Perception (pratyaksha), the Vaiśeśikas and Baudhāyas admit two, that is Perception and Inference (anumāna), the Sāṅkhya admit three—Perception, Inference and Verbal testimony (āgama and śabda) while the Naiyāyikas admit four. The Bhāshyakāra does not mention the name of Gautama, the Naiyāyika, but the words Gautamīya\textsuperscript{144} and Vākovākya\textsuperscript{145} in the Mahābhāshya, suggest his knowledge of this system of philosophy. In this connection certain other facts may also be taken into consideration, such as, the illustration (pratyakshaḥ tena anumānuṣayor abhisambandhah\textsuperscript{146})—the clear relation of smoke with the fire. The inference is impossible without previous perception, as mentioned in the Nyāyasūtra (atha tatpūrvakāṁ trividham anumānam),\textsuperscript{147} but in some cases inference is more reliable than perception (pratyakṣaḥ apy anumānabaliyastvaṁ tu evam).\textsuperscript{148} One also finds a reference to kriyā or action which is not visible but comprehended only by inference (kriyā nāmevyam atyantāparidṛṣṭā).\textsuperscript{149} The sense organs are capable of providing cognition only when they have direct association with the mind (manasā samyuktāni indriyāni upalabdhaṁ kāraṇāṁ bhavanti).\textsuperscript{150} The sense organs, incap-
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able of giving cognition (perception) by themselves, could only
do so through the connection with the mind, to which the
Naiyāyikas added another factor—the soul with which the
mind gets invariably connected. Thus, according to them, a
sense coming in contact with its object produces knowledge in
soul only if the sense is conjointed with the mind. This con-
junction is a necessary element in the definition of perception.

Another point, worth mentioning, is the conception of the
syllogism (avayavin). According to the Nyāyasūtra, (sādh-
yatvād avayavisamdehaḥ)¹⁵¹ there is, some say, doubt about the
whole, which is yet to be established, and parts alone are reali-
ties. A tree, for instance, is yellow in some parts and green in
others. If it were one whole the contradictory qualities or
yellowness and greenness could not have belonged to it simul-
taneously. Patañjali shares this view (avayavātmakatvāt
samudāyasya avayavātmakaḥ samudāyāḥ abhyantarō hi samu-
dāye 'vayavaḥ-tad yathā vrikṣhaḥ prachalaḥ saha avayavaiḥ
prachalati).¹⁵²

The question of desire, directly known by action, is also
referred to by the Bhāshyakāra (ichchhāyā hi pravṛttiṭa
upalabdhiḥ ichchhāyā hi pravṛttiṭa upalabdhir bhavati).¹⁵³
What one desires to do is clearly understood by his action.
According to the Nyāyasūtra, ‘desire, aversion, volition, plea-
sure, pain, and intelligence are the marks of the soul’ (ichchā-
dvesha-prayatna-sukha-duḥkha-jęnānāṁ ātmāno īṅgaṁ iti).¹⁵⁴
Desire is one of the signs by which soul is usually inferred to
exist. It is not directly comprehended by perception but only
by inference. One also notices references to malobservation—
things that actually do not exist, but appear to do so, as for
instance, mrigatrishnā¹⁵⁵—mirage, or the beautiful city of the
gandharvas (gandharvanagaram yathā).¹⁵⁶ The reverse case
of non-perception of realities is also referred to by the Bhāshya-
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kāra, as for instance, the movement of the Sun ādityagatīvāt\(^{157}\) is imperceptible, though real.

Many more passages and references could be traced to show that Patañjali was familiar with philosophical conceptions. It may be going too far to consider these in detail, but there are certain technical terms which may be mentioned, as for example, amugama\(^{158}\) samānādhikarana\(^{159}\) (having a common substratum), anantyaṭva\(^{160}\) (the state of infinity or eternity), anaikāntika\(^{161}\) the fallacy of undistributed middle, and a good many interesting philosophical maxims which are included in the comprehensive work — Paribhāṣhenduśekhara of Nāgājībhaṭṭa. The maxim of the rope which binds at both ends — ubhayataḥ pāśā rajjuḥ\(^{162}\) is most interesting. It leads one to an embarrassing position — a dilemma. As illustrated in the Jaimini section of Sarvadarśanasamgraha\(^{163}\) — “if you object that non-existence (or absence) cannot be a cause, we reply by asking you whether non-existence can be an effect or not? If it cannot, then we should have to allow that cloth is eternal, as its ‘emergent non-existence’ or destruction would be impossible. If it can be an effect, then why should it not be a cause also?” So this rope binds you at both ends. Another interesting maxim is ekadeśavikritasyānanyatvāt siddham\(^{164}\) — a thing that is changed in one part does not thereby become something else. Here Patañjali illustrates the cutting of a dog’s ear or tail which does not turn it into a horse or donkey but still a dog.

We have not taken into consideration the reference to substance (dravya) — different from qualities such as form, smell, odour, sound and touch (kim punar dravyām ke punar guṇāḥ śabda sparśa rūpa rasa gandhā guṇās tato ‘nyad dravyām);\(^{165}\) and the eternal entities, including sky, heaven, space
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and time (nītyā dyauḥ nītyā prīthivi nītyam ākāśam iti). The consideration of the philosophical data makes it clear that the Bhāshyakāra was familiar with the Naiyāyika philosophy. The philosophical literature in that period probably influenced him in his exposition of the grammatical śūtras, and he sought elucidation of the philosophy of grammar.

Medicinal and Surgical data in the Mahābhāṣya:

Patañjali refers to the three humours of the body — vāta (wind or air), pitta — the bilious humour secreted between the stomach and the bowels, and śleshma, caused by phlegm or mucus. He also mentions certain diseases like itch (pāman), scrofula (gadu) an excrescence on the head (gadusīras), and a kind of leprosy (dadru). He notices ladies’ disease associated with childbirth; sometimes causing the death of the lady during the birth of the first child (tathā sūtāyām asoshyamānāyām cha bhavati prathamagarbheṇa hateti). The child was also sometimes prolapsed (from the womb) — (garbho nirūṭhitah). A few specific remedies are also mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, as for instance, rice-gruel for curing kidney trouble (mūtra kālpate yavāguk), and barley water for excretion (uchchāraya yavanam iti). Ghee (ghrita) destroyed bilious substance (piṭtaghnam ghritam) and honey removed phlegm (śleshmaghnām madhu). Reference is also made to a medicinal oil (inguḍatāilam).

Administrative Information:

The information provided by the Bhāshyakāra on the
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political events, especially the invasion of the Yavanas, has been considered earlier. In our consideration of the administrative data, we notice village as the local unit and its headman was known as Grāmāṇī.\textsuperscript{177} A collection of five villages was called Pañchagrāma.\textsuperscript{178} A few officers mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, are commander-in-chief (senāni)\textsuperscript{179} and King’s physician (rājavaidya)\textsuperscript{180} and minor attendants, such as, the canopy holders (chhatradhāra),\textsuperscript{181} the gate-keeper (dvārapāla) and the executioner (śīrashghātin).\textsuperscript{182} Tolls or taxes (sulka)\textsuperscript{183} and collective fines are also referred to.\textsuperscript{184} This administrative information, supplied by the Mahābhāṣya, is too meagre to suggest if it is derived from the Smriti literature, or Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra.\textsuperscript{185} Patañjali also refers to the three objects of life—Dharma, Artha politics and practical life in general, and Kāma, viz. love or affection (dharmaṛthau arthaḍharmau, kāmāṛthau arthaḥkāmau).\textsuperscript{185}

Miscellaneous data:

This includes information on topics like arms and armaments, trees, birds and animals. The different kinds of arms—spear (ṣakti), plough (lāṅgala), goad (āṅkuṣa), staff (yashṭi), club (tomara), bow (dhanus) and another type of club (mūsala)\textsuperscript{186} were used; and a systematic planning of defence was made with a moat dug round the city (utkhaḥparikhā).\textsuperscript{187} The main strength of the army was called akṣhauhini— a very popular term.\textsuperscript{188} Amongst the fruits, plants and trees, men-
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tioned are: berry (badara), pomegranate (dāđima), jasmine (mallikā), khādira, (palāśa, pilu)—a kind of palm, the jujube tree (kuvalī), aradu, and the cotton plant (pichavā), bottle-gourd (alābu) and flax (uma). The animals, reptiles and birds, which are noticed in the Mahābhāshya, include, gōdhā—a iguana sarpa—an ordinary snake, and mahā-sarpa, beautiful cow (govrindāraka) and horse (aśva-vrindāraka), donkey (kara), camel (ushṭra), sheep (edaka), deer (mriga), peacock (mayūra), pigeon (kapota), a young sparrow (chātaka), large fish (timingila), goose (hamsa) and a kind of eagle (kura). The data provided by the Mahābhāshya, on these topics are also meagre. The information is too general for any presumption regarding treatises on Botanical and Zoological subjects known to the Bhāshyakāra.

Patañjali's style:

In order to estimate the worth of a literary work, it is necessary to consider the material furnished by it, and the way in which it is presented. In short, it is not only what is said,
but how it is said which is equally important. On this point Patañjali seems to have placed himself in the position of a young keen student anxious to master the riddles of grammar through a scientific and logical technique. A question is put and the student raises the issue in an intelligent manner with the teacher — who finally solves the problem. The pros and cons are equally weighed. It no doubt involves a heavy strain on the reader, especially those who are unfamiliar with the method followed, but certainly it represents a style of its own. Expressions and references relating to matters of every day life enhance the value of the work which also depicts the cultural condition in that period. With a view to giving a concrete idea of Patañjali’s style, one or two passages may be quoted here. The first is the famous Mauryan passage — being a comment on the sūtra jīvikārthe chāpānye. Pāṇini mentions that the suffix ka is added to a name denoting an image of a deity, but that suffix is dropped, if the image secures for the person a livelihood (jīvikā), provided it is not vendible (apanya). Now the difficulty is raised with regard to the images of Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha. Here the suffix ka is dropped despite the fact that the Mauryas in their greed for money had disposed of such images. So the form should be Śivaka, Skandaka and Viśākha-ka. Finally, he says that taking it for granted that the rule of dropping ka does not apply to those images of the Mauryas, still as regards images used for purpose of worship it does apply (bhavet tāsu na syāt yās tu etāḥ sampratipūjārthāḥ tāsu bhavishyati). In the second passage, from the rule laying down the eatable things, one can understand those things which are not to be eaten. When it is said that (only) five five-nailed animals may be eaten, it is to be understood that all the rest are not to be eaten or by forbidding the eating of something, those that may be eaten can be known. Thus, when it is said that the village cock or pig should not be eaten, it is to be understood that the wild cock or pig may be eaten. (abhakshyo-grāmyakukkuṭo 'bhakshyo grāmyaśūkara ity ukte gamyata etad āranyo bhakshya iti).

Patañjali seems to be conscious of his reader’s difficulty
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and limitations; and, therefore, he tries to interest him with similies and metaphorical expressions and maxims which have been considered earlier. Such a device is expected to lighten the strain on the reader. The difficulty to follow Pataňjali's Mahâbhâshya was, however, experienced even by the commentators—Kaiyaṭa and Nagojibhaṭṭa, but one can hardly deny that the Bhashyakâra tried to hit two birds with a stone. He succeeded in presenting grammar on a scientific basis for the Sishtas, and, for the succeeding generations, he was equally successful in presenting a picture of Indiâ of his time which was not free from political upheavals.

We have tried to assess in this chapter the literary talents of the Bhashyakâra and the probable literature on different subjects with which he was familiar. The reference to the Kâvyâ of Vararuchi Jâbâli, and his own experiments in poetic metres testify to the development of Kâvyâ literature in that period. Parallelism between passages from the Mahâbhâshya, and those taken from the Vedic literature illustrate the vast bibliography with which Pataňjali was conversant. As regards the Smriti passages, probably there was a common source for the Smritis and the Bhashyakâra. Drama and dramatic literature were well-known, and Pataňjali has actually quoted two such dramas. The popular literature was also utilized by the Bhashyakâra and we find a good many maxims, some dealing with bird fables. The data relating to Medicine, administration, Botany and Zoology are also considered in this Chapter. There was, very probably, literature on some of these subjects. We have not taken into consideration either Pâli or Prâkrit source for obvious reasons—paucity of any fixed datum of time, and because the present study is confined from the literary standpoint to the Mahâbhâshya alone. These were apparent reasons for skipping over those sources.
CHAPTER IX

ART AND ARCHITECTURE

The Śuṅga period is notable for a change in the sphere of art and architecture. The so-called national school of art, characterised by colosal mass on the one hand, and the court patronage on the other, assumed a democratic shape and became more popular among the masses. The ordinary people did not hesitate to donate or dedicate a piece of railing, or some other object for the service of the Lord. Despite the religious aspects underlying these works of art, one finds people in their merry-making mood, happy, cheerful, and gay. Another innovation is the introduction of the human form, not noticed in the Mauryan period, which plays a prominent part in complete alignment with natural objects, such as trees, creepers, animals etc. in happy harmony with one another. The method adopted is, no doubt, simple and the human beings are depicted in their simple outlook despite the social inter-fusion of different grades from the royalty and nobility to the aborigines. Art thus expresses the contemporary Indian mind and outlook in different shades, and forms involving iconographic conception of Indian divinities and such demi-gods and goddesses as Yakshas and Yakshis, Kinnaras and Kinnaris. Another important feature distinguishing the art of this period from that of Mauryans is the use of stone on a grand scale. The takṣahā or the carpenter, whose services were needed for carving out beautiful designs and details, is now replaced by the sañcārī or the sculptor. Patañjali refers to the Rājatakshan employed specially by the King (takṣa rājakārmaṇī pravartāmanāh svam karmam jahāti),¹ who then gives up his private work. The silpin too is mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya earning his livelihood on pay or wages (śūpino nāma te'pi svabhūtyartham eva pravartante vetanam cha lapsyāmahe),² but this term could be used for all types of artisans using technical skill. The fact seems to be that wood was not completely replaced by stone though the latter was more in use. This change can be seen in
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the lunette depicting an elephant procession in the Lomasa Rishi cave facade. Another important phase of artistic development in this period is the hewing of caves and vihāras to cater permanently for the spiritual and temporal needs of the Buddhist monks. This phase, owing to facility of natural resources, was localised to a particular region.

The famous stūpa at Bhārhut with its railings and toraṇas, and at Sāνchī with its railings, were also set up in the Šuṅga period, as is evident from the epigraphic records. Mathurā, Kauśāmbī and Sārnāth, too, were not slow in their artistic activities, and, their productions in this period are worth considering. The famous Bodh-Gayā railing enclosing the Bodhi tree, where the lord took his Chāmkrama, also belongs to this period. It, thus, becomes imperative to study the evolution of art and architecture in the Šuṅga period from different facets at the important centres of art. The famous Jain caves at Udaigiri and Khandagiri cannot be ignored and one would be interested in the Beṣnagar Garuḍa column as well which was set up during this period. The terracotta figures, notable for their mass production, have also to be considered from the point of view of style and special features. Lastly, we have to consider the earlier phase of the Rock-cut architectures of western India, and town architectural planning, such as we notice in the sculptures of the Bhārhut and Sāνchī gateways. There may be chronological over-lapping which need not be disapproved.

Bhārhut Stūpa, Railing and Toraṇas:

The sculptures from Bhārhut, being a part of the stūpa which once existed at the site in the Madhyadesa, and now forms part of a special gallery in the Indian Museum are a class by themselves. The name of the navakarmika, or superintendent in charge of the monument noticed in a record, suggests that it was erected under the supervision of a person and the expenses were met from the contributions made by members of both the sexes. The donors ranged from ordinary

4. Lüders List no. 773.
Bhārhut-Jetavana Scene (Courtesy, Indian Museum, Calcutta)
persons to those of the regal class to which the two mitra ladies belonged. The stūpa with its railings and gates was set up at one time, and not by stages as we find at Sāñchi. This is clear from the script of the donatory records inscribed on the railings. The time factor is completely eliminated both in the manner of presentation, as well as in the subject matter dealing with the life of the Master. There is symmetry, and no scene is left incomplete. Even the Jātaka stories, depicting the life of the Tathāgata in his previous births, represent that special note of solemnity and dignity which is essential for creating a firm impression on the mind of the devotee. It makes him conscious of life which is to be taken in a serious and ethical spirit. The votaries, simple and unsophisticated, do not lack that jovial feeling which one experiences after he has found a panacea for his sufferings. This may be illustrated by the dancing scene, so beautifully depicted in a rhythmical manner, when Gautama attained enlightenment. The figures of the Yakshas, Nāgas and Kinnarars with their female counterparts are also notable.

With all the seriousness of life, viewed in its religious and ethical background, the sociological outlook is not wanting. In fact the Śunga art at Bhārhat is richest in the social content — representing the life of the people — not without humorous scenes. Human life plays an important part, and the sculptor has taken pains to exhibit the picture of society explicitly and in a lucid manner, as he has handled the life story of the Master. Nature, too, is in harmony with both. As these sculptures have been treated in detail, we shall confine our study only to a few new pieces. A coping stone from Bhārhat, now in the Allahabad Museum, depicts an interesting scene. At the top there is a border of stepped merlons with alternate horizontal lotuses, while below there are four panels cut by an undulating creeper. The first contains only a hanging cloth, but in the second two figures are noticed engaged in conversation. They stand between two houses which have vaulted roofs, star shaped windows and mud walls. The figure on the left holds an animal in his left hand while another
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is seen seated on the top of another cottage. A chakra is placed between two thūpikas on the top of the cottage to the left. In the third panel one finds ornaments consisting of ear-rings, bangles and elaborate armlet. The last panel contains a simple cottage (Parnākuṭi). An inscription on the stone is read by the curator as Gaja Jātaka sasa, which is completed above the panel on the right with the additional word — Jātaka, according to B. M. Barua who considered the text of the full label analogous to another Bhārhat Jātaka label reading Vidāla Jātaka, Kukuṭa Jātaka. These two creatures mentioned in different stories seem to be important characters. This can only relate to the Gajakumbha Jātaka which describes the previous birth of the Buddha as a minister of the King of Banaras who took a tortoise and a hare giving to the slothful king an object lesson of how the indolent came to misery. The tortoise is symbolised by his laziness and the hare by his activity though the popular version is just the reverse.

The Sasa Jātaka story figures prominently in another sculpture on a rail pillar from Bhārhat, now in the Allahabad Museum; containing an elaborate scene in the middle. To the right is seen a spouted jar with two baskets filled with mangoes, and in the middle is a fire altar. An animal, probably a hare, is seen facing it. Behind him another animal whose head and half body are cut off, is seated in the left corner. A lizard and an other hare in between the hare and the half cut animal. The scene represents the story in the Sasa Jātaka where the hare sacrificed himself by plunging into the fire, when food was demanded from him by Sakra in disguise. The hare’s nobility was related in the course of giving thanks to a land owner of Sāvatthi who had entertained the Buddha and his monks for seven days. In this scene, the hare is shown ready to jump into the fire. This Jātaka scene is also observed at Nāgārjunikūṇḍa and in a sculpture in the British Museum.

8. No. 345; Vol. III. p. 139.
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Bhārhat (Top) Heavenly dancing scene. (Below) Ajatasatru's visit to the Buddha (Courtesy Indian Museum, Calcutta)
A moving elephant with two riders carrying the relics of the Buddha in an ornamental covering is seen in a fragment of a coping stone.\textsuperscript{13} It probably suggests the scene of one of the claimants carrying his share after the division of the relics. At the top, as usual, there is a border of stepped merlons alternating with blue lotuses, and at the bottom one finds bells fastened to a hanging chain.

The \textit{Vessantara Jātaka} scene is depicted on a corner pillar\textsuperscript{14} from Bhārhut with two faces, each side being divided into three panels by horizontal bands of railing. The scene in the upper-most panel shows a royal personage riding on a richly caparisoned elephant, two small figurines probably attendants are noticed near the tusk of the elephant. In the middle are four horses with manes while a male figure probably stands or is seated on a chair. The lower most panel, as usual, shows two stumpy figures supporting the structure with their upraised hands. On the other side in the uppermost panel a royal figure is pouring water with a \textit{kamandalu} in the hands of a Brāhmaṇa who faces him. At the back are seen two male figures with upraised hands. In the second panel there are again four horses with beautiful manes now yoked in a chariot while three figures, probably, Brahmins because of their matted hair stand near the feet of the horses with folded hands. At the bottom the two stumpy figures support the heavy structure with upraised hands. The story is too long to be told here, but its moral is ‘sacrifice for others’; thus stressing the efficacy of \textit{dāna} even at personal sacrifice. This Jātaka story is represented in another panel of Bhārhut railing\textsuperscript{15} as well as at Sāñchi.\textsuperscript{16}

Other fragments of coping stones from Bhārhut depict in one case two deer grazing and a Brahmin standing inside the foliage of a \textit{mandāra} tree. The bottom depicts hanging bells while at the top there is the usual border of stepped merlon. In another coping stone a peacock is shown with out-spread tail though the body is cut off and only a part is visible under

\textsuperscript{13} No. 500 — \textit{op. cit.} pl. VII.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{op. cit.} pl. VI(A) and B.
\textsuperscript{15} Barua: \textit{op. cit.} Pt. III. scene 138.
\textsuperscript{16} Marshall & Foucher — \textit{Sāñchi}. Pts. 23, 25, 27 etc.
a panel made by an undulating creeper. The sculpture is too mutilated to give any faithful representation. The inscription on the top is read as *Haṁsa Jātaka*.

Besides these Jātakas scenes, a few are noted for the humourous and jovial atmosphere. The acrobatic scene on the pillar post is interesting in this respect. The stone has circular panels at the top and at the bottom. In the middle there is a group of hanging men. They are nine in number and hold firmly the feet of the one just above with both the hands. The dress is, as usual, a loin cloth tied by a scarf, embroidered turban, necklace and bracelets and a long scarf thrown round the shoulder with ends falling on either side. To the right and left stand a male and female with folded hands on lotuses. The inscription on the sculpture records it as the gift of the nun *Pushyadattā* of Nāgarika. The association of an acrobatic scene with a Buddhist monument is very interesting. According to Barua, it stands on a par with the wrestling and dancing scenes and these fit well into the artistic scheme of the Bhārhut railing as seeming to represent a melā held in connection with the celebration of the Stūpa-festival (thūpamahā). Patañjali also refers to festival gatherings (samāja) and it was not uncommon to have entertainments and display of acrobatic feats.

Another piece of sculpture on a fragment of a coping stone from Bhārhut depicts an aśvattha tree inside a panel made by an undulating creeper, and two deer grazing and a man (supposed by the curator to be a Brahman) standing inside the foliage of a mandāra tree. The bottom border, as usual, shows hanging bells. According to Barua, the figure inside is simply that of a man in standing pose inside the foliage of a Banyan tree and not of a Brāhmin, while the scene depicts either two deer, one behind the other or one emerging first from the foot of the tree on the right and then appearing beneath it on the left. As regards the identification of the scene, it

17. op. cit. B. 19 pl. XIV.
18. ibid. No. B. 542.
19. op. cit. p. 51.
20. I. 1.50 p. 120.3.
21. op. cit. p. 49.
lies between two birth stories viz. *Kandina-Jātaka* (No. 13) and *Kuruṇga Jātaka* (No. 21).

These are some of the sculptures, mostly on the fragments of coping stone, now in the Allahabad Museum and they have been noticed here since they are new acquisitions. A detailed study of the Bhārhut sculptures, representing the earliest phase of Indian art, has been made by many scholars. It would not be proper to pronounce any opinion on the art as a whole unless we take into consideration the Yaksha and Yakshīs which figure so prominently both at Bhārhut as well as at Sāñchī.

**Sāñchī**:

According to Marshall, the original structure of burnt brick of the Great stūpa had suffered great damage before the outer casing was added to it, and it is plausibly conjectured that it was done by the order of Pushyamitra, the Śuṅga. The stūpa was of about the same size as the stūpa of Aśoka at Sārnāth, about 60' in diameter at the base with a raised terrace surrounding its base and a crowning pinnacle (*har-\(m\)ikā), surmounted by one or more umbrellas (*chhattā\(r\)āvalī) within a small square railing. The balustrades above the base and the raised terrace were presumably of wood since all vestiges of them have disappeared. A little further he suggested, that it was reconstructed under one of the Śuṅga kings about the middle of the second century B.C. The additions, made by way of reconstruction, comprised the existing envelope of stone in which the whole body of the original stūpa was encased; the lofty stone terrace and two flights of stairs at its base; the stone flagging of the processional path, the stone balustrades in place of the older-fashioned ones of wood—one around ground level procession, a second around the terrace berm, and a third on the top of the dome, and lastly, the *har-\(m\)ikā and umbrellas (*chhattā\(r\)āvalī) which crowned the whole. It has been pointed out by him that it could not have been done during the reign of the anti-Buddhist Pushya-

23. *ibid.* p. 29.
mitra, nor, for palaeographic reasons, could it be brought down much later than the middle of the second century B.C.

The contribution of the Śuṅga period at Sāñchī is confined to the minor carvings on the berm and stairway balustrades of stupas 1 and 3 which, according to Marshall, were executed shortly after the middle of the second century, B.C., but they throw little light on the history of the local art in stone. The sculptures of stupa No. 2, are the earliest important examples of indigenous relief work in stone. The problem of the subject matter did not present much difficulty as the artists were familiar with the motifs belonging to the life of the master along with the Buddhist emblems — the famous \textit{triratna} — Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha. The massive railing of 88 pillars round the stūpa, which was completed in a couple of years, provided scope for the sculptors to display their talents. Plants, flowers and trees, with their salient features were also associated with human figures and so too were the quadrupeds — the elephant, lion, horse and bull. A galaxy of fabulous creatures, fish tailed \textit{makaras}, winged human heads, stags with elephant heads and fish tails, cobra-headed \textit{nāgas} with human bodies and such other creatures, which the artists could easily conceive and carve out, found a place on the railings. The space being limited, scope too, was restricted with the result that we do not find Jātaka stories. Owing to the paucity of space, allusive emblems or figures were used to denote the important events, as for example, the lotus suggested Nativity, deer — \textit{mrigadāva}, and Wheel — the first sermon at Sārnāth.

The carvings display disparity in the quality of workmanship and are wanting in uniformity. This is rather natural, since the posts, cross-bars and coping stories were donated by different persons, while the sculptures were carved by different artists. The design and taste differed, depending on the resources of the donor, and the talents of the carver.\textsuperscript{24} This does not make the sculptures free from monotony which is apparent, as for example, principal designs are repeated, particularly, the Tree of Life design, or the Māyā Lakshmi\textsuperscript{25} figures, though

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{24} cf. Pl. 78, 23a, b, c.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} cf. Pls. 74, 75, 82, 83 etc.
\end{itemize}
slight difference is not imperceptible. The Wheel of Law surmounting a pillar and the latter, too, supported by the Tree of Life, is repeated a number of times with variations on the balustrade.\textsuperscript{26} It is needless to go into the differences which have been pointed out by Marshall. Despite unequal merits, the reliefs, with a few exceptions, form a thoroughly homogenous group marked by a few characteristic features of a technical nature.

The technical observation, from the point of view of stone cutting, reveals that the reliefs are strictly in one plane with little attempt to reach depth in stone cutting — whether for human floral or animal figures, or decorative devices. Here the law of frontality applied in the case of human beings, and the memory picture are fully operative with the result that the figures are carved front-faced and the feet are usually turned sideways, though occasionally in the same direction.\textsuperscript{27} In some cases weight is thrown on both the legs with the two halves corresponding exactly.\textsuperscript{28} Generally the arms and legs are in varying postures. If one arm is raised then the other hangs down, or held horizontally across the waist. The figures stand out in well-defined relief. There is a tendency to depart from the rigidity and stiffness, so common in the early art of Bhārhat and the artist is not unsuccessful in his attempt. There are, however, certain exceptions pointing to a more developed style, as for example, in the case of an elephant and a riders' trampling on a prostrate foe at the base of a Pillar.\textsuperscript{29} The riders are sitting with ease, but the elephant is carved out with a degree of freedom and energy. The realistic attitude of the beasts, and the vigorous, yet delicate, modelling of their heads, plead for a more matured nature of art in these reliefs which are perfectly Indian. It is possible, as has been pointed out,\textsuperscript{30} that the sculptor imitated his elephant group from some well-known prototype of that subject with which he was familiar and which was more advanced in style and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Pillar 3a, 5a, 44b, 46b — Ref. Marshall.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} Pl. 74, Ib, Ic; 126 & 15a — ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid. 12b, 15a, 49a.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} Pl. 74.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} op. cit. p. 102.
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technique. It may not have been an exact copy of the model before him or that which he may have seen and clearly remembered. Marshall has explained that in the second and first centuries B.C., the dissemination in India of Asiatic Greek art in the form of coins, gems, terracottas, small carvings and textiles acted as a valuable stimulus to indigenous art, not only providing it with new motifs but leading in many cases to the adoption of more developed technique. He also traced the strength of the western Asiatic influence in such motifs as centaurs, human-headed lions, and fish tailed stags and mermaids, and perhaps also in the Yakṣī grasping a bough. In this connection, it is necessary to compare the art at Sāñchī with that at Bhārhat with a view to tracing certain common features and differences and the possible foreign influence.

According to Marshall, once again, the balustrade and gateway of the stūpa at Bhārhat, like that of the second stūpa at Sāñchī were erected during the period of the Sungas, but various features of the carvings, as well as, the palaeography of the inscriptions indicate that the gateway and certain parts of the balustrades were posterior to the Sāñchī balustrade, though probably not by more than two or three decades. This fact has to be viewed with caution and we defer its consideration till we have noticed the common features, both in style and technique.

Characteristically Indian, both the schools were struggling from the trammels of archaism into freedom and exhibit somewhat similar traits of awkwardness and stiffness due to the constraint of the ‘memory image’, lack of perspective and the stiff effective law of ‘frontality’. Marshall concludes that “the reliefs of Bhārhat, like those of Sāñchī, are distinguished by the presumption of a small percentage of carvings of unusually free and advanced style, which there are good reasons for ascribing to north-western influence. Taken as a whole, the reliefs of Bhārhat mark a definite advance on those of stūpa 2

31. ibid. pl. 75 Pillar 7b.
32. ibid. 8a.
33. ibid. 7a.
34. Pl. 87 Pillar 75a.
35. op. cit. p. 103.
at Sāñchī.” In regard to subjects, they are altogether more ambitious; the sculptors are no longer content with simple decorations or figurine groups, as one notices at Sāñchī, but set themselves to portray a variety of scenes representing episodes from the Life of the Tathāgata or his previous births. Even in constricted spaces, the artists have squeezed in many figures crowding the gateway’s reliefs, as they are at Sāñchī.

The differences between the sculptures at Sāñchī and those at Bhārhat are due to each having different traditions and methods. At Sāñchī the art is more natural and unconstrained, the poses of the figures are full and easy as the skill of the sculptor could make them, their contours smooth and rounded, and their minor features unaccentuated. On the contrary, at Bhārhat the sculptor seems striving after conscious definition and truth rather than unaffected simplicity, with no laxity in style which is rather tense and artificial. The contours are clear cut and precise, ‘anatomical details consciously and incisely defined and every ornament put with meticulous accuracy’. Marshall noticed a certain restrained mannerism, a pleasing affectation and dignified stylishness about these sculptures which are not found on the earlier balustrade of stūpa 2, or on the later gateways at Sāñchī, and, while the Indian art of the Malwa school lacks in religious tone, that of Bhārhat is more impressive and ecclesiastic. Bhārhat was more closely connected with the early school of Mathurā which may have been the principal centre from which it diffused, while its eclipse may have been due to the Śaka conquest of that city which took place in the first century B.C.

These contentions have raised many interesting points. Firstly, Marshall presumed that the Bhārhat art was posterior to that represented on the earlier balustrade of stūpa 2 at Sāñchī, showing a more ambitious and advanced nature of sculptures, fitted for the purpose of depicting the true ecclesiastical history of Buddhism. Further, Bhārhat was more aligned to the early art of Mathurā which might have been the source of the dissemination of art at Vidisā, and this school seems to have been eclipsed as a result of the invasion of the Śakas. In this connection, space and horizon have also to be taken into consideration. If the Sāñchī sculptor lacks ana-
tomical details consciously and incisively defined, surely it is not he who is to be blamed, but the available space confining his activity to the balustrades alone. It is equally true that we notice certain Kharoshṭhī characters engraved as mason’s marks which indicate that they had some thing to do with those sculptures. This need not be a ground for presuming that the Bhārhut sculptures are posterior even by two or three decades to those at Sāñchī, where one does not find Kharoshṭhī signs. The Kharoshṭhī signature in the Maski inscription recording the Minor Rock Edict of Asoka is equally inexplicable, though it was presumed by Smith that the scribes of the day were skilled in both the scripts. Under these circumstances it would be unwise to presume the posterior character of the Bhārhut sculptures on the basis of some Kharoshṭhī mason marks.

It has also been suggested that these signs imply the utilization of foreign artists who were called to help the local talents. Political relations, such as existed between the Indo-Greeks and the Śuṅga rulers of Vidisā close to Sāñchī, would certainly have made it possible in the case of the Malawā school, but one does not trace Kharoshṭhī signs there. Coomaraswamy suggested that in some respects the art at Sāñchī seemed to start from a point less advanced than that of the preceding century. Thus, some reliefs on the same railing (fig. 52) exhibit a much greater knowledge of the figure representing pose and movement with animation and grace, and this stylistic advancement cannot imply foreign influence nor does the phrase ‘direct observation of nature’ and ‘free from the trammels of the memory image’ meet the case.

One may presume that though the two schools of Bhārhut and Sāñchī were independent of each other, they certainly had to rely on some guiding principles obtained by a synthesis, based on mental visualization and abstraction. The improvement in style and pose depended on the artist’s skill with the result that on the same railing some reliefs depicting the treatment of human figures are more primitive, while others
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are more advanced. As regards the age of the two schools, they were more or less contemporary, but Bhārhat seems older. It is rather strange that Bhārhat died down with the Śuṅgas while Sāñchī continued to flourish in the time of the Andhras and the Kushāṇas as well. As regards their relations with the Mathurā art, Bhārhat was certainly connected with it, but whether the former was an offshoot of the later or just the reverse is still undecided and one would prefer to keep an open mind on this subject. Vogel referred to the mixed character of the Mathurā school in which we find on the one hand a direct continuation of the old Indian art of Barahat (Bhārhat) and Sāñchī and on the other hand the classical influence derived from Gandhāra. These views might be applicable to the later phase of the Mathurā art. During the Suṅga Period, there is no question of any influence from the North-West.

Bodh-Gaya:

The railing at Bodh-Gayā, presumed to be associated with Aśoka, in fact later than Bhārhat and earlier than Sāñchī — dates roughly from about the first century B.C. About 30 pieces were found evidently belonging to distinct structures, some pieces of a granite and others of sand stone, but all are similar in style. According to Cunningham, there is considerable variety in the subjects depicted in these small medallions and amongst them are to be found illustrations of the famous Kalpadruma or wishing tree, the Indra-sāla-guhā and the Jethvana vihāra scenes. It is needless to go into details regarding the description of these scenes which are not new or capable of any fresh interpretation. Originality and abstraction, as we find at Bhārhat, are wanting, but the carvings have special interest embodying, according to Marshall, two distinct traditions — that of the Bhārhat-Mathurā school which is spe-

38. Coomaraswamy — op. cit. Pl. 51, 52.
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cially noticeable in the lotus medallions centred with human heads or busts. They, however, lack the same breadth of style and firmness, and precise modelling. The treatment of features is insignificant and workmanship is comparatively poor. The influence of the Malawa school is noticeable in easy postures and rounded contours of some of the figures and the simple but orderly composition. By way of illustration, comparison may be drawn between the Jetavana scene\(^{42}\) here and at Bhārhut.\(^{43}\) Though the Bodh-Gaya scene is more natural and there is no attempt to distort figures by putting them in the available space in any corner and at any angle, as we notice at Bhārhut, the former lacks vigour and freshness. Anāthapiṇḍika is no longer noticeable in that scene pouring water as a pledge of the completion of the gift, nor are the Gandha and Kosamba Kulis in their natural surroundings with a group of persons. This scene at Bodh-Gaya is shown in a most unostentatious manner lacking vigour but not natural simplicity devoid of angular deformities.

Most of the other subjects are treated in low relief, those on the copings being purely fanciful. One on the panels and medallions include weird centaurs, winged beasts, domestic animals, sacred trees and sundry scenes of human life exhibiting considerable skill in drawing and neat execution. According to Vincent Smith,\(^{44}\) both the conceptions and executions are purely Indian, but Marshall\(^{45}\) thought that a marked feature of the later, as well as the earlier sculptures at Bodh-Gaya, was the presence among them of various motifs of Hellenistic or Western Asiatic origin, such as, centaurs, winged and fish-tailed monsters, tritons, schematic animal freezes and most significant of all—the sun god in his characteristic four horse chariot. These show how freely in that period Indian sculptors were borrowing from the hybrid cosmopolitan art of western India, and one of them, at least the chariot of the Sun-god, gives a

---
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clear indication of the debt they may have owed to that art in the matter of technique.

Now here, too, one may not agree with Marshall's views as regards the influence of Western Asiatic art at Bodh-Gaya in the first century B.C., a question which is very problematic. The worship of the Sun-Sūrya was very common and Patañjali refers to this deity in about a dozen passages. So the subject matter is Indian in origin, but so far as animals and other creatures are concerned, we have already referred to the data available from the Mahābhāṣya on flora and fauna. One may presume that the Indian sculptors, who had hardly any model before them, depended more or less on their mental visualization, which was based on synthesis and abstraction of details and other available information. We are, therefore, not prepared to admit foreign influence in subject matter or design and style, but we keep an open mind on this subject.

Besnagar Column:

The Besnagar column quite close to Sāñchī which was set up by Heliodorus, son of Dion, an ambassador from the court of Antialkidas to Bhāgabhadrā, the Suṅga ruler at Vīdisā, should naturally have traces of foreign influence. A description of the shaft with the capital is necessary. The pillar is much smaller than the Aśokan ones and has eight angles. It is furnished with an ornamentation consisting of half-lotus flowers; and above, it is divided into sixteen panels, followed by a broad cluster of fruit and finally the shaft continues towards the summit with a surface divided into thirty-two panels. The last stretch is smooth and the capital exhibits the well-known Indian bell-shape. A few geese can still be distinguished inclining one towards the other, on the remains of the abacus. The whole structure was originally crowned with a Gāruḍa. According to Percy Brown the shape and fluting of the column form

capital are of Persepolitan provenance but at the same time bear a marked resemblance to the capital of the Bhārhut toraṇa with which the pillar was contemporary. In the ornamentation of the shaft, the lower part of which is octagonal and the upper sixteen sided, with a band above of thirty-two facets, there may have been the beginning of a method of enriching this part of the pillar which was developed with notable effect in the columns of the later style. Now, barring the shape and the fluting of the canniform capital which is not free from controversy, the capital does not betray any foreign influence, despite its being dedicated by a foreigner. Marshall has not failed to pronounce that the Persepolitan columns and the winged lions may well have been a legacy from Mauryan times when Yavana artists were employed by Aśoka. Even if their advent into India took place at a later date, their presence implies nothing more than that foreign objects of art of one kind or another had strayed into the workshops of Central India, and these furnished the local sculptors with a few more motifs and ideas. We have no reason to presume that the Yavana influence on Central Indian art was more direct in their period. One can hardly deny that owing to the political and cultural contacts, it was natural for the Indian sculptors to know some new motifs, but it is difficult to trace any influence more than this superficial contact. The art should have been mature enough to influence but no remains at any rate of any such monuments nor of any stone carvings at all, have been found in the Greek city at Taxila, which was the important centre of their settlements.

Mathurā:

Mathurā is notable for the most conspicuous specimens of the old Indian school of art and it is more akin to Bhārhut with remarkable parallels of toraṇas, railings, Yakshas, Vṛikshas, dwarfs and fantastic animals. Its essentially Indian character is unquestionable and this school can trace its history at least from the Śuṅga period, though the famous Yaksha statues are supposed to be of earlier times. The absence of an Aśoka column here is regrettable. During the Śuṅga period, its im-
portance is not unaccounted for. Patañjali mentions it a number of times and its association with the Śūrasenas. It is true that Mauryan relics have not been found here. The characteristic Mauryan polish is not noticed in any of the sculptures though the existence of old stūpas here is probable in the light of Huien-tsang’s\textsuperscript{48} testimony. The earliest class of sculptures belong to the second century B.C., and this includes the Parkham and Mansadevi statues. Many more Yaksha statues belonging to this period have been found after the account written by Marshall\textsuperscript{49} and they seem to form a class by themselves. According to Chanda,\textsuperscript{50} these Mathurā images are the crudest products of the early Indian school, though they do not lack certain aesthetic features. As these statues are not confined to Mathurā alone, it is presumed that they were products of a school of art, wholly the result of indigenous traditions and possessing distinct individuality inspiring the sculptors to carve out colossal images worshipped as Yakshas with their counterparts. These are also represented on railings and torāṇas at Sāñchi, Bhārhut and Bodh-Gaya. The cult of these Yakshas and Yakshīs, noticeable as the earliest specimen of Indian art was, according to Coomaraswamy,\textsuperscript{51} indigenous in origin with these non-Aryan deities or genii endowed with powers of wealth and fertility which they could confer on the devotee. Before the advent of Buddhism and Jainism they had been accepted as orthodox in Brahmanical theology with a corresponding cosmology of the famous Eight Quarters of the universe. Their worship survived for long, but in sectarian literature they served the purpose of exalting the principal deity either as guardians and defenders of the faith or to be pointed as ‘horrible example of depravity’.

From the iconographic point of view the Yaksha statues with their protuberant belly (kumbodāra), long dhoti tied with a belt and a special posture — raising of the right hand and putting the left on the hip, may have served as a formula for the carving out of images not excluding the Buddha image

\textsuperscript{48} Growse: Mathurā p. 62.
\textsuperscript{51} Yakṣas p. 36.
(Bodhisattva), as we find at Sārnāth and Mathurā. Coomaraswamy suggested that the early images of Yakshas or Yakshis, whether independent or attendant, provided the model for the cult images of other deities, such as Śiva or Buddha, when Bhakti determined the appearance of all deities in visible forms. The stylistic continuity is maintained in the Parkham and Patna Yaksha images, as well as, in those of the Bodhisattvas at Sārnāth and the Buddha statue in Lucknow Museum.

As regards other antiquities of the Śunga period, barring the terracottas, there are a few sculptures carved either on railing figures or cross bars including the two sides of a Toraṇa Tympanum showing scenes from Buddha’s life both through symbols and in human form. The last one possibly represents that transitional stage. A railing pillar obtained from the Yamunā near the Saptari Tilā-ghāt is especially important for the scene carved on the upper half rosette which has been identified by Foucher as the Jātaka of the worst evil. In its simple style of decoration, the usual type of the Brahmanical anchorite is easily recognizable with his heavy chignon, his beard and short garments, seated on a rolled up mat (brishi) at the door of his round parnaśālā and engaged in conversation with four wild inhabitants. These include a dove, a crow, a kneeling doe and a coiled snake. There is hardly any trace of foreign influence either in style or in the subject matter. The style is reminiscent of the old Indian school, as pointed out by Foucher, and the subject matter is the Jātaka of the worst evil. According to this story the worst of evils is neither irresistible passion (kāma), hunger or covetousness (lobha), envenomed hatred (dveṣa) nor perpetual fear (bhaya) but the body itself, the source of all troubles. Final repose comes from Nirvāṇa which is the supreme beatitude.

Another complete upright pillar, belonging to the second century B.C. has the carved figure of a dancing Yakshi wear-
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(Left) Mathura — The Jataka of the worst Evil Scene.
(Courtesy, Mathura Museum)

(Right) Mathura — The Dancing Yakshi (Courtesy, Mathura Museum)
ing a conspicuous head-dress — elaborate ornaments consisting of double ear-rings, *padaka*, pearl necklace, a chain passing over the left shoulder and an elaborate belt besides the usual armlets, bracelets and anklets. The Yakṣī is shown surmounting an atlantes dwarf with protruding eyes. One can see on the top panel, as suggested by the curator, the figure of the Buddha with a parasol holding disputation with the teachers of rival faiths. Really the figure appears to be that of Mahāvīra, the Jain Tīrthaṅkara because the Buddha image is not found in the sculptures of that period. It is, however, clear that the Mathurā sculptors placed their services at the disposal of all the three important religions — Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism. It is not surprising to find Mahāvīra depicted in this panel. The figure is so small that one does not detect Śrī *Vaiṣṇava* symbol. According to Coomaraswamy, the main Jain established represented by the Kaṃkāli Ṭīḷā already existed in the second century B.C.

The school of Mathurā is more related to Bhārhat than to Sānchī, and is represented by some fragmentary sculptures dating back to the middle of the second century B.C. The sculptors also carved out Brahmanical deities. A standing image of a two-armed Balarāma, with a canopy of serpent hood the head and snake coils carved at the back and sides of the body with the distinguishing symbols — a club (*mūsala*) in right hand and a plough (*hala*) in the left, is in the Lucknow Museum. The conspicuous turban, heavy ear-rings, the triangular folds of the dhoti hanging between the legs and the knotted girdle, as well as, the frontal effect of the carving suggest that the statue should belong to the Śuṅga period. In this connection it may be pointed out that Patañjali refers to the temples of Rāma viz., Balarāma and Keśava, with the playing of musical instruments. So it is nothing unusual if this statue of Balarāma, the earliest of all available images of Brahmanical deities in early Indian art, is carved at Mathurā.

We have not referred to the railing pillars, serving as an enclosure of stone round a stūpa or chaitya, enshrining an
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object of worship and forming an architectural pattern of its own, as observed at Sāñchi, Bhārhat and Bodh-Gaya. These also enclosed the stūpas — both Buddhist and Jain — at Mathurā. As regards the Buddhist stūpas, there were, according to Hiuen-tsang, still to be seen in the kingdom of Mathurā the stūpa in which were deposited relics of the holy disciples of Sākyamuni, that is, Sāriputra Moggallāna, Pura-Maitrāyānī-putra, Upali, Ānanda, Rāhula and Mañjuśrī. On the yearly festivals the religious people assembled and made their several offerings at the one which was the object of devotion. Five or six li, that is about a mile and quarter, to the east of the town was a monastery said to have been built by the venerable Upagupta whose nails were preserved as relics.\(^{61}\) As regards the Jain stūpa, the ancient one probably, according to Vincent Smith,\(^{62}\) could be dated about 100 or 50 B.C. The Punyāśālā, called Prāchīni in an inscription\(^{63}\) of the time of the Kushāṇa emperor Huvishka, was an ancient gallery of Brahmanical deities where the Lord from Wokhan had created an endowment. It is, thus, clear that there were at Mathurā, ancient monuments of the three principal religions, though few antiquities are now traceable, which may have been the result of certain plans of excavations carried out there in the last century. The contributions of the Śuṅga period in the Mathurā school of art were not confined to statues of Yakshas and their counterparts, and railing pillars, but included terracottas as well. Those belonging to the Śuṅga period have been recovered from many sites in the Gaṅgā valley. A study of the Śuṅga terracottas would be equally interesting.

**Terracottas:**

The terracotta figurines constitute an important element in art and they are noticed as early as the period of the Indus Valley Civilization. The subject has been considered at length


\(^{62}\) The *Jain Stūpa at Mathura* p. 22.

Statue of Balarama
(Courtesy, Lucknow Museum)
by many scholars. Coomaraswamy has divided these early Indian terracotta figurines into four groups— I. the Indosumerian, II. the period from 1000—300 B.C., III. the Śuṅga or early Andhra and IV. the Scytho-Parthian, Kushana, Gupta and later. The characteristic difference between the terracottas of different periods from a technical point of view is that those of the first group are modelled and there is use of moulds. The terracottas of the second group have moulded face and modelled body without any part being separately made and affixed. Those of the third group are moulded. Nudism is one of the most important characteristics of the female figurines in the earlier groups, but those of the fourth group are practically clothed. The nude goddess in the terracottas of the Śuṅga period is no longer met with, and on the technical side completely moulded plaques replace the modelled figurines. The body is never built up of separate parts nor does this occur again, though this method was followed in the making of wax moulds for the costing of bronze. The most characteristic type, as pointed out by Coomaraswamy, is a feminine divinity fully clothed in a tunic and dholī. Particular care is taken to show the details of the sex very clearly. The jewelled girdle remains a constant feature, but the types are more varied. The figures and head-dress retain practically the form and detail of the round-faced variety of the previous group—the turbans are larger. Coomaraswamy’s conclusions are based on those terracottas in the Boston Museum which, according to him, seem, with the exception of those in the first group, to have come from Mathura. But that place was not the only centre for the making of the terracottas. At another place he has referred to the terracottas of the Maurya and Śuṅga ages found at Basārḥ, Taxila, Bhītā, Nāgarī, Mathurā, Pāṭaliputra, Kosam and Sāṃkiṣā. Owing to paucity of space we may confine our study only to a few terracottas of the Śuṅga period recovered from Mathurā, Kosam and some other
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sites in the Gaṅgā valley.

At Mathurā, the finds of moulds of the Śuṅga period suggest\textsuperscript{69} that considerable progress had been made in the technique of making terracotta figurines out of an original model, which was first prepared in wax or clay and from which a mould was taken by squeezing on it clay which was baked, so that copies could be made completely out of it. The simpler plan was adopted of pressing the clay into the mould and roughly finishing the back by hand. It would, thus, appear that figurines and reliefs were made from moulds completely, and not partly as in earlier times. On the technical side completely moulded plaques took the place of the modelled one, only the partial moulding of the face took place during this period. There is a variation of feminine standing or seated types, as noticed earlier, in the pose of the figure or in the fan, mirror or other object which it holds in its hands.\textsuperscript{70} They are more akin to the Bhārhut sculptures from the point of view of style, observed in faces and ornamentation. Definite relationship exists between clay and stone objects. Amongst the terracottas of the Śuṅga period from Mathurā may be mentioned the dancing female or nartaki, engaged in her toilet, a woman in dancing pose and a wind pipe playing Yaksha.\textsuperscript{71} It would appear that the subject matter is not religious, and the female figurines (kanyās) are conspicuous giving a charming study of women in different poses of acting, dancing with music and playing with a parrot, their favourite sport. The religious ones include the goddess Śrī Padmā or Gaja Lakshmi with two elephants holding inverted jars and standing on uprising stalks of lotuses, or the goddess Vasudhārā\textsuperscript{72} with triple fish symbols shown on the right side. There are also other examples showing male and female figurines in pairs illustrating procreation (mithuna), or showing pot bellied dwarfs (kukshila yakshas) and dwarfish figures.\textsuperscript{73} A round plaque, showing within a headed border of kinnara-mithuna, a pair engaged in

\textsuperscript{69} JUPHS. Vol. 9, p. 12.
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a joy ride, is an excellent piece exhibiting the high quality of Śunaga terracotta art. The terracottas of this period also illustrate different types of Yakshas and Yakshinīs—the pot bellied (kukshika), ithyphallic (kumbhamushka), snouted (tundalika) and nude dwarfs (nagnaka).

Several interesting terracottas of the Śunaga period have been recovered from Kosam, Bhītā and Pāṭalipurata. Amongst the Kosam terracottas, the most important and interesting one is the Vāsavadattā-Udayana one now in the Bhāratha Kalābhavana in Kāśi in three plaques which, with their feet modelling, could be definitely assigned to the Śunaga period. These plaques were originally from Kauśāmbī and depict the story of Vāsavadatta’s escape in an authoritative manner. The third one is broken, but the first two give a complete version of the entire scene. There are three riders on the back of a female elephant noticeable for absence of tusks. Her front leg is raised. Amongst the riders in front a woman holds the goad in her hand against the head of the elephant, and by her side closely touching her sits a male figure holding a lute of seven strings. They are Vāsavadattā and Udayana. Vāsavadatta’s dress consists of sārī with the usual ornaments, heavy ear-rings and a necklace. Udayana wears a dhotī. On the back is another person holding the rope fastened round the body of the animal at the back throwing coins which are being picked up by two persons. There is a border of small rosettes, and decorative flowers occupy the free space in the background. The plaque is plain. The story of Vāsavadattā was well-known in the time of Patañjali and he refers to it in his Mahābhāṣya.

At Bhītā, too, in the course of excavations, terracottas of different periods were found including some of the Śunaga period. One scene in the group, belonging to the period, has been identified by Vogel with the meeting of Dushyanta and Śakuntalā scene. At the top two persons look over railings with foliage to right. Below, to the right a four horse chariot with the charioteer are noticed with a groom. To the left, there is a shrine with chaitya doorway and rail round it. In
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front and below the shrine is a tank with lotuses and a figure drawing water. At the bottom are noticed two deer and a peacock (?) to the right. The terracottas from Basarh in Muzaffarpur district, conforming closely to the earlier Mathurā type, can for the most part be assigned to the period 120 B.C. to the close of the first century B.C.  

As regards the terracottas from Pātaliputra, Gordon classified them under two groups. There are somewhat large heads, one of a childlike appearance of a rather unique character, and the other having a bicorn head dress, and there are almost complete figures with clothing and decoration and poorly proportioned limbs. On an examination of these figures it would appear that with the exception of the child face, these have that round rather ‘pug nose’ style of face which must be associated with terracottas of the period C 150-50 B.C. There is little doubt that all are really in the same round-faced flat-nosed tradition, and these figurines may be of Mauryan date, though stylistically they appear to be of the Śuṅga period—a decision, however, being in suspense. Ghosh, in a study of the early Indian terracotta figurines unearthed at Kumrahar, Bulandibagh and Patna University area, suggested that they belonged to the Mauryan period, but those from Taxila and Basarh in the early Indian group were really of the Śuṅga age. N. G. Majumdar referred to two terracotta human heads and two similar fragmentary specimens found at Buxar in Bihar whose style is typical of the Śuṅga times.

The most beautiful specimen of the terracotta art of the Śuṅga period is at present in the Indian Institute Museum at Oxford, notable for its ornamentation and dress. Johnston had suggested with reservation that the figurine represented Māyā who was worshipped in the Gaṅgā valley as Mother Goddess especially associated with fertility — symbolised in the case of this terracotta figurine by fish and ‘makara’, indicating sexual love. The statuette is not a votive plaque, but was
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Sri Mā — Aśunga Terracotta
(Courtesy, Indian Institute, Oxford)
intended to be affixed to a rounded surface, as shown by the
curvature of the back and two small holes for nails made with
stamps of different varieties. These are some of the specimens
of Śuṅga terracotta art, which we have considered with parti-
cular reference to their important characteristics—technical
and stylistic.

Architecture:

During this period there were definite improvements from
the architectural point of view. The stūpa at Sāñchī was
enlarged to nearly twice its size with replacement of the im-
permanent wooden railing by the stone one which serves as
an impressive production in the range of constructional
Buddhist art. The richly carved reliefs depicting scenes from
the Jātakas enhanced its architectural and artistic value. Such
railings are noticed at Bhārhut and Bodh-Gaya as well. The
torana or gateway was also erected at Bhārhut during this period;
but much more important architectural contributions of this
period are the rock-cut chaityas and vihāras which were hewn
out in the sylvan hills of the western ghats. The Śuṅga
monarchs had hardly any hand in it, nor did their empire ex-
tend as far as that region, but one can hardly deny that the
quarry-men with their hammers and chisels were bristling with
activity, catering for the need of the Buddhist monks during
this period.

The architectural formation in these rock-cut retreats was
the monastery proper with an arrangement for the accom-
modation of monks in the vihāra—a square central hall en-
tered by a doorway, in front of which was a vestibule, portico
or verandah. The doorway entered into square cells carried
still further into the rock, which were the abode of monks.
The style of architecture employed in the rock-cut monasteries
was a reproduction of the then existing structural originals of
such wooden buildings. Even the details relating to the joints
or fastening of constructions were copied, and the earlier rock
work was supplemented by a good amount of wooden con-
struction attached to its surface. Of the two structures—the
chaitya was more important than the vihāra, with its apsidal
end, colonnades and ribs at the top. The stūpa carved out
of the rock assumed a prominent place near the end, and was
plain except for the railing carved and the harmikā with the
parasol. The Hinayāna rock-cut temples belonging to this
period are at Bhaja, Koṇḍana, Pitalkhora, Ajantā (No. 10),
Bedsa and Ajantā (9) Nāsik and Kārle, probably carved out
in this order and definitely before the Christian era, though
it is suggested82 that the first four were cut out in the second
century and the remainder in the first century B.C.

The rock-cut architecture of Orissa belonging to the second
century B.C., consists of a collection of chambers which were
meant for Jain monks. There are no chaitya halls but only
cellular retreats akin to those vihāras of the western ghats.
The famous Hāthīgumpha inscription of the time of King
Khāravela suggests its excavation earlier than his period. Ac-
According to Percy Brown,83 all the excavations of the Orissan
group appear to have been made in the 150 years previous to
the Christian era, after which the production ceased, although
on the Khaṇḍagiri hill a short revival took place as late as
the mediaeval period when a few Jain cells were added. These
Orissan group caves imply an independent development little
in common with any other rock-cut architecture. The Rānī-
gumpha provides the characteristic features of the architectural
treatment in the Orissan cave temples. Percy Brown noticed84
in the design of the pillars supporting the verandahs and the
pilaster of the mural arcadings two traditions—one of indi-
genous origin derived from a wooden prototype and the other
noticed in the pilasters on the walls with their capitals formed
of addorsed animals, which represent according to him the
debased descendants of the Persepolitan order. In spite of
this classical motif, as suggested by Brown, there is much
in the decorative nature of the arches to connect it with the
early structural art of the country.

(ii) Town Architectural Plan:

The city architectural plan is also noticeable in the sculp-
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tures at Bhārhut and Sānchī which definitely suggest some model on which the houses with special reference to the palaces were built. Coomaraswamy made a special study of this aspect of architecture on the basis of the sculptural scenes depicting dwellings especially the prāśādas, and the literary evidence furnished by the Jātakas and other Pāli literature. The term pāśāda (prāśāda) designated a mansion typically of several stories, though it often denoted a palace or other pretentious dwelling. On the Bhārhut bas-reliefs one notices two types of buildings—the domed and the round in plan, the second being barrel-roofed and sometimes three storey high. The Vaijayanta Prāśāda, the palace of the Devas in the Trayasatrimsa heaven, is depicted as a three storied building, the highest in the sculptures. The basement story is an open pillared hall, the lower third of its height being closed by a Buddhist railing. The building is divided horizontally into three portions. The lower third of the second storey is also closed by a Buddhist railing, above which rise three arched openings, one on each section of the building. A broad band above these, probably of mouldings, runs the whole width of the temple. The third storey also has a Buddhist railing above which are two arched openings. The roof is not displayed.

The Kuṭī in the two specimens—Gandha and Kosamba is a single-storied building enclosing an altar or throne with a garland hanging over it. It has an arched doorway, surmounted by a second arch like hood moulding. The door of the Kosamba kuṭī is a dome with a small pinnacle on the top, but that of the Gandha kuṭī has gable ends with a pinnacle at each end.

The same arched door, with its semi-circular hood moulding and the same doomed roof is also noticeable in a building of similar outline. It appears to be an open-pillared hall with a throne in the middle, canopied by an umbrella hung with garlands. The punyasālā or religious house also offers an
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interesting piece of study. That of Pasenajita is a two-storied building enshrining the ‘Dharmachakra’. The lower storey is an open pillared hall standing on a plinth or basement ornamented with a Buddhist railing. The upper storey is divided into three portions, the middle one being slightly retired. There are arched windows covered with semi-circular hood-mouldings and the wall of the central portion is ornamented with a Buddhist railing up to the springing of the hood-moulding. The semi-cylindrical domed roof with two gable ends, and a line of eight small pinnacles springs from this level.

Cunningham also referred to the canopies, thrones, and ascetic hermitages; but there is one uniform pattern consisting of a long room, with either a pointed or a semi-cylindrical domed roof and a small opening in each gable to give air and light. The ends of the longitudinal timbers are shown in the gables, leaving little doubt about the thatching of the roof. At Sānchī, since the scenes depicting the architectural side are carved on toranas of the later period, they cannot be associated with the Śunga period, though the same type continued in later times as well. A survey of the scenes with buildings of two or three storeys, as pointed out by Smith accords with the colourful description of the splendours of such towns of ancient Indian, as Vaiśāli and Pātaliputra. Civil architecture is described in the Jātakas as well.

We have considered art and architecture of the Śunga period with particular reference to Bhārhut, Sānchī, Bodh-Gayā and Mathurā. While much has been written on these centres of art, and there is hardly anything new by way of presentation, we have confined ourselves to certain important sculptures of this period. The contribution of this age in the realm of art and architecture is not negligible. The art may be lacking in stupendous productions, but it is very rich from the stylistic and subjective standpoints. It is no longer confined to the royal palace or the pillars of Aśoka, but is more democratic. The subject matter is, no doubt, the life of the Tathāgata and scenes from Jātaka stories relating to his previous births. Here we notice lay devotees trying to give evidence of their
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bhakti and devotion towards the Lord, irrespective of their status. The famous sculptures carved on the gateways at Bhārhat, and the railings at Sāñchī and Bodh-Gayā which were set up during this period, are some of the best specimens of Indian art. The critic may notice some defect, particularly too many scenes in too little a space, but he can hardly be oblivious of the difficulties and the limitations imposed on the sculptor. The sudden change from wood to stone is another factor which cannot be lost sight of, and, if the carver could be equally proficient in his new setting, then certainly it is meritorious. The human form un-noticed in the Mauryan period is in alignment with nature and isolated objects are in full rhythm. The two important centres, Bhārhat and Sāñchī, have much in common, but there are differences based on separate traditions and methods. Marshall drew distinction with particular reference to restrained mannerism, pleasing affectation and dignified stylishness in Bhārhat sculptures, but that is not a proof to the posterior character of Bhārhat sculptures which is more impressive. The early school of Mathurā notable for the Yaksha statues may have been the principal centre from where art diffused, but the influence of local traditions was not less, with the result that the two schools of Bhārhat and Sāñchī were independent of each other, though both of them had to rely on certain guiding principles obtained through a synthesis, based on mental visualization and abstraction. We have considered the Besnagar Garuḍa pillar as well with a view to tracing foreign influence on Indian art in that period, since it was set up by a foreigner. One may keep an open mind on this particular aspect. We have also taken into account the terracotta figurines which have, of late, assumed great importance. The differences have been pointed out, and during this period moulds were used after an original model was first prepared. Here we have taken into account only some of the best terracotta figurines. Lastly, we also considered the architectural contribution of this period with reference to the encasing of the Sāñchī stūpa, the setting up of railings at different centres and the torana at Bhārhat. Even though the Suṅgas had no hand in the cave temples of the Western Ghats, and in Orissa, the early specimens were
excavated during this period. The sculptures also furnish evidence of the town architectural plan, which is an interesting study. On the whole, we can conclude that, despite the disturbance and turmoil caused by the two foreign invasions during this period, the activities on the speculative and materialistic sides were not repressed and the contribution of this period is fairly notable.
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