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PREFACE

Vaiśālī occupies an important place in the early history of India. This region, situated just to the east of the Gaṇḍaka (the ancient Sadānīrā), was Aryanised earlier than South Bihar. It developed as a centre of agriculture and trade while its forests attracted ascetics and religious teachers. A great experiment in the field of government was made here when a republic, the most well-known in ancient India, was founded by the Vṛijis (Vajjis) or the Lichchhavis at Vaiśālī. The region witnessed a religious upheaval of profound significance and interest in the sixth and early fifth centuries B.C. Kshatriya-Kuṇḍapura in the vicinity of the Vaiśālī City and part of Greater Vaiśālī was the birthplace of Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, the twenty-fourth and the last Tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas. The capital of the Lichchhavi republic was a favourite resort of Gautama Buddha and other wandering ascetics of the time. As this region, comprising roughly the Muzaffarpur and Champaran districts of the modern Bihar State and the adjoining Nepalese Terai, had no systematic and detailed history so far, there is ample justification for the publication of the present book.

The work consists of nineteen chapters. The first chapter is introductory. The remaining ones are divided into three Books:—

Book I (chapters 2-8) deals with the Monarchy on the basis of ancient Indian historical traditions.

Book II (chapter 9) is an interlude between the Monarchy and the Republic. This was a dark age of Vaisalian history for which we have only indirect references and no details at all.

Book III (chapters 10-19) is devoted to the Republic of the Vajjians or the Lichchhavis and deals with its chronology, constituent clans, territory and capital, political history, constitution, religious history (Buddhism, Jainism and other religious systems), society, and fall.
This work represents a substantial part of my thesis (written from July, 1954 to January, 1957) on which the Patna University awarded the Ph. D. degree on October 21, 1957; the degree was conferred on January 22, 1958. I have made this book up-to-date by utilising subsequent publications. The chapter on Buddhism has been re-touched while that on Jainism has been thoroughly recast, especially the portion concerning the birthplace of Mahāvīra where I have quoted opinions of competent authorities on the subject, given extracts from the early Jaina literature to show that Mahāvīra was born at Kuṇḍapura near Vaiśālī in the Videha country, and added a new section on 'the vicissitudes of Vaiśālī as a Jaina tīrtha and centre and the circumstances in which the Jinas came to forget the birthplace of their last Tīrtha-kara.'

While carrying on researches I had the privilege of receiving constant and ungrudging help from Dr. A. S. Altekar, Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Patna University, who later became Director of K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute (Patna) and retained this post till his death (November 25, 1959). The writing of each chapter was preceded by discussion with him on its subject-matter. And when my manuscript was ready, he obliged me by going through it in a thorough manner, correcting mistakes and making numerous useful suggestions. I should, however, make it clear that for the views expressed in this book I am solely responsible and nobody else. Dr. Altekar also helped me in procuring some rare volumes, which I had required for this book, from the National Library, Calcutta.

I am thankful to the authorities of the Patna University for having granted me leave from January 8, 1955 to May 10, 1956 and from November 24 to December 18, 1956 on half average pay for carrying on and completing my researches on North Bihar history.

Another quarter from where I got help and co-operation are the Patna College Library, the Patna University Library, the library of the Ancient Indian History and Culture (now Archaeology) Department of the Patna University, that of the Archaeology Department of the Government of
India (Patna), the Bihar Research Society Library, the
Sharada Sadan Library (Lalganj, Muzaffarpur district)
and the Jaina Siddanta Bhavana Library (Arrah).

The Patna University History Publication Fund has
advanced me a loan of one thousand rupees in connection
with the publication of this book for which I am thankful to
the Executive Committee of the Fund and its Chairman, Dr.
Ram Sharan Sharma, Professor and Head of the Department
of History, Patna University. Dr. Sharma took further interest
also in the publication of the book.

My thanks are also due to Mr. Ayodhya Prasad Jha,
Manager, Hindustani Press, Patna, who has assisted me in
the correction of the proofs, to Mr. Dwijendra Narayan Jha,
Research Scholar, Patna University, for his help in preparing
the Index, to Mr. Sundar Lal Jain of M/s. Motilal Banarsidass
for undertaking the publication of the work, and to the last-
named gentleman and Mr. Mulk Raj Suri, Manager of Shri
Jainendra Press (Delhi), for the courtesy with which they recei-
ved and carried out my frequent suggestions and alterations.

In spite of our best efforts, a few printing mistakes,
though generally not of a very serious type, have crept into
the book for which I crave the indulgence of the readers.

PATNA,
THE INDIAN REPUBLIC DAY, JANUARY 26, 1932.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

SECTION I

THE LAND

In ancient times two states flourished in North Bihar (i.e., Bihar north of the Ganges), viz., Vaisālī and Videha, which were conquered by Magadha under Ajātaśatru and Mahāpadma Nanda respectively in the beginning of the fifth (circa 484 B.C.) and the middle of the fourth centuries B.C. (circa 347 B.C.). Of these, Vaisālī included roughly the districts of Champaran and Muzaffarpur, and Videha the district of Darbhangā, the northern part¹ of the Monghyr district, the district of Saharsa, the northern part² of the Bhagalpur district and the district of Purnēa. The Nepalese Terai also, contiguous with these areas, formed part of these states.

Vaisālī was the name of the state as well as its capital. This, however, is not true of its eastern neighbour. The most ancient name for this region available in literature is Videha. This term is used in three senses—(1) the Videha tribe which inhabited the area east of the Gandak; (2) the Videhan state (with its capital at Mithilā usually identified with Janakpur in the Nepal Terai situated at a distance of 14 miles from Jaynagar Railway Station on the Indo-Nepal border); and (3) Videha as a geographical term which included the Vaisālī state also, along with the Videhan state, within its borders. It was in this last sense that Kuṇḍa-grāma (near Vaisālī), the birthplace of Mahāvīra, is placed in Videha² and that the mothers of Mahāvīra and Ajātaśatru, who were the sister and daughter respectively of Cheṭaka, the

¹ 1. i.e., the part north of the Ganges.
² 2. S. B. E., 22 (Oxford, 1884), pp. 194, 256. Also in medieval biographies of Mahāvīra (for which see infra), Saṅghagamatantra (explained below) and Homage to Vaisālī (Vaisali, 1948), p. 92 and notes 4 and 5 (where Vaisālī is said to be the capital of Videha). Cf. H. C. Raychaudhuri, Political History of Ancient India, 6th edition (Calcutta, 1953), p. 118 and n. 4.
Lichchhavi leader of Vaiśālī,¹ are called Videhadattā² and Vedehī (Vaidēhī)³ respectively.

There is no controversy whatsoever with regard to its northern and southern⁴ frontiers. The Sadānirā river acted as the boundary⁵ between Videha⁶ or Vaiśālī and its western neighbour Kosala; but its identification has been a matter of some dispute. It is identified by the Indian lexicographers with the Karatoya⁷ (modern Kurattee which flows through the Bogra district in East Bengal), but this seems to be too far east. On the ground that the Mahābhārata (II. 20. 27) distinguishes the Gaṇḍakī from the Sadānirā, it is held by Oldenberg⁸ and Pargiter⁹ that the Sadānirā was the Rāpti. But the authors of the Vedic Index¹⁰ question the truth of the Epic tradition and agree with Weber¹¹ in taking it to be the Gaṇḍakī (the Kondochates of the Greek geographers). The Sadānirā flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain¹² and formed the boundary between Kosala and Videha¹³ and its waters are never exhausted¹⁴. This last item of information from the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa shows that it must correspond to the Great Gandak of the present day.¹⁵ The extent of the western boundary of Videha land (or Tairabhuṅkī) is also indicated in the Saktisangamatantra¹⁶, a late work: “From the bank of the Gaṇḍakī to the forest of Champa (i.e., Champaran), the country is called Videha, also known as Tairabhuṅkī.” For understanding the implication of this statement we should proceed from the south (confluence of the Gaṇḍakī and the Ganges, i.e., the southernmost point of

1. S. B. E., 22, p. XV (genealogical table).
2. Ibid., pp. 193, 194, 256.
3. In Buddhist literature (see uggra for a discussion on this point).
5. Sat. Br., 1. 4. 1. 17.
6. Using the word in a wide sense.
10. Vedic Index, II, pp. 421-422; also pp. 298-299.
14. Sat. Br. 1. 4. 1. 16 (“Even in late summer that river, as it were, rages along: so cold is it!”).
15. D. R. Bhandarkar, A. B. O. R. I., 12 p. 104. H. C. Raychaudhuri suggests that the “Sadānirā may be Burhi Gandak” (P. H. A. I., p. 53, n. 1).
the Gaṇḍakī), along the Gaṇḍakī river, to the north (the Champaran forest).

From the Gupta period (fourth-fifth centuries A.D.) onwards the Vaiśāli-Videha region came to be known as Tirabhukti (or Tairabhukti in some texts). This name is found on some of the Basarh seals⁴ as one of the provinces of the Gupta empire. The *Bṛihad-Vishṇupurāṇa⁵* knows the very sacred country of Tairabhukti which extended from the Ganges to the Himālayas and from the Kauśikī to the Gaṇḍakī. Vāmana³ who lived in the eighth century A.D. mentions Tairabhukti in his *Liṅgaṇuṭāsana*, while this is offered as a synonym for Videha (or Vaideha) in the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa⁶* written by Purushottama-deva of about the twelfth century. The inclusion of Vaiśāli in Tairabhukti is proved by an inscription of the twelfth century A. D. which reads as *Tirabhuktau Vaiśāli-Tārā⁵*. The *Vividhatirtha-kalpa⁶*, a Jaina work of the fourteenth century A. D. by Jina-prabha Śūri, records the name of the region as Tairabhukti. The *Śaktisaṅgamatantra⁷*, which mentions only the western boundary of this region as shown before, makes Videha and Tairabhukti as synonymous. The author of the *Bṛihagadāta⁸* (17th century A. D.) says that Tairabhukti is so called because it extends up to the bank of the river Ganges. The name of the present Tirhut Division (which consists of the four districts of Darbhanga, Muzaffarpur, Champaran and Saran) is reminiscent of ancient Tairabhukti.

According to the geographical conceptions of the Brāhmaṇas and the Jainas Videha was situated just to the east of Kosala and the Sadānirā (the Gandak in our opinion) and included Vaiśāli and Kuṇḍagrāma. The Buddhist conception of Videha seems to differ from the above because the Buddhists mention Vajjiraṭṭha (Vṛjji-rāṣṭra) and Videha as two distinct geographical (and political) entities. Vaiśāli (an older name) and Vṛjji-rāṣṭra (called after the republican Vṛjjis or Vajjis) are identical as names of the same state.

5. A. S. I. A. R., 1903-04, p. 82.
SECTION II

THE SOURCES

The sources for the early history of Vaiśāli are of a literary character and may be divided under four headings, viz., Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jaina and foreign literature. No systematic history is available anywhere and only stray references are found on whose basis the edifice is to be constructed. Even these sources are generally late. Still another limitation is that fact and fiction are mixed up in such a way that on several occasions it is very difficult to extricate history from fables or fable-like stories.

The oldest part of the Brahmanical literature are the Vedic texts sub-divided into the Śaṃhitās, the Brāhmaṇas, the Āranyakas and the Upanishads. Of these, the first two contain useful references to certain personalities connected with Vaiśāli and the Aryan colonisation of the area lying east of the river Sadānīrā (Gaṅḍaka). They, however, do not go beyond this.

Our main sources for the history of Vaiśāli are the Epics and the Purāṇas. They are dated by some scholars according to the latest indications which can be discovered in them, and they are sometimes (if not too often) rejected as incompetent witnesses for the events of any earlier period. "The elementary fact that the date, whether of a building or of a literary production, is not determined by its latest addition is in their case generally ignored." The different parts of the Epics and the Purāṇas were written at different dates by different persons or sets of persons and the date of every part must be determined on its own account. But the nucleus of every Epic and Purāṇa existed at a very early date; and though the Epic-Puranic literature got its present form much later, it contains older tradition.

1. Said here with reference to the Purāṇas only.
INTRODUCTION

There is a difference of opinion among scholars as to the historical value of the royal genealogies furnished by the Purāṇas. Keith¹ is excessively sceptical about the historical value of the Purāṇas and is doubtful regarding the historicity of any event which is not explicitly mentioned in the Rig-Veda. He is supported partly by H. C. Raychaudhuri² and R. C. Majumdar³ and very indirectly by M. Winternitz.⁴ A. S. Altekar⁵ and A. D. Pusalker,⁶ on the other hand, have collected some typical cases to show that the Puranic genealogies are referring to kings who figure in the Vedic literature also. The greatest champion of this latter school of thought is F. E. Pargiter⁷ who gives more weight to the Puranic tradition than to the Vedic evidence. Despite a good deal of what is untrustworthy in them, the Purāṇas alone contain something like a continuous historical narrative, and it is absurd to suppose that the elaborate royal genealogies were all nearly figments of imagination or a tissue of falsehoods.⁸ This traditional history, which has its basis in facts, has mostly preserved ancient tradition, and when supported by Vedic texts its evidence is unimpeachable.⁹ No apology is therefore needed for the somewhat long account, given below, on the basis of the Epic and Puranic tradition.

1. For his views on the Purāṇas see J. R. A. S., 1914, pp. 118-136 (‘The Brahmanic and Kṣatriya Tradition’), 734-741 (‘The Earliest Indian Traditional History’), 1021-1031 (‘The Age of the Purāṇas’).
5. Presidential Address delivered at the Archaic Section of the 3rd Indian History Congress, Calcutta, on the 15th December, 1939. See Proceedings, pp. 33-77. This is also published in Journal of the Banaras Hindu University, Vol. 4, pp. 183-223, under the title, ‘Can We Reconstruct Pre-Bharata War History?’ (with three Appendices).
There are other works in Brahmanical literature which, though late provide valuable corroborative evidence, e.g., the Āśṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya and the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali.

If the Brahmanical literature is particularly useful for the monarchical period, the Buddhist and Jaina literature is equally so for the republican period of the North Bihar history. As a matter of fact, the material is so vast (especially in the Buddhist literature) that we have to make a selection. The Buddhist literature is also useful from a chronological point of view, because it furnishes valuable hints in that direction. Moreover, it vouchsafes "light when the light from Brahmanical sources begins to fall."

Foreign literature used here includes Chinese accounts and references which, though late, are useful for our period also.

1. P. H. A. I., p. 11.
SECTION III

THE CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEME

In a work of the kind attempted in the following pages it seems to be necessary to point out the chronological scheme adopted here.

We have tentatively taken c. 2000 B. C. as the date of the accession of Manu Vaivāsvata and the early Aryan expansion. We have accepted c. 950 B. C. as the date of the Mahābhārata War and in so doing we have followed Pargiter. According to this scholar 94 generations of kings ruled up to the Bhārata War. Thus Sumati (Pramati), the last known king in the Vaisalian genealogical list, who belonged to step no. 64 according to Pargiter’s list⁴, flourished about 1285 B. C. or 1300 B. C. (to take a round figure). We have accepted 487 B. C. as the date of the death of Gautama Buddha and suggested our own date (i.e., 561 B. C. to 490 B. C.) for Mahāvīra’s life.

All other dates may easily be calculated if necessary.

With this introduction we may now begin the history of Vaiśāli.

4. The average reign-period comes to 11 years for the entire pre-Bhārata War period.
BOOK ONE

THE MONRACHY

(Seven centuries)
CHAPTER II

THE RISE AND CONSOLIDATION OF VAIŚALIAN MONARCHY

(Nābhānedishṭha to Khanineta)

THE ANTIQUITY OF VAIŚALĪ

Vaiśalī is not mentioned in the Vedic texts and the material for the traditional history of the kingdom is derived from the Purāṇas and the Epics; but a number of personalities mentioned in connection with the Vaiśalī region in the Puranic tradition figure in the Vedic literature as well. Nābhānedishṭha, a king of the Vaiśalī region, can be inferred from the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā of the Yajur-Veda (III. 1.9. 4) and the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (V. 2. 14). Vatsapri Bhālandana, another king of the same region, is the reputed author of Rig-Veda, IX. 68 and probably of X. 45 and 46. He is mentioned in the later Saṃhitās and the Pañchavimśa-Brāhmaṇa. Marutta, one of the greatest kings of the Vaiśalī area, is known to the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 4. 21) and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 6). It may, however, be argued that these persons bearing same names as the rulers of the Vaiśalī region were different personalities. This is possible, but not probable. One Takshaka Vaiśāleya is mentioned in the Atharva-Veda (VII. 10. 29) as the son of Virāj and a descendant of Viśāla, and as the priest at a snake-sacrifice in the Pañchavimśa-Brāhmaṇa (XXV. 15. 3).

The first mention of the Vaiśalī region in ancient historical tradition occurs in connection with the episodes recorded in the Purāṇas regarding the first six Manus who belonged to the family of the first Manu and his sons, Priyavrata and Uttānapāda. The

1. Supported by Bd., II. 32. 121-122 and Mat 145. 116-117.
Maitrīya-Saṃhitā, III. 2. 2.
5. For their names see Märk, 53. 6-7.
descendants of Priyavrata\(^1\) are intimately connected with the Vaiśālī region and the adjoining sub-Himalayan and Himalayan tracts. His son Agnīdhra, when in old age, went to Śālagrāma\(^2\) on the Gaṇḍakī (above Vaiśālī where the river emerges from the Himālayas). Agnīdhra’s son, Nābhi, went to Viśālā\(^3\) for the sake of penances. This Viśālā might\(^4\) either be Badarikāśrama or more probably our Vaiśālī where the Great Forest (‘Mahāvana’) continued even up to the republican times (i.e., sixth century B.C.). Nābhi’s son was the famous Rishabha, the first Jaina Tīrthaṅkara, who retired in old age to the āśrama of Pulaha,\(^4\) which along with that of Pulastya, was at Śālagrāma\(^5\) on the Gaṇḍakī (Chakranadi)\(^6\). Rishabha’s son Bharata who gave his name to Hima-Varsha, which was called Bhārata-Varsha after him, too, in due course, retired, like his father before him, to Śālagrāma\(^7\) making over this region to his son Sumati. Susarma, a Brāhmaṇa of Viśāla town, called Vaiśālī and Viśālaputra\(^8\), was a subject of Uttama, the son of Uttanapāda and the father of the second Manu. Budha was the leading Brāhmaṇa of Viśālagrāma\(^9\) which village flourished in the time of the sixth Manu.

The Vaiśālī area is further associated with certain legends. The most important among these is that of Gajendra-Moksha (the rescue of the great elephant)\(^10\). This describes how a fight took place between an elephant and an alligator in the Gandak and how the former was released by Vishṇu from the clutches of the latter at the confluence of the Gandak and the Ganges later called Gajendramoksha-tīrtha, Harihara-Kshetra and Hari-Kshetra, situated within Viśāla-Kshetra. The place of Diti’s penance is also said to have been in the Vaiśālī region and the legend concerns the origin of her sons, the Maruts.\(^11\) A third

---

2. Vish, II. 1. 24.
8. Mārk, 70. 3-4.
9. Ibid., 76. 25, 37.
legend about the same region concerns the 'Manthana' ('scouring') of the Eastern Seas by the Maruts and others, with Mount Mandara (in the Aṅga region) as the seat of the 'Daṇḍa' or the ruling power supporting the Vaiśāḷī sea-rangers\(^1\).

Thus, although Vaiśāḷī is not mentioned in the Vedic literature and its monarchical history is based primarily on the Epic-Puranic materials, this kingdom was founded fairly early in course of the Aryan expansion in North-Eastern India and it cannot be said that the city played no part in the early Vedic period of Indian History.

**SOURCES FOR VAIŚĀLĪ MONARCHICAL HISTORY**

We do not possess prehistoric remains in the Vaiśāḷī-Videha area. So we have to fall upon the literary sources. The history of the Vaiśāḷī region is given by seven Purāṇas and also partially by the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata\(^2\). Only four Purāṇas give complete genealogical lists, viz., the Vishnu, the Garuḍa, the Vāyu and the Bhāgavata. Those in the other three Purāṇas and the two Epics are incomplete and defective. Thus the Brahmāṇḍa omits kings from Prajāni to Avikshita, though Marutta was well-known as the son of Avikshita; the Mārkaṇḍeya narrates the history of the kings of the Vaiśāḷī region at great length but only down to Rājyavardhana; the Liṅga mentions only the first four kings; the Rāmāyana begins the dynasty with Viṣāla, wrongly calling him 'son of Ikshvāku'; and the Mahābhārata list is incomplete at the beginning, goes down only to Marutta, and wrongly inserts a ruler of the name of Ikshvāku. Subject to these shortcomings the lists are in substantial agreement\(^3\).

References to some kings of the Vaiśāḷī region are found in four Purāṇas\(^4\) at the place where an account of Pulastya's offspring is given. Pulastya had been married to Ilavilā, the daughter of Tṛṇabindu, a king of the Vaiśāḷī region. Hence while tracing the lineage of Ilavilā these names are mentioned. Of these the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa list is fuller (Marutta to Tṛṇabindu), while the

Vāyu and the Liṅga Purāṇas, beginning with Marutta, omit rulers from Dama’s successor to Trāṇabindu’s predecessor. The Kūrma-Purāṇa, which does not give the Vaisalian genealogical list at any place whatsoever, mentions only Trāṇabindu. The Liṅga-Purāṇa, which mentions only first four names (Dishṭa to Ajavāhana) while treating the Vaisalian dynasty, thus furnishes some more names here for the benefit of the historian.¹

THE VAIŚĀLĪ AREA BEFORE THE ADVENT OF THE ARYANS

The earliest description of the Vaiśālī-Videha area is available in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (I. 4. 1. 10-19) in the story of Videgha Māthava. If we study it closely, we can get a pre-Aryan picture of the area east of the Sadānirā (modern Gandak) as follows:— (i) At that time it (the land east of the Sadānirā) was uncultivated. (ii) It was very marshy. (iii) It had not been sanctified by Agni Vaiśvānara, i.e., the Brahmanical Vedic sacrifices and civilisation in general and fire-cult in particular had not yet been introduced into this area. (iv) The Brāhmaṇas did not cross the Sadānirā river in former times, thinking, ‘it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara.’ (v) Even in late summer that river, as it were, raged along, that is to say, it was not affected by the heat of the summer, as the other rivers, but rushed along as rapidly and as well-filled as ever. It was so cold because of not having been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara. Although this was a well-filled river as it flowed from the northern (Himalaya) mountain and also as the name indicates (‘Sadānirā’, i.e., ‘she that is always filled with water’), still the water was practically unutilised because the land east of this river was highly uncultivated and very marshy (Śat. Br., I. 4. 1. 14-16, S. B. E., 12, pp. 105-106). The picture is not very encouraging and hence the founders of Vaiśālī and Videha had to perform a heavy and strenuous task immediately after their advent.

THE VAIŚĀLĀ DYNASTY AND ITS CAPITAL

In the Epic-Puranic account no name is given to this dynasty or kingdom at first. Even a famous king like Marutta, who is

¹ These additional references to the rulers of the Vaiśālī region have not yet been properly noticed by scholars.
mentioned in the Śatapatha - Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 6.) along with many other kings whose kingdoms or places of sacrifices or dynas-
ties are generally given (XIII. 5. 4. 1-23), does not find his king-
dom or capital mentioned in that book, though he has been
called there an Āyogava king. The Mahābhārata devoted many
chapters to the story of Marutta and Saṁvarta (XIV. 3-10), but
does not mention his kingdom or capital. Later on King Viśālā
is said to have founded Viśālā or Vaiśālī as his capital, and thence-
forward the kingdom was that of Vaiśālī, and the kings were
styled Vaiśālaka kings.¹ These names are usually extended retro-
spectively to include the whole dynasty.

MANU VAIVASVATA AND HIS SONS

All the royal lineages of the Epic-Puranic literature are
tracked back to Manu Vaivasvata who is said to be the son of
Vivasvat (the Sun). Here we have no intention to reopen the
question of various Manus and their comparative chronology
which has not yet been settled. Thanks to Pargiter, the history of
pre-Buddhistic India has been reconstructed to a great extent
on the basis of the Epic-Puranic literature, though a more detailed
account is still a desideratum. He begins his scheme with Manu
Vaivasvata and comes to the Bhārata War. Between Manu
Vaivasvata and the Pāṇḍavas (both inclusive) there are said to
have occurred 94 generations.

Manu Vaivasvata is said to have had nine sons,² and also a
daughter named Iḷā or an eldest son Iḷa who was turned into a
woman Iḷā. The nine sons assigned to Manu³ were Ikṣvāku,
Nābhāga (or Nṛgī), Dhrīṣṭa, Śaryāti, Narishyanta, Prāṁśu,
Nābhāṇedīṣṭha, Karūṣa and Pṛishadhrā.

Manu divided the earth, that is, India into ten portions.⁴

¹. Vaiśālaka in Vā, 85. 22; Bṛ, III. 61. 17; Gār, I. 138. 14.
Vaiśālīka in Viś, IV. 59. 61; Rām, I. 47. 18.
Vaiśālā in Bhāg, IX. 2. 36.

Kār, I. 20. 4-6. Ag, 273. 5-7. Hṛ, 10. 1-2. Śīv, VII. 60. 1-2. Cf. also
Vā, 54. 29-30; Bṛ, II. 38. 30-32. Also see Viś, IV. 1. 71; Gār, I. 138. 2-3;
Mārk, 79. 11-12 and 111. 4-5; Bhāg, IX. 1. 11-12; Mat, 11. 40-41; Pād, V. 8.
75-77; and Māh, I. 1. 42-47 (fanciful, incorrect). I. 75. 15-17.

³. Māh, I. 75. 17-18 says he had 50 other sons, who perished through mutual
dissension.

VII. 60. 16. Cf. Baudhāyana, II. 2. 3. 2.
The details of the distribution among the sons are not given. Some like Prishadhra were excluded.

For the purpose of this book we have to consider the history of the dynasty of only one of the sons of Manu, viz., Nābhānedishṭha, who established a line of kings that reigned in the country known afterwards as the kingdom of Vaiśāli.

THE LIST OF VAIŚALIAN KINGS

Before giving the traditional history of the kings of the Vaiśāli region, we propose to furnish their list for the sake of convenience. A few sources have inserted some additional names which also we have indicated here (e.g., 8A, 10A, 17A, 17B) in order to make this list exhaustive. After each name we have given the generation number furnished by Pargiter (A.I.H.T., pp. 144-149).

1. Nābhānedishṭha (2)
2. Nābhāga
3. Bhālandana (6)
4. Vatsa-prī (8)
5. Prāmśu (12)
6. Prajāni (or Prasandhi ? in Mbh) (16)
7. Kānitra (20)
8. Kshupa (24)
8A. Ikshvāku (Mbh)¹
9. Viṁśa (28)
10. Viviṁśa (32)
10A. Rambha (Bhāg)
11. Kānīnetra (35)
11A. Ativibhūti (Vīś) or Vibhūti (Gar)
12. Karandhama (38)
13. Avikshita (39)
14. Marutta (40)
15. Narishyanta (41)
16. Dama (42)
17. Rājyavardhana (44)
17A. Suvriddhi (Vīśh)
17B. Kevala (Vīśh)
18. Sudhṛiti (45)

¹. The Mahābhārata inserts (XIV. 4, 3-4) one Ikshvāku (shown above as 8A) between Kshupa and Viṁśa by mistake.
19. Nara (46)
19A. Chandra (Viśākha)
20. Kevala (47)
21. Bandhumat (48)
22. Vegavat (49)
23. Budha (50)
24. Trīṇabindu (Ikshvāku? in Rām) (52)
24A. Viśravas (53)\footnote{\text{1}}
25. Viśāla (54)
26. Hemachandra (55)
27. Suchandra (56)
28. Dhūmrāśva (57)
29. Śṛiṇājaya (58)
30. Sahadeva (59)
31. Kṛiśāśva (60)
32. Somadatta (62)
33. Janamejaya (or Kākutstha in Rām) (63)
34. Sumati (64)

The Purāṇa and the Rāmāyaṇa lists stop with Sumati who was a contemporary of Daśaratha of Ayodhyā and Śrīadhvaja of Videha.

Only one Purāṇa, the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, gives details of the careers of the kings of the Vaiśālī region up to Rājyavardhana. Their names with chapters dealing with them are as follows:—

1. Dishta (or Rishṭa)—(only mentioned in chs. 111 and 113, no details).
5. Prāṁśu—ch. 117.
6. Prajāti—ch. 117.
11. Khanīnetra—chs. 120-121.

\footnote{\text{1}} Inserted by Pargiter in his list. We, however, do not find sufficient reason to have him in the main body of this list for which see infra.
15. Narishyanta—chs. 132-134.

Hence, when no source is indicated in the following pages while dealing with these monarchs, it should be presumed that the statement has been taken from the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, our only source for the details of the kings of the Vaisāli region from Nābhāga to Rājyavardhana.

1. NĀBHĀNEDISHṬHA

He was one of the sons of Manu Vaivasvata.

His name has many variants in the ancient texts. It is found in the Purāṇas at two places, viz., (1) where the sons of Manu are named, and (2) where the genealogical list of the kings of the Vaisāli region is given. One additional reason for the confusion of the names is that one of the sons of Manu was also called Nābhāga¹ (or Nṛiga).² Consequently the name of Nābhānediṣṭha "has been greatly corrupted (through the influence of the name Nābhāga), thus, Nābhāgodīṣṭa, Nābhāgarīṣṭa, etc., and then split up into two, Nābhāga and Diṣṭa, Arīṣṭa or Risṭa"³. In some of the Purāṇas the total number of the sons of Manu is also stated as ten or nine or even less than this. In that case we can see whether the word Nābhāga coming just before Diṣṭa (or its variants like Risṭa or Arīṣṭa) is an independent name or part of one and the same name. Where no total number is stated, it is rather difficult to decide what the name is—whether it constitutes one name or two names. A possible help is offered where the genealogical list of the Vaisāli region with Nābhānediṣṭha as head begins.

Below (on the next page) are given important variants of the name Nābhānediṣṭha. First is given the name of another son of Manu whose name Nābhāga is responsible for causing so much confusion, then follows the variant reading of the name of Nābhānediṣṭha and then is given the name of the head of the Vaisāli family (in case it is found in that particular source).

2. So Bṛg and Viṣṇ. Lg calls him Nabhāga and also Nṛiga (I. 66. 45). Bhāg makes two sons of these names.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Näbhāga (or Nṛiga)</th>
<th>Näbhānediśṭha</th>
<th>Founder of Vaisalian family</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Näbhāga</td>
<td>Näbha uddi-</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Vā, 64. 29, 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>shṭa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>Näbhāgadishta</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Vish, IV. 1. 7, 7. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>Näbhāgo</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Bd, II. 38. 30, 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>dishta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>Näbhāgo</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Bd, III. 60. 2, 3 and 61. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>dishta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näbhāga</td>
<td>Näbhāgo</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Gar, I. 138. 2, 3, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>dishta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näbhāga</td>
<td>Näbhāgo</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Märk, 79. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>rishta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näbhāga</td>
<td>Näbhāgorishta</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Märk, 111. 5, 4 and 113. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>dishta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näbhāga</td>
<td>Näbhāgārishta</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Lg, I. 65. 18,18 and 66. 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>dishta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näbhāga</td>
<td>Näbhāgārishta</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Vā, 85. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>dishta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mbh, I. 75. 15, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>Näbhāgaarishta</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Ho, 10. 1, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>Näbhāga-aris-</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Kūr, I. 20. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga</td>
<td>hta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga and Nābhāga</td>
<td>Arishta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pad, V. 8. 76-77, 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga and Nābhāga</td>
<td>Arishta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mat, 11. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nābhāga</td>
<td>Risha</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Br, 7. 1, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛiga and Nābhāga</td>
<td>Näbhāgarishta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Br, 7. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nābhāga</td>
<td>Angorisha</td>
<td>Dishta</td>
<td>Mbh, II. 8. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nābhāga</td>
<td>(or Risha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correct reading of the royal name, however, appears to be Näbhānediśṭha (as Vish reading Näbhāgadishṭa, IV. 1. 7 shows) which occurs in Rig-Veda, X. 61. 18, a hymn attributed to him. But it appears from the table of the variants furnished above that Diśṭa was a convenient abbreviation of the name which was employed at several places. This might have been especially due to the possibility that the real name was forgotten later on.
This conjecture is supported by the fact that the Epics do not
know Nābhānedishṭha as the founder of the kingdom of
Vaiśāli. The Rāmāyaṇa does not mention the name at all. The
Mahābhārata, too, does not mention him at the place where the
Vaisalian genealogy (from Manu the daṇḍadhara to Marutta) has
been stated (Mbh, XIV. 4). Hence it appears the name of the
founder of the line of the Vaiśāli region, which later on turned
into a stronghold of heterogeneous cults, was forgotten.

The Purāṇas give the list of a line of kings without naming
at the outset any territory over which they ruled. At a
later stage they mention Viśāla who is said to have founded
Vaiśāli or Vaiśāli. According to the Rāmāyaṇa the territory of the
last ruler of the dynasty, named Sumati, lay north of the Ganges
(Rām, I. 45. 9) and south-west of Videha (Rām, I. 50. 1). This may
tend to settle the point and if this is accepted we may presume that
Nābhānedishṭha was the founder of the dynasty which ruled in
the same area whose history is being treated in the following
pages. An exception to this type of argument is provided by the
Pauravas who abandoned Hastināpura, shifted to Kauśāmbī and
made it their capital. We, however, do not hear of any
change of royal place or capital in the case of the dynasty of
Nābhānedishṭha.

The references to Nābhānedishṭha are found in the Rig-
Veda and the Yajur-Veda, where he is called the son of Manu.
Cf. Griffiths' Hymns of the Rig-Veda, Vol. II, p. 467, hymn 18;
p. 468, hymn 21; p. 469, hymns 1 and 4; p. 470, hymn 11. These
references make it highly probable that the kingdoms of Vaiśāli
and Mithilā were founded almost at the same time, though
Vaiśāli City may have come into existence at a later age.

---

1. Called Disṭavāṁśa in the Bhāg, IX. 2. 22.
2. There were more Viśālas or Vaiśālis than one (cf. Geog. Dict., p.
39) as we know from ancient literature, e.g., (1) one which lay in Videha
(used in a broad sense) whose history is treated here; (2) another was Ujjayinī
(Maṇḍhāτa, I. 30; Skanda-Purāṇa, V. 1. 47); (3) another was Badarikā
(popularly known as Badribisālī) which lay in the Himālayas (Skanda-Purāṇa,
II. 3. 4-5, 8; Mbh, III. 139. 11; XII. 344. 20; also III. 90. 25-26); (4) one
Vaiśāli appears to be near Kurukṣetra (Vāmana, 37. 30) as it appears from
the context, but it is not certain. Besides these, we come across references to a
place named Viśāla whose exact position cannot be known, e.g., Pad, VI. 189. 27
(Vol. 4, p. 1594), Bhāg, V. 4. 5. They might refer to our Vaiśāli whose
history is given here.

The story of Nābhānedishṭha is given in the *Tajur-Veda* and the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. He is there called a son of Manu who partitioned his estates amongst his sons. Nābhānedishṭha, still dwelling as a student with his preceptor, was left out of account. As advised by his father he performed the sacrifice of the Āṅgirasas and got much wealth. According to Hewitt what is proved in this story is that the Āṅgirasaḥ were the priests of the earthborn deities, and that it was by the help of Nābhānedishṭha that they learnt that it is in heaven that the real creative power resides, and that, as the imparer of this knowledge, Nābhānedishṭha took the place among the gods which had previously been assigned to Rudra the earthly father.

A hymn (*Rig-Veda*, X. 61. 18) is attributed to him. This shows that he was a poet, interested in religious matters and flourished quite early. He is praised in the *Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra*. His hymn is repeatedly mentioned in the *Brāhmaṇas*.

Nābhānedishṭha is etymologically connected in all probability with Nabānadhishṭa in the *Avesta*. Lassen saw in the legend a reminiscence of an Indo-Iranian split; but Roth showed conclusively that this was impossible, and that Nābhānedishṭha meant simply ‘nearest in birth’.

Many *Purāṇas* say that Nābhāga, son of Dīṣṭa, became a Vaiśya; but only one of them, the *Mārkapadeya-Purāṇa*, gives an account of this episode. It so happened that while yet young (*prathama-yauwane*) Nābhāga met a Vaiśya farmer’s daughter and fell in love with her. Desiring to marry her, he approached the girl’s father who, however, argued incompatibility and other...

---

6. *Kaśyapī-Brāhmaṇa*, XXVIII. 4, merely refers to him as connected with the Āṅgirasas. So also *ibid.*, XXX. 4; *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*, VI. 30, 31; *Pañcavimśita-Brāhmaṇa*, XX. 9. 2.
9. *Mārk*, chs. 113 (2-37) and 114 (1-5).
reasons. The farmer further reported to the king, who summoned Richika-Bhārgava and other Brāhmaṇas for consultation. They gave the ruling on the point, permitting the marriage after the marriage with a ‘princess’. Nābhāga rejected this on principle, and carried off the farmer’s daughter, Suprabhā by name, resorting to the ‘Rākshasa’ form of marriage. The farmer reported the occurrence. The king sent an army against the defiant son, but it was routed, whereupon he himself took the field and fought his son. In this crisis a ‘parivṛṣajaka muni’ intervened, ruled that since Nāghāga had become a Vaiśya by marriage with a Vaiśya (which was voluntary on both sides), the war should stop, for, by the laws of warfare, Kṣatriyas fight only with Kṣatriyas (Mārk, ch. 113) and thereby prevented the fatal conflict (Mārk, 114. 1). Thus the king became reconciled to his son and daughter-in-law and brought them to court, but Nābhāga persisted in leading the Vaiśya life of cattle-rearing, agriculture and trade; and this was also ultimately ruled by the king’s advisers headed by Bābhravya-Kauśika. Nābhāga, who had become a Vaiśya by marrying a Vaiśya maiden and had consequently fallen from his own sphere of righteousness, complied with the ruling of ‘those expounders of righteousness’ (taṁ dharmavādībhiḥ).

We do not know the names of the wife/wives and sons of Nābhānedishṭa. Evidently he had more sons than one (i.e., Nābhāga), because later on Bhalandana, the son of Nābhāga, had to fight with Vasūrāta (Mārk, 114. 13, 15) and other cousins for getting back his paternal kingdom (see infra). Also, the Brahma-Purāṇa (7. 42) and the Harivamśa (XI. 9) say that ‘two sons of Nābhāgarishṭa (or two sons, viz., the son of Nābhāga and that of Rishṭa), though Vaiśyas, attained Brāhmaṇa-hood.’

Nābhānedishṭa must have flourished very early, say, towards the end of the Aryan occupation of the Gangetic plain of India. This is supported by his mention in the tenth mandala of the Rig-Veda and in the Avesta. This is probable because the Gandak Valley must have been occupied by the Aryans later than the Punjab and Kuru-Paūchāla regions.

1. The Hu has Nābhāgarishṭa instead of Nābhāgarishṭa of the Br.

2. The first and the tenth upāstās of the Rig-Veda are considered to be the latest additions to the collection. See Winternitz, A History of Indian Literature, Eng. tr., Vol. I (Calcutta, 1927), pp. 57-59.
2. NĀBHĀGA

Nābhāga was deprived of his father's throne because of his having become a Vaiśya (Mārk, 114. 19). So the throne must have gone to his brother and the latter's sons. This inference is supported by the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa (114. 13-15) that speaks of Vasurāta and his brothers who were sons of Nābhāga's unnamed brother and on whose declining to part with half of the kingdom the son of Nābhāga fought a successful war.

We do not know the names of the wives (if he had more than one) and all the sons of Nābhāga. But indications are that he had at least three sons:—(1) From various Purāṇas (for references see infra) we know that Nābhāga had a son named Bhalandana. (2-3) The Harivamśa (XI. 9) says that two of his sons, though Vaiśyas, became Brāhmaṇas.¹

Nābhāga, like Edward VIII of England of our own time, preferred to deprive himself of the paternal throne for the lady of his love. He also lost his Kshatriya status, became a Vaiśya and followed his occupations, viz., cattle-rearing, agriculture and trade (Mārk, 114. 4). Conditions of the Vaiśāli region were especially suitable for these occupations, viz., (1) the proximity of the Himalayan area and the existence of the Mahāvana ('Great Forest') near Vaiśāli; (2) presence of uncultivated, marshy land requiring cultivation (cf. Sat. Br., I. 4. 1. 15); and (3) river-communication due to the Gandak and the Ganges. Nābhāga appears merely to be a symbol for the great agricultural and commercial activities which followed. Considering the later history of Vaiśāli this matter becomes important. "The story regarding Nābhāga's transformation from a Kshatriya into a Vaiśya was probably intended to explain the fact that Vaiśāli became a centre of trade and commerce at an early period".² The Brāhmaṇas seem to occupy an important position in the society of the time.

¹. Pargiter in his English translation of the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa (p. 593, f. n.) writes:—"The Bhāgasva Pur. says two of his (i.e., Dhiṣṭa's) sons, though Kshatriyas, obtained Brāhmaṇa-hood (IX. 2. 17)". This is wrong. What is stated in the Bhāg is that "The Kshatriya race of Dhiṣṭa, descended from Dhiṣṭa, attained Brāhmaṇa-hood on the earth". This Dhiṣṭa, a son of Manu Vaiśasvata (Bhāg, IX. 1. 12), is different from Dhiṣṭa, another son of Manu (ibid.).: Pargiter also accepts this (A. I. H. T., p. 84, n. 2). The Br (p. 26), however, states that "the sons of Nābhāga and Dhiṣṭa, though Kshatriyas, attained Vaiśya-hood."

Indeed, "it was the Aryan Brāhmaṇas who led the further advance into the countries to the east of the Gandak, and who superintended the establishment of the kingdom of Videha and the founding of the great city of the Vaiśyas, or Vāsyus, which became so celebrated under the name of Vaiśāli." Rangacharya² infers from the foggy and confusing evidences that the Vaiśāli line "was probably founded by a prince who was not very particular in his notions of marriage and who had a Vaiśya bride instead of a Kshatriya one." He feels that "the royal clan might really not have been so high or pure, though its kings outside the most Aryan of the Aryan kings in their ideals and practices." Marutta, a king of the Vaiśāli region who flourished afterwards, has been called an Āyogava in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 6). The chroniclers and law-givers, remembering probably the tradition of the Vaiśya lady's marriage with a prince, changed the very meaning of this epithet of the Vaisalian king and interpreted it as a caste born of a Vaiśya lady and a Śūdra male (cf. Mbh, XIII. 48. 13; Manu-Smṛiti, X. 12). Āyogava actually means 'one belonging to the stock of Ayogu.'⁴

Although Nābhāga was satisfied with his agricultural, pastoral and commercial vocations, his son, Bhalandana, born of his Vaiśya wife Suprabhā, did not accept this position. Exhorted by his mother, he tried to recover the paternal kingdom with the help of Rājarshi Nipa (probably of Kāmpilya), then residing in retirement in a Himavat āśrama, who gave him necessary arms and military training. Hereafter Bhalandana went to Vasurāta and others, Nābhāga's younger brother's sons, and demanded half the kingdom which they refused to give as he was a Vaiśya. He then worsted them in war, wrested the whole kingdom, and offered the crown to his parents. But Nābhāga refused it on two grounds: (1) he did not like to disregard the command of his father of not ruling over the kingdom; (2) he should not enjoy the kingdom which had been recovered by his son for him. Suprabhā, however, supported her son, now disclosing that Nābhāga had not really become a Vaiśya, for she herself was very

3. Ibid.
truly a Kshatriyā. She narrated a story about it saying that she was the daughter of king Sudeva who had previously been degraded to Vaiśya-hood and that an Agastya chief while cursing her had made the concession that striving for attainment of royalty for her husband and son, she (Suprabhā) could yet return to her Kshatriyā status. Nābhāga still stuck to his Vaiśya-hood and remained a farmer, and suggested that as such he would pay taxes to his son, who might become king by virtue of conquest. His view prevailing, prince Bhalandana ascended the throne (Mārk, 114. 6—116. 4).

3. BHALANDANA

He was the son of Nābhāga. His name is variously given as Bhalandana,1 Balandhana,2 Bhanandana,3 Halandhana4 and Bhanandara.5 The last two are given as variant readings in the foot-notes in the Bhāgavata and Garuḍa Purāṇas. While the second indicates his prowess, the third probably hints at his Vaiśya status (see infra). We have kept Bhalandana as the proper spelling as it is given by the majority of the Purāṇas.

We have seen before how he recovered his paternal throne and presented it to his father who declined the offer. He then ascended the throne and governed the kingdom in righteousness. His prowess, which he had shown in recovering his paternal kingdom, was not directed in bringing other kings to his subjection.

He performed a sacrifice according to rules.

Bhalandana was fortunate in having a well-behaved and able son named Vatsaprī. When he came of age he surpassed his father with the multitude of his good qualities.

Vatsa-prī's wife was Mudāvatī (later called Sunandā), daughter of Vidūratha, whose capital was on the river Nirvindhyā in Malwa (Mārk, 116. 27, 33). He gained her by slaying the Daitya (Asura) King Kujjimbha of 'Rasātala' or 'Pātāla'. Vidūratha performed the series of marriage rites for them both,

2. Viś, IV. 1. 19.
3. Mārk, 114. 6. Gar, I. 138. 6 (v. l.).
4. Bhāg, IX. 2. 23 (v. l.).
5. Gar, I. 138. 6 (v. l.).
6. The story of the romance of Vatsa-prī and Sunandā is given in the Mārk, ch. 116.
for his daughter Muḍāvatī and Bhalandana’s son. Thereafter Vatsapri in his early manhood sported with her in charming regions and in palaces and on hill-tops.

As time passed on, Bhalandana grew old and departed to the forest. Vatsa-prī himself became king.

Bhalandana proved to be a very righteous and religious ruler. Some of his hymns found their way to the Vedic collection. Being born of a Vaiśya lady and a degraded Kshatriya who had become a Vaiśya,¹ he was considered to have become a Vaiśya because it is declared there were three Vaiśya hymn-makers, viz., Bhalandana, Vatsa (=Vatsapri ?) and Saṅkīla.² Probably it was due to his hymn-making activity that the Brahmanda-Purāṇa (III. 61. 3) and the Vāyu-Purāṇa (85. 3) choose to call him a ‘scholar’ (‘vidvān’).

4. VATSA-PRĪ

Vatsapri was the son of Bhalandana. His name is variously given as Vatsapri,³ Vatsa-prīti,⁴ Vatsaprāpti⁵ and Ajavāhana.⁶ The Vāyu and Brahmanda Purāṇas do not mention any ruler between Bhalandana and Prāṇiṣu and thus omit his name.

We have seen that Vatsa-prī had married the daughter of king Vidūratha of the Mālava country. This matrimonial alliance was of great help to the Vaisalian kingdom because Vidūratha “made him his son-in-law and apparently also his successor—so that at least for a generation Vaiśāli held sway over Mālava.”⁷ S. C. Sarkar conjectures that Vatsa also succeeded to the Kāśi throne at the same time. His argument is that Vatsa was the son of the Kāśi king Sudeva’s daughter’s son (Bhalandana): after Sudeva in the Kāśi line we have Divodāsa II (half-brother of Suprabhā) and his son, the famous Pratardana: after Pratardana the Kāśi list shows Vatsa.⁸ The argument is


². Bhī, II. 32. 121-122. Mat, 145. 116-117.


⁵. Gār, I. 138. 6 (v. l.).

⁶. Lg, I. 66. 53.


⁸. Ibid., pp. 48-49.
alluring, but Vatsa of Kāśi belongs to generation no. 42 according to Pargiter, while Vatsaprī of Vaiśālī belonged to generation no. 8 according to the same scholar. Thus it is incompatible; but Vatsa-prī might have had some influence over the Kāśi kingdom for the reason indicated by S. C. Sarkar.

Vatsa-prī offered up sacrifices continually, while protecting his people with righteousness. Now the people, being protected by that high-souled monarch as if they were his children (cf. Aśoka of Magadha in the 3rd century B.C.), prospered, and in his realm there was no confusion among the castes; and no one felt any fear of robbers, rogues or villains, nor any fear of calamities, while he ruled as king (Märk, ch. 116; Pargiter's English translation, p. 610). He thus became a man of great fame and generosity.¹

Twelve sons were born of Sunandā, viz., Prāṃśu, Prachīra, Śūra, Suchakra, Vi-krama, Krama, Balin, Balāka, Chaṇḍa, Pra-chaṇḍa, Su-vikrama and Sva-rūpa. All the princes were of great parts and most victorious in battle (Märk, 117. 1-2).

Vatsa-prī Bhālandana is the reputed author of Rīg-Veda, IX. 68, and probably X. 45 and 46. This is also confirmed by the Puranic evidence² where it is stated that there were three Vaiśya hymn-makers (mantra-kṛitaḥ), Bhālandana (Bhālandaka), Vatsa (Vāsāśva) and Sankīla. Vatsa-prī Bhālandana is mentioned in the later Saṁhitās³ and the Pañcavimśa-Brāhmaṇa.⁴

After Vatsa-prī comes a somewhat confused period in the dynastic and political history of the Vaiśālī region: the Liṅga-Purāṇa stops with his name and gives no further names at all; the Brahmadeva-Purāṇa leaves a blank after Prāṃśu, his successor.

5. PRĀṃŚU

He was the eldest son of Vatsa-prī (Märk, 118. 3) and is known to have been a strong⁵ ruler. The Purāṇas,⁶ which

¹ Vish, IV. 1. 20.
² Bṛ. II. 32. 121-122. Mat, 145. 116-117. Variant readings of Br and Mat respectively have been provided.
⁵ Bṛ. III. 61. 4. Märk, 117. 3. The Calcutta edition of the text which I have used makes a mistake in the numbering after ch. 116. It omits ch. 117, calls this ch. 118, and continues the mistaken numbering to the end. I have referred to the chapter number after correcting it.
mention him, call him Prāṃśu, except one where the name Pāṁśu occurs.

He being the eldest became king. His younger brothers were subordinate to his authority like dependants. At his sacrifice the earth (‘Vasundhārā’, “container of wealth”) justified her name by reason of the many multitudes of things, which she gave away to the twice-born and which she parted with to the inferior castes. He duly protected his people as if his own begotten children. He possessed rich treasures with whose help he performed, it is said, innumerable sacrifices (Mārkaṇḍeya, ch. 117).

We feel tempted to identify Prāṃśu, the successor of Vatsa (-pri), an upholder of society and state and a great sacrificer, with Saṅkila, who is depicted by the Puranic evidence as one of the three Vaiśya hymn-makers (mantrakritaḥ), viz., Bhalandana, Vatsa and Saṅkila. Chronologically both Prāṃśu and Saṅkila are placed after Vatsa (-pri). Moreover, the dynasty of Dīṣṭa (or Nābhaṇedīṣṭha) to which these rulers belonged is reputed to be a Vaiśya dynasty. It may be argued that the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa which mentions Prāṃśu clearly (III. 61. 4) might not make a mistake in naming this ruler as a Vaiśya hymnmaker. But it can be said that the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa does not preserve the tradition fully as it omits the names from Prāṃśu’s successor (Prajāni) to Marutta’s predecessor (Avikshita); besides Prāṃśu, the name Pāṁśu is also available; and so a third name (Saṅkila) cannot be ruled out completely. Also, the Matsya-Purāṇa does not mention any king of the Vaisalian dynasty. So the argument cannot be applicable to this Purāṇa at all. And thus there can be no possible objection to this proposed identification.

Although Prāṃśu is highly praised in the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa (ch. 117) both for his valour and generosity, we have to take it with a grain of salt. There appears to have ensued confusion which is shown by the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa, omitting altogether the names in the dynastic list from Prāṃśu’s successor to Avikshita. These names are shadowy, except in one or two cases, where the details, in S. C. Sarkar’s opinion, indicate a break-up of the kingdom, and the advent of a new ruling

2. Bṛ, II. 32. 121-122. Māl, 145. 116-117.
family grafted on to the previous decadent line. S. C. Sarkar makes an original suggestion here: "it appears that there was another local princely family, also belonging to the Ikshvāku group, and descended from an earlier 'Prāṁśu' (than the one who was a son of Vatsa-prī), who was one of the eight brothers of Ikshvāku, son of Manu, and that this family ruled somewhere in the same Vaiśāḷi region." The conjecture seems to be based on the identicality of the name Prāṁśu. (For a similar suggestion regarding Kshupa, see infra.)

6. PRAJĀNI

Prajāni² was the son of Prāṁśu. His name is also given as Prajāti,³ Prajāpati⁴ and Pramati.⁵ He seems to be the same⁶ as Prasandhi in the genealogy in the Mahābhārata, Alvamedhika-Parvan, 4. 2. This suggestion of Pargiter seems to be acceptable especially on the phonetic ground where the only other competitor is Prāṁśu. But Prāṁśu's case is weakened as Prasandhi is shown as the father of Kshupa⁷, in which case he (Prasandhi) should be as close to Kshupa as possible. In the Purāṇas Kshupa is the grand-son of Prajāni and great-grandson of Prāṁśu. Hence we would prefer Prajāni to Prāṁśu in identifying him with the Prasandhi of the Mahābhārata.

The Mārkandeya-Purāṇa (ch. 117) says that at the sacrifice of Prajāti (Prajāni), Indra smote nine nineties of valiant Dānavas and Bala and Jambha, noblest of Asuras, and smote other very valiant foes of the gods. This need not be taken literally, but it hints at some conflict between the kingdom of Vaiśāḷi on one hand and the Dānavas and the Asuras on the other. And the omission of the names of kings from Prajāni to Avikshita in the Brahmanda-Purāṇa (III. 61) may point to the bad performance of the Vaisalians in this conflict. Regarding this omission we have another suggestion also to make. It appears there was some gap in the material on whose basis the chronicler of the Brahmanda-

1. Ibid. Brackets are not ours.
2. Va, 85. 4.
3. Mārk, ch. 117. He, XI. 10 (confused).
4. Visē, IV. 1. 22 (some texts of this Purāṇa give Prajāni). Br, 7. 26 (confused).
7. Mbh, XIV. 4. 3.
Purāṇa was writing. After Prāṁśu he found the word Prajāpati no doubt, but then there was a gap (stopping just before Marutta). Instead of thinking that Prajāpati (a variant of Prajāti or Prajāni, as shown above) was a son of Prāṁśu, he thought it prudent to compare Marutta (the next ruler available to him in his slightly damaged material) with Prajāpati (=the ‘Law-giver’) with a view to avoiding a possible risk.

Prajāni had five sons, of whom Khanitra was chief. Of them Khanitra became king.

7. KHANITRA

He was celebrated for his personal feats of prowess. He was a pacific, truth-speaking hero; he delighted in doing good to all living creatures. He uttered this prayer day and night:

"Let all created things rejoice, let them be affectionate even in solitary places! May there be welfare for all created things, and may they be free from affliction! May created things experience no bodily sickness nor any mental diseases! May all created things cherish friendliness to every living being! May there be bliss for all the twice-born; may they have mutual loving kindness! May all castes have full prosperity, and may all deeds attain perfect accomplishment! May the worlds be propitious to all created things! May your mind always be propitious! Desire ye at all times what is good for your son even as for yourselves! Similarly be ye benevolent in mind to all created things! This is unbounded good for you. Moreover, who sins against whom, that he causes any harm to any one besotted in mind? To him assuredly comes that result, that which accrues to the doer thereof. So thinking, ho! let the people be informed of their duties to all, lest ye wise people shall undergo secular sin. May there ever be bliss on the earth for him, who loves me now; and may even he, who hates me, see good things in this world!"

Like the Mughal emperor Humayun, Khanitra was very kind to his brothers whom he appointed to separate kingdoms; thus he placed Sauri over the east region with Suhotra Ātreya as

2. The Mahābhārata compares Marutta with Vīṣṇu (XIV. 4. 24) and Vāsava (XIV. 5. 14).
3. Mārk, 117. 12-20. No apology is required for quoting this prayer in full as it is an ancient example of what is now-a-days known as the Sārasvatī (lit., ‘progress of all’) ideal.
chaplain, Udāvasu (or Mudāvasu) over the south, with Kuśāvarta Gautama as chaplain, Sunaya over the western region with Pramati Kāśyapa as chaplain, and Mahāratha over the northern with a Vāsishṭha chaplain. Those four kings indeed enjoyed their own kingdoms, and Khānitra was their overlord. King Khānitra was always kind to his four brothers and all his people as to his own sons.

As in the case of Humayun much later, so in the case of Khānitra things did not go peacefully. Śauri’s minister, Viśvavedin, gave shrewd political advice to him, urging him to capture the over-lordship of Khānitra, and overcame his scruples. Then this minister contrived to bring the other brothers and their ministers under the leadership of Śauri. All these combined sent a big force against Khānitra, who however was influential enough to win back the rebel armies and turn them against the conspirators. The conspiring priests met their death, which upset the pious Khānitra and, in remorse for the great slaughter, he renounced the throne, anointed his son Kshupa, and went into vānaprastha with his three wives.¹

8. KSHUPA

Kshupa was the son of Khānitra. He is variably called Kshupa,² Chakshusha,³ and Chākshusha.⁴

On receiving the kingdom he protected his people and delighted them in righteousness like his father. That king was by disposition liberal of gifts and a sacrificer of sacrifices; he was just alike both to foe and friend in the path of the administration of justice. He emulated a more ancient king of the same name⁵ and enriched the Brāhmaṇas.

¹ For details see Märk, chs. 117 and 118.
² Viš, 85. 5. Gar, I. 138. 7. Märk, chs. 118 and 119. Mūh, XIV. 4. 3.
³ Viš, IV. 1. 24.
⁴ Bhāg, IX. 2. 24.
⁵ It must apparently be this Kshupa (Brahmā’s son, Märk, 119. 4) to whom reference is made in the Mahābhārata (XII. 166. 73) where it is said that after the sword of justice was fashioned Maunu gave it to Kshupa for the protection of the people, and Iksvāku got it from Kshupa. In the Mahābhārata one king named Kshupa has been mentioned in two enumerations (XIII. 115. 75; 165. 56) but nowhere has his territory or kingdom been stated. Hence we are unable to determine as to which of the Kshupas is meant in those lokas. Kshupa of Mūh, XIII. 115. 75 was among the kings who did not eat meat during the month of Kārtika; while that of XIII. 165. 56 was among pious persons.
His wife, Pramathā, gave birth to a son named Vīra or Vīmśa who, according to the Purāṇas, succeeded his father on the royal throne.

Between Kshupa and Vīmśa a king Ikshvāku is inserted in the genealogy given in the Mahābhārata (XIV. 4. 3-4). As Ikshvāku flourished much early, this insertion appears to be a mistake which was possibly committed by confusing this Kshupa of the Vaiśāli region with the more ancient king who was Brahmā's son. The story of the sword of justice (Mbh, XII. 166. 73) was apparently responsible for this mistake. The insertion of Ikshvāku here, coupled with a similar insertion in the Rāmāyaṇa, seems to suggest that though Nābhānedishṭa was the original founder of the Vaisalian dynasty, the Ikshvākus (Ikshvakuids) also did not long lag behind and they too were mixed up. This is supported by the fact that one of the clans of the Vajjian Republic was the Aikshvākas. Hence effort was made by the later chroniclers, who knew this fact, to incorporate Ikshvāku in the main genealogical list. Another explanation may be that this Ikshvāku may have belonged to a collateral line.

9. VIMŚA

Vimśa (lit. 'The Twentieth') was the son of Kshupa and is called so in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas generally. Only the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa calls him Vīra.

Our usual source, the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, does not say much about Vīra. It says that kings were brought into subjection by his majesty and valour and that his dear wife was a Vidarbha princess named Nandini. The Vishnu-Purāṇa calls him 'very strong,' and the Mahābhārata an 'ideal Bowman.' But the Mahābhārata regards him as the eldest of the hundred sons of Ikshvāku, who were religious and became all kings. This is wrong as it is due to a confusion.

4. Vish, IV. 1. 25.
5. Mbh, XIV. 4. 5.
10. VIVIMŚA

Vivirimśa (lit., 'The Twenty-Second') was the son of Vīśā. He is variously called Vivirimśa,¹ Vivirimśaka² and Vivirimśati.³

While Vivirimśa was ruling over the kingdom as a king of great vigour, the earth became densely populated with men. It rained on the earth in due season, and the earth abounded with harvests, and the harvests were most fruitful, and the fruits were full of juice, and the juices gave nourishment, yet the nourishment caused no outrageous behaviour; nor did the stores of riches become causes of debauchery among men.

After performing very many sacrifices, after protecting the earth, he met his death in battle, as the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa⁴ informs us, and departed hence to the world of Indra.⁵ Although the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa speaks highly of the reign of Vivirimśa, it says that he died in battle. This may indicate that there was some conflict either with a foreign king or in the royal family itself.

S. C. Sarkar suggests that "this group, beginning with Kshupa and counting twenty-two (vivirimśa) princes (mostly un-named), is clearly a separate family belonging to the same Vaiśāli country, descended from another 'early' Ikshvāku, namely Kshupa, like the one descended from Prāṁśu (as related before), and is inserted by later chroniclers in the break between Vatsa and Karandhama."⁶

According to the Mahābhārata (XIV. 4. 6) Vivirimśa had fifteen sons of whom the eldest was Khanīnetra (ibid., XIV. 4. 7). The Puranic source, however, mentions only Khanīnetra (v. l. Khanīnetra) and no other son. But the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (IX. 2. 25) inserts Rambha between Vivirimśati and Khanīnetra. As no other Purāṇa mentions him, we may dismiss this king. To us it appears that the Bhāgavata has introduced this additional king

5. The Poona edition reads Śakra-lokam; but the Calcutta edition records Śatru-lokam (Mārk, 119. 19, chapter no. given erroneously as 120) which may indicate a conflict and the probable defeat of the king.
because it had omitted Viśāṣa already. This Rambha may have been a younger brother of Kahanīatra, if the Mahābhārata tradition about the fifteen sons of Viśāṣa be correct.

11. KAHANĪETRA

He is called Kahanīatra in two Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata1 and Kahanīatra in three other Purāṇas.2 These terms appear to be interchangeable.

Kahanīatra was great in strength and prowess and also a great sacrificer. The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (IX. 2. 25) calls him religious (‘dhārmika’) which is supported by the details furnished by the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa. ‘After completing ten thousand sacrifices, he gave the earth with its seas away. He it was who sacrificed sixty-seven thousand and sixty-seven hundred and sixty-seven sacrifices with abundance of largesse.3 He gave away all the earth to high-souled Brāhmaṇas. After obtaining unparalleled increase of riches from that most noble giver, Brāhmaṇas accepted no donation from any other king.4

That king being son-less engaged in a hunt with the desire of obtaining flesh for a sacrifice to the pītris in order to obtain a son and was converted to ahiṁsā by the self-immolation of a deer (cf. Buddhist Jātaka parallels). Thereupon the childless Kahanīatra, abandoning animal sacrifice, strove to obtain a son with very arduous austerities on the sin-destroying river Gomati5 and had a son named Balāśva6 (better known as Karandhama). S.C. Sarkar7 interprets that the childless Kahanīatra obtained a son,—evidently an adopted one,—from the region of the Gomati river. As he was issueless, his possessions passed to Karandhama of the Turvāśa dynasty (probably of the Rewa and the Gomati

---

3. Mārk, 120. 2. 5. Here there appears to be an indirect hint at the number seventy-seven (ten thousand plus sixty-seven thousand = ‘seventy-seven’ thousand). The number of rājās at Vaiśāli in the time of the Līchchhavis is stated to be 7707 (i.e., ‘seventy-seven’ hundred and seven).
4. Mārk, 120. 3-4. If the tradition of land-gifts being made to the Brāhmaṇa is correct, there might have developed an agricultural non-priestly Brāhmaṇa community especially in what are now known as Bihar and U. P.
5. Possibly the kingdom of Kahanīatra extended up to the Gomati river.
6. Mārk, 121. 8.
region), by way of his adoption into this Vaiśālika family. He further says that the grafting of Karandhama (also called Bala-
‘Aśva’)
represents the introduction of an Aryan—‘Aila’—element into the midst of the Ikshvāku or Mānya region of Vaiśāli.¹

We possess two different accounts about the end of Khanīnetra. The Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa (121. 9) says that when Balāśva’s
(i.e., Karandhama’s) father died, he stood as king in the supreme sovereignty. The Mahābhārata (XIV. 4. 7-9, esp. 9), on the other
hand, states that Khanīnetra oppressed his brothers, but having conquered the entire kingdom he could not retain it, as the people
were not pleased with him; they dethroned him and installed his son Suvarchas as king, and then they rejoiced. The two accounts
about the end of Khanīnetra may be reconciled if it be supposed that the king did not long survive his deposition.

Sometimes a king named Ativibhūti (Vish, IV. 1. 28) or Vibhūti (Gar, I. 138. 8) is inserted between Khanīnetra and Karandhama. He might have been an unimportant king ruling for a brief period only. But then arises the question of his relationship with his predecessor, Khanīnetra, who had no issue in the beginning.

"With Karandhama and Avikshita we leave the times of the kings who synthesized pacifism and priest-lore, farming and agriculture and knightly chivalry; and we come now to the times of ruthless, martial, conquering and wide-ruling emperors."²

¹ Bracketed portion ours with a view to helping Sarkar by supplying an argument in favour of the theory of the introduction of the Aryan element. The horse is usually regarded as a typical Aryan thing. Names ending in ‘Aśva’ (=horse) begin in the Vaiśāli genealogy with Balāśva-Karandhama.

² We, however, do not accept the ‘Aila=Ārya’ theory of Pargiter and Sarkar.

CHAPTER III

THE EXPANSION AND ASCENDANCY OF VAIŚALIAN MONARCHY

(Karandhama to Rājyavardhana)

12. KARANDHAMA

"With Karandhama begins a fresh powerful Vaiśāleya dynasty, an imperial, wide-ruling one, which left its stamp on the general history of ancient India."

Karandhama was the son (an adopted son in Sarkar’s opinion) of Khaninendra in the opinion of most of our sources (i.e., Vā, Bhāg, Mārk and Mbbh), though of Ativibhūti or Vibhūti according to the Vīsh and Gar respectively.

His name is found written in various ways, viz., Karandhama, Suvarchas and Balāśva. He was also called Subalāśva and Balakāśva. But his most famous name was Karandhama which is fancifully explained at two places. He was so called because from his agitated hands was produced an army which burnt up his foes.

This famous Karandhama must be distinguished from another king of the same name, who was fourth in descent from Yayāti’s son Turvasu. In Pargiter’s opinion Karandhama of Vaiśāli belonged to generation no. 38 and his grandson, Marutta, to generation no. 40; while Karandhama and his son Marutta of the Turvasus belonged to generation nos. 40 and 41 respectively. This has induced S. C. Sarkar to suggest that both were identical and that Karandhama of the Turvasus was adopted

4. Mārk, 121. 8.
5. Mārk, Eng. tr., p. 623, n. 3.
8. A.I.H.T., pp. 146-147.
by the Vaiśāli line. In view of the express statement of the Purāṇas1 that these Karandhamas and Maruttas were different persons, we find it difficult to accept Sarkar's view, though, as the very remote times are concerned, the probability cannot be entirely precluded.

Karandhama carried out a wide conquest and levied tribute; but the defeated princes (Ikshvāku remnants of the Vaiśāli region in Sarkar's opinion) combined to revolt, and besieged his capital (‘pura’). Karandhama,2 however, broke up the siege. He was chosen in svayaṃvara by Virā, the daughter of Prince Vira-चandra3 (one of the chiefs of Vaiśāli, in Sarkar's opinion,4 referred to before).

The pair had a son named Avikshita, who learnt the whole of the Vedas and the Vedāṅgas and the Science of Weapons. This young prince was highly accomplished and was chosen at their svayaṃvaras by seven princesses successively, namely (1) Varā, daughter of Hemadharma; (2) Gaurī, daughter of Sudeva (evidently Sudeva of Kāśi, a contemporary of Avikshita); (3) Subhadrā, daughter of Balin (of Āṅga, Vaṅga, etc., a contemporary of Avikshita and Marutta and their priest, Saṁvarta); (4) Lilāvati, daughter of Vira (and therefore Avikshita's mother’s sister or half-sister); (5) Anibhā, daughter of Vira-bhadra (apparently the same as Vira or Vira-चandra above, and thus another sister or half-sister of Avikshita’s mother); (6) Mānyavati, daughter of Bhīma (apparently ‘Kratha’-Bhīma of Vīdarbha, a contemporary of Avikshita and Marutta); and (7) Kumud-vati, daughter of Dambha (said to be a successor of the Asura Kujrimbha of Mālava, who was a contemporary of Vatsa, a predecessor of Karandhama). S. C. Sarkar opines5 that of these the first, second, fourth and fifth marriages were calculated to strengthen legitimacy6 in Vaiśāli; the third to strengthen

association with the Āṅgirasa priests, who all along controlled the career of Karandhama’s line for six generations after him, and who also controlled Balin’s big kingdom in the east; and the sixth and seventh marriages were to continue the previous Vaiśālika connection with Vidarbha and Mālava. Those princesses who did not choose him at their svayāṁvara, Avikshita forcibly carried off by fighting rival princes. This high-handedness produced a catastrophe, when he seized Vaiśālini, daughter of King ‘Viśāla’ of Vaidiṣa¹ (wrong for Vaideha or Vaiśāli in the opinion of Sarkar).

According to the long story of Avikshita and Vaiśālini (given in Mārk, chs. 122-131) Avikshita refused to rule as king (for reasons proceeding from his own standard of heroism) and, therefore, when Karandhama and Vīrā left for ‘vānaprastha’ in a Bhārgava āśrama² (Mārk, 128. 35), their grandson Marutta had to be anointed the king of Vaiśāli. We shall examine this when we take up the reign of Avikshita.

The various wars and struggles in the times of Karandhama, Avikshita and Marutta given in the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa (chs. 121-131) have been interpreted by Pargiter³ in a different way. He believes that these were really speaking Haihaya raids. By this time the Haihaya conquests touched the kingdoms of Vaiśāli and Videha. The Vaiśāli realm was then under the rule of Karandhama, his son Avikshita and the latter’s son Marutta, three noted kings. It is said that Karandhama was besieged by a confederacy of kings and at length defeated them; that Avikshita had a great conflict with the king of Vidiṣā and others and was captured, but Karandhama and his allies beat them and rescued him; and that Marutta had a contest with the Nāgas. There can be little doubt, says Pargiter, that these enemies were

¹ “There is an obvious error here; as in several other known Epic-Puranic instances, there is a confusion between Vaidiṣa and Vaideha in the texts. Here, too, obviously, Vaideha is meant—or, better still, probably Vaiśāli itself is meant—for if the king is Viśāla and his daughter Vaiśālinī, his city cannot be other than Vaiśāli. At most it can be Vaideha, Vaiśāli itself having been taken possession of by Karandhama at this time. Or, it may have been a new Vaiśāli after the old one fell to Karandhama” (S. C. Sarkar, op. cit., p. 51, n.).

² “This Bhṛigu āśrama may be the same as Bhṛigu-tuṅga, on a mountain on the east bank of the upper Gaṇḍakī in Nepal. But, since Aurva is mentioned in the text here, it should rather be the Bhṛigu āśrama or Aurva āśrama in Ballia district” (S. C. Šarkar, op. cit., p. 52, n. 2).

³ A. I. H. T., p. 268.
the Haihayas, for Vidiśā was in the Haihaya region, and that they were beaten off. There is no indication that the Haihayas conquered the Vaiśāla kings, and Marutta was a famous king and Chakravartin. The Haihaya conquests eastwards must have been stopped by some kingdom, and tradition suggests that it was these Vaiśāla kings who did that. Thus the Haihayas, who had overwhelmed Kānyakubja and Ayodhyā, were now arrested by the Vaiśāla kings.

If this interpretation of Pargiter be accepted, Karandhama deserves great credit for saving Vaiśāli and north India from the devastating raids of the Haihayas.

Karandhama was a famous king of ancient times. He reigned at the beginning of the Tretā age.1 The Mahābhārata mentions a Kārandhama-tīrtha2 as one of the five important tīrthas. This must have been established after king Karandhama of Vaiśāli or a Rishi of that name. One fact in favour of the king is that while he was religious-minded, no Rishi of the name of Karandhama is so far known to us. The Mahābhārata knows Karandhama as a pious king of olden days.3 The religious nature of the king is known also from the Skanda-Purāṇa which speaks of him as a 'rājarshi'.4 In this Purāṇa there is a conversation between Mahākāla Siddha and king Karandhama which extends over two chapters,5 where religious matters have been discussed. His religious temperament is also indicated by his going to the forest with his wife Vīrā after relinquishing kingly office.6 After practising very arduous austerities there for a long time the king quitted his body and was followed by his wife after some time.

Karandhama seems to have enjoyed a long reign.

The Mahābhārata7 depicts him as a bold king who was not afraid of the feudatory princes’ onslaughts. He was ever busy

1. Viś, 85. 7. Or his son (Mbh, XIV. 4. 17).
2. Mbh, I. 216. 3. The other four tīrthas are Āgastya, Saubhadra, Pauloma and Bhrāradvājīya (I. 216. 3-4, with commentary).
3. Mbh, II. 8. 16 (in the palace of Yama) and XIII. 165-53 (enumeration). His territory is not indicated. There were more Karandhamas than one.
4. Skanda-Purāṇa, I. 2. 40. 129.
5. Ibid., I. 2. 40. 41.
7. Mbh, XIV. 4. 10-16; 5. 8-12.
with encompassing the well-being of the people, being devoted to the Brāhmaṇa, speaking the truth, practising purity and controlling his senses and thoughts. His family priest was Aṅgiras.⁰

With Karandhama begins a new age in Vaisalian imperial history; he flourished at the beginning of the Tretā age (which coincides with a new age at Vaiśālī), began the movement for stopping the Haihaya raids, and from his time the influence of the Aṅgirasa priests increased at the court of Vaiśālī. One more significant feature is found when we examine the genealogical table of Vaiśālī. Up to Khanindatra (step no. 35) we find that the number of rulers or generations at Vaiśālī (as known to us) was only eleven;⁵ but between Karandhama (step no. 38) and Sumati (step no. 64) we find very few breaks (which are step nos. 43, 51, 53 and 61): kings representing all the other steps are available. This means that tradition from Karandhama onwards is kept better.

13. AVIKSHITA

He was the son of Karandhama and is called Kārandhama⁶ also for that reason. His name is found written in many ways, viz., Avikshit,⁴ Avikshit,⁶ Āvikshit,⁸ Avikshita,⁷ Avikshita⁸ and the abbreviation of the last Avikshi.⁹

He flourished at the beginning of the Tretā age¹⁰ and should not be confused with another Avikshita¹¹ who was the son of Kuru and father of Parikshit.

The early account of Avikshita has already been given under Karandhama as those events are said to have taken place in the reign of Karandhama. From this Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa account we know the names of his numerous wives and the significance of those marriages.

---

1. Mbh, XIV. 5. 8.
2. See supra.
3. Mbh, XIV. 4. 17; 8. 34.
9. Mārk, 130. 22, 25; 131. 9, 11, 17, 23, 32.
11. Mbh, I. 94. 52.
It is stated in the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa that Avikshita refused to rule and so Karandhama anointed his (Avikshita’s) son, Marutta, on the throne, before taking to the ‘vānaprastha’ āśrama. We are unable to accept this statement in view of the fact that all other evidences (esp. the Mahābhārata) regard Avikshita as a ruling prince.

One important service rendered to Vaisalian monarchy by Avikshita is his contribution to checking the Haihayas raids. The Mārkandeya-Purāṇa states how he was involved in a struggle with the Vaidiśa city (i.e., Vidiśā in Central India) on account of his liking for Vaiśālinī, daughter of king Viśāla of the Vaidiśa city. Pargiter regards this enemy as the Haihayas. The tradition of his initial defeat at the hands of the Vaidiśa king is probably only to show to what extent the Haihayas were powerful.

Avikshita was a famous king of the past. He is known to the authors of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa and the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa as the father of Marutta Āyogava. He is known to the Mahābhārata as well where a short account of this king is given. All the kings are said to be under his control; and alike by virtue of his riches and of prowess, he became their emperor. He was given to sacrifices and performed hundred horse-sacrifices. The powerful and learned Āṅgirasa himself served him as priest.

14. MARUTTA THE GREAT

Marutta is mentioned in six Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata in the Vaisalian genealogical lists. Everywhere (except the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa whose text is corrupt) he is known as the son of Avikshita. The Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa calls him the son of Prāṁśu who

1. Mārk, ch. 128.
2. The Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa (III. 61) omits rulers from Prajāni to Avikshita. Hence the omission of Avikshita by this Purāṇa may not have any special significance.
5. Mbh, I. 1. 298.
flourished long ago. As a matter of fact, this Purāṇa has omitted kings from Prajāni (Prāṁśu’s successor) to Avikshita (Marutta’s predecessor) and hence has done the inevitable thing for concealing its ignorance or omission. Marutta as the son of Avikshita is known to the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa as well. Three Purāṇas mention him while tracing the lineage of Ilavilā, daughter of Trinābindu of Vaiśālī.

Marutta is a celebrated king of ancient times. He is known not only to the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata but to the Brāhmaṇas as well, while his priest Saṁvarta is known to the Rig-Veda. He is compared with Vishṇu, Vāsava and Prajāpati. The Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata call him a Chakravartin, i.e., a sovereign who conquered surrounding kingdoms or brought them under his authority, and established a paramount position over more or less extensive regions around his own kingdom. According to the Mahābhārata he is one of the sixteen great kings of ancient India. Another list in the Mahābhārata speaks of twenty-four kings and Marutta is included there. He is among the five remarkable emperors (saṁrāja) of yore, who gained the title Saṁrāja. There he is noted for his prosperity. The list which describes the descent of the sword of justice

2. Śat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 6.
3. Bṛ. III. 8. 35. Vā, 70. 39. Lg. I. 63-56. Vā calls him Mānasa, while in Lg he is known as Mānava.
4. RV, VIII. 54. 2 (Ved. Ind., II, p. 414).
5. Mbh, XIV. 4: 24: 5. 14 and Bṛ. III. 61. 4. respectively.
Mārk, 129. 3. Mbh, XIV. 4. 23.
7. The ideal characteristics of a chakravartin are explained in Vā, 57. 68-80 and Bṛ. II. 29. 74-88; cf. Mat, 142. 63-73. Term explained in reference to Marutta, Mārk, 129. 6; 131. 49.
8. The list of sixteen celebrated monarchs and their doings is called the Suhālasā-rājasa and is given twice in the Mahābhārata, viz., VII. 55-70 (Marutta in VII. 55-70) and XII. 29. 18-144 (Marutta in XII. 29. 18-24). It may not be without significance that the name of Marutta appears first in both the lists.
10. Mbh. II. 15. 15-16 (Marutta in II. 15. 16).
11. He who conquers the whole of Bhārata-varsha is celebrated as saṁrāja: Vā, 45. 86. Bhārata-varsha is explained in all aspects in Vā, 45. 72-85.
12. Mbh. XII. 166. 68-81 (Marutta in XII. 166. 77). This list, like other lists, does not aim at chronological order; yet it shows who were remembered as righteous rulers. Pargiter (A. I. H. T., p. 42) regards it as a Brahmanical compilation.
includes Marutta who received the sword from Muchukunda and passed it over to Raivata. This shows that he had reputation for justice. Marutta is included in many other enumerations of pious or generous kings in the *Mahābhārata* which shows him to be a very celebrated monarch. In some lists Marutta’s mere name is mentioned and nothing is said of his father or his famous Āṅgirasa priest, Saṁvarta. But there is no doubt that at all these places only Marutta Āvikshita is intended, because among the kings bearing that name he was the most famous—it is he who is regarded as one of the sixteen great kings of ancient India. In one of the lists the name Marutta is mentioned twice, evidently with a view to accommodating another Marutta as well (presumably of the dynasty of Turvasu). But there, too, while one Marutta is mentioned merely by name (I. 10), the other is called ‘the powerful king of the earth Marutta’ (I. 16).

Marutta is very famous for his sacrifices. One such sacrifice was performed against the wishes of Indra who had employed Bṛhaspati, son of Āṅgiras, as his priest and deprived him (Marutta) of his family priest’s services. Marutta then chose Saṁvarta and by his aid performed magnificent sacrifices. Indra was also later pleased and the sacrificial assembly was attended by gods. Many gifts were made to the Brāhmaṇaś. Golden vessels were used, it is said. These things are echoed in

1. *Mbh*, II. 8. 7-28 (Marutta in II. 8. 10, 16—among the kings in the palace of Yama); III. 94. 17-22 (Marutta in III. 94. 21—a list of meritorious kings); XII. 234. 16-36 (Marutta in XII. 234. 28—a list of kings who gained great merit by liberality or devotion to Brāhmaṇaś); XIII. 137. 3-27 (Marutta in XIII. 137. 16—a list of kings who gained great merit by liberality or devotion to Brāhmaṇaś); XIII. 165. 48-59 (Marutta in XIII. 165. 52—a list of pious kings).

2. *Mbh*, I. 1. 227; II. 8. 10, 16; II. 15. 16; III. 94. 21; XII. 166. 77; XIII. 165. 52.


4. In some other lists of kings in the *Mahābhārata* Marutta is not mentioned at all, e.g., II. 53. 21-23; IV. 56. 9-10; VI. 9. 5-9; XII. 8. 33-34; XIII. 76. 25-27; XIII. 115. 68-75. Of these the non-inclusion of this great conqueror and sacrificer among the kings who did not take meat in the month of Kārtika (*Mbh*, XIII. 115. 68-75) appears to be rather significant. For an unidentified Marutta see *Mbh*, II. 7. 17 (in the palace of Indra along with Rishiś); also XII. 49. 83. The first appears to be a Rishiś.

5. *Mbh*, VII. 55. 37-50; XII. 29. 18-24; XIV. 3-10 (a most detailed account). *Bṛg*, III. 61. 4-7.

6. *Mbh*, XIV. 4. 22; 5. 8; 6. 5, 7, 14; 7. 3.

the Epic-Puranic literature. Marutta gave his daughter to Saṁvarta. Yudhishṭhira who flourished much later was highly benefited by Marutta’s sacrifices as he procured gold from the Himālayas which had been left there by Marutta and employed it for his own purpose.

The Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa says Saṁvarta inaugurated Marutta Āvikshita Kāmapriśi (‘descendant of Kāmapra’) with the ‘Aindra Mahābhisheka’ ceremony, i.e., the great inauguration ceremony of Indra (VIII. 4. 21). In his effort to extract history out of legend S. C. Sarkar interprets ‘Indra’ as “a rival emperor (an ‘Indra’)”. After Marutta became superior to the previous emperor in power, he celebrated the occasion by the ‘Aindra Mahābhisheka’ ceremony (coronation as the ‘Indra’ of the time), as he had now become the new ‘Indra’.

It was probably this ‘Aindra Mahābhisheka’ coronation sacrifice of Marutta in the Vaiśāli region which was sought to be interrupted by a ‘Rāvaṇa’ (apparently in vain). This same Rāvaṇa may have subdued the Nāga capital of Bhogavati, for the Nāgas were under the protection of Marutta as we know from the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa.

The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 6) shows Marutta Āvikshita as a performer of the horse-sacrifice and speaks highly of his prestige saying that the Maruts became his guardsmen, Agni his chamberlain, and the Viśve-Devas his counsellors.

Among the places of his sacrifices may be mentioned

1. Mbh, VII. 55. 43-44; XII. 29. 22-23; Mārk, 129. 15-18; Bhāg, IX. 2. 27-28. Vish, IV. 1. 32-33. Also Saṭ. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 6 and Śatkhāyana-Śravuta-Śūtra, XVI. 9. 15.

2. Mbh, XII. 234. 28; XIII. 137. 16.

3. For the Muṇjavat mountain situated on the ridge of the Himālayas (Mbh, XIV. 8. 1) from where the gold was procured, see Pargiter, Mārk, Eng. trans., p. 655, n. 1.

4. Mbh, XIV. 3. 20-21; 63. 2; 9; 89. 21.


7. Rām, VII. 18. It is called here ‘Māheśvara Śattra’ (VII. 18. 16). Ṣvāra=Indra.

8. As is well-known, ‘Rāvaṇa’ is not a name but a title, and many South Indian or Rākṣas princes bore this title (Tamil Iṟēvaṉ or Iṟaiṉ =god, king, sovereign, lord, J. R. A. S., 1914, p. 285). Stories of several Rāvaṇas have, however, been amalgamated in the Rāmāyaṇa.

9. Rām, VII. 23. 5. For Bhogavati, the city of the Nāgas in Pāṭalag, see Sörens, Index, p. 147.
Uṣīrabīja at the Lake Jāmbūnada in the north, probably in remote Vāhlīka, Plakshāvataraṇā (Yamunātīrtha) on the Yamunā near Kurukshetra and the north of Himavat near Meru on the golden base of the mountain where the Brāhmaṇas left much gold. Probably it is this Marutta of the Gaṇḍaki Valley who is mentioned in the Skanda-Purāṇa as having invited Jaya and Vijaya to his sacrifice (yajñakarmāṇi) and given them much wealth. Due to curses these two, i.e., Jaya and Vijaya, were turned into an elephant and a crocodile respectively living on the bank of the Gaṇḍaki river—a location which favours the identification with this generous and sacrificing Marutta of the Vaiśāli region.

Marutta, besides being a sacrificer, was a conqueror as well. The Mārkandeya-Purāṇa is full of praise for his achievements. It gives details of his victory over the Nāgas. Pargiter regards the Nāga attacks as the Haihaya raids. Thus Marutta finally checked the Haihayas and saved Northern India from their attacks and the consequent devastations.

Marutta married seven wives. They were:—(1) Prabhāvatī, daughter of ‘Vidarbhā’ or the king of Vidarbha; (2) Sauvīrī, daughter of ‘Suvīrā’ or the king of Sauvīrā; (3) Sukesī, daughter of Ketuvīrāya Māgadhā (i.e., of Ketuvīrāya of the Eastern Āna dynasty of Aṅga, Vaṅga, etc., of which kingdom Magadhā with Girivraja was then an integral part); (4) Kekāyī (elder) daughter of the Madra (or Kekāya) king Sindhu-vīrā; (5) Sairindhri, (another younger) daughter of the Kekāya king; (6) Vapushmatī, daughter of the (Ānava) king of Sindhu; and (7) Suśobhanā, daughter of ‘Chedirāja’ or the Chedi king (Kaiśika or more probably Chidi). These matrimonial alliances must have strengthened his position immensely. His father

1. Mbh, V. 111. 22-23 (with commentary).
2. Mbh, III. 129. 16-17.
4. Skanda-Purāṇa, II. 4. 28. 6-8.
5. Ibid., II. 4. 28. 18.
6. Mārk. chs. 129 (beginning), 131 (end).
8. See supra.
9. These Nāgas might be of Rājagriha or Assam or some other region as well. But at the time of which we are speaking, the Haihayas were very powerful. Hence Pargiter’s conjecture.
10. Mārk. ch. 131.
Avikshita too had married princesses from the houses of Vidarbha and Anāga. By looking into the genealogical chart of Pargiter we may conjecture that the father-in-law nos. 1, 3 and 7 of Marutta were Kunti (successor of Bhīma, father-in-law of Avikshita), Anāga (successor of Balin, father-in-law of Avikshita) and Chidi (by equating ‘Chedirāja’ with Chidi) respectively.

Marutta is said to have had eighteen sons of whom the eldest was Narishyanta who succeeded him. He seems to have lived to the age of eighty-five years (interpreting ‘85000 years’ in that way), and in old age he retired to ‘vānaprastha’ after anointing Narishyanta as his successor. His daughter had been given to Saṁvarta in marriage. S. C. Sarkar supposes two other daughters for Marutta, viz., Iinanā, mother of Dushyanta who was adopted into the royal family, and Mamata, wife of Saṁvarta’s brother Utathya and of Bhīshamapati whose (Mamata’s) son Bharadvāja’s son (or grandson) Vitatha (Vidathin) was adopted as Bharata’s successor.

The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 6) calls Marutta Āvikshita as an Āyogava king. There does not appear to be any doubt that the kings of the Vaisālī region were not considered of a very high lineage due to Nābhāga’s marriage with a Vaisya girl. The three Vaisya hymn-makers mentioned in the Brahmaṇa-Puruṣa were probably of the Vaisālī region. But, it appears, later on the kings of the Vaisālī region improved their position presumably due to matrimonial alliances and sacrificial activities. Hence it does not look reasonable to interpret Āyogava in a sense in which the Manu-Smriti (X. 12) interprets it, i.e., a product of a Vaisya girl and a Śūdra male. Later on, geographical and tribal names, e.g., Vaideha, Māgadha and Sūta were given derogatory meanings which cannot be accepted at their

1. In the case of Ketuvirya Māgadha I have accepted the suggestion of S. C. Sarkar who regards him as king of Anāga. It may be pointed out that Vasu Chaidya and Bhīshadra of Magadha belonged to step nos. 78 and 79 respectively while Marutta the Great belonged to step no. 40.
2. A. I. H. T., pp. 146-147.
3. Märk, 131. 48; 132. 3.
5. Mbh, XIII. 137. 16.
8. Märk, 132. 4 calls Marutta ‘a lordly Kshatriya’ (Maruttaḥ Kshatriyasyaśabhaḥ). Also see Märk, 136. 15 (read with 133. 38).
face. The term Ayogava\(^1\) literally means ‘belonging to the stock of Ayogu’. This name (or title) seems to have been forgotten later on. But it appears it has something to do with the use of iron (etymologically, ayasa gantā) in that remote age.

Marutta was a great figure. His greatness is generally emphasised, both in war and in righteous government,\(^2\) and it is remembered that he “regarded his subjects as his children”\(^3\) (like Aśoka Maurya more than a thousand years later). He was a great conqueror as well as a great sacrificer; enormously opulent and exploiting Himalayan gold-bearing regions, he was unstinted in his gifts; in his reign ‘chaityas’ were raised all over the land\(^4\) (again, as in the days of Aśoka).\(^5\)

Pargiter rightly regards Marutta as ‘the greatest king’\(^6\) of ‘Dishta’s line’ (i.e., the dynasty of Nābhānēdīṣṭha).

15. NARISHYANTA

Narishyanta was the eldest of the eighteen sons of Marutta.\(^7\) Some Purāṇas\(^8\) do not mention his brothers at all. S. C. Sarkar

5. There were two Karandhamas, one in the Vaiśālī dynasty and the other in Turvasu’s lineage. (Distinguished in Vi, 98, 2; Bṛ, III, 74, 2; Br, 13, 143 and Hs, 32, 118.) The former had a son Avikshita and grandson, the famous Marutta; the latter had a son Marutta. They are sometimes confused, e.g., Br, 13, 144-145; Hs, 32, 119-120 and Mbh, XII, 234, 28 (XIII, 137, 16 is correct). This Marutta, son of Karandham, was fifth in descent from Yayāti’s son Turvasu (Hs, 32, 116-121; Viṣṭ, IV, 16, 3). There was, another Marutta, fifth in descent from Śālabindu (Maṭ, 44, 24; Vi, 94, 24; Bṛ, III, 70, 25; Br, 15, 7; Lg, I, 68, 29; Hs, 36, 4-7; and probably Mbh, XII, 29, 88), who had been vanquished by Māndhārī. For an unidentified Marutta, see Bṛ, III, 68, 1-6; Vi, 92, 1-6; Mbh, XII, 49, 83. In order to find a way out of this situation, S. C. Sarkar takes recourse to an ingenious suggestion (op. cit., p. 53): “Marutta’s name occurs in several dynastic lists in about the same time (as evident from synchronisms), apart from the Turvaśa line to which he primarily belongs,—namely, the Vaiśālī, the Paurava, the Videha, and the Yādava (Vidaṁbha) king-lists. This position was apparently due to the overlordship of Marutta over these ruling families, and temporary or permanent ‘grafting’ by adoption or conquest or royal marriage, to legitimise the overlordship’. Names of kings with step nos. within brackets are furnished from Pargiter’s synchronistic table:—Marutta of the Turvasu line (41), Marutta of Vaiśālī (40), Maru of Videha (38) and Marutta of the Yādava line (Vidaṁbha) (30).
7. Mārk, 131, 48; 132, 3.
8. Viṣṭ, IV, 1, 34; Vi, 85, 12; 70, 30 (calling him Charishyanta).
Gar, I, 138, 9; Bṛ, III, 61, 7; 8, 35, 48, I, 63, 56.

---

\(^1\) Ayogava
\(^2\) righteousness
\(^3\) regarded his subjects as his children
\(^4\) chaityas were raised
\(^5\) again, as in the days of Aśoka
\(^6\) greatest king
\(^7\) eldest of the eighteen sons
\(^8\) Purāṇas
believes\(^1\) that Narishyanta and his son Dama of the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa are the same as the famous Dushyanta and Bharata-
‘Damana’ respectively and that they were adopted by the house of Vaiśāli.

Narishyanta performed a sacrifice at which he gave so much wealth to the Brāhmaṇas that they required no more later on. Consequently when he began a sacrifice again, he got no Brāhmaṇas then to conduct it after the sacrifice had been begun. After considerable difficulty he could appoint a few sacrificial priests at his sacrifice.\(^2\) From this it appears that he was a great sacrificer and donor.

His wife was Indrasenā, a princess descended from Babhrū. She gave birth to a son named Dama. He learnt different branches of learning from Vṛishaparvan, Daitya Dundubhi of Tapovana, Śakti and Ārṣṭīsena. Sumanā, daughter of Chāru-
karmaṇ (v. l. Chāru-dharmak), king of Daśārṇa, chose him at a svayaṁvara. He was opposed by two princes, viz., Mahā-
nāda (v. l. Mahānanda) (the Madra king’s son) and Vapushmat (the son of Saṅkarandana, king of Vidarbha). He proved too strong for them and returned with his bride. After a long time, when Sumanā conceived a child, king Narishyanta anointed Dama to the kingdom and departed to the forest with his wife Indrasenā.

Narishyanta had a tragic end. He was killed in the forest by Vapushmat, son of Saṅkarandana and king of the southern region, who had been defeated by Dama at the svayaṁvara of Sumanā.

16. DAMA

He is generally known as Dama.\(^3\) Only one source calls him Tama.\(^4\)

The one event known of his reign is the revenge he took of his aged father’s murder by Vapushmat, king of the southern country. Having learnt of the sad event he invaded the capital

---

of Vapushmat. (A full description is given of this Deccan expedition.) There was a tumultuous battle. The enemy, with all his relations, was slain. Then he offered the water-oblitation to his dear father with the very blood of Vapushmat and also offered pinga to him with his flesh, and returned to his city.

With this account closes the narrative of the solar kings in the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa.

An ancient king, Damana by name, is available in the Mahābhārata in an enumeration. He may or may not be this Dama.

17. RĀJYAVARDHANA

He is called Rājyavardhana,2 Rājyavardhanaka,3 Rājavardhana4 and Rāshṭravardhana.5

His queen was Mānini, daughter of Vidūratha,6 the king of Dakshiṇāpatha (evidently the successor of Vapushmat of the episode referred to above,—who had no other way but to make peace with Dama by submission and a subsequent matrimonial alliance). A tender story is given about Rājyavardhana’s first grey hairs and Mānini’s grief at that discovery. The pair repaired to the Guru-Viśāla forest in the hills of Kāmarūpa and began to propitiate the sun-god at his temple there. Consequently he obtained the boon of equal longevity and good and happy life for all concerned.7 He was a philosopher-king and his rule was an ideal and pacific one.

Rājyavardhana is the last king of the line of Dishta of whom the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa gives any detail. Then we are faced with a great difficulty which is almost insurmountable. He had sons and grandsons8 and his dynasty continued; but we do not possess any details about it.

3. Bṛ, III. 8. 35.
6. This is another Vidūratha, of Kuṇḍina in Vidarbha or Berar, not of the Nirvindhyā region in Mālava.
7. Mārk, chs. 109-110. The story has been narrated in connection with sun-worship.
8. Mārk, 110. 34.
CHAPTER IV

A PERIOD OF SHADOWY KINGS

(Sudhrīti to Budha)

18. SUDHRĪTI

Due to lack of details the successors of Rājyavardhana appear to be shadowy figures, except only three, viz., Trīṇabindu, Viśāla and Sumati, about whom a few things are incidentally known. We shall, however, notice all the known kings below.

Rājyavardhana was succeeded by Sudhrīti according to the most of our Puranic sources. But according to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa¹ there were also Suvṛiddhi and Kevala who ruled between Rājyavardhana and Sudhrīti. We suggest that here the Purāṇa has made a mistake, because Suvṛiddhi may be the same as Sudhrīti who came later and soon we come across another Kevala too. Thus there appears to be a confusion in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa genealogy of Viśāla.

Sudhrīti² was the son of Rājyavardhana. His mother’s probable name appears to be Māninī, who was the daughter of Vidūratha (king of the South) and the queen of Rājyavardhana.³ Sudhrīti must have had many brothers, because Rājyavardhana is said to have had many sons and grandsons.⁴ He might have proved to be a source of strength to the kingdom during the period of his father’s penances for securing the welfare of his subjects.

19. NARA

Nara (Saudhrīteya)⁵ was the son of Sudhrīti.⁶ A variant reading of his name given only in one source (in a foot-note)

Viś, IV. 1. 39. Vā, 85. 13 (Sudhrītin).
3. Mārk, 10g. 10.
4. Mārk, 110. 34.
5. Bhāg, IX. 2. 29.
Bhāg, IX. 2. 29. Bṛ, III. 61. 9; 8. 35.
is Manas. If the tradition recorded in the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa is correct, he might have been able to see his grand-father, Rājya-
vardhana. 

Between Nara and his successor Kevala the Vīshnū-Purāṇa (IV. 1. 41) inserts a king Chandra by name. But we shall have occasion to meet Chandra (or Suchandra) much later in this dynasty. So this insertion, unsupported by any other Purāṇa, may not be accepted by us.

20. KEVALA

Kevala was the son of Nara according to most of our sources. Only the Vīshnū-Purāṇa calls him the son of Chandra.

21. BANDHUMAT

He was the son of Kevala. Another variant reading of his name available is Dhundhumat.

22. VEGAVAT

He was the son of Bandhumat. If king Viṣāla of Vaiśālī, who flourished in the Tretā age and offered pīṇḍa to his forefathers at Gayā, is identified with the famous founder of Vaiśālī City, Vegavat, being his great grand-
father, is represented as the killer of many rishis. His (another) name is said to be Kṛishṇa, i.e., Black. Due to his sins he had to remain in hell for some time till he was released on account of the pīṇḍa of Viṣāla.

23. BUDHA

The name is given variously as Budha or Bandhu.

2. Mārk, 110. 34.
4. Viś, IV. 1. 41.
8. The story of Viṣāla and his forefathers is given in Nārada, II. 44. 26-41; Varāha, 7. 13-26; Vā, 111. 7-15; Gar, 84. 37-43; Ag, 115. 54-59.
If king Viśāla of Vaiśāli, who flourished in the Tretā age and offered piśṭa to his forefathers at Gayā, is identified with the famous founder of Vaiśāli City, Budha, being his grand-father, is represented as cruel, a killer of the Brāhmaṇas and a sinner. His (another) name is said to be Rakta (v. l. Pīta in Varāha, 7. 17, meaning the Yellow), i.e., Red. Due to his sins, he had to remain in hell for some time till he was released on account of the piśṭa of Viśāla.¹

The unpopular acts of Vegavat and Budha must have accelerated the decline of the monarchy which had already set in. Need was felt of a vigorous ruler who might rise equal to the occasion.

¹ For references see supra.
CHAPTER V

THE RESURGENCE OF VAISALIAN MONARCHY

(Tṛīṇabindu)

24. TṛīṇABINDU

It was Tṛīṇabindu who saved Vaisalian monarchy from total collapse and gave it a new lease of life for eleven generations.

Tṛīṇabindu is said to be the son of Budha in the Puranic accounts.¹ But this may not mean much. In the Rāmāyaṇa² the father and mother of Viśāla, who are Tṛīṇabindu and Alambushā respectively according to the Purāṇas, are said to be Ikshvāku and Alambushā. This presents a difficulty because Ikshvāku, who was one of the sons of Manu Vaivasvata, flourished much early (step no. 2) as king of Ayodhyā according to the Rāmāyaṇa itself,³ and not just before king Viśāla, the founder of Vaiśālī City (step no. 53 in Pargiter). Thus this reference may mean one or more of the following things:

(1) That as Viśāla, the founder of Vaiśālī City, is shown as the son of Ikshvāku, a son of Manu Vaivasvata, it may be presumed (or, the tradition asks us to presume) that the city of Vaiśālī was founded much early. Ikshvāku belongs to step no. 2 in Pargiter's list. So Viśāla would belong to step no. 3. And, in reality, step no. 3 represents Nābhāga in Vaisalian history, who had become a Vaiśya. So the phonetic similarity between Vaiśya (Viś) and Vaiśālī may not be accidental.⁴

(2) That probably the whole thing has been confused, the list was begun with Ikshvāku, several intervening names were omitted and Ikshvāku was given a wrong wife, Alambushā.

(3) That this was Ikshvāku II (different from Manu Vaivasvata's son) who married Alambusā (or Alambushā).

². Rām, I. 47. 11 (Ikshvāku), 12 (Alambushā).
³. Rām, I. 70. 21; II. 110. 6-7.
⁴. Cf. the suggestions of Hewitt (J. R. A. S., 1889, p. 262) and V. Rangacharya (Vedic India, Part I, p. 426) regarding the connection between Vaiśya and Vaiśālī.
(4) That the father of Viśāla (and, for that reason, the
dynasty of Viśālī) had Ikshvāku blood in him.\(^1\) This is sup-
ported by the fact that one of the clans of the Vajjian Republic,
which flourished much later, was called the Aikśhvāka.

(5) That Ikshvāku was an alternative name for Trīṇa-
bindu\(^2\) because of (a) the genealogical position of the former as
the father of Viśāla; (b) Ikshvāku’s being the husband of Alām-
bushā, who was really the wife of Trīṇabindu; and (c) the inter-
changeable character of the terms Ikshvāku and Trīṇabindu in
the Epic-Puranic sources where the glories of the Vaisalian rulers
are sung. The Rāmāyaṇa\(^3\) says that “by the favour (prāśāda)
of Ikshvāku all the Vaisālīka kings were long-lived, great-souled,
valorous and highly virtuous”; while the Purāṇas\(^4\) state, almost in
identical terms, that “by the favour (prāśāda)\(^5\) of Trīṇabindu all
the Vaisālīka\(^6\) kings were long-lived, great-souled, valorous and
very virtuous.” The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa\(^7\) says that “these Vaiśāla
kings maintained the reputation of Trīṇabindu”. Thus, read-
ing in between the lines we feel that this Ikshvāku of the Rāmā-
yaṇa is either no other than Trīṇabindu himself or this is the name
of the stock.

S. C. Sarkar\(^8\) suggests that Trīṇabindu was “a local prince
who rose to eminence.” From the emphasis attached to him he
may be regarded as the founder of a sub-line in Vaisalian
monarchy.

The Purāṇas\(^9\) say that Trīṇabindu flourished at the third
‘mouth’ of the Tretā age. According to Pargiter,\(^10\) the Tretā
age lasted from step nos. 41 to 65. In the case of Vaiśālī it has to

---

1. Rangacharya (Vedic India, I, p. 426) infers that the Vaiśālī line
was a branch of the Ikshvākus.
2. The Rām (VII. 2) knows Rājarshi Trīṇabindu, his āśrama (called
Trīṇabindvāśrama), his un-named daughter and her husband, Pulastya. The
mention of Pulastya leaves no doubt that this Trīṇabindu was of Vaiśālī. Quite
naturally enough, his āśrama was in the Himalayan area (Rām, VII. 2.7).
3. Rām, I. 47. 18.
5. V. l. prabhāsa (Bṛ), lit. influence.
6. V. l. Vaiśālaka (Bṛ).
7. Bhāg, IX. 2. 36.
9. Bṛ, III. 61. 11; 8. 37. Vā, 70. 31; 85. 15. Lg, I. 63. 57.
10. A. I. H. T., p. 197.
be slightly modified from nos. 41-65 to nos. 38-65 as Karandhama (step. no. 38) is specifically stated\(^2\) to have flourished at the beginning of the Tretā age.\(^2\) If we divide the Tretā age into four equal parts, they may be as follows:—

1. Nos. 38-44 (Karandhama to Rājyavardhana=6 kings). It is significant that from Karandhama onwards the line is almost continuous.\(^3\) The Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa stops with Rāśṭravardhana (i.e., Rājyavardhana), which may not be entirely devoid of significance. Probably this Purāṇa decided to give details only up to the first quarter of the Tretā age.

2. Nos. 45-51 (Sudhrīti to Budha\(^4\)=6 kings). Mere names are available for this quarter. We possess no details at all. Probably this was a period of rapid decline.

3. Nos. 52-58 (Trīṇabindu to Śrīṇījaya=6 kings). Trīṇabindu is said to have flourished in the third ‘mouth’ of the Tretā age. From our scheme, indicated here, it appears that he flourished at the beginning of the third quarter of it\(^5\) (just as Karandhama also flourished at the beginning of the Tretā age). He is a remarkable figure.

4. Nos. 59-65 (Saḥadeva to Sumati\(^6\)=5 kings). This Saḥadeva, son of Śrīṇījaya, is mentioned at some other places too (see infra). Hence he is worthy of heading this list of kings of the fourth quarter. Sumati was the last known king of Vaiśāli. He was a contemporary of Daśaratha of Ayodhyā and his son Rāma, with whom the Tretā age closes.

While some Purāṇas call Trīṇabindu a mahipati\(^7\) (king), others know him as a Rājarshi.\(^8\) The Rāmāyaṇa\(^9\), too, calls him

---

1. Vyā., 85. 7.
2. Strengthened by the statement in the Mahābhārata (XIV. 4. 17) that his son flourished at the beginning of the Tretā age.
3. From Nābhānedishṭha to the accession of Karandhama Pargiter’s table shows step nos. 2 to 37. But we have only eleven names for these 36 steps. Thus either the kings were long-lived or many names were omitted by Puranic chroniclers. From Karandhama onwards we possess names almost regularly.
4. Budha belonged to step no. 50. His known successor, Trīṇabindu, belonged to step no. 52.
5. Pargiter agrees that ‘the beginning of the third quarter’ of the Tretā age is meant (A. I. H. T., p. 178). But contrast S. C. Sarkar, op. cit., p. 62 who interprets it as ‘the last of the three different ‘commencements’ of that epoch as computed by different chronologists.’
6. Sumati belonged to step no. 64. No names after him are available at all.
a Rājarshi and shows him as doing penance in the āśrama (known after him as Trिनabindvāśrama) in the great mountainous tract of Meru (Himālayas), thus trying to justify the epithet and giving a clue to his previous history of being a rājā. The territory over which he ruled is not indicated. He is probably identical with Sita, i.e., White, who is represented as the father of king Viśāla of Vaiśālī in the Purāṇas where the glory of Gayā is sung.

The name of the queen of this ruler was Alambushā (v. l. Alambusā, Gar and Vish). She is said to be a good apsaras. Pargiter thinks that the queen of Trिनabindu of the Vaiśāla dynasty was so named after a mythological person and that she was not an apsaras in reality. The Bhāgavata epithet devi seems to support this hypothesis of Pargiter. In S. C. Sarkar’s opinion apsaras were dancing girls (or devadāsīs) attached to monasteries for temple service or virgins assigned to the vanguard of processions in ceremonies or car-festivals, either moving in front of the chariots or attending the gods on the ‘apsas’ (=front part) of cars.

Trिनabindu and Alambushā had four children, vīc., a daughter Ita, and three sons, Viśāla, Śunyabandhu and Dhumraketu. Only the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (IX. 2. 31, 33) mentions all of them saying definitely that Alambushā gave birth to these sons and the daughter. Other Purāṇas generally mention Itā and Viśāla. Viśāla as the son of Alambushā and an unnamed

1. One Trिनabindu is known to the Skanda-Purāṇa (II. 4. 28-2). His daughter, Devahūti, had been married to Kardama. He, who appears to be a rishi, is different from our Vaiśalian rājarshi. Also see ibid., VII. 1. 138.

2. The story of Viśāla and his forefathers is given in Nāradīya, II. 44. 26-41; Varāha, 7. 13-26; Va, 111. 7-15; Gar, 84. 37-43; Ag, 115. 54-59. See infra also.


6. Alambushā is the name of a famous apsaras (Mbh, I. 65. 49; 123. 61; IV. 9. 16; IX. 51. 7-13; XIII. 19. 44; 165. 15). The sameness of name no doubt suggested that Trिनabindu’s queen was an apsaras (A.I.H.T., p. 136).


9. Va, 85. 16; also 70. 31 (dtr. only). Br, III. 61. 11-12; also III. 8. 37 (dtr. only). Vish, IV. 1. 47, 49. Gar, I. 138. 11-12.
daughter of Rājarshi Trinābindu (married to Pulastya later) are known to the Rāmāyana as well. Two Purāṇas mention Trinābindu’s daughter Ilavilā only and are apparently not interested in his son or sons. The Padma-Purāṇa (VI. 269. 15) mentions Pulastya (Ilavilā’s husband) and his son Viśravas, but not Ilavilā, Viśāla and their parents. Trinābindu does not appear to be known to the Mahābhārata.

We do not know anything about Śūnyabandhu and Dhūmraketu. About Viśāla, who founded Vaiśālī or Viśālā City after his name, we shall speak later. At present we would like to collect known facts about Trinābindu’s daughter Ilavilā, who appears to be a remarkable lady for several reasons, as we shall presently see.

Many variant readings of the name of Ilavilā are available in the Purāṇas, viz., Ilavilā, Ailavilā, Iḍavilā, Iḍivilā and Draviḍā. The Rāmāyana and the Padma-Purāṇa do not mention her by name, though the former names her father, husband and son and the latter her husband and son. One Purāṇa calls her a Viprā (i.e., a lady of the Vipra class). She was born of Alambushā and was peerless in beauty and well-read. She lived with her father Rājarshi Trinābindu at an āśrama known as Trinābindvāśrama apparently founded by himself in the (Himālaya) mountains where the education of this princess of Vaiśālī took place.

Her marriage with Pulastya (or ‘a theology teacher of

1. Rām, I. 47. 12 and VII. 2 respectively.
3. A king, however, bearing the name Trinaka is mentioned by the Mahābhārata (II. 8. 17) without saying anything about his territory or date. He may or may not be our Trinābindu. A rishi Trinābindu is known to this work (see Sørensen for references).
7. Vā, 70. 31.
8. Vā, 85. 16.
10. Pad, VI. 269. 15.
13. Vā, 70. 31. Lg, I. 63. 58.
Pulastya order⁴ as S. C. Sarkar¹ prefers to all him) is given in the Rāmāyaṇa.² It so happened that Brahmarshi Pulastya, son of Prajāpati, went to the Tṛṇabindicāstra for discourses on the sacred law and ultimately settled down there, engaged in studies. Feeling disturbed by the presence of sportive yet irreproachable maidens, he cursed them that whosoever would visit him would become pregnant. Tṛṇabindu’s daughter,³ ignorant of this curse, visited him and became pregnant.⁴ When she narrated this to her father, he took her to Pulastya and requested him to accept her as his wife. The Brahmarshi agreed and Tṛṇabindu’s daughter pleased him by her conduct and character. She was further educated by her scholar husband, whose name is generally given as Pulastya in the Puranic sources⁵ also.

The marriage between the princess Ilavilā and Pulastya is highly significant, as it connects the royal line of Vaiśālī with the Paulastyas (Rākshasas) of the South. It produced results on the history of Laṅkā and also on that of Ayodhya. This marriage between a Kshatriya princess and a Brāhmaṇa rishi further shows that the kings of Vaiśālī had a liberal outlook on such issues. The story of the curse of Pulastya as given in the Rāmāyaṇa rather takes away much from their unsound attitude for which they had been famous since the time of Nābhaṅga.

The product of this union between Ilavilā and Pulastya was Viśravas.⁶ He was so called because his mother used to listen to and learn the Vedas from her husband reading them.⁷ He, too, became a learned youth abiding by or delighting in the

---

2. Rām, VII. 2.
3. She is not named in the Rāmāyaṇa.
4. “Love-making in the co-educational āśramas of those days was quite common” (Education, p. 173, n. 1).
5. Vē, 70. 31. Lg, I. 63. 58. Kūr, I. 19. 8. Bhāg, IX. 2. 32 wrongly makes Viśravas (who was really her son) her husband. Ed, III. 61. 11; 8. 38 and Vē, 85. 16 do not mention Pulastya, but say that Viśravas was the son of Ilavilā (Dravidā). Vaiḥ, IV. 1. 47 and Gar, I. 138. 11 mention Ilavilā but are silent about her husband and son; the converse is true in Pad, VI. 269. 15 and Rām, VII. 2.
6. According to the Mahābhārata (III. 274. 14; 275. 1) Pulastya created Viśravas with half of his own self. The Mūḥ does not know Ilavilā, the mother of Viśravas, and probably also her father Tṛṇabindu. But the epithet Ailavilā is known to it (see infra).
7. Rām, VII. 2. 31.
courses of Vedic study like his father. He became engaged in Vedic studies at an early age and developed a fine character. This Ailavila scholar was a Vipra, a Dvija, a Muni and a Rishi. The abode of Viśravas Muni was on the Narmada river where Kubera was born.

Just as the marriage of Ilavilã, the princess of Vaiśali, with Pulastya was significant leading to the increase of the influence of Ailavilas and Vaisalians in several directions (see infra), so also the marriages of her son, Viśravas, with the daughters of Bharadvaja (or a Bhāradvaja rishi) and others served to increase the influence of the new dynasty of Tṛṇabindu. It is for some such reason that Viśravas has been called a 'Paulastyakulavardhana' (=increaser of the family of the Paulastyas) and his wives 'Paulastyakulavardhanãh' ('vârdhikâh') (=increasers of the family of the Paulastyas).

Viśravas had four wives who became responsible for the expansion of the family of Pulastya. They were (1) Devavarṇini, daughter of Bṛhaspati according to the Purâṇas and Bharadvaja according to the Râmâyana, (2-3) Pushpotkaṭā and Vâkâ (v. l. Balâkā, Lg), daughters of Mālyavat, and (4) Kaikasi (v. l. Nikashā, Râm), daughter of Málin. Viśravas's son by Devavarṇini was Vaiśravaṇa Kubera. Pushpotkaṭā bore Khara and others. Vâkâ produced Triśiras, Dûshaṇa and

2. So called, because of his being a son of Ilavilã, in Kûr, I. 19. 9 (Ailavila) and Lg, I. 63. 59 (Ailavila).
Mbh, III. 281. 14; XIII. 185. 12.
7. Besides his Himalayan āśrama (cf. Râm, VII. 2) and Vaiśali.
9. The contemporary Bhāradvājas (step 54 of Pargiter's list, A. I. H. T., p. 191) were an influential priestly group. Was Bṛhaspati the personal name of one such Bhāradvāja?
12. Vâ, 70. 32. Lg, I. 63. 59. Kûr, I. 19. 9 ("vârdhikâh").
14. The story of her marriage is given in some detail in the Râmâyana (VII.9).
15. For some references to Nikashâ see Râma-Kathâ, pp. 378-379.
others. The children of Kaikaśi were Daśagṛiva (‘Rāvaṇa’), Kumbhakarṇa, Vibhiṣaṇa and Śūrpaṇakha, the last being a daughter.

Thus the dynasty of the Paulastyas (Rākshasas) of the South (South India and Ceylon) was derived from the royal line of Vaiśāli.

The eldest son of Viśravas Paulastya Ailavila and Devavarnini was Viśravāṇa Kubera Ailavila. He became known as ‘Dhana-pati’ or the Lord of Riches ‘by virtue of his own efforts’ (that is, in the direction of trade and commerce apparently). Under instructions of his father Viśravas, he took possession of the abandoned city of Laṅkā, built in ancient times by the architect Viśvakarman for the Rākshasas. Viśravāṇa settled in the abandoned Laṅkā and made it an appanage of Vaiśāli. He maintained contact with his parents in Vaiśāli with the help of his ‘pushpaka-vimāna’ (=a large ship). When his step-brother Daśagṛiva prepared to take Laṅkā by force, he gave it up and retired to Vaiśāli and the North. Not being satisfied with this, Daśagṛiva attacked and defeated Kubera and captured his ‘pushpaka’ fleet, which he used for his own purposes now, until it was restored to ‘Viśravāṇa’ (Rām, VI. 127. 60; VII. 41), that is, to Viśravāṇa’s dynasty in Vaiśāli, by Rāma Dāsārathī who had conquered ‘Rāvaṇa’.

S. C. Sarkar suggests that the human and Puranic Viśravāṇa should not be confused with the god Kubera, called Viśravāṇa; probably the god Kubera was optatively so designated in ancient times as having been specially worshipped by or dear to the Viśravāṇas (descendants of Viśravas being Mānavas.

1. See a useful article by G. Ramdas in I. H. Q., Vol. 5, 1929, pp. 281-299 on ‘Rāvaṇa and His Tribes’. He has collected evidences from the Rāmāyana to prove that Rāvaṇa had one head and two arms like any human being and that the notion that he had ten heads and twenty arms must have been the result of certain interpolators, who misconceived the significance of such appellations as ‘Daśagṛiva.’

2. For a comprehensive account of the Paulastyas in the Purāṇas see Bṛ, III. 8. 34-70; Vṛ, 70. 29-63; Lṛ, I. 63. 55-66; Kṛ, I. 19. 7-15; Paḍ, VI. 265. 15-26 and Bhāg, IX. 2. 31-32 (partially); Cf. Māḥk, III. 274. 11 to 276. 3 (differently); Rām, VII. 2 to 5 and 9; III. 22. Also see A. I. H. T., pp. 241-242; S. C. Sarkar, Education, pp. 169-173 and Homage, pp. 59-62.

3. Viśravāṇa Kubera is called ‘Ailavila’ (Māḥk, V. 102. 10; 111. 20; 139. 14; IX. 47. 25).


of Vaiśālii who became ‘dhana-patis’, i.e., merchant-princes, ‘lords of riches’, millionaires by trade); the Vaiśravaṇas were of course nobles belonging to the Vaiśāli royal family, and Vaiśālii must have from the earliest days been one of the greatest trade centres of India; cf. the wealth of the Lichchhavī aristocrats (plutocrats) of Vaiśāli in a subsequent age.

In S. C. Sarkar’s opinion the ‘pushpaka’ of the ‘dhanapati’ son of Viśrava (daughter’s son of king Trīṇabindu) seems to refer to a particular type of merchantship used by Vaiśālii merchant-princes for river and sea-borne trade. Sarkar tries to explain the name by saying that the two ends of a sailing ship with the spreading sails in the middle would in a diagrammatic representation look like an opening ‘pushpa’. If the ‘pushpaka’ could go up to Viśrava’s āśrama, this must have been situated at the foot of the mountains where the Gaṇḍakī broadens out into the plains.2

Another suggestion of S. C. Sarkar3 concerning the maritime activities of the ancient Vaisaliens is that probably the term ‘Sinhihikā’ with its variant ‘Hiṁsikā’ came to be used of ‘pirate ships’ in ancient India. One such ‘Sinhihikā’, evidently of the Vaisalian fleet captured and utilised by the Iraiavān, is said in the Rāmāyana (V. I. 173-190) to have intercepted ‘Hanumant’ on the high seas, while he was crossing over to Laṅkā (probably on board a ‘Vānara’ ship).

The influence of Ilavilā is indicated by the fact that the epithet Ailavila is used for several persons connected with the Vaiśālikas, Kauberakas (Yakshas) and the Kosalas (Ikhvākus). Viśrava, the son of Ilavilā, was naturally called an Ailavila.4 Vaiśravaṇa Kubera (son of Viśrava Asilavila) is also called an Ailavila.5 Not only that. Two kings6 of Kosala, vīr, Vṛiddhāśarman (step no. 58 in Pargiter’s list, the royal name is

2. Ibid.
4. Or ‘Hiṁsikā’ (A. S., II. 28).
6. Mbh, V. 102. 10; 111. 20; 139. 14; IX. 47. 25.
15. Viśh, IV. 4. 75-82. Gar, I. 138. 96-97. Bhāg, IX. 9. 42-50. Dīlipa II is called an Ailavila in Mbh, VII. 61. 1. Ailavila in Mbh, XII. 166. 76 may mean Dīlipa II (as Pargiter thinks, A.I.H.T., p. 42) or some other ancient king (Sørensen, p. 25): this king received the sword of justice from Bharata and gave it to Dhundhumāra.
Brahmanic) and his grandson Dilīpa II Khaṭvāṅga (step no.60 in Pargiter's list) are given this epithet in the dynastic lists and the latter in the Mahābhārata as well. Thus, Sarkar thinks, Vṛiddhaśarman might have been a brother of Viśravas Ailavila.

The reign of Trinabindu and the careers of his daughter and her relations make this epoch of Vaisalian history very important. The mention of Trinabindu in the Rāmāyaṇa outside the Vaisalian genealogical list shows that he was an important ruler. The prevalence of the epithet Ailavila and the derivation of the Paulastya family from Ilavilā make her career significant. The influence of Vaiśālī increased as a result of these marriages. The abandoned Laṅkā was colonised. The Vaisalian fleet (called the ‘pushpaka-vimāna’ in the Rāmāyaṇa narrative) began to ply from the Gaṇḍakī and the Ganges to far-off Ceylon. The fleet must have included ‘pirate ships’ (‘Śimhikās’ or ‘Hiṃsikās’) as well. These developments must have led to the growth of trade and commerce. The old capital might have now become inadequate to accommodate all. So need was felt for a new or second capital. This task was accomplished by Trinabindu’s son and successor, Viśāla.
CHAPTER VI

THE FOUNDATION OF A NEW VAIṢĀLI

(Viśāla)

25. VIŚĀLA

Viśāla was the son and successor of Tṛiṇabindu,¹ his mother being Alambushā.² According to Pargiter³ the first successor of Tṛiṇabindu was Viṣravas (his daughter’s son) and his second successor was Viśāla. S. C. Sarkar⁴ wants to take Viṣravas and Viśāla as identical. It appears, however, safer to accept the verdict of the Purāṇas in regarding Viśāla as the son and successor of Tṛiṇabindu.

Viśāla was the founder of Vaiśāli⁶ or Viśālā⁸ as the capital of the kingdom which has been hitherto called the kingdom of Vaiśāli in anticipation. It has been a universal practice to name countries, towns, mountains and rivers, especially in newly developed regions, after discoverers, conquerors, founders and celebrated men, and the same method must have been adopted by the Aryans who conquered North India and founded new kingdoms and towns there.⁷ Thus countries are said sometimes to have been named after kings, such as Gandhāra,⁸ Ānarta,⁹ and Sauvīra.¹⁰ Similarly towns, such as Śrāvasti,¹¹ Hastināpura¹² and Vaiśāli¹³

³. A. I. H. T., pp. 147, 273.
⁵. Bhāg, IX. 2. 33.
¹¹. Vā, 87. 27. Mat, 12. 30. Hu, 11. 22. Also other references.
¹⁴. See supra.
were named from the kings who founded them. We need not, however, take the term 'founded' too literally. It may even mean 're-built' or 'enlarged'. A typical case is furnished by Hastinapura. Some passages make this the capital of Dushyanta and Bharata; but the latter's fifth successor Hastin is distinctly stated to have founded that city. If those passages are right, Hastin may have enlarged it and given it his name. Some such thing appears to have taken place with regard to Vaisali as well inasmuch as long before Visala we hear of many important kings of the Vaisali region who must have had some capital. Moreover, one Takshaka Vaisaleya is mentioned in the Atharva-Veda (VIII. 10. 29) and the Pañchavimśa-Brāhmaṇa (XXV. 15. 3) and a place called Vișālagrāma flourishing at a remote period is referred to in the Mārkandeyay-Purāṇa (76. 25. 37). Thus the truth seems that Viśāla (step no. 54) enlarged the capital city and gave it his name as Hastin (step no. 51) had done with regard to Hastinapura a few years before.

Although Vaisali's contributions to Jainism and Buddhism are well-known, none has so far referred to the contributions of the very founder or re-builder of the city (King Viśāla), after whose name it was called Vaisali, to the cause of Hinduism. The pinda ādāna of king Viśāla of Vaisali is specifically mentioned in no less than five Purāṇas. This Viśāla appears to be identical with the founder of our Vaisali, because the offerer of pinda at Gayā (a) flourished in the Tretā age; (b) was a king; (c) was named Viśāla; (d) lived at Viśāla Puri, i.e., had his capital at Viśāla Puri;

2. Mkh, I. 74. 13 (Gajasāhvaya).
3. Mkh, I. 94. 46 ('the excellent city').
4. See supra.
6. This was first pointed out by T. P. Bhattacharyya in his review of Homage to Vaisāli in The Searchlight of the 12th June, 1949.
(e) was the lord of Viśālā; and
(f) was connected with a territory (i.e., Vaiśālī) not far away from the Gayā City.

The only possible objection which may be raised against this identification is that here the father of king Viśālā is said to be Sīta (i.e., White), and not Trīṇabindu. The context leaves no doubt that this was an epithet and not a proper name; because his (Sīta's) father and grandfather are called Rakta (i.e., Red) and Kṛishṇa (i.e., Black) respectively. And about them it is also stated that they were killers of Brāhmaṇas and Rishis respectively. Thus, in reality, these colours indicate the extent of their sinfulness; e.g., Trīṇabindu is Sīta or white and was, therefore, not sinful; Trīṇabindu's father (or Sīta's father) was Rakta or red due to the blood-shed of the Brāhmaṇas; and Sīta's grandfather was Kṛishṇa or black indicating the black character of the man who had killed so many Rishis. If these are not regarded as epithets, they may be taken as alternative names.

The story given in the Purāṇas says that king Viśālā of Viśālā, being childless, had offered pīṇḍa at Gayā and consequently his father (Sīta), grandfather (Rakta) and great-grandfather (Kṛishṇa) attained heaven, he was blessed with a number of children and he, too, went to heaven after this life. This gives us an important sidelight on the life of Viśālā. This connection between Viśālā (Vaiśālī) and Gayā was long remembered, probably because the connection did not cease with Viśālā, but continued even after him. It was perhaps to commemorate this event that in the Gupta period (4th and 5th centuries A.D.) seals1 were issued at Vaiśālī in which we get perhaps the earliest representations of the Gayā Vishṇupada Temple, as it was in that period. Thus the earliest known founder of Vaiśālī was a follower of ancestor-worship (pīṇḍadāna cult) and in the fourth century A.D. the same cult revived there perhaps with the revival of monarchy2 too. In the opinion of T. P. Bhattacharyya3 the doctrine of numbers was related to the śrāddha and pīṇḍadāna cult of which not only (ancient) Bodhagayā and Vaiśālī, but also whole

2. Had monarchy anything to do with pīṇḍadāna cult?
Western India was a great centre in the pre-Buddhistic period. He further says that Jainism and Buddhism arose out of it.

The *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa* regards king Viśāla as 'very religious.' This epithet may have something to do with his ancestor-worship.

The *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa* calls Viśāla (step no. 54) brave. This title may either be customary or he might have control over Magadha as well (which included Gayā) at this time. This is not improbable, because the era of Vasu Chaidya Uparichara (step no. 78) and Bṛihadratha (step no. 79) had not yet begun.

References to Viśāla and Viśālā are found in Puranic literature; but as these names were famous in ancient times, it appears, they were adopted by others as well. Kings Viśāla of the Vaidiśa City and Viśāla of Kāśipuri have already been referred to. A Brāhmaṇa named Viśāla and his son Viśālī are mentioned by the *Mārkandeya-Purāṇa*. While these references may clearly be dismissed as having no connection with our Viśāla, the same cannot be said with regard to Viśāla, though this was also the name of Ujjayinī and Badarī. Viśālagrama is mentioned in the *Mārkandeya-Purāṇa*. One Viśāla is referred to in the *Padma-Purāṇa*. A Viśālā was visited by the Rishis. It was to a Viśālā that king Nābhi, father of Rishabha, retired in old age for penances. We are unable to say anything definitely about the last two, but the first two may refer to our Viśālī.

1. *Bṛ, III. 61. 12.*
2. The *Varāha-Purāṇa* (48. 6-24) mentions one king Viśālā (48. 6) of Kāśipuri who had been deprived of his kingdom by his relatives. In this story the incarnations of Vaiṣṇava including the Buddha and Kalkin have been mentioned. Thus this was some other Viśāla. Was there any blood relationship between the houses of Vaiśālī and Kāśi?
4. *Mārk, 122. 20 ff.*
5. *Varāha, 48. 6-24.*
6. *Mārk, 70. 4.*
7. *Mārk, 70. 3.*
10. *Vāmanā, 37. 30.*
12. Viśālā is the name of the daughter of Varuna also (*Pad, II. 77. 79*). For the conversation between Viśālā and Yayāti, see *Pad, II. 77. 6-103* (Vol. I, pp. 286-284).
It may be added that our Vaisālī contained a Great Forest ('Mahāvana') which continued up to the time of Gautama Buddha.

Of all the kings of the Vaisālī region, Viśāla seems to have made a deep impression on the posterity probably because of his foundation (or rebuilding) of Vaisālī City, promotion of ancestor-worship (pīṇḍadāna cult) and personal bravery. People could not forget him. Even today there is a big mound at Basarh (Muzaffarpur district) which bears the name of Rājā Viśāla Kā Garh ('the Fort of King Viśāla').

1. For a description of this mound, see Cunningham’s Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. I (Simla, 1871), pp. 55-56; Vol. XVI (Calcutta, 1883), pp. 6, 12, 89-91; Ancient Geography of India (second edition, ed. Surendranath Majumdar Sastri) (Calcutta, 1924), pp. 507-508; Maulvi Muhammad Hamid Kuraishi, List of Ancient Monuments protected under Act VII of 1904 in the Province of Bihar and Orissa (Calcutta, 1931), pp. 20-26; Muzafarpur District Gazetteer (Calcutta, 1907), pp. 139-141. For the earliest modern notice see J. A. S. B., 1835, p. 128 (by J. Stephenson).
CHAPTER VII
THE SUCCESSORS OF VIŚĀLA AND THE FALL OF VAISALIAN MONARCHY
(Hemachandra to Sumati)

26. HEMACHANDRA

Viśāla’s son is known as Hemachandra in all sources. He is said to be ‘very strong’.

If the piṇḍa-dāna story of Viśāla is believed, it may be presumed that Hemachandra was born to him after he had offered piṇḍa at Gayā.

27. SUCHANDRA

He is variously called Suchandra, Chandra and Chandrāka. He was the son of Hemachandra.

28. DHŪMRĀŚVA

He is known as Dhūmrāśva or Dhūmrāksha.

29. SRIṆJAYA

He is called Sriñjaya by most of our sources. Only one source calls him Sañjyama. The Brahmaṇḍa and the Vāyu call him a ‘scholar’.

8. Viśh, IV. 1. 52. Bhāg, IX. 2. 34.
10. Bhāg, IX. 2. 34.
Sriñjaya is mentioned as an ancient king in various enumerations in the Mahābhārata. As the territory over which he ruled is not indicated, we are unable to say if Sriñjaya of Vaisālī is meant.

30. SAHADEVA

Sahadeva was the son of Sriñjaya. He has been called 'wealthy' and 'strong'.

A king named Sahadeva Sārīñjaya is mentioned in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa (II. 4. 4. 3-4). In the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34. 9) Sahadeva Sārīñjaya is mentioned with Somaka Sāhadevya. The Mahābhārata (III. 90. 5, 7) speaks of a Sahadeva (son of Sriñjaya, commentary on II. 5) as sacrificing at Agnisīras and on the Yamunā. Though there is no definite evidence to prove that this Sahadeva, son of Sriñjaya, was the same as the king of Vaisālī, yet we feel tempted to suggest that the probability cannot be precluded entirely in spite of the fact that Sahadeva of the Mahābhārata sacrifices on the Yamunā and not on the Gandak. Sahadeva is referred to in the Mahābhārata (II. 8. 17) again, but here his territory is not indicated.

According to our scheme, the fourth quarter of the Tretā age began in the time of this Sahadeva, son of Sriñjaya.

31. KRISĀŚVA

He is generally called Krisāśva and only rarely Kuṣāśva. The Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa and the Rāmāyaṇa know him as 'very religious'.

1. Mbh, I. 1. 225 (in Nārada's enumeration); II. 8. 15 (in the palace of Yama); XIII. 115. 72 (among the kings who abstained from meat during the month of Kṛṣṇa-pūrṇimatī).
3. Bṛ, I. 111. 61. 15. Rām, I. 47. 15.
5. It may be pointed out that Sahadeva, king of the North Pañchāla (step 69), was the great-grandson of Sriñjaya (step 66), and not his son (see A. I. H. T., pp. 116, 148).
6. See ante under Tṛṇabindu.
8. Rām, I. 47. 15.
One Kṛiśāśva is mentioned as an ancient king in the *Mahābhārata*, but his territory is not indicated.

32. SOMADATTA

Kṛiśāśva was succeeded by his son Somadatta.

No less than two sources recognise him as a performer of horse-sacrifices. The *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Vāyu* call him a Rājarshi. These and the *Rāmāyana* know him to be very valorous and chivalrous.

33. JANAMEJAYA

Somadatta was succeeded by his son Janamejaya. The *Rāmāyana* knows this king by a different name, Kākutstha. The *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* reverses the order and after Somadatta has Sumati (Saumadattti) and then Janamejaya. This may be regarded as a mistake, because it is not corroborated by any other source.

One ancient king, named Janamejaya, is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, but his territory is not indicated. The possibility, that this might have been the name of more than one king, cannot be ruled out.

34. SUMATI

He is variously called Sumati, Sumanti and Pramati.

1. *Mbh*, II. 8. 17 (in the palace of Yama); XIII. 165.49 (enumeration).
7. It may incidentally be remarked that the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and the *Rāmāyana* use the very same adjectives in their texts in respect of Hemachandra, Sahadeva, Kṛiśāśva and Somadatta (mahābhalaḥ, pratāpavan, paraṇa-dhārmikāḥ and mahāśīśaḥ-pratāpavan respectively).
10. *Bṛg*, IX. 2. 36.
11. *Mbh*, I. 1. 228 (in Saṅjaya’s enumeration of deceased kings); II. 8. 20 (in the palace of Yama); XII. 234. 24 (attained heaven by giving his body for the sake of a Brāhmaṇa); XIII. 137. 9 (attained heaven by giving a chariot and cows to a Brāhmaṇa).
Generally speaking, he is regarded as the last ruler of the dynasty. Only the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa differs and says that after Somadatta came Sumati Saumadatti who was succeeded by Janamejaya, the last ruler of the dynasty in the opinion of this Purāṇa.

Thanks to the Rāmāyaṇa we have an independent reference to this king Sumati who is merely mentioned by the Purāṇas.

Vaiśāli had ceased to be an important kingdom at this time, because its king (Sumati’s predecessor or Sumati) is not mentioned in the list of kings who were invited by king Daśaratha of Ayodhyā to attend his sacrifice. There is no doubt that the territory occupied by this kingdom was much less extensive at this time. But it may be argued that this list indicates with what kingdoms in Daśaratha’s time Kosala’s relations were friendliest. If it is so, it looks rather strange that the very neighbour of Kosala should not have been mentioned by name, especially when the kings of Ayodhyā, Vaiśāli and Videha belonged to the same stock. It is probable that he may have been one of the ‘other kings’ (Rām, I. 13. 28) not mentioned specifically in the Rāmāyaṇa.

This sacrifice of Daśaratha took place (1+1+15 = ) seventeen years before Rāma’s visit to Sumati, king of Vaiśāli. We are unable to say as to who was the king of Vaiśāli when the sacrifice of Daśaratha took place—whether he was Sumati or his predecessor Janamejaya. But in respect of the visit of Viśvāmitra, Rāma and Lakshmana to Vaiśāli we know it definitely that the king of the small territory at that time was Sumati. The Rāmāyaṇa gives details of the trip of Viśvāmitra, Rāma and Lakshmana from Ayodhyā to Mithilā. As we have not taken

1. Rām, I. 13. 20-29. Cf. Pargiter, A. I. H. T., p. 276 and J. A. S. B., 1897, pp. 96, 97. This list mentions ‘the kings of Mithilā, Kāśi, Kekaya, Āṅga, (South ?) Kosala, Magadha, the East (Prāchīnā), Sindhu, Sauvira, Sūrāśṭrapurā (Saurāṣṭrapurā), and the South (Daksīṇapura) and other kings on the surface of the earth.’

2. By combining Rām, I. 14. 1; 18. 8 and 20. 2.


4. There are four stages of this trip:—(1) from Ayodhyā to the confluence of the Sarayū and the Ganges: north of the Ganges: in the kingdom of Kosala (Rām, I. 5. 5) —Rām, I. 22. 4 to 24. 11; (2) from the confluence of the Sarayū and the Ganges to the Malada-Karūsa and Magadha kingdoms and back to the Ganges: south of the Ganges—I. 24. 12 to 45. 8; (3) in the kingdom of Vaiśāli: north of the Ganges—I. 45. 9 to 48. 91; (4) in the kingdom of Videha: further north of the Ganges (including the marriage ceremony and the Parāśu-Rāma episode) —I. 48. 10 to 77. 6. For a brief description of the trip see S. G. Sirkar, Ed. 1841, pp. 116-123.
up the history of Eastern U. P. and Bihar for our study here, we need not discuss the geography of the whole trip. We shall only review the movement of the party in the Vaiśāli kingdom.¹

As much later in the time of the Vajjian Republic, so in the time of Sumati, the Ganges formed the southern boundary of the state of Vaiśāli. The party consisting of Viśvāmitra, Rāma and Lakshmana, which had earlier decided to visit the capital of the Maithila King Janaka on the north of the Ganges amidst the Himalayan ranges and see his great festival there (31. 6-7, 11, 15), crossed the Ganges (45. 8), somewhere between the confluence with the Soṇa and Vaiśāli on the Gaṇḍakī, on board a boat, with decks comfortably carpeted and canopied (sukhāstirṇā, 45. 7). This boat, or rather ship, belonged to other ṛishis, i.e., to another local Vedic school (45. 7) either at the confluence, subsequently the site of Pātaliputra, or at Vaiśāli, and was placed at the disposal of the excursionists.² When they reached the northern shore, they sat on the bank of the Ganges (to take rest) and saw Viśālā Purī (45. 9). As Vaiśāli is not situated on the Ganges, but on the Gaṇḍakī, and is removed from the Ganges by 20 miles,³ this Ramayanic statement can only mean that the distant towers or the pinacles of the temples met their gaze as they cast their glance northwards.⁴ Local tradition believes that Rāma crossed over from the southern side of the river Ganges to the northern side at Hajipur.⁵ There is still a ghāṭa, known as Rāmchaurā Ghāṭ,⁶ which claims this distinction and is regarded as sacred on this account. This event

---

1. The references given hereafter belong to the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyana.
2. S. C. Sarkar, Education, p. 120.
3. This being the distance between Basarh and Hajipur (Muzaffarpur District Gazetteer, p. 138).
4. Is it possible that the party did not land on the northern bank of the Ganges, but continued the journey on the boat in the Gaṇḍakī river and landed just south of, and quite near, Vaiśāli—a fact which has been omitted by the Ramayanic tradition? In that case, too, they might see the town of Vaiśāli. But see infra.
5. S. N. Singh, History of Tirhut, p. 33.
6. Cf. terms like Kabirchaurā (a sacred spot at Vārānasi associated with the famous saint Kabīr) and Tulsičaurā (the sacred place containing the tūlsī plant).
of Rāma’s visit to Rāmchaurā Ghāṭ is referred to in Holi songs as well¹ sung in that part of the Muzaffarpur district.

The party then went to Vaiśālī, which was an excellent town (uttamāpurī, 45. 11), “charming and heavenly, in fact, a veritable paradise” (45. 10). Sumati, the king, received them splendidly and they were guests for a night there (47. 19, 48. 9); thence they proceeded to Mithilā City, halting on the way at the ancient suburban āśrama of the Gautamas.

S. C. Sarkar thinks that the ‘pushpaka’ fleet, which ‘Rāvaṇa’ of Laṅkā had captured from Kubera, was restored to Vaiśravaṇa (Rām, VI. 127. 60-62; VII. 41. 2-16, 42. 1), that is, to Vaiśravaṇa’s dynasty in Vaiśālī, by Rāma Dāsarathī who had conquered ‘Rāvaṇa’, and that Pramati (i.e., Sumati) of Vaiśālī, whom Rāma met in early youth, must have lived long enough to rejoice at this restoration of the lost fleet.²

The Purāṇas³ after giving the list of the kings of Vaiśālī up to Sumati say that these were the Vaiśālaka kings. This indicates that Sumati in their opinion was the last king of Vaiśālī. What became of Vaiśālī after him is not indicated at all.

---

1. E.g., “He Rāmchaurā Ghāṭ Rāmchaurā Ghāṭ (jahān) Rām nabhālana Gaṅgā”, i.e., “(This is) Rāmchaurā Ghāṭ (where) Rāma bathed in the Ganges”. These songs contain much of the valuable tradition handed down from generation to generation, but have not yet been collected together to the regret of us all.


CHAPTER VIII

LIFE UNDER VAIŚALIAN MONARCHY

While other Purāṇas1 only mention the kings of the Vaiśālaka dynasty, it is only the Mārkandaṇeya-Purāṇa2 which gives details of the individual rulers of the Vaiśāli region, though only up to a certain stage (i.e., up to the first quarter of the Tretā age according to our view). The Rāmāyaṇa, besides giving the genealogy up to Sumati, speaks in some detail of three kings, viz., Marutta, Trīṇabindu and Sumati,3 who belonged to the first, third and fourth quarters of the Tretā age respectively. The Mahābhārata,4 while giving the genealogy up to Marutta, describes in detail the story of Marutta and his sacrifice. Stray references to the kings and priests of Vaiśāli are found in other ancient works as well. Thus, with the help of these, we can present a picture of the life under Vaisalian monarchy. In so doing, however, we have to be very cautious, because the sources to be utilised by us were written much later than the actual events had taken place. And there is always the possibility of the writers’ projecting their own times and views into the ancient times. We shall try our best to avoid this kind of pitfalls. Moreover, there are many things which are well-known and may be applicable to any monarchy. We shall not elaborate such things.

ADMINISTRATION

Vaiśāli was a monarchical state ruled by a dynasty of princes originally descended from Manu Vaivasvata. It was a Kshatriya dynasty. The prevalent notion about royalty as can be gathered from the Mārkandaṇeya was that only the Kshatriya could rule and not a Vaiśya.5 It was for this reason that Nābhāga, son of Nābhānediṣṭha and grandson of

2. Mark, 113 to 136 and 109 to 110.
3. Rām, VII. 18, VII. 2 and I. 47 respectively.
4. Māh, XIV. 3-10 (Sahivarta-Maruttīya section).
Manu Vaivasvata, who had become a Vaiśya due to his having married a Vaiśya girl, had to lose his throne. Not only that, when Nābhaṅga’s son, Bhalandana, approached his paternal uncle’s sons, Vasūrāta and the other sons, and demanded half of the kingdom, they said that he was the son of a Vaiśya and hence not entitled to enjoy the earth. He, however, defeated his cousins and got back the throne. But the kings of this dynasty, it appears, continued to be called Vaiśyas, because we find Bhalandana and Vatsa (-pri) mentioned as Vaiśya hymn-makers.¹

We cannot be very sure about the rigidity of caste system at such a remote period and possibly the Puranic chronicler was giving the state of affairs in his own time. However, the position seems to have improved later as Marutta and his successors are known as Kṣhatriyas.² It does not appear to be proper to interpret ‘Āyogava’, the epithet given to Marutta, son of Avikṣhita, in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa,³ in a sense in which it is used in the Manu-Smṛti (X. 12).⁴

Kingship was hereditary.⁵ Generally the king used to anoint his son before he proceeded for the vānaprastha stage.⁶

Some of the kings had many queens.⁷ We do not know the constitutional distinction among those queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession with an elaborate ritual. A more important ritual was the Aindra Mahābhisheka⁸ with which king Marutta is said to have been consecrated. This consisted of five important ceremonies. In the first place, an oath is administered by the priest to the king-designate.⁹ Next follows the Ārohaṇa or enthronement. When

---

2. See supra.
3. Šat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 6.
5. See esp. Mārk, 117. 29-31 (Viśva-vediu’s statement).
6. There are several instances.
7. For details see infra.
8. Ait. Br., VIII. 12-23. The following kings are said to have been consecrated with the Aindra Mahābhisheka:—Janamejaya Pārikṣhita, Śāryāta Mānava, Śatānika Śārājīta, Āmbūṣṭhīya, Yudhāṁraubhātī Auγrasainya, Viśva-karman Bhauvana, Sudās Pajavana, Marutta Avikṣhita, Āṅga Vairochana and Bharata Daunṣhyanti (Ait. Br., VIII. 21-23).
the king is seated on the throne, we have the Utkroṣana¹ or proclamation. The king-makers proclaim him saying: "Him do ye proclaim, O men (janāh) as king and father of kings. . . . The sovereign lord of all beings (Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati)² hath been born, the eater of the folk (Viśāmattā)² hath been born, the destroyer of enemies (Amitterāṃhantā)² hath been born, the protector of the Brāhmaṇas (Brāhmaṇānām goptā)² hath been born, the guardian of the law (Dharmasya goptā)² hath been born." When the king has been proclaimed, there is an address with the formula, abhimanaṇa.³ Then comes the anointment (abhishekhana).⁴

Closely connected with the Aindra Mahābhishheka was another important ceremonial called the Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice.⁵ Marutta is definitely stated to have performed this sacrifice.⁶

Sacrifices of several kinds were performed by the kings of the Vaiśāli region. Legendary stories of these are given by the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa.

This brings us to the question of the functions of the king which are emphasised especially in the stories of Avikshita and Marutta.⁷ These include, amongst others, the punishment of the wicked and the protection of the subjects, especially the well-behaved and the Brāhmaṇas. The kings were followers of the paternal principle of government⁸ and regarded the subjects as their children.⁹

Coming to the private life of the king, we find that hunting was a favourite royal pastime.¹⁰ Many gifts were made and in that glad and opulent city sportive courtesans of the prettiest forms danced an exquisite dance to the accompaniment of songs and musical instruments¹¹ in case of the king’s rejoicing.

¹. Ibid., VIII. 17.
². The significance of these important attributes of kingship has been admirably brought out by H. C. Raychaudhuri (P. H. A. I., p. 169).
⁵. Ibid., p. 170.
⁶. Śat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 6.
⁸. Mārk, chs. 116 (Vatsapri), 117 (Khanitra, Prabhū) and 129 (Marutta).
⁹. Cf. the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya and the inscriptions of Aśoka for a similar idea.
¹⁰. Mārk, chs. 120 (Kaniketa) and 126 (Avikshita).
¹¹. Mārk, ch. 128.
The prince was given proper education and training. He had to marry first in his own caste.

The king was not an absolute despot in practice. His power was checked, in the first place, by the Brāhmaṇas. The second check was supplied by the ministers individually or in council, and village headmen who aided in the consecration of the king and whom the king consulted on important occasions. The existence of a Royal Council (Sabhā) is clearly suggested by references to Sabhāsads in Vedic texts, particularly in connection with king Marutta Āvikshita. Another check was supplied by the general body of the people (Jana) who were distinct from the ministers and Grāmaṇis or Grāmikas, and who used to meet in an assembly.

The ministers were undoubtedly an important part of the administrative machinery. The idea is admirably put in the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa where a minister Viśvavedin says to Śauri (a brother of Kaniṭtra)—"Thou art the worker, we are the instrument." Ministers of some kings are mentioned. It was advisable for a king to set spies upon his ministers as well as on other servants.

This brings us to the espionage system which seems to be regarded as essential for the state at that time as it is, for any other period of Hindu history.

Subordinate or vassal kings, too, are referred to. One-sixth was the tax payable to the king. It was a good source of income to the state.

1. Mārk, chs. 122 (Āvikshita), 128 (Marutta) and 133 (Dama).
2. Cf. the famous story of Nābhāga in Mārk, ch. 113.
3. The story of Nābhāga is a typical example (Mārk, chs. 113-114). Cf. also the story of Marutta and Sāvha. The former gave his daughter in marriage to the latter.
7. Ait. Br., VIII. 17 where the people (Jana) are clearly distinguished from the Rājakartāra (King-makers).
9. Mārk, chs. 125 (Karandhama), 134 and 136 (Dama), 109 (Rājyavardhana).
10. Mārk, 129. 32.
12. Mārk, chs. 117 (Kaniṭtra), 129 (Marutta), 109 (Rājyavardhana).
Another essential part of government, like finance, was the army. It consisted of four parts, *viz.*, elephants, horses, chariots and infantry.\(^1\) We have references to many battles and weapons, but there is nothing special about them and they follow the usual pattern.\(^2\) Very possibly later things were projected into these early times with regard to this.

**SOCIETY**

The society of the time was divided into four castes, *viz.*, Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. The caste system seems to have been established very early. The story of Nābhāga also illustrates this point. One of the principal duties of the king was to maintain the existing caste system.\(^3\) Vatsaprī is praised because in his realm there was no confusion among the castes. The duties of the Kshatriyas are referred to at some places\(^4\) and at one place\(^5\) the term Kshatriya is defined as ‘one who guards somebody from injury.’ But it was Nābhāga who appears to be the founder of Vaiśāli’s economic prosperity. He was degraded to Vaiśya-hood and he preferred to live like a true Vaiśya. He devoted his attention to the tending of cattle, cultivation and trade.\(^6\) Much of the marshy land\(^7\) east of the Gandak river must have been brought under cultivation by him and through his agencies. The caste system was, however, not rigid and people from one caste might go to the other caste.\(^8\)

Marriage was a well-established institution. We find instances of Rākhshasa form of marriage\(^9\) too. The Gāndharva form of marriage was ordained for Kshatriyas only.\(^10\) The svayamvara system was prevalent among the royal families,\(^11\) but on some occasions the svayamvaras did not end peacefully and the girls were taken away by force.

---

8. See *zupa*.
9. *Mārk*, chs. 113 (Nābhāga), 122 (Avikshita) and 133 (Dama).
11. *Ibid.*, chs. 122 (Karandhama, Avikshita) and 133 (Dama).
The first wife of a prince must be Kshatriyan and other wives might belong to other castes. This was the general rule. Nābhāga did not observe this rule and was consequently degraded to become a Vaiśya for having taken as his first wife a Vaiśya girl. S. C. Sarkar conjectures that concubines of the Vaiśya class were customarily taken into the Vaiśāleya harem, as in some other harems, especially in the early period and cites Nābhāga’s abducting a Vaiśya tenant’s daughter as an example.

Marriage connections between equals were desirable. Father’s permission was sought when marrying a maiden. Father’s permission on the part of the bridegroom also was considered necessary as is evident from the insistence of the Vaiśya father on the prince’s (Nābhāga’s) securing the king’s permission.

There was no objection to marrying a lady who had been previously abducted by ‘asuras’ or others and rescued, either forthwith or after long stay with the abductor. The easy and normal subsequent ‘re-marriages’ of such girls show that, of the later objections to widow-remarriages, a principle one had little force in those days. Several instances of the type are known to the Vaiśāleya tradition. To an uncertain but a remote early period (pre-Mānva, referring to Auttami-Manu) the Märkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa ascribes two instances of abduction, of Uttama’s queen and of a Brāhmaṇī, and the subsequent smooth restoration of both to their husbands. Bhalandana’s son Vatsapṛī (step 8), of the Vaiśāli line, rescued the youthful Mudāvatī, daughter of his father’s friend, king ‘Vidūratha’ of the Nirvindhāya region, from her abductor Kujrīmbha, whom he slew; he then married her, though she had lived with that Kujrīmbha for a considerable length of time. Avikshita (step 39) married the Vidiśā princess Vaiśālinī-Bhāminī after rescuing her from an abductor whom he slew (he had declined to marry her before, having been defeated before her at her svayamvara where he had seized her). Again Dama (step 42) married

1. Ibid., chs. 113-114.
4. Ibid., chs. 69-72.
5. Ibid., ch. 116.
6. Ibid., chs. 122-127.
Sumanā-Dāśārṇī after she had been seized from him by the Madra and Vidarbha princes, whom he slew or defeated and thus rescued her.¹

Polygamy was an established institution. Khanitra (step 20) had three wives.² Avikshita (step 39) was not content with the seven wives³ who became his by self-choice, and developed a princely hobby of carrying off princesses holding their svayam-varas and thus filling his harem; and his capture of a Yādava princess led to a concerted attack (apparently a Haihaya invasion), which was resisted successfully by his father Karandhama.⁴ Marutta (step 40) followed his father in having seven royal wives;⁵ besides he was a particularly rich prince who rose to Samrāṭ-hood by wealth alone, while others had to fight for the rank.⁶

There are hardly any traces of ‘niyoga’ amongst the Vaiśāleyas and the Vaidechas.⁷ The explanation may be the martial character of the Vaiśāleyas⁸ and the absence of laxity in the Vaidechas at such a remote time.⁹

Instances of widow-burning are available. Thus the Vaiśāli king Khanitra’s (step 20) three devoted wives are said to have died along with their husband, with whom they had retired to the forest in old age; how they died is made clear by the subsequent case of the retired Vaiśāli king Narishyanta (step 41) and his wife Indrasenā who ascended the funeral pyre of her husband when he was murdered by a Yādava king, Vapushmat, in his forest retreat. Such ‘sahamaraṇa’ was not, however, fully customary in this family, for a few steps above, Virā, the queen of Karandhama (step 38), continued in her austerities for several years after her husband’s death in their forest hermitage (within a Brāhmaṇa settlement).¹⁰ Thus widow-burning does not appear to have been a custom at the time. This was practised

¹. Ibid., ch. 133. For this see A. I. S. H., p. 197.
². Ibid., 118, 16.
³. Ibid., 122.
⁴. Ibid., chs. 122-127.
⁵. Ibid., ch. 131 (end).
⁷. A. I. S. H., pp. 163-164.
⁸. See the graphic account of the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa.
⁹. Later on, in Ashṭāvakra’s time, however, there were temptations at the Janaka court (Mābh., III. 133).
among many primitive Indo-Germanic races in Asia and Europe, and it can only be expected to have existed among the early Indo-Aryans in some form or other. But the Vedic literature shows very few traces of such a custom. It is not referred to as an ancient custom in the Rig-Veda, whereas it is found in the Atharva-Veda. Thus these stray references to widow-burning may have some truth in them.

We find numerous references to kings' going to the forest after anointing their sons or successors. The practice was not popular in India in the beginning. But the same cannot be said with reference to North-Eastern India. We know from Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions that the kings of Videha used to adopt the vânaprastha stage of life very frequently. Vaiśāli and Videha, situated in the same geographical unit (surrounded by the Himālayas and the Gandak, the Ganges and the Kosi rivers), also had kindred people (Mānya) as rulers. Moreover, the Himālayas being so near, it was possible for the Vaisalian rulers, as for the Videhan ones, to practise austerities without any difficulty. Thus though the development of the four stages of life belongs to a later age, we may accept these Puranic statements as correct regarding the Vaisalian kings joining the vânaprastha stage.

RELIGION

Details of Indian religion for the period under review are fairly well-known. These religious practices must have been prevalent in the Vaiśāli region more or less. But here we shall not repeat those things. We shall mention only such things as are known definitely in connection with Vaiśāli. This limitation of ours should never be lost sight of.

The Vedic sacrificial religion was in vogue. The kings of the Vaiśāli region used to perform several sacrifices in their times. The number of sacrifices performed by them is often legendary and the stories of gifts made on such occasions also are

1. A. I. S. H., p. 82.
2. AV., XVIII. 9. 1-3, and perhaps also 4.
3. Mārk, chs. 116 (Bhalandana), 118 (Khanitra), 128 (Karandhama), 132 (Marutta) and 134 (Narishyanta).
4. Mārk, chs. 116 (Bhalandana, Vatsapri), 117 (Prāśāha, Prajāti), 119 (Kahupa, Vāviraśa), 120 (Khaninetra), 128 (Karandhama), 129 (Marutta), 132 (Narishyanta), 109 (Rājyavardhana).
of the same category; but the fact of their being sacrificers may be accepted without any hesitation. The long story of Marutta’s sacrifice\(^1\) with the help of Saṃvarta also points to the same conclusion.

This brings us to the question of priesthood. The court of Vaiśālī became the centre of the Āṅgirasā priests. Thus Karandhama’s chaplain was an Āṅgirasā rishi; so was the chaplain of his son, Avikshita. And the court of Marutta Avikshita was very much under Āṅgirasā priestly influence. Saṃvarta, an Āṅgirasā priest and a brother of Uchatya (father of Dīrghatamas) and Bṛhaspati (father of Bharadvāja and grandfather of Vidathin), was given Saṃyatā,\(^2\) the daughter of king Marutta, in marriage. This indicates the power and influence enjoyed by the priestly class in the royal court. These rishis who began in the country of Vaiśālī, moved westwards in time. Bharadvāja moved to Kāśi and became the purohita to king Divodāsa II of Kāśi. Vidathin Bhāradvāja was adopted by king Bharata as his son and the Bhāradvājas remained connected with the Paurava dynasty. Another direction for the expansion of the Āṅgirasas was the east and Dīrghatamas, carried downstream, was taken to Āṅga where he was welcomed by king Bali.\(^3\) The Āṅgirasas were later joined by the Vishṇuvṛiddhas, the Hāritas and the Rathitaras.\(^4\)

Principal divinities worshipped in the Vaiśālī region were the Fire, the Sun, Indra, and Lākshmi. Fire-offerings were made by the rishis who dwelt in the hermitages. These were defiled by the evil-behaved Nāgas in the time of Marutta\(^5\) who had to take steps to prevent this. Rājayavardhana is depicted as a great worshipper of the Sun.\(^6\) Assiduously practising severe austerities Khanînetra gratified Indra in order to obtain a son and the adorable Indra, lord of the gods, granted him the boon of having a son.\(^7\) The blessings of Indra and all other world-guardians and the rishis were sought on the birth of Marutta.\(^8\)

With great sacrifices Marutta sacrificed to Indra and the other

---
\(^{1}\) *Mbh*, XIV. 3-10.
\(^{2}\) A. I. S. H., p. 148, n. 1; p. 178, n. 4.
\(^{3}\) A. I. H. T., pp. 158, 220, 310. References are given there.
\(^{4}\) A. I. H. T., pp. 246-247. See also references under them.
\(^{5}\) *Mārk*, ch. 130.
\(^{7}\) *Ibid.*, Ch. 121.
\(^{8}\) *Ibid.*, Ch. 127.
The study of the Vēdas was an important aspect of religion and of the prince’s training. Kahantra was well-versed in the Vēdas. Aviskhita while a prince learnt the whole of the Vēdas. Marutta acquired the Vēdas from the religious teachers and thus became skilled in the Vēda. Prince Dama learnt the Vēdas from Śakti. The Rich, Yajus and Sāman hymns were repeated by the sun-worshippers in the reign of Rājayavardhana who, according to his own statement, had studied all the Vēdas. Other branches of the Vedic literature were yet to be developed and hence they justifiably do not find mention.

1. Ibid., ch. 129.
4. Mābh, XIV. 5-10.
5. Mārk, ch. 125.
6. Ibid.
9. Mārk, ch. 117.
10. Ibid., ch. 122.
11. Ibid., ch. 128.
12. Ibid., ch. 133.
13. Ibid., ch. 109.
BOOK TWO

THE INTERLUDE

(About six centuries)
CHAPTER IX
THE DARK AGE OF VAISALIAN HISTORY
(from the end of the rule of King Sumati to the
foundation of the Vajjian Republic)

From the end of the rule of King Sumati to the foundation of the Vajjian Republic is a long period of about six centuries which may rightly be called the Dark Age of Vaisalian History. No king of Vaisali after Sumati is known to literature. The existence of Vaisali city or a republic here before or at the time of the Bharata War is also not clearly indicated. Its absorption by some strong neighbour (like Kosala or Mallarashtra or Videha) is also not known. This complete silence about Vaisali constitutes a yet unsolved mystery of ancient Indian history.

In the absence of the concrete evidence we are left to surmise. Some courses so far suggested are:

1. "Neither the king nor the people of Vaisali are mentioned to have taken any part in the Bharata War. But the Mallas are mentioned and perhaps they had the upper hand in the territory of Vaisali and perhaps a good portion of it was enjoyed by the Videhas." The same writer, D. S. Triveda, suggests at another place that "the kingdom was probably merged into that of Mithila".

2. A slightly different suggestion has been made by S. C. Sarkar about the fate of Vaisali. "After Pramati, it formed part of Kosala for some time. But with the decline of Kosalan power (due to partition of Rama’s empire into eight parts among the children of the four brothers), it may have passed into the possession of the dynasty of Mithila, where Rama’s brother-in-law Bhānumant ruled. In the times of the

1. Māh, II. 30. 3, 12. (Triveda’s wrong reference has been corrected here.)
3. Ibid., p. 140.
Bhārata War the Vaiśāli princes had separate political and matrimonial relations with the Yādavas and the Pāṇḍavas; but, after the Bhārata War, the continued eclipse of Ayodhyā and the revival of Mithilā leaves no doubt that the Vaiśāli region became part of this Videha kingdom."

3. A sane suggestion of V. Rangacharya is as follows: "It is very probable that in the centuries which followed Sumati, Vaiśāli was either subject to Videha, and eventually shared with it the upheavals which brought about the triumph of oligarchical or republican governments, or was subject to the same commotions even in earlier times."

We may offer some reasons for believing that Vaiśāli was absorbed by Videha:—

(a) Śīrādhvaja Janaka followed an annexationist policy towards Śāṅkāśyā. This policy might have been continued later. After the Bhārata War we find a "revival of Mithilā (after Kṛtakṣaṇa, who was contemporary with that war), under the Janaka Ugrasena and at least three other Janakas after him (Janadeva, Dharmadhvaja, and Āyasthūṇa),—which renaissance lasted for about twelve generations after the Great War, that is for about 250 years."8

(b) While Videha was growing from strength to strength, there was continued eclipse of Ayodhyā. To make matters worse, Kosala engaged itself in a contest with the adjoining Kāśi kingdom.

As the Mahābhārata does not mention Vaiśāli as a republic in spite of the fact that it provides us with the names of many tribes and contains two valuable chapters showing the strength and weakness of the republican form of government, it does not appear reasonable to regard it as a republic at such a remote time. "Had the republic been organised after the fall of Vaiśāli monarchy, its president or people must have figured in the Mahābhārata days."8 The reason of the complete absence of the Vaisalian royal names for the post-Sumati period appears to be that the territory was probably

---

1. See infra.
3. This second part of our argument is given by S. C. Sarkar, op. cit.
divided among several tribes and clans and hence it was not considered proper by the chroniclers to include the names of petty kings and kinglets or heads of such clans.

The Mahābhārata furnishes indirect evidences of the fact that Vaiśāli existed in some form or other in the age of the Bhārata War. As we already know, Viśālā and Vaiśāli are interchangeable. But such a Viśālā (in the sense of our Vaiśāli) is not mentioned in the Mahābhārata. There Viśālā stands for Badari¹ or a place near Badari² according to the commentary of Nilakanṭha. The Great Epic, however, mentions Vaiśāli (a princess), Vaiśāleyaḥ Bhoginaḥ (the Nāga chief-tains of Vaiśāli) and Viśālā (a river) which may be considered as connected with our Vaiśāli. If Nilakanṭha is rejected as a late authority belonging to the seventeenth century A. D., Viśālā may refer to Vaiśāli instead of Badari or a place near it.

Bhadrā-Vaiśāli was probably the “daughter of the king of Viśālā”.³ And this Viśālā might be our Vaiśāli. Tradition knows of kings of different dynasties sharing the favours of this princess. The king of Kārūṣha (either Vṛiddhaśarman or Dantavakra), Śiśupāla of Chedi, and Vasudeva of Dvāravatī (and Mathurā) are all stated to have had Bhadrā-Vaiśāli (which name can have belonged to only one person in Sarkar’s opinion) for their wife. Śiśupāla, however, obtained her by (impersonation or) force,⁴ because he abducted the Vaiśāli princess Bhadrā while she was on her way from Vaiśāli to Dvārakā; but regarding Vasudeva and Kārūṣha there are no special statements. This Bhadrā is also stated to have been Śiśupāla’s maternal uncle’s wife, whom he enjoyed under the guise of the Kārūṣha king, who was his mother’s sister’s husband. So Vasudeva and his brother-in-law apparently had equal access to Bhadrā-Vaiśāli. Thus she may either have been a ‘shared’ wife of Vasudeva, the Kārūṣha king, and Śiśupāla or a widow of one of the latter two, finally taken into the seraglio of Vasudeva. On the death of Vasudeva, she,⁵ along with his other favourite wives (viz., Devaki, Rohini-Pauravi, and Madirā) ascended his funeral

¹. Mbh, III. 139. 11; XII. 344. 20.
³. Sūrcean, Index, p. 699.
⁴. Mbh, II. 45. 11.
⁵. Mbh, XVI. 7. 18.
We are not sure if Bhadrā-Vaiśālī was one girl or there were three separate girls bearing this name.

As might be expected, Kṛṣṇa's cousin, Arjuna, was assisted in the Bhārata War by 'Vaiśāleyāḥ Bhogināh' said to be the 'Nāga' chieftains of Nāga clans; 2 but 'bhogināḥ' might also be equivalent of 'rājānāḥ'. (Probably the 'Nāga' princes were called 'Bhogins' or 'Bhojas' 3 for wearing the Nāga emblem—the cobra-hood mark, 'bhoga'—on their crowns, like Egyptian sovereigns.) Here, too, the 'bhogināḥ' or 'rājānāḥ' of Vaiśālī are referred to (in the plural). 4

The geography of the Mahābhārata knows of a Viśālā river, which was a branch or affluent of the Gandāki near Vaiśālī. This river is said to be a sacred one, in 'Gaya' country, counted as a second Sarasvatī, one of the 'Sapta-Sarasvata' group of sacred rivers, a tīrtha for pitṛi-worship, and as having a shrine of Karavīra, 5 the Nāga, at Karavīra-pura 7 on its banks. S. C. Sarkar 8 finds it tempting to identify these place-names with Kolhuā village (containing the Asokan pillar of Vaiśālī), adjacent to Saraiyā, on the east bank of the Bayā river (wrong for 'Gaya').


2. Mbh, VIII. 87. 44. We may add that one Takshaka Vaiśāleya is referred to in the Aṭhara-Śeda (VII. 10. 29) and the Nāgas of Vaiśālī are mentioned in the Dīgha-Nīkāya (Dial., II, p. 288). The association of Śīśu-'Nāga' with Vaiśālī (George Turnour, Mahārāmsa, Ceylon, 1837, Introduction, pp. 37-38) also may not be without significance. Serpent-images of the Gupta times found in the area are preserved in the Vaiśālī Museum.

3. The Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) refers to the use of 'Bhoja' as designating the clan name of a princely family. It says that all kings of living creatures (chiefly beasts) in the southern region are inaugurated for the enjoyment (of pleasures) and called 'Bhoja', i.e., enjoyer. A. Banerji-Sastri ('Visvāmitra in Bihar' in Proceedings and Transactions of the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference, Patna, 1930, p. 186) suggests that Bhojpur in Shahabad district was one of the seats of the Bhojas and that this term is not concerned with Rājā Bhoja of Ujjain in Malwa (contrast Shahabad District Gazetteer, p. 232). If it is so, the 'Bhogināḥ' or Bhojas of Vaiśālī, so close to Bhojpur, come within the range of possibility.

4. S. C. Sarkar, Homage, p. 63. Here also we have adopted Sarkar's view.

5. Mbh, IX. 38. 4, 21; XIII. 25. 44.

6. Ibid., I. 35. 12; V. 103. 14.

7. Ibid., XIII. 25. 44.

8. S. C. Sarkar, Homage, p. 63. We have found his suggestion to be useful and hence incorporated it here.
We now want to offer a suggestion which, if accepted, gives us a glimpse into the life and destiny of the Vaiśāli people in the age of the Bhārata War. The Mahābhārata gives a list of the eastern tribes vanquished by Bhīmasena in his digvijaya. This includes the Gaṇḍakas (i.e., the Gaṇḍaka people). Who were these Gaṇḍaka people? We propose to identify them with the people of Vaiśāli for two reasons:—

1. The people of Vaiśāli were (as they are even now) the inhabitants of the Gaṇḍaka valley and hence could very appropriately be called the Gaṇḍakas.

2. The Gaṇḍakas are mentioned just before the Videhas. Thus, if this order gives any clue to the geographical position of the tribes, it is this that the Videhas lay to the east of the Gaṇḍakas, as Bhīmasena was proceeding from the west to the east.

We have to make another suggestion also at this stage. In our view the three principal caste groups of Vaiśāli are mentioned in the Mahābhārata, viz., the Śarmakas (Brāhmaṇas), the Varmakas (=Kshatriyas) and the Gopālakakshas (=Vaiśyas) in connection with the eastern conquests of Bhīmasena. The Mahābhārata mentions the defeated parties at two places in the same chapter in the following order:—

List I—the Gopālakakshas, the Northern Kosalas, the king (adhipa) of the Mallas and (the) Jalodbhava (country).

List II—the Southern Mallas, Bhogwat Parvata, the Śarmakas, the Varmakas, the Vaidheka king Janaka, the Śakas, the Bārbaras and the seven Kirāta chieftains (adhipatis).

1. Mbh, II. 29. 4.
2. The practice of calling the people after a river valley was known to Megasthenes also who mentions the Gangaridai, v. l. Gangaritai (McGrindle, Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, Calcutta, 1925, p. 32). Pargiter suggests (J. A. S. B., 1897, p. 102) that the allusion to the Suhmas and Pra-Suhmas between Videha and Magadhā in the account of Bhīma's eastern conquests (Mbh, II. 30. 16) seems to be an error and that the reading should be Sonaḥ and Pra-Sonaḥ, which would mean people living near the river Sona, the modern Sone. He adds that the above suggestion of his may be compared with the name Śanavatyas which occurs along with Anis, Vaṅgas, Pundras and Gayas (Mbh, II. 52. 16), and which seems to be a mistake for Śanavatyas.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., II. 30. 3; VI. 9. 36.
7. Ibid., II. 30. 3-4.
Here, just as the king of the Mallas of list I and the Southern Mallas of list II complete the Malla picture and Jalodbhava of list I and the Šakas, the Barbaras and the Kirāta chieftains of list II complete another picture of the Himalayan tribes, similarly, we venture to suggest, the Gopālakakshas of list I and the Šarmakas and the Varakas of list II complete the picture of the Gaṇḍaka tribe mentioned in the previous chapter, i.e., of Vaiśāli. Our reasons for this identification are as follows:—

1. The position of the Šarmakas and the Varakas just before Videha leaves no doubt that they lived in the territory of Vaiśāli lying just to the west of Videha.

2. In Jaina literature Kuṇḍapura, the birth-place of Mahāvīra, is depicted as consisting of two distinct and well-defined parts, viz., those meant for the Brāhmaṇas (in the south) and for the Kshatriyas (in the north) who may easily be identified with the Šarmakas and the Varakas, because Šarman and Varman are recognised to be the titles of the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas respectively. Only the Vaiśāli area is noted for such a clear-cut distinction at such a remote time.

3. In Tibetan literature the city of Vaiśāli is depicted as consisting of three districts where lived the upper, the middle and the lower classes according to their positions. This also hints at some distinction presumably based on caste.

4. After identifying the Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya sections of Vaiśāli, the natural temptation is to make an effort for finding out the third constituent part (or element) of Vaisalian population which should be connected with or equivalent to the Vaiśya class, because in the sixth century B.C. we hear of Vaiśya from Jaina literature. Moreover, the story of the origin of the Lichchhavis as given by Buddhaghosha mentions cowherds who brought up the Lichchhavi (or Vajji) prince and princess. Who were these cowherds? The clue is provided by the word Gopāla-kaksha mentioned in the Mahābhārata whose location (in the Mahābhārata) near about Kosala, Malla and Jalodbhava (Himalayan) territories also supports our identification of the

3. B. C. Law, Kshatriya Clans in Buddhist India, pp. 18-21.
Gopāla-kakshas with the Vaiśya population of pre-Lichchhavīan (pre-Vajjian) Vaiśāli. It may be added that Vaiśāli had already come to possess a good Vaiśya population due to the degradation of Nābhāga and his descendants from Kshatriya- hood.1

5. At one place the Mahābhārata gives the list of tribes in this order:—the Kachchhas, the Gopālakakshas, the Jāṅgalas, the Kuru-Vaṇṇakas, the Kirātas, the Barbaras, the Siddhas, the Vaidehas and the Tāmraliptakas.2 The mention of the Gopālakakshas along with the Himalayan tribes and the Vaidehas supports our view.

6. That the three sections of the Gaṅdaka people of Vaiśāli existed from beforehand is proved from other sources: (a) The Brāhmaṇas acted as priests. The famous story of Sarīvarta in the time of Marutta illustrates this. Moreover, the Vasishṭha priests of the Ikshvākus of Ayodhyā probably came to Vaiśāli also along with the Ikshvākus as the Lichchhavis of the later period are called Vaiśishṭhas. The Ikshvākus had three kingdoms namely at Ayodhyā, Vaiśāli and Mithilā. The remnants continued in the Vajjian period also. (b) The story of Nābhāga says that he and his descendants were degraded to become Vaiśyas. They continued as farmers and Gopālakakshas in the time of the Mahābhārata and even later.

Thus we can conclude that the period of the Bhārata War saw the beginning of a process of dividing Vaiśāli into three caste group areas which culminated in the sixth century B. C. of which we have so much evidence. The possibility of the advent of some fresh tribes from the mountainous areas and their admixture with Vaisalian population also cannot be entirely precluded.3

The Pali commentary4 Paramatthajotikā on the Khuddaka-

---

1. The story is given in the Mārka, 113-114. Nābhāga's wife asked her son Bhalaṇḍana to be a Gopāla (Mārka, 114. 6, 9) which word now assumes peculiar importance for us.
3. Cf. V. Rangacharya, Vaiśā India, Part I, p. 434: "It is quite probable that, to a certain extent, this important political and constitutional change was due to the advent of the Mongoloid or semi-Mongoloid elements from the farther north and east". The existence of the Nāga Bhoginas of Vaiśāli (Mārka, VIII. 87. 44) may also point to the admixture of population by this time.
Pātha narrates a story about the origin of the Lichchhavis (Vajjīs) which is of a legendary character. This speaks of an ascetic along the shore of the Ganges close by a settlement of cowherds and also a (local?) king. We have no means to examine these details. Gradually the "dark age" was nearing its close when the Lichchhavis came to the scene to usher in a new era of republicanism in the history of the Gaḍākā Valley.
BOOK THREE

THE REPUBLIC

Circa 725 B. C.—C. 484 B. C.

( About two and a half centuries )
INTRODUCTION

So far we have treated the monarchical history of the Vaiśāli region. But some time before the advent of Buddhism the whole tract came to be dominated by a group of some republican clans with their capital at Vaiśāli. We are fortunate in possessing wealth of details about this period in Buddhist literature and in the subsequent pages we shall utilise it; but before we do so we have to note a few problems which still remain unsolved and for solving which we have no means. They are:

1. The last known monarch of Vaiśāli was Sumati who was a contemporary of Daśaratha. Some time before the advent of Buddhism Vaiśāli is found to be the capital of the Vaiśāli region. The beginning of the Vajjian Republic (i.e., the Republic of the numerous clans so called) may be placed at c. 725 B.C.¹ But this does not solve the problem. It raises some connected issues, e.g., (a) When did the Lichchhavis (the most important of the clans) come to power—(i) just after Sumati or (ii) after the Mahābhārata War or (iii) just before the Vajjian Republic or (iv) simultaneously with it? (b) Did the rise of all the republican clans take place at the same time or did they come one after the other and get themselves amalgamated with one another?

2. Karāla Janaka was the last king of the Janaka dynasty who perished with his relations, and the dynasty came to an end. Did the Lichchhavis have anything to do with the fall of the Janaka dynasty (under Karāla Janaka)? Who were the successors of the Janakas at Mithilā?

Leaving these problems unsolved due to lack of data, we now take up in detail the history of the Vajjian Republic which represents the most glorious period of North Bihar history.

¹ See infra.
CHAPTER X
THE DATE OF THE FOUNDATION
OF THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

The exact date of the foundation of the Vajjian Republic is not known to us. For determining this we may put forth the following data:—

1. The Vajjian Republic was a well-established institution in the time of the Buddha (567-487 B.C.) who spoke well of it and referred to its seven great characteristics. For attaining this high position we must allow about one or one and a half centuries.

2. The Aṅguttara-Nikāya refers to sixteen Mahājanapadas (states) which include, besides Vajji, Kāśi and Aṅga as well. Kāśi was conquered by Kosala and Aṅga by Magadha at later dates. Thus the Vajjians had established their republic before the Kosalan conquest of Kāśi and the Magadhan conquest of Aṅga. The exact, or even approximate, date of the first event is not known. The second event took place in the reign of Bimbisāra (547-495 B.C.).

3. The story of Karāla Janaka, who perished along with his kingdom and relations due to his misrule, shows that there was a great dynastic revolution in Videha ending in his death. This might probably have something to do with the foundation of the Vajjian Republic in the Vaiśāli region. In the absence of any concrete data, we may accept this as a working hypothesis and proceed to determine the date of the death of Karāla Janaka, the last king of the Janaka dynasty of Videha.

For this purpose we have to know the number of generations of Videhan rulers who governed Videha from the Bhārata

1. The Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta. See infra for details.
2. P. H. A. I., p. 96. See ibid., pp. 95-96 for an analysis of relevant texts. Raychaudhuri accepts “the Buddhist list as a correct representation of the political condition of India after the fall of the House of Janaka” (p. 96).
3. See P. H. A. I., pp. 82-83 for references.
4. Raychaudhuri has already done it when he says (ibid., p. 83) that “the overthrow of the monarchy” in Videha “was followed by the rise of a republic—the Vajjian Confederacy.”
DATE OF FOUNDATION

War (C. 950 B.C.) to the death of Karāla Janaka. And for determining this, we have to find out the number of generations of Indian kings that ruled between the Bhārata War and the rise of Buddhism. This can be done with the help of the Purāṇas which supply post-Bhārata War genealogies for three dynasties, and numbers of kings of various Indian states who ruled between the Bhārata War and the reign of Mahāpadma Nanda. From a critical analysis of the three post-Bhārata War genealogies of the Pauravas (Hastināpura-Kauśāmbī), the Aikshvākus (Kosala) and the Bāhradraathas (Magadha) and their comparison with the numbers of kings of various Indian states who ruled between the Bhārata War and the reign of Mahāpadma Nanda, we arrive at the conclusion that twenty-two generations flourished between the Bhārata War and the rise of Buddhism. The process resulting in the said conclusion is as follows:—

Pradhan¹ has reconstructed the genealogies of these three post-Bhārata War dynasties handed down to us in a more or less perfect order, all of them starting from the time of the Mahābhārata War and stopping with the age of Gautama Buddha: (1) the Paurava line of the descendants of Arjuna Pāṇḍava, (2) the Kosala line of the descendants of Bhīradbala, and (3) the Magadha line of the descendants of Sahadeva Jārāśandhi. He has shown that from the accession of Parikshita (grandson of Arjuna Pāṇḍava) to the accession of Udayana (son of Śatānīka II) twenty-two generations passed away;² from the accession of Bhīratkshaya on the death of his father Bhīradbala at the Bhārata War to the accession of Prasenajit (circa 533 B.C.) twenty-two generations passed away;³ and we have a line of twenty-two kings from Somādhi (successor of Sahadeva Jārāśandhi) to the last king Ripuñjaya both inclusive.⁴ Thus we find that from the Bhārata War to the rise of Buddhism twenty-two generations passed away. We accept this verdict

¹. S. N. Pradhan, Chronology of Ancient India (Calcutta, 1927), pp. 244–259.
². Ibid., p. 259. Hence from Arjuna’s son Abhimanyu to Śatānīka II’s accession there were 22 generations.
³. Ibid., p. 253.
⁴. Ibid., p. 254. The accession of Bimbhāra, who presumably succeeded Ripuñjaya in Magadha, and in whose time the rise of Buddhism took place, is dated 547 B.C., if we accept the Buddhist tradition (ibid., pp. 244, 245).
of the three post-Bhārata War genealogies available to us. The average reign for the period works out at \((950-540) \frac{1}{22} = 18\frac{2}{11}\) years, \textit{i.e.}, 19 years.

If we compare this result with another similar piece of Puranic evidence, we find that our conclusion is correct. The \textit{Purāṇas} give the numbers of kings of certain Indian states who ruled from the time of the narration of the \textit{Purāṇas} (\textit{c}. 850 B.C., according to Pargiter) to the extermination of those states by Mahāpadma Nanda (whose accession took place in 347 B.C. if the Buddhist evidence contained in the \textit{Mahāvaṃsa} is relied on). According to the \textit{Purāṇas} "there reigned between those initial and final points, 24 Aikshvākus, 27 Pañchālas, 24 Kāsīs, 28 Haihayas, 32 Kaliṅgas, 25 Aśmakas, 26 Kurus (Pauravas), 28 Maithilas, 23 Śūrasenas and 20 Vītihotras, that is 257 kings in ten kingdoms, or a mean of 26 kings."\textsuperscript{1} For these 26 we may allow reigns of medium length. Pargiter,\textsuperscript{3} who examined 14 series of from 20 to 30 kings in various eastern and western countries, found that the longest average just exceeded 24 years in one case, the shortest was about 12 and the average of all was 19. Hence, on principle, we may allow 19 years as the average to each reign. And this is confirmed when we find out the average in this particular case which works out at \((850-347) \frac{1}{26} = 19\frac{1}{19}\) years, \textit{i.e.}, 19 years (according to the rule of approximation).

We can test this in another way too. In order to get the number of generations from the Bhārata War to the accession of Mahāpadma Nanda, "we must add the kings who preceded those three kings" (during whose reigns the \textit{Purāṇas} were narrated), "namely, 5 Pauravas (for Yudhishṭhira’s reign must be included), 4 Aikshvākus and 6 Bārhadrathas, that is, a mean of 5".\textsuperscript{4} Thus the number of generations comes to \(26+5=31\) and the average reign for the entire period works at \((950-347) \div 31 = 19\frac{1}{4}\) years, \textit{i.e.}, 19 years.

\textsuperscript{1} The average of the dates of accessions of Bimbisāra (547 B.C.) and Prasenajit (533 B.C.) has been taken as 540 B.C. for the sake of calculational convenience.


\textsuperscript{3} A. I. H. T., pp. 181-182.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 182.
Applying the result to the history of Magadha in whose case only the list of kings is continuous, we find that our conclusion that twenty-two generations passed away between the Bhārata War and the rise of Buddhism (say, 540 B.C., taking the approximate mean date of the beginning of the reigns of Bimbisāra, Śatānīka II and Prasenajit) receives strange corroboration. According to our calculation there were twenty-two generations up to the time of Bimbisāra’s accession. The total number of generations from the Bhārata War to the accession of Mahāpadma Nanda, as shown above, is 31. Thus there should be nine generations from the accession of Bimbisāra to the accession of Mahāpadma Nanda, which is admirably correct.¹

Next we attempt to find out the number of generations of Videhan kings between the Bhārata War and the extinction of the Janaka dynasty and the subsequent predominance of the Vajjian Republic in North Bihar. One thing is certain that the Vajjian Republic had been established much earlier than the rise of Buddhism. If we admit all the kings of Videha for the post-War monarchical period, there will be too many of them and our chronological framework will collapse. Hence we can state frankly that there is no ‘accommodation’ for all of them.²

The Jātakas mention the names of fifteen kings³ of Videha in all, including those of Makkhādeva, who is regarded as the founder of Mithilā monarchy, and Āṅgati whom we consider to have flourished not earlier than the sixth century B.C.⁴ Thus there are left thirteen kings whom we would like to place in the post-War period before the death of Karāla Janaka. For practical purposes, this list may be regarded as more or less complete.

¹ According to the Mahānāmas (Pradhan, op. cit., p. 288) the rulers of Magadha and their reign-periods were as follows:—Bimbisāra (52 years), Ajātaśatru (32 years), Udāyin (16 years), Anuruddha and Muddha (8 years), Nāga-Dāsaka (24 years), Sūnāga (18 years), Kālāsoka (28 years) and the ten sons of Kālāsoka (22 years).

² A few may be ‘accommodated’ if we suppose a collateral branch.

³ The names of the kings of Videha available in the Jātakas are as follows (Jātaka Nos. are given within brackets):—(A) Suruchi I, Suruchi II, Suruchi III, Mahāpanāda (489 and 264); (B) Mahājanaka I, Aritthajana, Polajanaka, Mahājanaka II, Dīghāvā (539); (C) Śādhana, Nārada (494); (D) Nimi, Kalāra (9, 408 and 541); (E) Makkhādeva (9 and 541); and (F) Āṅgati (544).

⁴ For arguments, see Ratilal N. Mehta, Pre-Buddhist India, p. 52.
Thus there were thirteen kings and they belonged to twelve generations (as in one case the ruler was succeeded by his brother and not son)\(^1\).

Giving 19 years to each generation, as indicated just before, we can say that the twelve generations of post-Bhārata War kings of Videha ruled approximately for 225 years. Thus their period of rule extends from 950 B. C. to 725 B.C. This fits in well with the date of Nimi also, the penultimate sovereign of Videha, who is said to have adopted the faith of the Jainas.\(^2\) Pārśva was probably the first historical Jina. He flourished 250 years before Mahāvīra whose date in our opinion\(^3\) is 561 B.C.—490 B.C. Hence the date of Pārśva would be 840 B.C.—740 B.C. The Arhat Pārśva lived thirty years as a householder, eighty-three days in a state inferior to perfection, something less than seventy years as a Kevalin, full seventy years as a Śramaṇa, and a hundred years on the whole.\(^4\) Thus he became a Jina in 810 B. C. and lived up to 740 B. C. So Nimi of Videha could have accepted Jainism after 810 B. C. and not before that. This fixes the upper limit.

The lower limit is fixed by the fact that the Jātakas mention 12 generations of Videhan kings who ruled for about 225 years.

Hence in our opinion the end of the Janaka dynasty took place in about 725 B.C. Raychaudhuri's view\(^5\) that “the fall of the Videhan monarchy” (\(i.e.,\) the death of Karāla Janaka) took place “probably early in the sixth century B. C.” is unacceptable to us for the reasons stated above.

Thus, in our view, the foundation of the Vajjian Republic, which is believed to have synchronized with the fall of the Janaka dynasty of Videha, took place in about 725 B.C. This also gives adequate time to the Republic to organise itself on a sound footing so as to elicit praise from the Exalted One.

Having discussed the kāla (date), we may now proceed to take up the pātra (actor, character) and the deśa (territory) of the Republic.

1. Ariṭṭhajanaka and Polajanaka were brothers, both being sons of Mahājanaka I.
2. S. B. E., 45, p. 87.
3. See infra.
5. P. H. A. I., p. 95.
CHAPTER XI

THE CONSTITUENT CLANS OF THE
VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

The form of government established in a good portion of North Bihar after the abolition of monarchy is called ‘Saṅgha’\(^1\) or ‘Gaṇa’\(^2\) in Buddhist literature. There was no king in this form of government; nay, every head of a family was a ‘king’ there.

What was the name of the Saṅgha or Gaṇa that ruled the Vaiśāli region in the time of the Buddha and Mahāvīra (i.e., in the sixth century B.C.)? The name appears to be Vṛjji (in Sanskrit) or Vajji\(^3\) (in Pali). In the famous passage in the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta,\(^4\) the Buddha refers to the seven characteristics of the republican Vajjis (or Vajjians). Pāṇini\(^5\) also refers to the Vṛijjis. Kauṭilya,\(^6\) however, distinguishes the Vṛijjis from the Lichchhivikas.

What was the number of the constituent clans of the Vajjian Republic? Here we are in the dark. The name of a judicial committee of the Republic—Astṭhakulakā\(^7\) (Asṭṭhakulakā)—has been interpreted as giving the total number of the kulas or varṇas (clans) constituting the confederacy and it is said on that ground that the confederacy included eight confederate clans.\(^8\) The argument has no legs to stand on, because the word Astṭhakulaka (i.e., Council of Eight Kulakas) is a judicial word\(^9\) and should not be interpreted in a literal manner as has so far

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
5. Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, IV. 2. 131.
7. D. A., II, p. 519. There is no other evidence regarding the number of the clans (D. P. P. N., II, p. 813, n.).
been done. There is no basis to think that the eight members of the judicial court represented the eight clans of the Republic. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that because of the preponderant position of the Lichchhavis in the Republic, they might have had more representatives in the said court, if at all the appointment was made on the basis of the clans for which no evidence exists.

Let us now try to know the names of the constituent clans of the Vajjian Republic before we take up their details.

The Lichchhavis of Vaiśālī were the most important and influential clan of the Vajjian Republic. They occupied the capital which was the seat of monarchy in remoter past. Another important clan was the Jñātṛikas to which family Vardhamāna Mahāvira, the twenty-fourth and the last Tirthaṅkara, belonged. The identity of the other clans remains uncertain. It may, however, be noted that in a passage of the Sūtrakritāṅga the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikshvākas and the Kauravas are associated with the Jñātṛis and the Lichchhavis as subjects of the same king and members of the same assembly. In order to know the real value of this passage, it is proper to give below the whole of it and the next one:

"Here in the East, West, North, and South many men have been born according to their merit, as inhabitants of this our world, viz., some as Āryas, some as non-Āryas, some in noble families, some in low families, some as big men, some as small men, some of good complexion, some of bad complexion, some as handsome men, some as ugly men. And of these men one man is king, who is strong like the great Himavat, Malaya, Mandara, and Mahendra mountains, . . . . who governs his kingdom in which all riots and mutinies have been suppressed. And this king had an assembly of Ugras and sons of Ugras, Bhogas and sons of Bhogas, Aikshvākas and sons of Aikshvākas, Jñātṛis and sons of Jñātṛis, Kauravas and sons of Kauravas, warriors and sons of warriors, Brāhmaṇas and sons of

1. S. B. E., 45, p. 339 (Sūtrakritāṅga, II. 1. 19).

2. Here Hermann Jacobi, the translator, remarks in a footnote (S. B. E., 45, p. 339, n. 1) that "this is one of the āvṛṣaka or typical descriptions which are so frequent in the canonical books. The full text is given in the Aupapātika-Sūtra, ed. Leumann, § 11, pp. 26 ff."
Brāhmaṇas, Lichchhavis and sons of Lichchhavis, commanders and sons of commanders, generals and sons of generals. (13)

“And of these men some one is full of faith. Forsooth, the Śramaṇas or Brāhmaṇas made up their mind to go to him. Being professors of some religion (they thought) ‘We shall teach him our religion’. (And they said): ‘Know this, dear sir, that we explain and teach this religion well’. (14)"

The context makes it clear that the description of the king, who is an unknown figure without any geographical indication, is purely literary or canonical, and never of a historical character. Hence the view that the passage indicates the names of the “peoples of the confederacy” is not tenable; because it is based on insufficient, unsatisfactory and rather unhistorical material. Who is that king who is strong like great mountains and has suppressed all riots and mutinies in his kingdom? Why, when and where did this king hold an assembly of various clansmen and others (e.g., Brāhmaṇas and warriors) together with their sons? What was the relation between the king and the clans: were they under him or his neighbours? It is difficult to answer these pertinent questions satisfactorily. The assembly, if any, was of a religious character which anyone interested in religious and spiritual discussions might attend, even sons of the clansmen and the Brāhmaṇas and others (whose ages are not indicated and) who might not become members of a political assembly so easily. The passage in question simply shows that the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikshvākas and the Kauravas had some sort of connection (what sort of connection it was is not clear) with the Jāātṛis and the Lichchhavis.

Although the above Sātrakṛtilāga passage does not prove anything with regard to the republican character of the tribes or clans mentioned therein or their probable membership of the Vajjian confederacy, it may be presumed, because of the association of the Jāātṛis and the Lichchhavis with the other clans, that these other clans, viz., the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikshvākas and the Kauravas, lived in close proximity with the Jāātṛis and the Lichchhavis. Thus they might have occupied parts of North Bihar or Tirhut, although they might not have separate repub-

1. “Apparently the king is meant” (Jacobi, S. B. E., 45, p. 339, n. 3).
2. P. H. A. I., p. 120 (by implication).
lican constitutions for themselves; at least we do not have any evidence for their separate republican constitutions. It may be added that because the Lichchhavis and the Videhas were the principal clans of North Bihar possessing this region, these other clans must have been of much less importance in North Bihar.

It is convenient to place here the known history of the republican Lichchhavis and other clans that inhabited the Vajjian territory. It is these who were the founders and the preservers of the Vajjian Republic.

1. THE LICHCHHAVIS

The Lichchhavis were the most powerful of the clans that inhabited the Vajjian territory (Lichchhāvi Vajjiratthavāsī hi pasatthā). They are mentioned most in Buddhist literature among the Vajjian tribes. Their capital was at Vaiśāli. Another reason of their comparative importance was that it was they who re-emerged later as masters of Vaiśāli and Nepal. This shows that "their power endured, whether independently or under the suzerainty of some greater power, for 800 years or more." Thus "the race of the Lichchhavis and their organisation must have been of great vitality." These are Lichchhavi, 1

1. The Videhas of Mithilā, as we shall show later, had a monarchical constitution at least up to the time of Mahāpadma Nanda (c. 347 B. C.).
3. "The kings of Tibet and Ladak also trace their descent from the Lichchhavis" (A. G. I., p. 517).
5. Ibid.
6. For a discussion see B. C. Law, Kshatriya Clans in Buddhist India, pp. 2-9 and Tribes in Ancient India (Poona 1943), pp. 294-297.
Lechchhavi, Lechchhai, Lechchhaki, Lichchhivi, Nichchhivi, Lichhikhi, and Lichhavi. Of these the Lichchhavi seems to be most widely used in Pali literature and inscriptions and on coins, and also in non-Indian literature. The earliest mention in Sanskrit literature of this people is in Kauṭilya’s Arthāśāstra, where they are called Lichchhivīs. Medhatithi and Govindarāja, the two earliest commentators of the Manu-Smṛiti, read Lichchhivi and this reading tallies exactly with the name as given by Kauṭilya. Therefore, this form represents the earliest spelling of this word in the Brahmanical Sanskrit literature. It is only Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, the Bengali commentator of the fifteenth century, who reads Nichchhivi in this verse of Manu (X. 22). This was due to a confusion between La and Na of the fifteenth century in the Bengali language. Moreover, these letters are frequently inter-changed in our tongues as we know from our common experience.


2. Sūtrakritāṅga (S. B. E., 45, p. 321, n. 3).
4. Kauṭilya’s Arthāśāstra (XI. 1). Some Gupta inscriptions, e.g., the Bhitari stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta and the Gayā copper-plate inscription of Samudragupta, considered to be spurious (Fleet, pp. 53 and 256 respectively; Sircar, pp. 313 and 265 respectively). Medhatithi and Govindarāja on Manu (X. 22) for which see Bühler, The Laws of Manu, S. B. E., 25 (Oxford, 1886), p. 406, n.
5. Kullūka Bhaṭṭa and Rāghavānanda on Manu (X. 22) for which see usual editions.
6. Nandanačārya on Manu (X. 22) for which see Bühler, op. cit., p. 406, n.
The origin of the Lichchhavis (or the Vajjians) has been a matter of great controversy. Western scholars (and an Indian writer) regarded them as of foreign extraction, though they were not unanimous with regard to their exact nationality. Thus the Lichchhavis have been represented as Scythians, Kolaris, Tibetans and Persians by different authorities.

Samuel Beal\(^1\) takes the Lichchhavis or Vajjis to be a branch of the Yue-chi forgetting that the latter came to India in the first century B.C. while the Lichchhavis were a highly civilized and prosperous people in the sixth century B.C.

In the opinion of J. F. Hewitt\(^2\) there are “very strong indications that the Vajjians, who were certainly the earliest settlers in the country, were of Kolarian race, who had lived there long before the arrival of the Dravidians and Aryans”. The learned writer ignores the existence of the pre-Vajjian Aryan dynasty of rulers at Vaisali.

V. A. Smith\(^3\) found similarities between the customs of the Tibetans and those of the Lichchhavis in the practice of the exposure of the dead and also in judicial procedure. And hence he came to the conclusion that the Lichchhavis, the ruling tribe or clan in the Vrijiji country of which Vaisali was the capital, was really a Tibetan (or Mongolian) tribe which settled in the plains during the prehistoric times. This view was attacked by B. C. Law,\(^4\) K. P. Jayaswal,\(^5\) H. C. Raychaudhuri\(^6\) and others. The arguments advanced by the Indian scholars were that (1) the customs of the disposal of the dead were prevalent among the Vedic Aryans from whom the Lichchhavis were descended; and (2) in the case of Tibet we have only three courts as against the seven tribunals of the


Lichchhavis; further, we know very little about the relative antiquity of the Tibetan procedure which might very well have been suggested by the system expounded in the *Aṭṭhakathā*.

Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana suggested a Persian origin for the Lichchhavis holding that the name Lichchhavi (Nichchhibi of Manu, X. 22) was derived from the Persian city of Nisibis. There is very little in Vidyabhusana’s surmise except a fancied resemblance between the names Nichchhivi and Nisibis. Inscriptions of the Achaemenids are silent about any Persian settlement in Eastern India in the sixth or fifth century B.C. The Lichchhavi people were more interested in Yaksha Chaityas and the teaching of Mahāvīra and the Buddha than in the deities and prophets of Iran.

The Lichchhavis have been invariably represented as Kshatriyas in ancient Indian literature. As the *Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta* informs us, they claimed a share of the remnants of the Buddha’s body on the ground that they were Kshatriyas like the Buddha himself: “The Exalted One was a Kshatriya and so are we. We are worthy to receive a portion of the relics of the Exalted One.” Similar claims based on the same argument were put forth also by Ajātaśatru, the king of Magadha, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Koliyas of Rāmagāma, the Mallas of Pāvā and the Moriyas of Pippalivana, while the Śākyas of Kapilavastu claimed him as their very kin. In the introduction to the *Sīlā-Jātaka* we read of a Lichchhavi girl, the daughter of a Kshatriya and high-born. A Lichchhavi named Mahāli says, “I am a Khattiya, so is the Buddha. If his knowledge increases and he becomes all-knowing, why should it not happen to me?” In the Jaina *Kalpa-Śūtra* Trīśalā, sister to Čheṭaka, the Lichchhavi leader of Vaisālī, is styled Kshatriyāṇi.

---

2. P. H. A. I., p. 122, n. 3.
The Lichchhavis enjoyed great prestige, which is not usually accorded to foreigners. The Buddha\(^1\) compared them with the Tāvatiṃsa gods.\(^2\) That they were looked upon as persons of very high pedigree appears also from a passage in a work of the Jaina sacred literature, the *Śūtrakṛitiṅga* (I. 13. 10), where we read: “A Brāhmaṇa or Kshatriya by birth, a scion of the Ugra race or a Lichchhavi, who enters the order of alms giving him by others, is not stuck up on account of his renowned Gotra.”\(^3\) In the time of the *Arthaśāstra* (XI. 1) of Kautilya also the Lichchhavis (Lichchhivikas) and the Vṛjīs (Vṛjjikas) were of equal rank and position with the great Kshatriya peoples of Northern India, \(viz.,\) the Madras (Madrakas)\(^4\) in the west, the Kuru-Paśchālas\(^5\) in the central region and the Mallas (Mallakas)\(^6\) in the east.

Accounts of the origin of the Lichchhavis are furnished in Buddhaghosha’s *Paramatthagotika* on the *Khuddekapājha*\(^7\) and the *Pujāvalīya,*\(^8\) a Ceylonese Buddhist work. These stories are entirely mythical but show at least that the Lichchhavis were regarded as Kshatriyas.\(^9\)

In the Nepal Vaṃśāvalī the Lichchhavis have been allotted to the Sūryavamśa or solar race of the Kshatriyas.\(^10\) This is quite in agreement with the evidence from the Buddhist sources and the Jaina records that they were Vāsishṭhas by gotra, for we know from the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*\(^11\) that the gotra

---


2. The Tāvatiṃsa-devā are the gods in heaven of the Great Thirty-Three, the principal deities of the Vedic Pantheon (*Dīkṣārī, II, p. 103, n. 2*). Had the Lichchhavis been kinmen of snub-nosed peoples who lived beyond the Himalayas, the writers of the *Mahāparinibbāṇa-Sutta* and the *Mahāvastu* would not have instituted this comparison.


4. The Madras and the Vṛjīs are grouped together in a *śūtra* (IV. 2. 131) by Pāṇini also, who flourished earlier.

5. The Kauravas are associated with the Lichchhavis as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly (S. B. E., 45, p. 339).

6. For the affinity of the Lichchhavis with the Mallas and the Śākyas see Law, *Kṣatriya Clans*, pp. 16-17.


or pravara of a Kshatriya is the same as that of his Purohita or family priest, who makes him perform the sacrifices.¹ The Vāsishṭha gotra was therefore the gotra of their family priest, and we know that the Vāsishṭhas were the family priests of the kings of the solar race, especially of the Ikshvākus.

Manu (X. 22) concurs in the view that the Lichchhavis are the Rājanyas or Kshatriyas, though of the Vrātya variety, who are not very particular about initiation and similar other ceremonies and practices required to be performed by the regulations of the orthodox Brāhmaṇas.²

The inter-relation between the Lichchhavis and the Vṛijis (or Vṛijikas) is not quite clear. At some places these terms appear to be inter-changeable.³ And this is not improbable, because although the Lichchhavis were the most prominent constituent of the Republic, it was generally called the Saṅgha or Gaṇa of the Vajjis.⁴ The Lichchhavis would not possibly have allowed this name, had they not themselves been Vajjians. In one passage⁵ the Lichchhavi, Mahānāma, seeing that a band of young Lichchhavis who had been out hunting were gathered round the Buddha, is represented as saying, “They (i.e., these Lichchhavis) will become Vajjians, they will become Vajjians (Bhavissanti Vajji bhavissanti Vajji)!” This probably only means that there was great hope of these Lichchhavi young men becoming true Vajjians, practising the seven conditions of welfare taught by the Buddha, conditions which ensured their prosperity, and leading a more cultured life. Thus the Vajji (Vajjian) appears to be a more dignified term.⁶ It might have originally been given to the tribe which inhabited

1. For this rule see Āvalokitēsvara-Srauta-Sūtra, I. 3. 3; XII. 15. 4. Also see R. G. Bhandarkar, Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems, p. 12.

2. Also see Manu, X. 20 (definition of Vṛātya), II. 38-39 (upper limit of the initiation).

3. By combining A., IV, pp. 16-27 (Vajji-Varga) and Dīśa., II, p. 80; also the legendary story given by Buddhaghosha of the origin of the Lichchhavis (Paramatthajotikā on the Khuddakapāṭha, ed. H. Smith, P. T. S., pp. 138-160: Kshatriya Clan, pp. 20-21). The writer of D. P. P. N. (Vol. II, pp. 814, 779) also seems to hold the same view, though he does not give suitable examples as we have done in this foot-note.


6. Was it for this reason that Pāṇini (Aṣṭādhyāyī, IV. 2. 131) preferred the term Vṛijī to Lichchhavi?
what is known as Vajjirattha (Vrjiti-rāśṭra), i.e., the Vajjian country, in Buddhist literature. Later a separation seems to have taken place among the Vajjis or Lichchhavis, because the Arthadīśstra (XI. 1) of Kautilya mentions the Lichchhivika and the Vṛjīka1 (v.i. Vrajika) as two distinct republics belonging to the class whose consuls bore the title of ‘Rājā’ or ‘King.’

We now take up the details of the clans other than the Lichchhavi-Vṛjī one. Of these we obviously regard the clan of Mahāvīra as more important than the rest.

2. THE JNĀTRIKAS

The Jñātrikas, who also were Kshatriyas,2 were the clan of Siddhārtha and his son Mahāvīra, the Jina. Siddhārtha’s wife was Trisalā, the sister of Cheṭaka, the Lichchhavi leader of Vaiśāli. The principal seats of the Jñātrikas were Kshatriya-Kuṇḍapura (or Kuṇḍagrāma) and Kollāga, suburbs of Vaiśāli.

The Jñātrikas were of Kaśyapa gotra.3

Buddhist literature also knows this clan because it calls Mahāvīra Nāṭaputta and Nāṭaputta.4

The religion of Pārvanātha seems to have influenced his tribe early because the Ačāraṅga-Sūtra5 states that the Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra’s parents were worshippers of Pārśva and followers of the Śramanās.

The Jñātrikas could not have been a separate republic, because their settlement was quite close to Vaiśāli, probably a part of the central capital. We may, however, presume that they might have co-operated with the Lichchhavis in the emergence of the Vajjian Republic.

Rahula Sankrityayana6 suggests that the present Jethariyā

1. Some time ago I proposed the name Vṛjikā or Vṛjikā for the dialect spoken at present in the Muzaffarpur District after the glorious republican tribe of the Vṛjīs inhabiting the ancient Vajji-raṭṭha. This name is gradually gaining currency.
3. Ibid., pp. 193, 255.
4. Many examples. As Nāṭaputta is one of the epithets of Mahāvīra (e.g., A., I, p. 220; IV, pp. 180 ff; 429), we venture to suggest that the Nāṭa of Manu (X. 22), a Vṛṣṭya Rājanya clan like the Lichchhavi and the Malla, is Nāṭa, i.e., Jñātri, another republican tribe of the Sarayū-Gandāka Valley.
5. S. B. E., 22, p. 194.
Brāhmaṇa (a subdivision of the Bhūmihāra Brāhmaṇa community), found in a large number in the Vaiśālī area and having Kāśyapa as his gotra, is the modern representative of the Jñātṛis (Jñātri=Jñātara=Jatara=Jathara=Jathariyā=Jethariyā). We, however, do not accept this because the Jethariyā community came to the Muzaffarpur district in the Muslim period, has its ancestral village at Jethar (Jayasthala) Dih in the Saran district and was known as a subdivision of ‘Pachhimā Brāhmaṇa’ till a few decades ago. Moreover, Jñātri =Jethariyā is not possible from a philological point of view.

3. THE UGRAS

The Anguttara-Nikāya refers to the close connection of the Ugras with Vaiśālī, the capital of the Vṛijian Republic. They are also associated with Hatthigāma. A city of the Ugras is mentioned in the Dhammapada Commentary. If the word Ugra in Ugraputra of the Brihadāraṇyaka-Upanishad (III. 8.2) is a proper name, we may say that the Ugras were a militant race found in Kāśi and Videha states also. Buddhist literature mentions a “city of the Ugga” which was visited by the Buddha who converted a great number of the Ugga people in it. From the different versions of the story it becomes very difficult to identify this Ugra city which might be Sāvatthi (Śrāvasti) or Sāketa or Champā. One Polāsapura situated somewhere between Kāmpilyanagara and Vāṇijyagrama is mentioned in the Uḍāsagadasāṇa where many people of the Ugga and Bhoga tribes are said to have entered into the monastic state. This place might be either in Paśichāla or in Kosala or in the Vajji country. Our only aim in mentioning these facts is that the Ugras were not

1. Purāñattaya-nibandhāvalī, p. 108; Buddhacharyā, p. 493, n. 2. Sankrityayana says that this identification was first suggested by K. P. Jayawal and that he has only added some arguments (Purāñattaya-nibandhāvalī, p. 108).
limited to one town or state: they seem to have occupied a good part of the Gangetic Valley.

That the Ugras, like the Lichchhavis, were looked upon as persons of very high pedigree appears from a passage in a work of the Jaina sacred literature, the Sūtrakritāngā (I. 13. 10),¹ where we read: "A Brāhmaṇa or Kshatriya by birth, a scion of the Ugra race or a Lichchhavi, who enters the order eating alms given him by others, is not stuck up on account of his renowned Gotra."² They were, according to the Jainas, descendants of those whom Rishabha, the first Tīrthaṅkara, appointed to the office of Kotwals or prefects of towns.³

The Lalitavistara,⁴ a Buddhist work, mentions the script of the Ugras, being one of the 64 scripts intended to be taught to boy Gautama (Bodhisattva) by the tutor Viśvāmitra. Another such script mentioned, in which we may be interested here, is that of Pārva-Videha.

According to Manu, X. 9, 49, the Ugras were a mixed caste, sprung from a Kshatriya father and a Śūdra mother (so also in the Abhidhāna-Chintāmai, v. 896), who lived by catching and killing animals living in holes. There is a Rajput clan (gotra) called 'Uga' still existing in the Mallani area on the borders of Marwar and Sind.⁵ In Bengal there is a class of people (mostly agriculturists) commonly called 'Āguri', who claim to be Ugra Kshatriyas and fall into two divisions, popularly called 'Jāna' and 'Sūt'.⁶ Hoernle⁷ throws out the suggestion that the Ugga may be identical with the Tartar tribe of the Ung (Ungkut) or Uighur (Yue-chi), a portion of which had settled in Tibet, and thence may have descended to settlements in India.⁸ In view of the high pedigree of the Ugras this view does not appear to be acceptable.

5. See the Rajputana Gazetteer, p. 275; also Sherring's Hindu Tribes and Castes, Vol. III, p. 46.
4. THE BHOGAS

The Bhogas, too, like the Ugras, are said to be Kshatriyas in Jaina literature. They were descendants from those whom Ṛishabha, the first Jaina Tīrthaṅkara, acknowledged as persons deserving of honour.¹ The Mahāparinibbāṇa-Suttanta² mentions Bhaṇḍāgāma, Hatthigāma, Ambagāma, Jambugāma and Bhoganagara on the way from Vaiśāli to Pāvā.³ As the Bhogas are associated with the Jñātṛis and the Lichchhavis as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly⁴, this Bhoganagara seems to be in the Vaijjan territory and not outside it. It may be also worth noting that in Rockhill’s Life of the Buddha⁵ there is mention of a place called Bhoga-nagara, or ‘City of the Bhogas’, which from the context would appear to have been situated “in the country of the Mallas” in Hoernle’s opinion.⁶ Among the people who entered into the Jaina monastic state were many people of the Ugga and Bhoga tribes of Polāsapura⁷ situated somewhere between Kāmpilyanagara and Vāṇijyagrama. Thus the Bhoga people seem to have occupied several towns in the Gangetic Valley.⁸

Regarding the Bhogas Hoernle⁹ was not able to obtain any information save the solitary notice in Sherring⁹ of a class of Brāhmaṇas in the Punjab, called ‘Bhog’, about whom the Jainas of these parts know nothing.

5. THE AIKSHVĀKAS

The presence of the Aikshvākas (Ikshvakuids) as a tribe inhabiting the Vṛrijī territory, which had its metropolis at Vaiśāli, is vaguely suggested by the Jaina text Śūtrakṛitāṅga.¹⁰

---

⁴. Life of the Buddha, p. 192.
⁵. Uvāsagadassō, II, Appendix, p. 57.
⁶. Uvāsagadassō, II, p. 139.
⁷. The Mahābhārata (VIII. 87. 44) refers to the Nāgas who were Vaiśālīyuḥ Bhogīvaḥ. Did these Bhogin Nāgas of Vaiśāli have something to do with the Bhogas of Bhoganagara who formed part of the Vaijjan Republic with its capital at Vaiśāli?
Who were these Aikshvākas?

Three possibilities suggest themselves to us:—

(1) The descendants of Sumati, the last known king of Vaiśālī, might have continued. They were descended from Nabhānedīśha, a brother of Ikshvāku. Moreover, the Rāmāyaṇa knows Viśāla and his successors to be descended from Ikshvāku and the Mahābhārata also introduces a king named Ikshvāku in the Vaisalian king-list supplied by it.

(2) The house of Videha was descended from Ikshvāku’s son Nimi. Thus a section of the Vaidehas might have preferred to go by the name of Aikshvākas and not Vaidehas. And they might have settled in the Vajji country.

(3) Possibly a section of the Aikshvākas of Ayodhyā might have emigrated to and settled in any part of the Vajjian country.

6. THE KAURAVAS

The association of a body of the Kauravas with the Vajjian group of clans is interesting. We offer three suggestions in this regard:—

(1) It is stated in the Mahābhārata that Pāṇdu went to Mithilā and conquered the Videha country and that Bhīma defeated the Gaṇḍaka people and the Vaidehaka king ‘Janaka’ and making Videha as a base of operations he furthered his conquests; he also defeated the king of Kauśikī-kachchha. It appears that some Kaurava prince was imposed on this eastern territory or a part of it and/or some Kaurava people began to inhabit the area from that time. Thus later, when the Vajjian Republic was formed, they inevitably formed part of it.

(2) When Hastināpura was abandoned by the Kauravas and Nichakshu, their royal leader, came to and established Kausāmbi on the Yamunā in the Vatsa country, probably

1. Rām, I. 47. 11-12, 18.
2. Mbh, XIV. 4. 3.
3. This is not quite improbable. Cf. the somewhat similar fate of the Kauravas due to several factors.
5. Mbh, II. 29. 4, 30. 13 (Varmakas and Śarmakas).
6. Mbh, II. 29. 4 (Videhas), 30. 13 (‘Janaka’).
7. Mbh, II. 30. 15.
8. Mbh, II. 30. 22.
some Kauravas following the track of the Ganges came to the Vaisali country and settled here.

(3) Kuru Brāhmaṇas, e.g., Ushasti Chakrāyaṇa, had begun to settle in the capital of Videha long before the rise of Buddhism.¹

WERE THE VIDEHAS OF MITHILĀ PART OF THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC?

The view so far held about the Videhan state during the period of the Vajjian Republic is that after the death of Karāla Janaka it turned into a republic and became a component part of the Vajjian Confederation which was later destroyed by King Ajatasatru of Magadha and that the Videhas, who were an important republican clan of the Buddha's time, were one of the eight constituent clans of the Vajjian Confederacy. This view was accepted by later authorities without any scrutiny with the result that now-a-days this is universally accepted.

We have examined the arguments of the previous writers closely and have come to the conclusion that Videha continued to be a monarchy even after the death of Karāla Janaka and did not form part of the Vajjian Confederacy, it was conquered by Mahāpadma Nanda and it is only later that we find it in the time of Patañjali as a republic.

Before advancing our own reasons we propose to examine the argument of the previous writers who have regarded Videha to be a republic in the sixth century B.C.

The two parts of the argument are as follows:—

(a) “Hwen Thsang gives the name of the country² in its Sanskrit form as Fo-li-shi, or Vriji; but it is also stated that the people of the north called the country San-fa-shi, or Samvaji,³ which is the Pali form of Samvriji, or the "United Vrijas". From this name, I infer that the Vrijis were a large tribe which was divided into several branches, namely, the Lichchhavis of Vaisali, the Vaidehis of Mithila, the Tirabhuktis of Tirhut,⁴ etc. Either of these divisions separately might

1. H. C. Raychaudhuri, P. H. A. I., p. 120, n. 3.
2. The Darbhanga-East Nepalese Terai Country.
3. 'Hiouen Thsang', II. 402; note by M. Stanislas Julien. This reference is furnished by Cunningham.
4. "In the Trikandasona the names of Lichhavi, Vaideha, and Tirabhukti are given as synonymous" (A. G., I., p. 509).
therefore be called Vrijis, or any two together might be called Vrijis, as well as Samvrijis, or the "United Vrijis.""

(b) "The exact number of their clans would appear to have been eight, as criminals were arraigned before the athakulaka or "eight clans", which would appear to have been a jury composed of one member from each of the separate divisions of the tribe. Hwen Thsang mentions that the people of the north called them San-fa-shi, or Samvajji, that is, the "United Vajjis"...... The name of Sam-Vrjii, or the "United Vrijis", was therefore a descriptive title of the whole nation of the eight clans, who, as the Buddha remarked, were accustomed to hold frequent meetings, to act in concert, and to uphold the ancient Wajjian institutions.""2

Thus the whole argument rests on two words, viz., San-fa-shi and Athakulaka. The first word is not found in the account of Hiuen Tsiang, although Cunningham states to the contrary. It is in a note added to the text.3 Even if we suppose that this word is used by Hiuen Tsiang, it is not of much value, because it is a very late piece of evidence from a foreigner and refers to a name prevalent among the "northern people" and not in India. We shall show later how the judicial word Athakulaka has nothing to do with the eight clans. Thus the whole edifice of the United Vajjis consisting of eight clans including the Videhas falls to the ground. Moreover, nowhere is this stated that the Videhas were a republican clan and that they were one of the eight clans of the Vajjian Saṅgha. It was only a presumption of Cunningham, never examined seriously by anyone,4 and accepted by all5 without any question.

2. Ibid., pp. 512, 513.
3. Watters, II, p. 81. Beal, Buddhist Records, II, p. 77, n. 99 ("Northern people call this San-fa-shi-Samvaji. It is in Northern India.—Ch. Ed.").
4. Not even by T. W. Rhys Davids (Buddhist India, pp. 22, 25-26) who says—"The Vajjians included eight confederate clans, of whom the Lichchavis and the Videhas were the most important" (ibid., pp. 25-26), but furnishes no evidence for this statement.
It appears the modern historians were misled not only by (1) the word San-fa-shi or San-fa-chih by which name the northern people called the inhabitants of the Darbhanga-East Nepalese Terai area in the seventh century A.D., (2) the term Atthakulakaka used for a judicial committee in the fifth century A.D. and misinterpreted for atthakula, i.e., eight clans and (3) the great authority of Cunningham and Rhys Davids, but by certain other points as well:

(1) The Lichchhavis once had formed a federation with their western republican neighbours, the Mallas, according to a Jaina work. Thus it was easy to presume that they had also formed a federation with their eastern neighbours, the Videhas, who were wrongly taken to be republicans.

(2) In a passage of the Sutrakritanga as many as six clans (viz., the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikshvūkas, the Jāṭris, the Kauravas and the Lichchhavis) are mentioned as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly. Hence it might have been thought that these were the six out of the eight clans of the Vajjian (i.e., Lichchhavi-Videhan) Confederacy.

(3) In the Trikāṇḍāsesha the names of Lichchhavi, Vaideha and Tirabhukti are given as synonymous. Thus the republican character of the Lichchhavis was probably transferred to the Videhan people as well.

(4) The Videhas are treated as a republic by Patañjali (IV. 1. 168). Hence in the time of the Buddha also they were taken to have been republicans.

(5) The Aṅguttara-Nikāya furnishes a list of the sixteen Mahājanapadas that flourished together during a period posterior to Karāla Janaka but anterior to Mahākosalā. This list includes Vaijji, but Videha does not find mention here presumably due to its lack of importance at the time. But it was easy to think that the omission of Videha in the list was probably due to its inclusion in Vaijji.

4. P. H. A. I., pp. 118, 120.
7. Ibid., p. 50.
(6) Some names of the kings of Mithilā, e.g., Sumitra and Virudhaka, were available for the sixth century B.C. But they were ignored and misinterpreted. This was facilitated by the fact that according to the *Aṛthaśāstra* (XI. 1) of Kauṭilya the rulers of the Lichchhavika and the Vṛijika republics bore the title of ‘Rāja’ or king.

Now we place our own arguments for regarding the Videhan State as a monarchy during the period under review:—

While nowhere is this stated that Videha was a republic in the age of the Buddha, we come across the names of some kings of Videha in the Buddhist literature who apparently belonged to the sixth century B.C. or later (but not earlier than Karāla Janaka on any account).

The *Dīpavānśa* gives a legendary account of kings of some Indian States but it may contain some historical truth. It says that Kalārajanaka’s son was Samaṅkara who was followed by king Asoka, an inaugurated prince. Earlier, it informs us that the last of the kings (of Champānagara) was Nāgadeva, the lord of the earth; his sons and grandsons, twenty-five princes, governed their great kingdom in the town of Mithilānagara; the last of these kings was valiant Buddhaddatta; his sons and grandsons, twenty-five princes, governed their kingdom in Rājagaha, best of the towns. Thus the *Dīpavānśa* seems to preserve the following traditions about Videha:—(i) that there were kings at Mithilānagara even after Kalārajanaka; (ii) that twenty-five kings or so ruled at Mithilānagara, the last of them being valiant Buddhaddatta; and (iii) that the kingdom passed on to the master of Rājagriha (-Pātaliputra), i.e., Magadha.

1. See *infra* (p. 121) for references.
2. For example, cf. “Sumitra lived at a very remote period of antiquity. His name here is not intended to be that of a king living at the time of Buddha’s birth” (*Lalita-vistara*, Eng. tr., p. 54, n. 27).
3. Jayaswal (*op. cit.*., p. 49) actually identifies the Vṛijikas of the *Aṛthaśāstra* passage with the Videhas.
7. The name indicates that this king flourished after the Buddha which supports our point. The adjective ‘valiant’ may probably refer to the fierce struggle between him and the king of Magadha (i.e., Mahāpadma Nanda according to the Puranic sources).
Sometimes we meet specific royal names of Mithilā like Āṅgati, Sumitra and Virudhaka.

The earlier teacher of Āṅgati was Guṇa Kassapa whose doctrines bear a striking resemblance with those of the famous Purāṇa Kassapa, the elder contemporary of the Buddha, and of Maskarin Gosāla, another contemporary of the Śākya sage. Hence Mehta places him "somewhere in the earlier part of the 6th century B.C."

The Lalitavistara gives an interesting account of king Sumitra of "the very charming city of Mithilā": "The king has a mighty army of elephants, horses, chariots, and foot soldiers; he is rich in gold both in ingots and in coins, precious stones, pearls, lapis-lazuli, conch-shells (śaṅkha), marbles, corals, silver, native and wrought, and all other objects of wealth; he himself is of undaunted might and vigour, well-allied and virtuous". But his weak points are also stated: "The king, it is true, is very old, unable to govern well his kingdom, and the parent of many children". Although the description is conventional, the existence of a ruling monarch at that time (579 B.C., i.e., twelve years before the birth of Boddhisattva) cannot be denied, especially when republican Vaiśālī is also described there as a contrast.

A minister of King Virudhaka of Videha, named Sakala, was compelled to flee to Vaiśālī from his own country owing to the jealousy of the other ministers. There he soon became a prominent citizen. Shortly afterwards he was elected Nāyaka.

Another version of the story is available in the Gilgit Manuscripts where Khaṇḍa is the prime minister of an unnamed king of Videha (‘Videharāja’). He was the head of 500 ministers (amātyas). Other ministers, becoming jealous, conspired to destroy him. They approached the king and

1. Jātaka No. 544, Vol. VI.
2. Mehta, Pre-Buddhist India, p. 52; also see p. 336.
6. Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part II, pp. 3-5, esp. p. 5, where a contrast is made between monarchies (like Videha, Śrāvasti, Rājaśrīha and others) and republics (like Vaiśālī); also see R. C. Majumdar, ‘Historical Materials in Gilgit Manuscripts’, B. C. Law Volume, Part I, p. 134.
poisoned his ears by representing that "Khaṇḍa is the real king and may, if he so desires, seize the throne." The king gradually grew suspicious and looked for an opportunity to bring about his downfall. Khaṇḍa, coming to know of this, became afraid and thought thus, "Where shall I go? If I go to Śrāvasti, it is under a king, and so there would be the same troubles. So would be the case in Vārānasi, Rājagriha and Champā which are all subject to the authority of one person (ekādhīna). Vaiśālī is under a gaṇa (gaṇādhīna). What is desired by ten is disliked by twenty. So by all means I must go to Vaiśālī." Consequently he went to Vaiśālī where he was cordially received by the republican Lichchhavis. The Gilgit Manuscripts passage leaves no doubt that in the sixth century B.C. Videha was a monarchy¹ like Kosala and Magadha and unlike Vaiśālī.

Welcome light on this rather complicated problem is thrown by the Purāṇas which say that between the compilation of the Purāṇas and the annihilation of Kshatriya states in India by Mahāpadma Nanda there reigned among others 28 Maithilas² (i.e., 28 kings of Mithilā). Thus the Purāṇas are of opinion that monarchy continued at Mithilā—a point which is corroborated by the Buddhist literature also, as shown above. If so, Ajātaśatru, who destroyed the Vajjian Republic, did not extirpate Mithilā which continued till the time of Mahāpadma Nanda. Had Mithilā or Videha been a constituent element of the Vajjian Confederacy, the destruction of the Confederacy would have naturally meant the end of Mithilā as well. But we do not find Mithilā or Videha as part of the empire of Magadha in Ajātaśatru’s time³ even after the destruction of the Vajjian Republic. Evidently the destruction of the Videhan kingdom was the work of a later king of Magadha (i.e., Mahāpadma Nanda).

Thus our conclusion is that the Videhas of Mithilā did not form part of the Vajjian Republic.

¹ R. C. Majumdar (ṣṭ. cit., p. 141) noticed it, though he did not propound any theory about it: "The mention of Videha as a kingdom is important. Rhys Davids includes Videha among the tribal republics."


³ P. H. A. L., p. 214, n. 2: "According to the Ārya-Maṇjuṭi-Mūlakalpa (Vol. I, ed. Ganapati Sastri, pp. 603 ff) the dominions of Ajātaśatru embraced, besides Magadha, Āṅga, Vārāṇasī (Banaras), and Vaiśālī in the north. The exclusion of Mithilā (Videha) from this list is significant."
Vijayendra Suri has drawn our attention to an important point with regard to the constituent clans of the Vajjian Republic. He thinks that there were only six families (kulas) among the Āryas\(^1\) and in support of his view he quotes two Jaina sources, viz., Prajñāpanā-Sūtra (with commentary), folio 56a, and Sthānāṅga-Sūtra (with commentary), folio 358a (sūtra 479), both of which state that there were six Ārya kulas, namely, the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Rājanyas, the Aikshvākus, the Jñāṭris and the Kauravas. Suri equates the Jñāṭris with the Lichchhavis or the Vaiśālikas to which we do not agree. In our view it is the Rājanyas who are to be equated with the Lichchhavis. On this we are supported by the Manu-Smṛiti and the Sūtrakṛitäṅga. The former concurs in the view that the Lichchhavis are the Rājanyas or Kshatriyas though of the Vrātya variety.\(^2\) The famous passage from the latter analysed above\(^3\) provides us with the names of the following clans in this order—the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikshvākas, the Jñāṭris,\(^4\) the Kauravas, and the Lichchhavis. By comparing the two lists given by the Jaina sources (quoted by Suri) and by the Sūtrakṛitäṅga we come to the irresistible conclusion that the Rājanyas of the first list are identical with the Lichchhavis of the second list, all other names being common to both.

These six clans may be treated as inhabiting the Vajjian territory.

---

2. See supra, p. 111; also p. 112, n. 4.
4. The Jñāṭris are taken to be a section of the dynasty of Rishabha and Ikshvāku by some Jaina commentators for which see Vijayendra Suri’s Vaiśāli, 2nd ed., p. 50 and his Tirthankara Mahāvīra, Vol. I, p. 90.
CHAPTER XII

THE VAJJIAN TERRITORY AND ITS CAPITAL

I

"The Vajji (Vṛjī) territory lay north of the Ganges and extended as far as the Nepal hills. On the west the river Gandak possibly separated it from the Mallas and perhaps also the Kosalas. Eastwards it may have approached the forests that skirted the river Kosi and the Mahānandā." 1 "The Lichchhavi territory may have extended northwards as far as Nepal where we find them in the seventh century A.D." 2

This definition of the extent of the Vajjian territory by H. C. Raychaudhuri seems to be correct except that the eastern boundary does not appear to be acceptable because, as we have shown above, Videha was distinct from the republican Vajjian state and was a monarchy at that time. It may, however, be presumed that the Vajjian Republic was stronger than the Videhan kingdom, because while the former is one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas according to the Aṅguttara-Nikāya, 3 the latter is not included in that list. If so, the Vajjian territory might have extended much farther towards the east; but we cannot say with exactness the eastern extent.

There is no doubt that the Champaran district was included in the Vajjian Republic. Firstly, the place, where the Lichchhavis, desiring to follow the Buddha to the scene of his nirvāṇa, were forbidden to do so, 4 has been identified by Cunningham 5 with Kesariya in this district situated about 30 miles north-west of Basarh, the site of old Vaiśālī. Bloch 6 has accepted this identification. Secondly, the chetiyanī

1. P. H. A. I., p. 118.
2. Ibid., p. 119.
of the Vajjis referred to by the Buddha must be the earthen stūpas or chaityas of Navandgarh (Lauriya-Nandangarh) and other mounds in the Champaran district; because in the Muzaffarpur district such mounds are not so numerous and even those which are extant are not so ancient; and from the nature of the statement made by the Buddha, these mounds must be nearer Vaiśāli, the capital of the Vajjis. Moreover, it has been suggested that in the Champaran district Kesariya, Motihari, Navandgarh (Lauriya-Nandangarh) and Simrun (Simraon) were possibly the capitals of the different clans of the Vṛjīs.

Was Nepal included in the Vajjian Republic? Although a definite reply to this question is not possible, we are inclined to hold an affirmative view on the following grounds:

(1) The Tharus, who inhabit a very long strip of land in the sub-Himalayan Terai from Kumaon to Jalpaiguri up to the present day, call the villages inhabited by non-Tharus Baji villages and the inhabitants irrespective of their caste, religion or race, Bajis. The term appears to be a Tharu corruption of Sanskrit Vṛji or Pali Vajji. It has no other meaning in the language of the Tharus or the other dialects of the area. This must be a "survival of an old name when its meaning is forgotten."

(2) There was geographical contiguity between North Bihar and Nepal. For this reason the latter acted as the natural field for the expansion of the brave and warlike Lichchhavis. They seem to have utilised the Nepal timber in constructing their wooden houses, as no Vajjian houses have survived.

(3) It was probably due to previous association that when pressed by circumstances the Lichchhavis (or at least some of them) left Vaiśāli and took refuge in Nepal where they ruled for a long period.

2. Suggested by Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, pp. 515-516.
3. E.g., a large ruined fort at Katra which is said to be "the largest mound near Muzaffarpur" (Cunningham, Archaeological Survey Reports, Vol. XVI, p. 35).
4. A. G. I., pp. 513-514. Also see Champaran District Gazetteer, p. 16.
6. Ibid.
(4) A Kirāta dynasty is said to have ruled over Nepal in the beginning. According to K. P. Jayaswal the beginning is dated in 600 B.C. or 590 B.C. This dynasty might have been subordinate to the Vajjis in the beginning.

The somewhat wide extent of the Vajjian territory is easily understood if we remember that (a) the Lichchhavis of Vaiśālī were regarded on par with Prasenajit of Kosala and Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, (b) the Magadhan state being constantly harassed by the Vajjians considered it advisable to erect a fort at Pātaligrāma to check the enemies, and (c) Ajātāśatrulu had to make a firm determination to destroy the Vajjians for which he consulted no less a personage than the Buddha. Ajātāśatrulu had to fight a formidable enemy indeed.

II

The identification of Vaiśālī, the capital of the Vajjian territory, had long been a point of discussion among scholars. General Cunningham, with his immense knowledge of the country and of the Buddhist literature, identified the present village of Basār̥h in the MuzAFFarpur district of Bihar as marking the spot where stood Vaiśālī in ancient days. This identification has been accepted by scholars. W. Hoey was the only person to challenge this; he sought to establish the identity, though on very insufficient evidence, of Vaiśālī with a place called Cherānd in the Saran district, situated on the northern bank of the Ganges about seven miles south from Chapra. This identification has been proved to be entirely untenable by V. A. Smith in his papers on Vaiśālī, and he has succeeded in establishing that the identification by Cunningham of the

4. The Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta begins with this episode (Dial., II, pp. 78-81).
6. See my article entitled ‘Vaiśālī, the Birth-place of Lord Mahāvīra’ in Homage, pp. 85-90.
village of Basarh with Vaisali admits of no doubt. This identity has been proved still more decisively by the archaeological excavations on the site carried on in 1903-04 by T. Bloch, in 1913-14 by D. B. Spooner, in 1950 by K. Deva, and in 1958-59 by A. S. Altekar. And now-a-days this identification is universally accepted to such an extent that if a fresh attempt is made, it may be regarded as sheer waste of energy.

From an examination of the history of the foundations of Vaisali we are tempted to conclude that there were three phases in the life-history of this great city: (1) Before the time of king Visala we hear of several important kings, but no source mentions that these kings ruled at Vaisali. Hence either Vaisali might have existed but does not find mention or the capital was some other city in the pre-Visalian times (a course which cannot be ruled out entirely). (2) Vaisali was founded by king Visala and it remained the seat of the kings for several generations. (3) Then there is a gap and we do not know definitely if the monarchical Vaisali was re-settled or the old city had already been abandoned or destroyed due to some reason and a new Vaisali was founded by the Vajjians or the Lichchhavisa.

Out of proto-Vaisali, monarchical Vaisali and Vajjian or republican Vaisali, we have already seen the first two and at present we have to examine the origin of Vaisali, also called Visala, as known from the Buddhist sources.

An account of the mythical origin of the Lichchhavisa, the Vajjii country and the capital Vaisali is given in the Paramatthajotikā on the Khuddakapāṭha by Buddhaghosha. The Pujāvaliya, a Ceylonese Buddhist work, also gives the same account though with some slight variations. These stories, of course, are entirely mythical and must have grown up much later, there being no evidence in the sacred canon itself

1. Archaeological Survey of India Annual Report for 1903-04, article on 'Excavations at Basarh' on pp. 81-122.
3. His work of excavation in the Vaisali area is being continued by K. K. Datta.
to corroborate any part of the narrative. B.C. Law\(^1\) gleans from these stories two outstanding facts that, in his opinion, do not seem to admit of any doubt, viz., that the city was founded by the Lichchhavis and that the area covered by the town was very extensive; in fact, it owes its name Vaisāli to its being viśāla or very large and wide in area. B.C. Law’s first conclusion may not be unequivocally accepted because the Purāṇas and the Rāmāyaṇa ascribe the foundation of Vaisāli or Viśālā to a king named Viśāla. But his second conclusion is well-established because the Panañchasūdanti and other Buddhist sources\(^2\) also say that Vaisāli is so called because it is extensive.\(^3\)

This brings us to the consideration of the reasons as to why Vaisāli was so called. As is usually known, it is because it was founded by a king named Viśāla and because it was very wide in extent. Both the reasons are based on the word Viśāla from which Viśāla and Vaisāli are derived. It might have been so called because of the Viś or Vaisya population of the town also.\(^4\) The Mahābhārata\(^5\) knows a Viśāla river in the locality and that river might have lent this name to the town. In our opinion the śāla in the name of the city (Viśāla or Vaisāli) seems to possess some significance and might have something to do with the naming of the city. The Himalayan area adjoining Vaisāli and Vaisāli itself were full of sāl trees and forests. In the Vaisāli area there was a forest called Gosingasālavana. Vaisāli itself was full of sāl trees.\(^6\) One of the names of the Gaṅgā river is Śālagrāmi, because it passes through village Śālagrāma (in Nepal) which is so called because of sāl forests and the śālagrāma stones found there. Śāla means prākāra\(^7\) (wall) also. And particularly in the case of Vaisāli we learn in the Jātakas that

3. Is it the result of a popular etymology?
5. Mbb, IX. 38. 4, 21; XIII. 25. 44.
this city was encompassed by three walls\(^1\) at a distance of a gāvuta from one another. It is difficult to say which of these suggestions is correct.

The determination of the extent of Vaiśāli city is a knotty problem. The known data in this connection are as follows:—

1. We learn from the introductory portions of two Jātakas\(^2\) that a triple wall encompassed the town. Each wall was a league (gāvuta) distant from the next.\(^3\)

2. The Mahāvagga\(^4\) gives the following account of Vaiśāli:—“At that time Vesāli was an opulent, prosperous town, populous, crowded with people, abundant with food; there were 7707 storeyed buildings, and 7707 pinnacled buildings, and 7707 pleasure grounds (ārāmas), and 7707 lotusponds.”\(^5\)

3. Buddhaghosha gives a mythical account of the origin of the Vajjī country and the Lichchhavis in which he says that the country inhabited by the Lichchhavis who were worthy of being abandoned (Vajjītabba) and measuring three hundred yojanas\(^6\) was called Vajjī and that when the number of the Lichchhavis increased quickly and there was no room in the city for their gardens, pleasure-groves, residential houses and attendants, three walls were thrown up round the city at a distance of a gāvuta (a quarter of a yojana) from one another; as the city was thus again and again made larger and still larger (visālikajā), it came to be called Vesāli.\(^7\)

1. Jātaka Nos. 94 and 149.

2. Jātaka Nos. 94 (Lomahānasa-Jātaka) and 149 (Ekapāpasa-Jātaka).

3. Jātaka No. 149.


5. S. B. E., 17, p. 171.

6. Law, Kṣatriya Clans, p. 21. It looks rather strange that so many states (e.g., Vaijjī, Videha, Aṅga-Magadh and Kāśi-Kosala) should all be of 300 leagues in circuit each. For Videha see Jātaka Nos. 406 and 489. For Kāśi-Kosala and Aṅga-Magadh see Vīśeṣa-Pīṭaka, Hindi, p. 14, n. and p. 15, n. and for the latter also Buddhakapāṇi, p. 78. Peculiarly enough both Kāśi-Kosala and Aṅga-Magadh had each 80,000 villages (Vīśeṣa-Pīṭaka, Hindi, p. 14, n.). Thus these statements (about 300 leagues and 80,000 villages) appear to be of a traditional character and can hardly have any historical value.

(4) The Tibetan *Dulwa* (iii f. 80) gives the following description: "There were three districts in Vaišāli. In the first district were 7000 houses with golden towers, in the middle district were 14000 houses with silver towers, and in the last district were 21000 houses with copper towers; in these lived the upper, the middle and the lower classes according to their positions." A similar description of Vaišāli is given by the *Gilgit Manuscripts*.

(5) From what we read of the description of the ruins of the city that Hsiian Ts'ang saw in the seventh century A.D., there can hardly be any doubt of its wide extent. The Chinese traveller relates: "Its old foundations (i.e., the foundations of the capital city of Vaišāli) are from 60 to 70 li in circuit. The royal precincts (i.e., the palace-city or the walled part of the city) are about four or five li round: there are a few people living in it." This would mean an area of about twelve miles in circumference for the town. The citadel or palace precinct was less than a mile (4 or 5 li) in circuit.

(6) An idea of the extent may be had also by examining the existing remains spread over several villages like Basarh, Chakramdas and Kamman Chhapra in the Lalganj thana of the Hajipur subdivision and Bania, Kolhua and Basukund in the Paroo thana of the Muzaffarpur subdivision.

While there may not be any apparent hesitation on our part in accepting the erection and subsequent existence of three walls encompassing Vaišāli, we can reject at the outset the versions of the *Mahāvagga*, the *Paramatthajotikā* and the Tibetan *Dulwa* as legendary and consequently of little value. Thus our bases which remain are the Chinese account of Hiuen Tsiang and the modern relics which may be accepted without any difficulty. Thus if we accept the account of Hiuen Tsiang in whose opinion the circumference of Vaišāli was about twelve miles and presume the city to be a square as the tradition of the

existence of three parallel walls erected at a regular and equal distance (a gāvuta) wants us to take, each side of Vaiśāli will be three miles and the area will be nine square miles. The distance between the Asokan pillar at Kolhua and the main mound (known as Rājā Bīsāl Kā Garh) at Basarh and also that between the remains at Basarh and Basukund are about three miles or so in each case. This strengthens our point. Also the area of Pātaliputra in the time of Megasthenes (fourth century B.C.) was about 16 square miles and that of Vaiśāli might not have been more.¹

Hoernle in his English translation of the Jaina work, Uvāsagadasaśa, advances the suggestion that the three districts of Vaiśāli referred to in the Tibetan Dulva “may very well have been Vaiśāli proper, Kuṇḍapura and Vaiśayagāma, occupying respectively the south-eastern, north-eastern, and western portions of the area of the total city. Beyond Kuṇḍapura, in a further north-easterly direction lay the suburb (or ‘station’, Sannivesa) of Kolla āga (see § 7), which appears to have been principally inhabited by the Kshatriyas of the Nāya (or Jñāti) clan, to which Mahāvira himself belonged; for in § 66 it is described as the Nāya-Kula.”² Hoernle further observes that the phrases used in the Āchārāṇga-Sūtra, like “uttara-Khattiya-Kuṇḍapura-sannivesa or dāhiṇa-mā haya-Kuṇḍa pura-sannivesa, do not mean the northern Kshatriya (resp., southern Brahmanical) part of the place Kuṇḍapura, but the northern Kshatriya (etc.) suburb of Kuṇḍapura”, i.e., that suburb (sannivesa) of the city of Kuṇḍapura, which lay towards the north and was inhabited by the (Nāya clan of) Kshatriyas; it was distinguished from the southern suburb of the same city.

¹. It might be circular also according to this tradition. We have, however, taken it to be of the square size for the convenience of calculation of area.
². Palibothra (Greek for Pātaliputra) is said to be a city eighty stadia in length and fifteen in breadth (Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, tr. J. W. McCrindle, second edition, Calcutta, 1926, pp. 65, 210). Cf. Fleet, J. R. A. S., 1907, p. 648 (9. 193 miles × 1. 723 miles = 15, 846 sq. miles for Pātaliputra).
³. For a reason see infra. Vaiśāli is not included among the six great cities of Buddhist India or the ten great cities of Jaina India: For these lists see P. H. A. I., p. 107 and Jagdish Chandra Jain, Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canons, Bombay, 1947, p. 251 respectively.
⁴. And in the Aṣṭhakathā.
(Kuṇḍapura or Vesālī) which was inhabited by Brāhmaṇas. This interpretation is confirmed by the parallel phrases in Kap. §22 (et passim), Khattiya-Kuṇḍagāme nayare and māhaṇa-Kuṇḍagāme nayare, which are rightly translated by 'the Kshatriya (resp., the Brahmanical) part of the town Kuṇḍagāma'. He adds that "the phrase uchcha-niya-majjhimāṁ kulāṁ, 'upper, lower and middle classes', applied to the town of Vāṇiyagāma in §§ 77, 78 [of the Uvāsagadasāṇa], curiously agrees with the description of Vesālī given in the Dulva."  

The total population of Vaiśālī is not known. But according to the Mahāvastu, 3 168000 Vaisalians, divided equally (84000+84000) in outer and inner citizens, came to greet the Buddha when the latter visited Vaiśālī for the first time, after his Enlightenment. It may, however, be noted that as 84 is a mystic number, this figure may not help us much.

A few things known about other North Indian towns may be mentioned here with a view to having a comparative estimate, though obviously the materials given here should not be taken literally in every case.

Vaiśālī appears to be a smaller town than Pāṭaliputra (which grew later) if we compare the areas of the towns furnished by two foreigners, viz., Hiuen Tsiang in the case of Vaiśālī and Megasthenes in the case of Pāṭaliputra. Another point known in this connection is that the revenue from the western gate of Vesālī which led from Sāvatthī into Vesālī was one hundred thousand which was given to Mahāḷī; 5 while in the ninth year of Aśoka's reign his income from the four gates of the city of Pāṭaliputra is stated to have been four hundred thousand kahāpanas daily, with another one hundred thousand for his sābha or council. 6 The figures, however, appear to be traditional.

Buddhaghosha says that in the Buddha's days there were 57000 families in Sāvatthī and that it was the chief city in the country of Kāśi-Kosala, which was 300 leagues in extent and

1. Ibid., p. 5.
2. Ibid., p. 6.
4. Discussed already (p. 131).
had 80,000 villages.\(^1\) The population of Sāvatthī was 18 crores.\(^2\) An exactly similar statement is made with reference to Rājagaha and Aṅga-Magadha.\(^3\) In the case of Vajji and Vaiśāli we find that the Vajji country is stated to measure 300 yojanas\(^4\) and, while the number of villages in Vajji is not stated, there are said to exist in the Buddha’s time 7707 palaces (pāsādā), 7707 kūṭāgāras, 7707 ārāmas and 7707 tanks (pokkha-raṇiya) at Vesāli according to a Mahāvagga\(^5\) account and 42000 houses in all the three districts of Vaiśāli according to the Tibetan Dulva.\(^6\) As the figures supplied are traditional, no historical conclusion is possible except that these cities were in a flourishing state.\(^7\)

From the accounts that we get from the Buddhist books, whether Pali or Sanskrit or Tibeto-Chinese, we observe that Vaiśāli is represented as a town that was rich and prosperous. The Mahāvagga, one of the oldest books of the Pali canon, tells us that at the time the Buddha lived, Vaiśāli “was an opulent, prosperous town, populous, crowded with people, abundant with food; there were 7707 storeyed buildings, 7707 pinnacled buildings, 7707 pleasure grounds and 7707 lotus-ponds.”\(^8\)

A similar account of the prosperity of Vaiśāli is given in the Lalitavistara: “The rich, good, generous and happy

---

1. Ibid., III, p. 614.
7. The Udānagadāsā mentions householders of some Indian towns with possessions in terms of certain crores of measures of gold. If it be supposed that the author of the Jaina work wants to convey some idea about the comparative importance of the towns, the data furnished may be of some use. Towns and the possessions of the individual householders in terms of crores of measures of gold are given below:—
   1. Rāyagīha 8
   2. Bānārasi 8 and 6
   3. Champā 6
   4. Kampillapura 6
   5. Ālabhīyā 6
   6. Sāvatthī 4 and 4
   7. Vānīyaρāma 4
   8. Polāsapura 1
city of Vaiśālī (i.e., Vaiśālī), inhabited by numbers and adorned by covered court-yards, gates, triumphal arches, windows, palaces, towers, lofty mansions, gardens and groves over-stocked with flowers, rivalling the domains of the immortals in beauty. . . . . . .

The passage speaks of the splendour and prosperity of the capital of the Lichchhavis. It was a prosperous and gay city, full of music.

In the Tibetan works, a similar account is given of the prosperity and opulence of Vaiśālī which is invariably described in the Dulva as a kind of earthly paradise, with its handsome buildings, its parks and gardens, the singing birds, and continual festivities among the Lichchhavis. "Nanda, Upānanda!" exclaimed the Chhabbaggiyā Bhikshus when they visited Vaiśālī, "the Blessed One never saw the like of this, even when he was among the Trayastrimśat devas."

The *Romantic History of Śākya Buddha*, translated by Beal from Chinese sources, gives an account similar to that in the *Lalitavistara*. Here we read of a god in the Tushita heaven who speaks thus, "This Vajora country has a city called Vaiśālī, rich in every kind of produce; the people in peace and contentment; the country enriched and beautiful as a heavenly mansion; the king called 'Drumaraja'; his son without the least stain on his scutcheon; the king's treasuries full of gems, and gold and silver; perhaps you will be born there."

4. He must have been a republican 'king' ( = 'Dharmarāja'?).
CHAPTER XIII

POLITICAL AND FOREIGN RELATIONS UNDER THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

It is only in the days of the Buddha and Mahāvīra that we have details of the Vajjian Republic; but if we try, we may get some glimpses of the Republic prior to the days of the sixth century B.C. prophets also.

Naturally, the first task of the Republic was the consolidation and the perfection of the administrative machinery, especially because the number of clans inhabiting the Vajjian territory was not small. The seven fundamental principles of the Vajjian democracy (and hence of ancient Indian democracy), referred to by the Buddha in the Mahāparinibbāṇa-Sutta, were evolved and followed. The cult of Pārśvanātha entered Vajji and came to have its adherents. The state became strong and the writer of the Aṅguttara-Nikāya considered it necessary to include it among the sixteen Mahājanapadas of that period.

Up to the middle of the sixth century B.C. the Vajjian Republic and the Magadhan kingdom were going side by side; after the accession of Bimbisāra (547 B.C.) to the throne of Rājagriha they came face to face.

We do not know whether Bimbisāra seized Magadha after expelling the Vajjis beyond the Ganges. Such a view, favouring the expulsion of the Vajjis from Magadha, has been expressed by D. R. Bhandarkar. But the only evidence put forward by him is that Vaiśāli is spoken of in an early Buddhist work, the Suttanipāta, as Māgadham puram. It may be pointed out that this argument is based on a wrong meaning of the text. The

1. According to the Āchārīya-Sūtra, II. 15. 16 (S. B. E., 22, p. 194) the Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra’s parents were worshippers of Pārśva and followers of the Śramaṇas.

2. The period refers to c. 700 B.C. or so when Kāśi was still a flourishing state, because Kāśi (later conquered by Kosala) appears as one of the sixteen states in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya list.

3. Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 73.

commentator has taken Māgadhāṇa puram not in apposition to Vaiśāli but as a synonym of Rājagriha. Mention of the Pāśaṇa-chetiya in the same verse also goes to show that Māgadhāṇa puram was not Vaiśāli. At several places we find mention of the chaityas or chetiyas round about Vaiśāli, but nowhere do we come across a Pāśaṇa-chetiya. From verse 1014 of the Suttanipāta it appears that the chetiya was situated on a mountain peak. It is quite possible, therefore, that it was one of the chetiyas round about Rājagriha, especially when we know that there is no mountain or hill at or near Vaiśāli.

There does not appear any reasonable doubt in concluding that there was a war between Bimbisāra and the Lichchhavis, as such a war is referred to incidentally in some of the Buddhist sources. But they do not indicate either the causes or the date of such a war, which leaves us to take recourse to surmises. Probably this war was connected either directly or indirectly with, and followed, the Magadhan conquest of Aṅga. Did the Lichchhavis protest against Bimbisāra’s conquest of Aṅga? Was Aṅga in alliance with the Vajjians? Or, had it extended its frontiers or sphere of influence over the trans-Gangetic region which the Buddhist literature knows as Aṅguttaraṇa? To us it appears that about this time Aṅga had become powerful and had some sort of control over Aṅguttaraṇa. When Bimbisāra conquered Aṅga, he might have claimed sovereignty over Aṅguttaraṇa also. But in the meantime the Lichchhavis (or the Vajjians) might have conquered back the territory of Aṅguttaraṇa which once had belonged to them. This might have provided a possible cause of conflict between Bimbisāra and the Lichchhavis.

Although the war seems to have been a long drawn-out one, its details are not preserved. Only one incident is recorded, that of the visit of Bimbisāra incognito to Ambapāli, the famous

1. B. C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, p. 328. Law conjectures that most probably it was the Grīḍhrakūṭa (Pali Gījṭhakūṭa) monastery.


3. This may be presumed from the fact that Aṅga is one of the sixteen Mahājanapadhas of the Aṅguttara-Nikāya list where Videha is not mentioned at all.
courtesan of Vaiśālī. Bimbisāra heard of her through Gopāla, his minister; he visited her at Vaiśālī, though he was at war with the Lichchhavis, and remained with her for seven days. Ambapālī bore him a son named Abhaya (or Fearless). This story which makes Abhaya or Abhayakumāra, as the Jaina books have it, a son of Ambapālī, the courtesan of Vaiśālī, is not vouchedsafed by the Pali books where her son through Bimbisāra is called Vimala Koṇḍaññā who became a Bhikkhu and whose preachings are said to have given her a deep spiritual insight.

From Jaina sources we know that Bimbisāra married Chellanā, daughter of Cheṭaka, the Lichchhavi Rājā of Vaiśālī. D. R. Bhandarkar connects this event with the Magadha-Vaiśālī War and holds that “this matrimonial alliance was a result of the peace concluded after the war between Bimbisāra and the Lichchhavis.”

Can we determine the date of this peace and the matrimonial alliance that followed? There is no harm in making an effort.

Rahula Sankrityayana gives a conversation between the Buddha and Bimbisāra on the basis of the Dhammapada-Atthaka-kathā (IV. 2) in which Bimbisāra’s sovereignty over three hundred yojanas (i.e., over Aṅga-Magadha) is mentioned. The date of this conversation according to Sankrityayana is Phālguna full-moon after the sixth rainy season of the Buddha which comes to March, 526 B.C. according to our calculation. Thus, if Sankrityayana’s opinion of the date of the said conversation be accepted, we may say that peace was established before March, 526 B.C. and not after that.

Ajātaśatru, from his eagerness to wrest the throne from his father, Bimbisāra, appears to be fairly grown-up at the time of his accession which event took place in 495 B.C. If he was thirty-four at that time, he was born in 529 B.C. Thus the marriage of Bimbisāra and Chellanā, mother of Ajātaśatru, might have taken place in 530 B.C., if not earlier. This date (530 B.C.) may be accepted as a working hypothesis for the present for conclusion of the Magadha-Vajjian War.

2. Psalms of the Sisters, pp. 120-121; Psalms of the Brethren, p. 65.
What was the name of the Lichchhāvi lady who was given in marriage to Bimbisāra either as a result of the matrimonial alliance or as an independent transaction? Several names of this lady are known to the indigenous and non-Indian Buddhist literature and to the Jaina literature. According to the Nirayāsālī-Sūtra, one of the early works of the Jainas, she was Chellanā\(^1\), the daughter of Cheṭaka, one of the 'Rājās' of Vaisālī, whose sister Kshatriyāṇī Triśalā was the mother of Mahāvīra. According to the Dīvyaavādāna\(^2\) king Bimbisāra reigned at Rājagriha, Vaidehi was his Mahādevī (or Chief Queen) and Ajātaśatru, his son and prince (Kumāra). This Vaidehi was naturally a princess from Videha, i.e., Vaisālī. The fact that Ajātaśatru is called Vedehi-putta or Vaidehiputra\(^3\) may enable us to infer that one of the wives of Bimbisāra was Vaidehi, i.e., a Videhan or Vaisalian princess whose personal name, however, is not indicated here. And Ajātaśatru was born of her. This Nikāya evidence is taken to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaisālī was situated in Videha.\(^4\) The Tibetan Dulva gives the name of Vāsavi to Ajātaśatru's mother and narrates a story\(^5\) which cannot be traced in the Pali Buddhist books. The genealogical table according to this story stands as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
| \text{Sakala} & \\
| \text{Gopāla} & \text{Simha} \\
| \text{Bimbisāra} & \text{Vāsavi} & \text{Upavāsavi} \\
| & & (Vaidehi) \\
| & \text{Ajātaśatru} & \\
\end{array}
\]

As Vāsavi was of a family from Videha,\(^7\) she became known as Vaidehi. After a while she bore a son, who, on account of the

---

1. Jacobi, S. B. E., 22, p. xiii and n.; also see Homage, p. 93 and n.
5. Rockhill, pp. 63-64.
prediction made to his mother, received the name of Ajātāśatru or 'the enemy (while) not (yet) born'. In another Tibetan life of the Buddha her name is Śrībhadra, which reminds us of the name of Četaka's wife Subhadra.\(^1\) In Vol. I, page 38, n. 1 of The Book of the Kindred Sayings,\(^2\) however, Maddā (Madra) appears as the name of Ajātāśatru's mother.

Thus we have five names of Ajātāśatru's mother, that is, Chellanā, Vaidehi, Vāsavi, Śrībhadra and Maddā (Madra). Of these two, viz., Vaidehi and Madrā, appear to be mere appellations inasmuch as Vaidehi means a Videhan princess and Madra may mean a princess from the Madra country. It appears later tradition ascribed the motherhood of Ajātāśatru to each of the queens of Bimbisāra, viz., those from Videha, Kosala and Madra (Chellanā, Kosalādevi and Khemā respectively).

The Jaina tradition is unanimous about Ajātāśatru's mother who is called Chellanā. The Buddhist tradition, however, is not so. The Dīyānaddāna states, "At Rājagriha reigns the king Bimbisāra. Vaidehi is his Mahādevi (or Chief Queen) and Ajātāśatru, his son and Kumāra (Prince)."\(^3\) There can, therefore, be no doubt that the Videhan princess was the mother of Ajātāśatru in the opinion of that work. The Buddhist Nikāyas also call Ajātāśatru Vedchiputta (Vaidehi-putra), i.e., son of the Videhan princess. But Buddhaghosa, in the commentary of the Sānhyutta-Nikāya, III. 2. sections 4-5, gives an alternative meaning of the word Vedeka in Vedhiputta by resolving it into "Veda-ihā", Vedana ihati or intellectual effort and seems to suggest that the expression Vedhiputta simply means "Son of the Accomplished Princess." He says that here the other meaning deriving the expression from Videha, the country, is not admissible.\(^4\) Buddhaghosa himself in other passages\(^5\) has taken the more natural sense of the word but

---

1. S. B. E., 22, p. xiii, n. 3.
2. Tr. Mrs. Rhys Davids and S. Sumangala Thera.
3. Dīyānaddāna, p. 545.
4. The context is provided by the occasion when a contest arose over Kāśi village between Prasenajit of Kosala and Ajātāśatru of Magadha and the latter claimed the village saying that it had belonged to his mother (referring to Kosalādevi, the Kosalan wife of Bimbisāra). See Buddhacharyā, p. 409, esp. n.
sometimes, as here, he has been misled into a fanciful interpretation. There are other pieces of evidence also from Buddhist literature on this point. In the Saṁyutta-Nikāya Prasenajit of Kosala calls Ajātaśatru his nephew, but this may not mean much beyond formality. The commentary on the Tachchha-Sākara-Jātaka (Jātaka No. 492) refers to the war between Ajātaśatru and Prasenajit, but does not say clearly that Mahākosala’s daughter (Prasenajit’s sister) whom Bimbisāra married was Ajātaśatru’s mother. This silence may be regarded as important. It is only in the Thūsa-Jātaka (No. 338) and the Mūshika-Jātaka (No. 373) that the Kosalan princess is definitely said to be the mother of Ajātaśatru. The preface to the Jātakas says—"At the time of his (Ajātaśatru’s) conception there arose in his mother, the daughter of the king of Kosala, a chronic longing to drink blood from the right knee of king Bimbisāra (her husband)". Here the commentators have evidently made a confusion between the two queens of Bimbisāra.

Bimbisāra learnt of Ambapāli, the famous courtesan of Vaiśāli, through a trader of Rājagriha, who had been to the Lichchhavi capital and hence had recommended this institution to the Māgadhan king. The recommendation was accepted and Sālavati was selected for the post. Thus Vaiśāli was emulated at that time even by the Magadhan capital. The secret visit of Bimbisāra to Ambapāli may be placed later than this event.

The Brāhmaṇa envoys of Magadha (along with those of Kosala) are indicated as residing at Vaiśāli on some business. This shows active intercourse between Vaiśāli and Magadha on a political level.

Vaiśāli had relations also with the neighbouring states in the west.

Taking up the republican states of the Mallas first, we find many points of contact and similarity between the Mallas and the Lichchhavis. Both belonged to the Vaiśishṭha gotra.

1. The Book of the Kindred Sayings, I, p. 110.
Both had the Saṅgha (republican) form of government. The members were called Rājās who assembled in their respective Santhāgāras or Mote-Halls. They showed enthusiasm for the newly developing religions of the sixth century B.C., viz., Buddhism and Jainism. For this and other reasons, both were condemned together as Vrāyas by Manu.

The relation of the Lichchhavis with their neighbours, the Mallas, seems generally to have been friendly. They stood together against their common foe, Ajātaśatru. The Kalpa-Sūtra informs us that to mark the passing away of Mahāvīra, nine Mallakis (Mallaīs) and nine Lichchhais (Lechchhais) were among those who instituted an illumination on the day of the new moon, saying, "Since the light of intelligence is gone, let us make an illumination of material matter." The only instance of hostility between these two republican groups is provided by the story of Bandhula Malla, who was the commander-in-chief of the Kosalan king. But this was a personal affair of Bandhula concerning neither the Malla nor the Kosalan state—a point which is missed by scholars. The eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāśi-Kosala are mentioned as having sided with the nine Mallais and the nine Lechchhais against Ajātaśatru. They instituted an illumination in honour of Mahāvīra's death along with these allies. Their identity is quite uncertain. H. C. Raychaudhuri throws the suggestion that the Gaṇarājas of Kāśi-Kosala apparently refer to the Kālāmas, Śākyas and other clans in the Kosalan empire.

2. For Lichchhavis, Arthashastra, XI. 1; Lalitavistara, Eng. tr., p. 39; numerous other examples. For Mallas, Arthashastra, XI. 1; Dialogues, III, p. 201, n. 1.
5. P. H. A. I., p. 212 (on the evidence of the Nirapāvallī-Sūtra).
6. S. B. E., 22, p. 266.
8. E.g., B. C. Law, Kshatriya Clans, p. 129: "There were, however, occasional hostilities [between the Lichchhavis and the Mallas], as is shown by the story of Bandhula, a Mallian prince."
10. S. B. E., 22, p. 266.
The Lichchhavis appear to have been on friendly terms with Kosala. Mahāli, a great Lichchhavi of Vaiśāli, and Prasenajit, yet a prince of Kosala, read together at Takkasilā and developed great friendship there. Prasenajit, while going to arrest Aṅgulimāla, the murderer, tells the Buddha, whom he meets on the way, that both Bimbisāra of Magadha and the Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli are his friends. The Brāhmaṇa envoys of Kosala, along with those of Magadha, are found lodging at Vaiśāli when the Buddha was once staying at the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood.

Vatsa established a matrimonial alliance with Vaiśāli, because Jaina literature tells us that Mrīgāvatī, one of the seven daughters of Cheṭaka of Vaiśāli, had been married to Śatānika, king of Vatsa with capital at Kauśāmbī. This gets corroboration from Bhāsa’s Svapnavasavadatta where Udayana, son of Śatānika, is called Vaidehiputra. Mrīgāvatī, being of Videha, might well be called Vaidehī and her son for this reason could be known as Vaidehiputra.

The relation of the Vajjians with Ajātaśatru, Bimbisāra’s successor on the throne of Rājagriha, will be dealt with when we take up the fall of the Vajjian Republic.

1. Called Mahā-lichchhavi in Dhāmmapada (p. 219).
4. D., I, p. 150.
6. Act VI, p. 68 (Ganapati Sastri’s ed.).
CHAPTER XIV

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

THE STATE AND ITS TERRITORY

The VaJJian State extended over what is generally known as Vajji-raṭṭha (Vṛjji-rāṣṭra in Sanskrit) in Pali literature. The influence of this State might have extended over at least the southern portion of Videha along the Ganges river. In the second half of the sixth century B.C. this latter tract, known as Aṅguttarāpā in Buddhist literature, was under the possession of Bimbisāra of Magadha.

THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT

The VaJJian State was under a form of government known as the Saṅgha or Gaṇa. As the Lichchhavis were the most important element, it was also called the Lichchhavi-Gaṇa. It was a Gaṇadharma State as distinguished from a Rājadhīna State.

The VaJJian State is usually but erroneously regarded as a federal republic. But, as we have shown in a previous chapter of this book, it was only a republic and not a republican federation, because Videha was not a constituent element of what has generally been called the VaJJian Confederacy. The formation of a temporary federation, however, with their neighbours, the Mallas, is known to a Jaina source. This con-

1. In arranging the topics in this chapter we have derived help from The Constitution of India (Delhi, 1949).
2. This is merely a presumption, the basis being the tradition that a Gangetic port was the bone of contention between the Lichchhavis and Ajātaśatru.
4. M., I, p. 231. Another typical example of this form of government was provided by the Mallas (ibid.).
federacy existed in the year when Mahāvīra died. The composition of the Federal Council was of the following description:¹

1. The eighteen Gañarājas of Kāśi and Kosala,²
2. The nine Mallakis, and
3. The nine Lichchhavīs.

Grand total—36 members (Gañarājas).

This indicates that the federal states had equal votes, that the federation was based on terms of equality. The Mallas were not so great a political power as the Lichchhavīs, yet in the Federal Council both had equal number of members, that is equal voice.³

CITIZENSHIP

Although the Vajjian Republic was a tribal republic, outsiders were eligible to citizenship. Kātyāyana, modifying one of the rules of Pāṇini (IV. 3. 100), says that a person of Vṛiji-bhakti⁴ may be called a Vṛijika. A Vṛijika therefore might not have been a born Vṛiji. It has to be noticed that Kauṭilya (A. Ś., XI. 1), in mentioning the king-consul republics, uses the form Vṛijika. The ‘Vṛijikas’ included Vṛijis and non-Vṛijis owning a common Vṛiji allegiance, which would include people originally conquered by the Vṛijis or people voluntarily amalgamated with the Vṛijis.⁵ It is thus evident that this republic extended citizenship to outsiders.⁶

DIRECTIVE PRINCIPLES OF STATE POLICY

What were the directive principles of state policy among the Vajjians?

The seven points of the excellence of the Vajjians⁷ as indicated by the Buddha before Ānanda and Varshakāra at

1. Ibid.
2. We suggest that there might have been nine Gañarājas belonging to the republican tribes of Kāśi and the other nine Gañarājas to those of Kosala.
5. It may be noted that in a passage of the Sātrakṛitiśaṅga (II. 1. 13) the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikshvākas, the Jñātris, the Kauravas, the warriors, the Brāhmaṇas, the Lichchhavīs, the commanders and the generals are indicated as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly (S. B. E., 45, P. 339).
Grīḍhrakūṭa (the Vulture's Peak) at Rājagriha may be regarded as the directive principles. Analysed in this light these are as follows:

1. The Vajjians should hold full and frequent public assemblies.

2. They should meet together in concord, and rise in concord, and carry out their undertakings in concord.

3. They should enact nothing not already established, abrogate nothing that has been already enacted, and act in accordance with the ancient institutions of the Vajjians as established in former days.

4. They should honour and esteem and revere and support the Vajjian elders, and hold it a point of duty to hearken to their words.

From the legislative side we pass on to the social and religious aspects.

5. No women or girls belonging to their clans should be detained among them by force or abduction.

6. They should honour and esteem and revere and support the Vajjian shrines (chetiyāni) in town or country, and allow not the proper offerings and rites, as formerly given and performed, to fall into desuetude.

7. The rightful protection, defence, and support should be fully provided for the Arahants among them, so that Arahants from a distance may enter the realm, and the Arahants therein may live at ease.

There is no doubt that the Vajjians were directed by these principles because they had already been taught these conditions of welfare by the Buddha when he was staying at Vaiśāli at the Sārandada Chaitya.¹

THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE

A later document, the Aṭṭhakathā,² mentions three highest officers, viz., the President (Rājā), the Vice-President (Upa-Rājā) and the Generalissimo (Senāpati). An early authority (Jātaka, I, p. 504) adds a fourth officer: the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Bhaṇḍāgārika). There is no

¹. The teaching referred to is set out in full at A., IV, 16 ff., but the persons taught are there called Lichchhavis.
doubt that these were the four highest administrative officers and that they composed the cabinet or central executive authority. They had executive, military and also judicial functions to perform.

These posts were elective.

The real power of administration especially in regard to foreign affairs seems to have been vested in a smaller body of nine Gañparājas or archons (Kalpa-Sūtra, 128).

THE CENTRAL LEGISLATURE

The Central Legislature or the Parliament of the Vajjian (or Lichchhavī) Republic is said to have consisted of 7707 members. Each member was called a Rājā. It appears the Rājās were drawn from the Lichchhavī tribe.

The Jātaka No. 149 gives an interesting passage which describes the constitution of the Lichchhavis:

"Of the kings who were permanently residing and ruling there (i.e., in Vaiśālī) the number was seven thousand seven hundred and seven. The number of Upa-Rājās was the same, as also the number of Senāpatis and Bhanḍāgārikas (Treasurers)".

This indicates that there were 7707 Rājās, 7707 Upa-Rājās, 7707 Senāpatis and 7707 Bhanḍāgārikas. Thus each member of the Central Legislative Assembly had one viceroy, one general and one treasurer.

2. See infra for judicial functions.
3. A., III, p. 76. Lalitavistara, Eng. tr., p. 39 (Every one considers himself to be the king, ‘I am the king, I am the king’). Cf. the account of Khaṇḍa in the Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part II (beginning).
5. Jātaka Nos. 149 and 301. Cf. Mahāsaggas (VIII. 1. 1. 1) of the Vinaya-Piṭaka also. See also the Dhammapada Commentary, III. 436. According to the Mahānastu (I, p. 261) there were 168000 Rājās at Vaiśālī. A. S. Altekar (State and Government in Ancient India, 2nd ed., Banaras, 1955, p. 115, n. 1) suggests that "probably the total population of the ruling class was 168000 and the Assembly probably consisted of the heads of big joint families, each consisting of about 20 persons."
7. Jātaka No. 301 provides the basis for such a conclusion. It may be remembered that the term Rājau in some cases denoted only a Kshatriya (B. C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, p. 322). But contrast the Sūtrakṛtāṅga (S. B. E., 45, p. 339).
The number 7707 and each member’s having one viceroy, one general and one treasurer have led to great controversies\(^1\) and considerable ingenuity has been exercised in interpreting these.

The number 7707 probably represents the number of foundation families who constituted the ruling class.\(^2\) This number may not be regarded as large when we remember that an unnamed republic on the eastern side of the Beas (presumably the Yaudheya republic) was governed by a council (i.e., Central Assembly) whose membership was 5000 according to the Greek historians (McCrindle, *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature*, p. 45)\(^3\) and the Assembly of the republic of Athens consisted of more than 42000 members every one of whom had a right to attend its session and vote on the proposals.\(^4\) In actual practice, however, not all the members cared to attend. The country people did not like to spend time and money to attend all the meetings. The normal attendance in Athens was 2000 to 3000, hardly 7 or 8 per cent of the total membership.\(^5\) The same was the case most probably in India also. Out of the 7000 members of the Assembly about 10 per cent may have attended the meetings.\(^6\)

A. S. Altekar has tried to justify the famous *jātaka* statement that there were 7707 kings and an equal number of Upa-Rājās, Senāpatis and Bhaṇḍāgārikas in the Vaiśālī State. He says that when the Aryans came and occupied this territory, it seems to have been divided into about 7700 Kshatriya families, who became something like the zamindar families of the State. They


3. Pointed out by K. P. Jayaswal (*op. cit.*, p. 57) who remarks (p. 58): “The large number of the members of their council is comparable with the number of the Lichchhavi-gaya”.

4. This is pointed out by A. S. Altekar (*Homage*, p. 69; *State and Government in Ancient India*, 2nd ed., p. 115).


were all Kshatriyas and were known as Rājans. The heads of these families were staying in the capital and they had their own managers in the moftusil who were known as their treasurers. If the Kshatriya householders were known as Rājans, their sons were naturally called Uparājans or Yuvarājjas. Each member of the Kshatriya aristocracy owed military service to the State and was probably the head of a small militia recruited from his zamindari. When he was not able to lead this militia himself, he used to nominate a Senāpati or general to act for him. Thus naturally the Lichchhavi State possessed 7707 ‘Kings’, 7707 ‘Yuvarājas’, 7707 generals and 7707 treasurers.¹

Though every one of these 7000 and odd Rājās had theoretically the same powers and rights, in actual practice, the voice of the elders prevailed.²

The rulers of the republic (Gaṇarājjas) underwent the ceremony of consecration by anointing. There was a Coronation Tank at the Vaiśālī City for this particular purpose³ which was especially guarded.

The place where the Parliament or the Central Legislative Assembly met was called the Santhāgāra⁴ (Samstāthāgāra in Sanskrit). According to the Aṭṭhakathā when the Vaisaliens came to their House of Law (Parliament) the tocsin used to be sounded at their House of Law.⁵ There they discussed not only matters political and literary, but also agricultural, commercial and religious.⁶

The Gaṇa (or the Lichchhavi-Gaṇa) was the sovereign body. It transacted business on behalf of the whole people.⁷ It appointed members of the Executive Council and other functionaries.⁸

6. E.g., Vinaya, I, p. 233=Horner, IV, p. 318 and A., IV, 179 ff (the story of the conversion of Siha); also Dialogues, III, p. 16 (the story of Pājkaputta).
8. Ibid. Also see Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part II (beginning) for a graphic description.
THE CENTRAL JUDICIARY

The uniqueness of the Lichchhavi constitution of Vaiśālī lies in its judicial system which passed through the following stages:—

1. If a citizen was accused of a crime, preliminary enquiry into the case was held in the Court of the Justices (Vinichchaya-Mahāmāttas), who evidently were the regular court for civil causes and ordinary offences.

2. The Court of Appeal was presided over by Vohārikas or 'Lawyer-Judges.'

3. The High Court had its Judges, called the Sūtradhāras or 'Doctors of Law'.

4. There was yet a Council of Final Appeal, called the Court of the Eight or Ashṭa-Kulaka.

Any of these successive courts could pronounce a citizen innocent and acquit him.

5-7. And if all the courts held him guilty, the matter was still subject to the decision of the members of the Executive Cabinet, i.e., the Senāpati, the Upa-Rājā (Vice-President) and the Rājā (President).

8. If he was found guilty by the President, he was punished according to a book called Paveṣi-Potthaka (the Book of Precedents), i.e., he was brought to book.

Thus we find that the President (Rājā) was also the highest judicial authority. There was also a Judicial Minister who could be even an outsider, a paid officer. Liberty of the citizen was most jealously guarded.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

We do not possess a detailed description of the Lichchhavi government. It is only with the help of the incidental references that an account has been prepared by scholars. Consequently we have no idea of the local government of the Vajjian

1. The details are available in a late source: D. A. (Samaṭgalasīrāini), II, p. 519. Also see Hindu Polity, 3rd ed., pp. 46-47 for a clear exposition.


3. It seems that the 'Rājā' who was the highest authority in the administration of criminal justice was different from the ordinary 'rājās' who constituted the popular assembly (B. C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, p. 326, n.).

Republic. A passage, however, in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya\(^1\) throws interesting light on the subject. The Buddha preaching to the sons of the Lichchhavis says that high careers open to a Kula-putta or cadet of a family were these: he might become consecrated to rulership, might become a Rāṣṭrika, or Petta-nika, or the Generalissimo, or the President of a Township (Gāmagāmanika), or the President of an Industrial Guild (Pūgagāmanika). A sixth career is also added: ‘Supreme rulership (over other rulers) by turns’.\(^2\) It is meant that all these offices were elective and a Kula-putta was eligible to all these in a Gaṇa-State like that of the Vajjians.

The Buddhist Church was based on the republics of the sixth century B.C. for its rules and regulations. The republican origin of the Buddhist Saṅgha has been discussed by K. P. Jayaswal in his Hindu Polity (chapter 6). We do not possess any details of the procedure of deliberation in the Vajjian Republic. But if we eliminate the religious modifications from the descriptions of the Buddhist Church, we may have a picture of the procedure in the Republic of the Vajjians.\(^3\)

1. A., III, p. 76.


3. This has already been done by K. P. Jayaswal in Hindu Polity (chapter 11) with the help of the Vīṇeya-Piṭaka (Mahāvagga and Cullavagga) and need not be reproduced here.
CHAPTER XV

THE BUDDHA AND BUDDHISM IN THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

As regards religion and religious history of the Vaiśālī region under the Republic, we possess ample material in Buddhist and Jaina literature and it has been a problem for us as to how to arrange this vast material. The reason is that Vaiśālī, a favourite resort of the Buddha, played a prominent part in the history of Buddhism; it was the birthplace of Mahā-vīra, the twenty-fourth and the last Tirthāṅkara of the Jinas; and it was also a centre of other miscellaneous cults.

First of all, we take up the Buddha and Buddhism. In dealing with this subject, especially regarding converts and sites, we have derived much help from G. P. Malalasekera’s Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names which we gratefully acknowledge. Most of the material being connected with Vaiśālī and the places along the Magadha-Nepal road and the Gaṇḍāka river, this chapter on the Vajjī country is naturally longer. For the sake of clearly understanding the whole material, we have made subdivisions in the chapter following the chronology of the life of Gautama Buddha.

(A) GAUTAMA’S CONTACT WITH VAIŚĀLĪ BEFORE ENLIGHTENMENT

The Vajjians from the very beginning appear to have been interested in philosophy and later they founded a school called the Vajjiputtaka school after them. The Champāraṇya forest (in Champaran district) and the Gaṇḍāka area provided places for hermitages of rishis. In the sixth century B.C. the area was full of philosophical activity and Gautama, who had renounced the world, thought it fit to consult people there. According to the Lalitavistara¹ Gautama, after receiving his ascetic’s robe, is

entertained at the hermitage of the Brāhmaṇa woman Śāki, then at that of the Brāhmaṇa woman Padmā, and then by the Brāhmaṇa sage Raivata and by Rājaka, son of Trimanḍika, until he reaches Vaisālī and joins Āḷāra. The Mahāvastu gives two accounts. According to one, Gautama, after leaving Kanṭhaka, paid a visit to the hermitage of Vasishṭha and then stayed with Ārāda before proceeding to Rājagriha. Another account says that after leaving the world, Gautama went straight to Vaisālī without any previous visits, joined Ārāda, and after rejecting his teaching went to Rājagriha and practised the teaching of Udraka Rāmaputra. The Therigāthā Commentary mentions another teacher of Gautama, named Bhaggava, whom Gautama visited before Āḷāra. In the Milinda-paṇha Āḷāra is mentioned as Gautama’s fourth teacher. The Buddha-Charita mentions Ārāda or Āḷāra and gives a brief account of his philosophy.

Although the accounts differ, it appears almost certain that Gautama consulted some Brāhmaṇa philosophers, presumably of the Vajji country, and a famous philosopher of the time, Āḷāra Kālāma, who had his seat at Vaisālī. Buddha-ghosha tells us that in Āḷāra Kālāma, Āḷāra was his personal name and he was so called because he was dīgha-pīngala (long and tawny).

At one place in the Majjhima-Nikāya the Buddha describes his visit to Āḷāra who recognised his pupil’s eminence and treated him as an equal, but Gautama, not having succeeded in his quest, took leave of Āḷāra to go elsewhere.

Āḷāra Kālāma was one of the two teachers to whom the thoughts of Gautama went after his Enlightenment as the best recipients of his teachings. But by that time the teacher was dead.

2. Ibid., p. 118.
3. Therigāthā Commentary, p. 2.
5. Buddha-Charita, XII. 17 ff.
(B) THE BUDDHA’S FIRST VISIT TO VAIŚĀLI
AFTER ENLIGHTENMENT

It is not possible to know how many visits were paid by the Buddha to Vaiśāli, but the books would lead us to infer that they were several.¹

The Commentaries² of the Buddhist Tripitaka and the Mahāvastu³ give detailed descriptions of the circumstances of the first visit of the Buddha to Vaiśāli.

Vaiśāli was inhabited by 7707 Rājās, each of whom had large retinues, many palaces and pleasure parks. There came a shortage in the food supply owing to drought, and people died in large numbers. The smell of decaying bodies attracted evil spirits, and many inhabitants were attacked by intestinal diseases. The people complained to the ruling ‘prince’, and he convoked a general assembly, where it was decided, after much discussion, to invite the Buddha to their city. As the Buddha was then at Veluvana in Rājagriha, the Lichchhavi Mahāli, friend of Bimbisāra and son of the chaplain of Vaiśāli, was sent to Bimbisāra with a request that he should persuade the Buddha to go to Vaiśāli. Bimbisāra referred him to the Buddha himself, who, after listening to Mahāli’s story, agreed to go.

The Buddha started on the journey with five hundred monks. Bimbisāra decorated the route from Rājagriha to the Ganges, a distance of five leagues, and provided all comforts on the way. He accompanied the Buddha, and the Ganges was reached in five days. Boats, decked with great splendour, were ready for the Buddha and his monks, and we are told that Bimbisāra followed the Buddha into the water up to his neck.

The Buddha was received on the opposite bank by the Lichchhavis, with even greater honour than Bimbisāra had shown him. As soon as the Buddha set foot on the Vajjian territory, there was a thunderstorm and rain fell in torrents. The distance from the Ganges to Vaiśāli was three leagues; as the Buddha approached Vaiśāli, Sakka came to greet him, and, at the sight of the Devas, all the evil spirits fled in fear.

¹. D. P. P. N., II, p. 942. The Muzaffarpur District Gazetteer (p. 139) says that the visits were three, which is wrong.
In the evening the Buddha first taught the Ratana-Sutta to Ananda and asked him to go round the city, accompanied by the Lichchhavi princes, reciting the Sutta within the three walls of the city and sprinkling water from the Buddha's bowl. This Ananda did during the three watches of the night, and immediately all the evil spirits fled from the city and the people recovered from their diseases. They then gathered at the Mote-Hall with various offerings and thither they conducted the Buddha. In the assembly were present not only all the inhabitants of Vaisali, but also the Devas of two Deva-worlds, with Sakka at their head. The Buddha preached the Ratana-Sutta to this great crowd, and 84000 beings were converted.

Because this Sutta was first preached to ward off the evil from Vaisali, the Ratana-Sutta became the most famous of the Buddhist Ward-runes (Parittas). The Sutta seems also to have been known as the Gangārohana-Sutta. The Sutta is given in the Mahāvastu where it is described as Svastiyanana-gāthā.

It is said that during this visit the Buddha stayed at Vaisali for two weeks, preaching the Sutta for seven consecutive days; on each day 84000 beings realised the Truth. The Buddha then left Vaisali.

The Lichchhavis accompanied him to the Ganges with redoubled honours, and in the river itself, Devas and Nāgas vied with each other in paying him honour.

On the farther bank, Bimbisāra awaited his arrival and conducted him back to Rājagṛih. This journey of the Buddha along the Ganges is called Gangārohana. Great

---

1. One of the Suttas of the Khuddakaṇātha. It is also included in the Sutta-Nipāta (verses 222-238). Cf. Chālavadha, P. T. S., 37. 191 (Gangārohana-Sutta).

2. The Paritta or Parittā, which means protection, is a collection of texts taken from the Khuddakaṇātha, the Aṅguttara-Nikāya, the Majjhima-Nikāya and the Sutta-Nipāta, and recited on special occasions to ward off illness and danger. The Miliyadāsaka (pp. 150-151) gives a list of the chief Parittas: the Ratana-Sutta, the Khanda-parittā, the Mora-parittā, the Dhajoja-parittā, the Adhipatiya-parittā, and the Aṅgulimāla-parittā (S. B. E., 35, p. 213). To these are generally added in the extant collection of Parittas, the Mahāgala-Sutta and the Metta-Sutta. See D. P. P. N., II, pp. 157-158, 709-710 and Dialogues, III, pp. 185-186, 170; cf. Atharva-Veda, III. 20-27.


6. The number is traditional.
festivities marked the event of the Buddha's return to Rājagriha and the Buddha recited the Saṅkha- Jātaka to the monks to explain the unparalleled honours he had received during the journey.¹

We do not know the exact date of the first visit of the Enlightened One to the Lichchhavi capital. The Buddha-vanisma-Atṭhakathā² says that the Buddha visited it in the fifth year after the Enlightenment and spent the vassa (rains) there. But from the account given in the Commentaries it appears that the Buddha returned to Rājagriha soon. Thus probably this visit may be dated earlier, say the third year after Enlightenment.³ The author of the Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names⁴ conjectures that probably it was the year during which king Bimbisāra gifted Veluvana to the Buddha and the Order and the Teacher stayed for two months at Rājagriha that at the beginning of the rainy season the Buddha visited Vaiśālī at the request of the Lichchhavis and preached the Ratana-Sutta. This means the first year⁵ after the Enlightenment. But we feel some time may be given for the Buddha in order to attain fame so that he might attract the attention of the Vaisalians.

**(C) THE FOUNDATION OF THE NUNS' ORDER AT VAIŚĀLĪ**

Vaiśālī is memorable in Buddhist history for the foundation of the Order of Nuns which was laid here. This took place in the fifth year of the Buddha's ministry. The Buddha came to Vaiśālī from Kapilavastu and stayed at the Kūṭāgāra Hall in the Mahāvana. This was the great occasion when Mahāprajāpatī Gotami, the foster-mother of the Blessed One, came with five hundred other Sakyan women from Kapilavastu, and, through the intercession of Ānanda, obtained permission for women to go forth from the household life and enter the home-

---

¹. For a summary of the Mahāvastu account of the Buddha's visit to Vaiśālī see B. C. Law, Kshatriya Clans, pp. 45-48 and our Vaiśālī Ki Jhāṅki (Patna, 1953), pp. 38-46.
⁵. Buddhacharyā, p. 35.
less state under the doctrine and discipline proclaimed by the Buddha. Eight Chief Rules (Aṭṭha Garudhamma) were imposed on the nuns and these rules were never to be transgressed. Some details of the Nuns' Order were also fixed up at Vaiśāli.\(^1\)

(D) THE FORMULATION OF VINAYA RULES AT VAIŚĀLI

Vaiśāli played an important part in the formulation of Vinaya rules of the Buddhist Order because various Vinaya rules are mentioned as having been laid down at this place.\(^2\) This appears to be one of the five principal towns of the time (viz., Śrāvasti, Rājagriha, Kauśāmbi, Vaiśāli and Kapilavastu) where the Vinaya rules of the Buddhist Order were framed.\(^3\)

The rules framed at Vaiśāli are of various types, e.g., those pertaining to food, water, cloth, buildings, general living and the like. The things which were prescribed for the Bhikkhus in a time of scarcity were not to continue in the time of plenty.\(^4\) Meat of an animal killed for that purpose and fish caught specially to be given to the Bhikkhus were disallowed to them.\(^5\) Food not given to the monk was not to be accepted by him;\(^6\) nor was he to give food to a naked ascetic (achelaka or Ājīvaka) or a wanderer or a female wanderer.\(^7\) When the Buddha found water at Vaiśāli unfit for drinking purposes, he permitted the use of strainers and filters for the Bhikkhus.\(^8\)

On another occasion the Buddha, while on the high road between Rājagriha and Vaiśāli, saw a number of Bhikkhus with superfluous chīvaras almost 'smothered up in robes', going along with robes made up into a roll on their heads, or on their

---

2. D. P. P. N., II, p. 942. No attempt has, however, been made in this Dictionary or anywhere else to give exhaustive references on this point.
backs, or on their waists. Then, after testing the severest winter nights at Vaiśāli by means of personal experience, he fixed the maximum number of robes to be used by the Bhikkhus, i.e., one double waist cloth, one single upper robe and one single under garment. Again it was at Vaiśāli that the great teacher taught the Bhikkhus many matters connected with the sort of houses they were to build and live in. The use of mosquito curtains was allowed after the Bhikkhus had been troubled by mosquitoes. Some important Pārājika rules of the Buddhist Order were framed at Vaiśāli.

Thus we find that the Lichchhavi city had an important share in moulding the Order of the Buddha.

(E) PROGRESS OF BUDDHISM AT VAIŚĀLI

The Buddha had many other associations with Vaiśāli and the Vajji country. The vast material available on this aspect in Buddhist literature has been arranged here disciple-wise and place-wise for having a clear idea of the subject.

(1) Important Converts to Buddhism

Buddhism made a ready appeal to the people of Vaiśāli, especially the Lichchhavis. One principal reason of this was that the Buddha had many discourses at Vaiśāli. Consequently many Lichchhavis accepted Buddhism. They put before the Buddha numerous questions about religion and dogma that presented any difficulty to them and “we think that the bringing

1. S. B. E., 17, pp. 210-212. An extra suit of robes was also provided (ibid., p. 214; also Horner, Vol. II, pp. 1-11). A rug made of pure black sheep’s wool was disallowed to the monk (Horner, Vol. II, p. 74). For some other rules see S. B. E., 20, pp. 110-111 (nakedness prohibited), 114 (towel), 116-117.

2. For this aspect see S. B. E., 17, pp. 119-121 (Kappiya-bhāmi); 20, pp. 101-116, 189-191 (samakamma).


4. For the Pārājika rules, i.e., rules regarding offences involving Defeat (Nos. 1, 3 and 4) framed at Vaiśāli see Horner, I, pp. 1-63, 116-150, 151-191; also cf. ibid., II, pp. 208-211. The rules are interesting, but lack of space prevents us from giving their details.

5. Among the important Suttas are the Mahāli, Mahā-Sīhārasa, Chula-Saschaka, Mahā-Saschaka, Tewi-jja-Vaschchhagota, Samakutta and Ratans; also the Tesważe-Jētaka (No. 246) and the Sigāla-Jētaka (No. 152) were preached at Vaiśāli (D. P. P. N., II, p. 943).
together of all these Lichchhavī questions to the Master will well repay the trouble bestowed upon them.\textsuperscript{12} The people of Vaiśālī were meditative and very often dealt with philosophical questions relating to nirvāṇa,\textsuperscript{2} the means of attaining nirvāṇa,\textsuperscript{3} dosa, moha, adosa, amoha,\textsuperscript{4} and the influence of the purity of sila, tapa, etc.\textsuperscript{5} Serious problems relating to the destruction of action, destruction of sensation, etc.\textsuperscript{6} engaged the attention of the Lichchhavīs. They took delight in jhānas.\textsuperscript{7} Once, when the Buddha was at Vaiśālī, there were 500 Lichchhavīs assembled at the Sārandada Chaitya. There was a talk about the five kinds of rare gems, Hatthiratana, Assaratana, Māñjiratana, Itthiratana and Gañapatiratana. The Buddha solved the problem in an unexpected way by speaking of five kinds of precious gems.\textsuperscript{8} On another occasion, when the Blessed One was at Vaiśālī, he was worshipped by 500 Lichchhavīs arrayed in various coloured garments, ornaments, and trappings. The Lichchhavīs gave Pīngiyāni 500 upper garments, after listening to a gāthā in praise of the Buddha sung by him. Pīngiyāni offered the Buddha three garments. Then the Buddha spoke of the five rare gems before the Lichchhavī.\textsuperscript{9} Such was the influence of the Buddha on the Lichchhavīs that even careless boys, wandering about with hounds and bows and arrows, would lay aside their arms when they saw the Buddha seated under a tree and would surround him with clasped hands, eager to hear him—a situation which surprised Mahānāma, a Lichchhavi of rather advanced age.\textsuperscript{10} On another occasion some Lichchhavīs saluted the Buddha with folded hands as soon as he was seen by them; some sat silent at a distance from the Blessed One.\textsuperscript{11} Once a large number of Lichchhavīs, when going to see the Buddha who was at Vaiśālī, resounded the Mahaṇāvana with a great tumult of joy on seeing the Buddha, as they were greatly devoted to him and had a strong

10. A., III, pp. 75-78 (pp. 62-64 in English translation).
faith in him. This noise so greatly troubled the Bhikkhus that they were unable to proceed with their meditation.\(^1\) The influence that the teachings of the Exalted One exercised upon the fierce Lichchhavis is unique. Of the many stories showing how noble and inspiring were the Blessed One’s teachings, we may refer to one indicating how they cured a wicked Lichchhavi prince of the ferocity of his spirit and temper. The magic power of the Buddha’s wholesome and edifying lecture had the beneficial effect of removing the arrogance and selfishness of the prince from the core of his heart, which became afterwards full of love and kindness.\(^2\) The Lichchhavis were so very devoted to the Buddha that they are said to have arranged a voyage for him by boat.\(^3\)

We now propose to refer to individual converts to Buddhism which will help us in forming an idea of the progress of Buddhism at Vaiśāli which was, indeed, passing through a great religious upheaval at that time.

1. NANDAKA

Nandaka, a minister (Mahāmātra) of the Lichchhavis, visited the Buddha at the Kūṭāgāraśāla in Vaiśāli. The Buddha told him that the Ariyan disciple, possessed of unwavering loyalty to the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha, and having Ariyan virtues, is assured of enlightenment and happiness. During the conversation, a man came to tell Nandaka that his bath was ready. Nandaka sent him away saying that the inner washing—loyalty to the Buddha—was far more important.\(^4\)

2. SIHA

Siha (Sanskrit Simha) was a Lichchhavi general of Vaiśāli. He was a follower of the Nigāṇṭhas and one of their most famous patrons, the others being Upāli Ghapati of Nālandā and Vappa, the Sakyan of Kapilavastu.\(^5\)

\(^1\) A., V, p. 193.
\(^3\) Diśyavadāna, pp. 55-56.
\(^4\) S., V, p. 389.
When the Buddha visited Vaiśāli, Siha having heard reports of his greatness, wished to see him, but Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta dissuaded him, saying that Gautama denied the result of actions and was not worth a visit. But in the end, accompanied by five hundred chariots, he went to the Buddha. Having discovered in conversation with the Buddha that he was falsely accused of preaching wrong doctrines, Siha declared himself to be the Buddha's follower. The Buddha accepted his adherence on condition that he would continue to give alms to any Nigaṇṭhas who sought them at his house. This generosity made Siha honour the Buddha even more highly.¹

There are two discussions, in more or less identical terms, in which Siha asks the Buddha a philosophical question and gets the reply.²

3. AJITA

He was a general of the Lichchhavis and a follower of the Buddha. Immediately after his death he was born in Tāvatīmśa (realm of the Thirty-and-three); he visited the Buddha to refute a statement made about him by the naked ascetic Pāṭikaputta to the effect that he had been born in the Mahānīrāya (Great Purgatory) as a result of having followed the teaching of the Buddha.³

4. DUMMUKHA

He was a Lichchhavi chieftain. He was present at the discussion of the Nigaṇṭha Sachchaka with the Buddha, and seeing Sachchaka discomfited in the debate, Dummukha compared him to a crab pulled out of a pond and ill-treated by village boys.⁴

The Commentary says that Dummukha just happened to be his name. He was in reality quite handsome.⁵

5. MAHĀLI

Mahāli was a Lichchhavi chief. He was educated at Takkasilā. After his return to Vaiśāli, he devoted himself to

¹. Viś., I, pp. 233 ff. A., IV, pp. 179-188. See also Teśovāda-Jātaka.
the education of the young Lichchhavi men, but, through over-
exertion, lost his sight. He continued to instruct them, however, and was given a house by the gate which led from Sāvatthī into Vaiśāli. The revenue from this gate, worth one hundred thousand, was given to him.¹

When Bandhula came to Vaiśāli to satisfy the pregnancy-
longings of his wife Mallikā, Mahāli, hearing the rumble of his chariot, instantly recognised it. He warned the Lichchhavis not to interfere with Bandhula, and, finding that they insisted on pursuing him, urged them to turn back when they saw Bandhula’s chariot sink up to the nave, or at least when they heard a sound like the crash of a thunderbolt, or when they saw a hole in the yokes of the chariot. But they paid no heed to his warnings and were killed.²

When the Lichchhavis decided to invite the Buddha to Vaiśāli to rid the city of its plagues, Mahāli it was who went with the son of the Purohita to Veluvana (Rājagriha) to inter-
cede with Bimbisāra, that he might persuade the Buddha to come. Mahāli was a favourite of Bimbisāra and a member of his retinue. He had attained Sotāpatti at the same time as the Magadhan king.³

On two occasions⁴ there were philosophical discussions between Mahāli Lichchhavi and the Buddha who removed his doubts. Mahāli visited the Buddha at the Kūṭāgāraśālā to ask if he had seen Sakka.⁵

This Mahāli is perhaps identical with the Mahāli men-
tioned in the Apadāna⁶ as the father of Sīvalī. His wife was Suppavāsā.

There was one Lichchhavi whose personal name was Mahāli, but he was called Otṭhaddhā because he had a hare-lip.⁷ He went to visit the Buddha at the Kūṭāgāraśālā in Vaiśāli at a time when the Buddha had given orders that no one should be allowed to see him; but through the intervention of the novice

Siha, Oṭṭhadhda was admitted to the Buddha's presence with a large retinue of followers, all splendidly adorned in various ways. There was a long conversation on spiritual matters.² Buddhaghosha calls Oṭṭhadhda a rājā. We do not know if this Oṭṭhadhda Lichchhavi was the same as had received education at Takkasāla.

Mahāli is called Mahā-Lichchhavi in Dhammapada (p. 219).²

6. MAHĀNĀMA

He was a Lichchhavi. He saw a number of Lichchhavi youths sitting by the Buddha at the foot of a tree in the Mahāvana at Vaiśāli; he expressed his joy at the sight for, he said, the Lichchhavis were usually so mischievous. The Buddha thereupon told Mahānāma of five things the practice of which would lead to progress.³

It was probably this Mahānāma⁴ who was the father of Ambapāli, the famous courtesan of Vaiśāli.

7. AMBASAKKHARA

He was one of the Lichchhavi chieftains of Vaiśāli during the Buddha's time. He was a nihilist by persuasion. Once while going through the city he saw a beautiful woman. Wishing to possess her, he commandeered her husband's services. The husband was helped by a peta (spirit) and thus the attempt was foiled. Consequently Ambasakkhaṇa was converted to the Faith, and, after having listened to a sermon by Kappitaka, became a Sotāpanna.⁵

8. SĀLHA

When the Buddha was at Vaiśāli, a Lichchhavi named Sālha and another Lichchhavi named Abhaya approached the Buddha. Sālha questioned the Buddha regarding the way that

1. D., I, pp. 150-158.
2. Quoted in Cowell: Jātaka, IV, p. 94, n. 1. The word (Mahā-li), according to some, may also mean 'the great lion' (J. R. A. S., 1889, p. 262, foot-note).
3. A., III, pp. 75-78.
was made by purity of morals and that made by self-mortification. The Buddha answered the question with many similes. We are not told that either of the Lichchhavis became converts on this occasion.

9. ABHAYA

As mentioned already, once Abhaya accompanied Sālha to the Buddha who explained the implications of the Ariyan way.

On another occasion he came with another Lichchhavi, Paṇḍitakumāraka, to Ānanda in the Kūṭāgāraśālā in Vaiśālī, and discussed with him certain views held by Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta. Ānanda taught him the Buddha’s three ways of purification.

He was sent by his teacher Nātaputta to confuse the Buddha.

At another place he propounds the views of Purāṇa Kassapa, who was an ahetu-vādin, a ‘no-cause-theorist.’

10. PĀΝḌITAKUMĀRAKA

He was a Lichchhavi who, with Abhaya, visited Ānanda at the Mahāvana in Vaiśālī and held a discussion regarding ascetic practices.

11. BHADDIYA

He was a Lichchhavi who visited the Buddha at the Kūṭāgāraśālā and asked if it were true that the Buddha was a magician who, by a glamorous trick, enticed away the followers of others. The Buddha advised Bhaddiya not to be led away by hearsay but to judge for himself; and he then proceeded, by means of question and answer, to convince Bhaddiya that his teachings were truly founded on fact and, if accepted and practised, would benefit not only human beings but the very trees of the forest.

The Commentary adds\(^1\) that at the conclusion of the discourse, Bhaddiya became a Sotāpanna.

12. AṆJANA-VANIYA THERA

Aṇjana-vaniya was born at Vaiśāḷī in the family of a rājā of the Vajjians. During his adolescence, the three-fold panic of drought, sickness and non-human foes affected the Vajjian territory. Afterwards the Exalted One put a stop to the panic and addressed a great concourse and preached the Ratana-Sutta. Hearing his discourse the prince won faith and left the world. After passing through the preliminary training, he settled in the Aṇjana wood at Sāketa. When the rains drew near, he got a castaway conch and built over it a hut of grass and engaged himself in a strenuous study for one month. Then he won Arahantship.\(^2\)

13. RAMAṆĪYAKUṬIKA THERA

He was a nobleman of Vaiśāḷī and left the world after hearing the Buddha preach the Ratana-Sutta. After ordination he dwelt in a pleasant hut in a beautiful forest, where he won Arahantship. One day some women tried to tempt him, but in vain.\(^3\)

14. PIYAṆJĀHA THERA

He belonged to the family of a Lichchhavi nobleman of Vaiśāḷī. When he grew up his chief interest was war, hence his name (“ever destroying what is dear to his enemies”).

When the Buddha visited Vaiśāḷī, Piyaṇjaha found faith in him, joined the Order and became an Arahant, dwelling in the forest.\(^4\)

15. VASABHA THERA

He belonged to the family of a Lichchhavi rājā of Vaiśāḷī and joined the Order when the Buddha visited that town,\(^5\)

\(^1\) A. A., II, p. 558.


\(^3\) Theragāthā, verse 58. Theragāthā Commentary, I, pp. 122 ff.

\(^4\) Theragāthā, verse 76. Theragāthā Commentary, I, pp. 168 ff. Also Apadāna, I, 161.

\(^5\) Theragāthā, verses 139-140. Theragāthā Commentary, I, 257 ff. According to another source he was born in Sāvatthi and was ordained under Sāriputta at the age of seven (Apadāna, II, 437 ff).
winning Arahantship in due course. Out of compassion for
his patrons, he enjoyed what he received from them; the
common-minded thereupon deemed him self-indulgent.

16. VAJJIPUTTA ĂHERA (No. 1)

He belonged to the family of a minister of Vaisāli, and
seeing the majesty of the Buddha who visited the city, he joined
the Order and lived in a wood near by. A festival took place
in Vaisāli, with much singing and dancing and gaiety. This
distracted Vajjiputta, and he expressed his disgust in a verse
spoken in scorn of the forest-life. After his conversation with
the woodland sprite, he sought the Buddha, who preached to
him. He attained Arahantship at the end of the Buddha’s
sermon.¹ His story is given at another place also.²

17. VAJJIPUTTA THERA (No. 2)

Vajjiputta or the son of the Vajjis belonged to a Lichchhavi
rājā’s family, and while still young, and learning various arts,
such as training elephants, was filled with the desire for renun-
ciation. One day he went to a vihāra where the Buddha was
preaching, entered the Order, and not long after became an
Arahant.

After the Buddha’s death, when the Chief Elders were
living in various places prior to their agreed meeting for the
recital of the Dhamma, he saw Ānanda, still a learner, teaching
the Doctrine to a large assembly. Wishing to urge him to higher
attainment, Vajjiputta uttered a verse, and this verse was among
them which led to Ānanda’s attainment of Arahantship.³

18. KUTIVIHĀRĪ THERA

He was the son of a nobleman in the Vajji country. Hav-
ing heard the Buddha preach the Ratana-Sutta he left the world.
One day, while strving after insight, he was caught in the rain

². Dhammapada-Aṭṭhakathā (P. T. S.), III, pp. 460 ff. See also S. A.,
I, p. 228, where also he is called rājā. There may be confusion between
Vajjiputta (1) and (2).
³. The verse is found in Theragāthā (verse 115). In S., I, p. 199 the
verse is attributed to a forest deva who wished to agitate Ānanda. In Rockhill,
pp. 155 ff, Vajjiputta was Ānanda’s attendant at the time and preached to
the people while Ānanda meditated.
and sought shelter in a wood-man’s hut. As soon as he sat down there on a mat, he became an Arahant. The Buddha, having heard by virtue of his divine ear the conversation between the monk and the watch-man, uttered verses of approbation. The monk was so called because he obtained insight in a hut. He is probably identical with Udakapūjaka Thera of the Apadāna.¹ The reason for such speculation is that in the past he had given cool water to Padumuttara Buddha.²

19. VAḌḌHAMĀṆA THERA

He belonged to a Lichchhavi rājā’s family in Vaiśālī and was a devoted follower of the Buddha, delighting in waiting upon him and in making gifts to the monks. Later, because of an offence he had committed, the Buddha passed on him a sentence of punishment. He was much grieved and sought the forgiveness of the Saṅgha,³ and, because of his agitation, he renounced the world and joined the Order. But he was given up to sloth and torpor, till the Buddha admonished him in a verse.⁴ He then put forth effort and became an Arahant.

20. VIMALA KOṆḌAṆṆA THERA

He was the son of Ambapālī and Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha. Vimala was his earlier name, but later he came to be called Vimala Koṇḍañña. When the Buddha visited Vaiśālī, Vimala was impressed by his majesty and entered the Order, attaining Arahantship soon afterwards.

A sermon preached by Vimala helped Ambapālī to develop insight and win Arahantship.⁵

21. ŚIVALI THERA

He was the son of Suppavāsā, daughter of the king of

¹. Apadāna, I, 142 ff.
³. He is probably identified with Vaḍḍha though no mention is made of Vaḍḍha having entered the Order.
⁴. This verse is found in the Theragāthā (verse 40); elsewhere (Theragāthā, verse 1162) this verse is ascribed to Moggallāna as having been spoken by him to a monk named Tissa and again repeated (verse 1163) by him to Vaḍḍhamāṅa.
⁵. Theragāthā Commentary, 207.
Koliya. According to the *Apanâna* account his father in his last birth was the Lichchhâvi Mahâlî.

From the time of his birth Sâvalî could do anything. Sâriputta talked with him on the day of his birth and ordained him with Suppavâsâ’s permission. Sâvalî ultimately attained Arahatship.

Sâvalî was declared by the Buddha as pre-eminent among the recipients (of benefits or blessings).

22. AMBÂPÂLÏ

A Lichchhâvi named Mahâna of Vaiśâlî found a child at the foot of a mango tree in his garden and brought it up as Ambâpâlî. She grew up so full of beauty and of grace that many young princes vied with one another for the honour of her hand. Finally, in order to end their strife, they appointed her as a courtesan.

In the *Theragâthâ* there are two verses which, according to tradition, were spoken by Ânanda in admonition of monks who lost their heads at the sight of Ambâpâlî. Whether this was before or after she joined the Order we are not told.

It is said that when Ambâpâlî heard of the Buddha’s visit to Vaiśâlî, she and her retinue drove to meet him and, after hearing a discourse, invited him and the monks to a meal the next day. The Buddha accepted this invitation and had as a result to refuse that of the Lichchhâvis of Vaiśâlî. It was after this meal that Ambâpâlî gave over her park, the Ambâpâlîvana, to the Buddha and the Order. She had already built a vihâra in her own garden which she gave to the Buddha and the Order. The Buddha accepted the gift and stayed there for some time before going on to Beluva.

Ambâpâlî had a son Vimala Koṇḍâña, who was an eminent Elder. Having heard him preach one day, she

4. The Commentary says that just before Ambâpâlî’s visit to him, the Buddha admonished the monks to be steadfast and mindful, lest they should lose their heads about her (D. A., II, p. 545).
5. *Vin.*, I, pp. 231-233; D., II, pp. 95-98. The two accounts vary in details, e.g., in the *Dîgha* version the Buddha was already in Ambâpâlîvana and not in Koṇṭigâma when the courtesan visited him.
renounced the world and working for insight by studying the law of impermanence as illustrated in her own ageing body, she attained Arahatship.\(^1\)

Nineteen verses ascribed to her are found in the \textit{Therigāthā}.\(^3\)

### 23. SĪHĀ THERĪ

Sīhā, a daughter of the sister of the Līchchhāvī general Sīha, was born at Vaiśālī at the time of Gautama Buddha. She was called Sīhā after her maternal uncle, Sīha.

She heard one day the Buddha preach to Sāriputta and entered the Order with her parents’ consent. For seven years she tried, without success, to concentrate her mind. Then she tied a noose round her neck and fastened the end to a tree, and in this position she compelled her mind to gain insight. Then she loosened the noose. At last she won Arahatship.\(^3\)

### 24. VĀSIṬṬHI THERĪ

Vāsiṭṭhi was born in a clansman’s family at Vaiśālī. Her parents gave her in marriage to a clansman’s son of equal position. She bore a son. The child died very young, and his mother was mad with grief. One day she ran away from home, and, in the course of her wanderings, came to Mithilā, where she saw the Buddha, who calmed her grief. He taught her the Doctrine and had her ordained at her own request. She soon after became an Arahat.\(^4\)

### 25. JAYANTI

Jentī (Sanskrit Jayantī) or Jentā was born in a princely family of the Līchchhāvis at Vaiśālī. She won Arahatship after hearing the Dhamma preached by the Buddha.\(^5\)

### 26. SUPPAVĀSA KOLIYADHĪTĀ

Suppavāsa was the daughter of the rājā of Koliya.\(^6\) Her

---

1. \textit{Therigāthā} Commentary, verses 206-207.
2. \textit{Ibid.}, verses 252-270.
husband was the Lichchhavi Mahāli. She was the mother of Sivali.

She was described by the Buddha as foremost among them who gave excellent alms. She is included in a list of eminent upāsikās and is mentioned with Anāthapiṇḍika, Chulla-Anāthapiṇḍika and Visākhā, as givers of gifts which were gladly accepted by the monks.

27-30. SACHCHA, LOLĀ, AVAVĀDAKA AND PAṬĀCHĀRA

A Nigaṇṭha and a Nigaṇṭhi, who were given to argument and disputation and were Lichchhavis according to the context, married at Vasāli and had four daughters, viz., Sachchā, Lolā, Avavādakā and Paṭāchārā and a son named Sachchaka. These five children were also great disputants. One day the four sisters engaged in a dispute with Sāriputta at Sāvatthī. Having been defeated all the four female ascetics joined the Order and became Arahants.

31. UGGA

He was a householder of Vasāli, declared by the Buddha to be the best of those who give agreeable gifts.

His original name is not known. He came to be called Ugga-Setṭhi, because he was tall in body, lofty in morals and of striking personality.

The first time he saw the Buddha he became a Sotāpanna and later an Anāgāmi.

When he was old, the thought came to him one day while he was alone, “I will give to the Buddha whatever I consider most attractive to myself and I have heard from him that such

1. Aṭṭhakathā, II, p. 494 (verse 28); but see A. A., I, 244 where her husband is described as a Sakyan noble.
4. Dh. A., I, p. 339; in this context she is spoken of as living in Sāvatthī; this was probably after Mahāli went to live there. Cf. Dh. A., IV, pp. 193 ff.
a giver obtains his wishes. I wish the Buddha would come to my house now". The Buddha, reading his thoughts, appeared before his door with a following of monks. He received them with great respect and, having given them a meal, announced to the Buddha his intention of providing him and the monks with whatever they found agreeable.

While staying at the Kūṭāgāraśālā in Vaiśāli, the Buddha once declared to the monks that Ugga was possessed of eight marvellous qualities. The rest of the story is very similar to that of Ugga of Hatthigāmaka.

We possess a list of things of which Ugga himself was fond. We are told that he offered these things (which included muslin from Banaras) to the Buddha and also to five hundred monks (according to the Commentary). He died soon after and became an Arahant.

32. KIRAPATIKA

He was a householder of Vaiśāli and a pious follower of the Buddha. He was a man of charitable disposition. Buddha-ghosha says that the householder's name was Kira, but that he was called Kirapatika on account of his great influence. He gave his workmen regular and generous wages.

33. KOSALAVIHĀRĪ THERA

He was born in Vaiśāli and was one of those who heard the Buddha preach when he came to quieten the panic which arose there, as recorded in the Ratana-Sutta. After the sermon Kosalavihārī left the world. At the conclusion of his novitiate he dwelt in a forest near a village in Kosala. A lay adherent seeing him camping under a tree built for him a small hut, and there the Thera attained Arahantship. He acquired his name from having dwelt long in Kosala.

2. A., IV, pp. 208-212. Cf. a similar confusion between these two Uggas in S., IV, pp. 109 ff. This is perhaps due to uncertainty on the part of the compilers as to which Ugga was meant.
5. Samantapādaśākā, IV, p. 817.
34. Valliya Thera

He belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family of Vaiśāli, and was named Gaṇḍimitta (v. l. Kaṅhamitta). Much struck by the Buddha when he came to Vaiśāli, he joined the Order under Mahā-Kāchchāyana. Because he was dull of insight and depended too much on his colleagues, he was called Valliya ( creeper), like the ivy which must lean on something in order to grow. Later, following the advice of Venudatta Thera, he developed insight.¹

He is probably identical with Chandanamāliya of the Apadāna.²

35. Suyāma (Suyāmana) Thera

He belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family of Vaiśāli and was expert in three Vedas. He saw and heard the Buddha at Vaiśāli, and, having entered the Order, attained Arahatship while his head was being shaved.³

He is evidently identical with Kusumāsaniya of the Apadāna.⁴

36. Rohini Theri

She was the daughter of a prosperous Brāhmaṇa of Vaiśāli. When the Buddha visited Vaiśāli, she heard him preach and became a Sotāpanna, taught the Doctrine to her parents, and, with their permission, entered the Order, where she became an Arahan.

The Therīgāthā⁵ contains a set of verses spoken by her in exaltation, when, after becoming an Arahan, she recalled to mind the discussion she had had with her father while she was yet a Sotāpanna.

It is said⁶ that the last stanza of the series was spoken by her father, who later himself joined the Order and became an Arahan.

¹ Theragāthā Commentary, I, 292 ff; two verses addressed by him to Venudatta are included in the Theragāthā (167-168).
² Apadāna, II, 423 ff.
³ Theragāthā, 74; Theragāthā Commentary, I, 165 ff.
⁴ Apadāna, I, 160.
⁶ Therīgāthā Commentary, 219 ff.
37. VIMALĀ THERĪ

She was the daughter of a courtesan of Vaiśālī. Having one day seen Moggallāna begging in Vaiśālī for alms, she went to his dwelling and tried to entice him. The Elder rebuked and admonished her, and she became a lay follower and later entered the Order. Then, after great effort, she became an Arahant.1

38. THERIKĀ

She was born in a family of Vaiśālī and was so called because of her sturdy mind. She married and became a devoted wife, accepting the Buddha’s teaching, after hearing him preach at Vaiśālī. Later she heard Prajāpati Gautamī and wished to leave the world, but her husband refused his permission. One day, while cooking she developed the thought of impermanence, and became an Anāgāmī. When her husband realised this, he took her to Prajāpati, who ordained her.2

A barber of Vaiśālī is indicated as a true believer, sheltered in the Three Refuges (the Buddha, the Law and the Order of Brethren) and from time to time he would listen to the Master’s discourses.3

Thus several sections of the population of Vaiśālī responded to the call of Śākyamuni.

(2) Important Buddhist Sites

We have reviewed above the progress made by Buddhism in the various sections of Vaisalian population. Now we propose to examine important Buddhist sites at Vaiśālī because without this our review would remain incomplete.

We begin from the north and the north-west.

1. THE MAHĀVANA

This was a forest which is said to have stretched right up to the Himālayas as Buddhaghosha explains in his Sumanāgalavilāsini (Commentary to the Mahāli-Sutta in the Dīgha-

1. Therīgāthā, verses 72-76. Therīgāthā Commentary, pp. 76 ff.
2. Therīgāthā, verse 1. Therīgāthā Commentary p. 5.
Nikāya). In commenting upon the word ‘Mahāvana’, he says: "Outside the town lying in one stretch up to the Himālayas, there is a natural forest which on account of the large area covered by it is called Mahāvana"¹ (lit. ‘Great Forest’). We may not accept the verdict of Buddhaghosha that it stretched uninterruptedly up to the Himālayas, because in that case a good part of the Vaijī country would be covered with forests. Probably it was so vast that an impression was created on the visitor that it must have extended up to the Himālayas. This forest provided a good field for Lichchhavi hunters and elephant-tamers and for Buddhist meditators who did not fail to utilise it. The famous Kūṭāgāraśālā, where the Buddha often stayed, was constructed here. Near by were other forests, such as Gosīngasālavana.²

It may be pointed out that forests bearing the name Mahāvana existed also near Kapilavastu and Uruvelakappa and on the banks of the Nerañjarā.³

2. THE KŪṬĀGĀRAŚĀLĀ

It was in the Mahāvana or the Great Forest that the Kūṭāgāraśālā, the famous monastery where the Buddha used to stay and preach, was situated. According to the Northern books,⁴ the Kūṭāgāraśālā was on the bank of the Monkey Tank or Monkey Lake (Markaṭahrada-tīre). The hall lay from north to south and faced east.⁵ There was shade in front of the house.⁶

Buddhaghosha offers a comment explaining the origin of the name Kūṭāgāra: "In that forest (i.e., Mahāvana) was established a saṅghārāma or monastery. A pāsāda or a storeyed building was built on pillars and putting a pinnacle above, it was made into a Kūṭāgāraśālā resembling a chariot of the gods (deva-vimāna). From it, the whole saṅghārāma or monastery

². A., V, pp. 133-134.
⁵. D. A., I, p. 311. Dīyaṭadhāna, I, p. 197, n., however, says that the storied house faced the west.
⁶. Dīyaṭadhāna, I, p. 199: "Very well, Sīha, spread out a mat for me in the shade in front of the house."
is known as Kūṭāgāraśālā". This agrees with the description of the double-galleried vihāra, given by Fa-hien. Part of the monastery consisted of a storeyed house with a hall below surrounded only by pillars instead of walls. These pillars held the gabled room which formed the main part of the Buddha's Gandhakuṭṭī there. On the top there was a kūṭa or peak, so that there were two galleries, one below and the other above, and from the upper storey rose a pinnacle as we see in the vimānas or rathas referred to by Buddhaghosha.

The real meaning of the Kūṭāgāra was not correctly understood in the beginning. It does not mean "an upper room, an apartment on the top of a house" or "an upper chamber". Really speaking, it was a building having a roof ending in a point. Thus the proper translation of the word will be "point-house, house with a point." It cannot be mere chance that the kūṭāgāra is especially mentioned at a breath with prāśāda, of which it may be considered as it were the architectonic complement, the prāśāda being characterised over against the kūṭāgāra by its flat roof.

It was customary for the Buddha, when staying at the Kūṭāgāraśālā, to spend the noonday siesta in the woods outside the Mahāvāna at the foot of a tree; visitors coming at that time would, if their desire to see him was insistent, seek him there or be conducted to him. Sometimes he would express his desire to see no one during such a retreat except the monk who brought him food.

On some occasions the Buddha would walk from the Kūṭāgāraśālā to places of interest in the neighbourhood, e.g., the Śarandāda Chetiya and the Chāpāla Chetiya.

5. See, e.g., D., I, p. 151; A., III, pp. 75-78.
Many of the Buddha’s immortal discourses were delivered at Vaiśāli at Kūṭāgāraśālā in the Mahāvana.

3. THE GILĀNA-SĀLĀ (GLĀNA-SĀLĀ)

There was a sick-ward attached to the Kūṭāgāraśālā, where the Buddha would often visit the patients and talk with them. Once he told a sick monk that by practising five things during illness one could be sure of the speedy destruction of the āsavas. On another occasion his advice was that a monk should meet his end collected and composed.

4. THE MARKAṬA-HRADA (MONKEY TANK)

There was a tank known as Markaṭa-hrada or Monkey Tank on whose bank was situated the Kūṭāgāraśālā. This may be identified with the present small tank, called Ram-kund, on the basis of the account of Hiuen Tsiang who says: “By the side of it (i.e., a stūpa built by Aśokarāja) is a stone pillar about 50 or 60 feet high, with the figure of a lion on the top. To the south of the stone pillar is a tank. This was dug by a band of monkeys (Markaṭa-hrada) for Buddha’s use. When he was in the world of old, Tathāgata once and again dwelt here.” The same authority adds that not far to the south of this tank was a stūpa where the monkeys, taking the alms-bowl of Tathāgata, climbed a tree and gathered him some honey. Not far to the south was a stūpa which was the place where the monkeys offered the honey to the Buddha. At the north-west angle of the lake Hiuen Tsiang found a figure of a monkey.

5. THE CHAIYAS

The Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli built many chaityas inside

6. Ibid., p. 68.
7. This scene is also found at Sanchi on a pillar (pl. xxvi, fig. 2, Tree and Serpent Worship). Beal thinks that the pillar was the work or gift of the Vaiśāli people (Beal, op. cit., p. 68, n. 74).
8. Beal, op. cit., p. 68.
and outside their great city and with great liberality and magnanimity they delivered over the best among them to the Buddha and the Buddhist Church. That these chaityas were beautiful and fine buildings where one might prefer to dwell as long as one liked, even to the end of the kalpa, appears from a passage in the Dīgha-Nikāya where the Buddha, while staying at the Chāpāla Chaitya, said about each of the chaityas that it was charming and then suggested to Ānanda that Tathāgata might be inclined to live there for a kalpa or the remaining part of a kalpa, meaning perhaps that in such beautiful surroundings life would be pleasant and worth living.

The names of the following Vaisalian chaityas are preserved in Buddhist literature:—Udena, Gotamaka, Sattambaka, Bahuputta, Sārandada, Chāpāla, Markaṭahrada and Kapinahya.

About the location of most of these we have some indications in Buddhist literature itself:

A naked ascetic residing at Vesālī, named Kandaramasuka, had taken upon himself seven rules of life. Four of these were that he would never go beyond the Udena shrine on the east of Vesālī, the Gotamaka shrine on the south, the Sattambha shrine on the west, and the Bahuputta shrine on the north. This passage indicates the position of these shrines or chetiya at Vaisālī.

The Markaṭahrada Chaitya was situated on the Monkey Tank (Markaṭa-hrada) itself, while the Sārandada and Chāpāla Chaityas were close to it.

We take up each chaitya now. For the first six chaityas mentioned in the Nikāyas, we have followed the order given in the Dīgha-Nikāya itself.

\[\text{(a) THE UDAYANA CHAITYA}\]

It was situated in the east of Vaisālī and was considered one of the beautiful spots of that town.

Rhys Davids conjectures that these chaityas were probably trees or barrows.\(^1\) The *Dhammapada Commentary*\(^2\) describes the Udena and the Gotamaka shrines as *rukkha-chetiyaṇī* to which men pay homage in honour to have their wishes fulfilled. The *Digha-Nikāya Commentary*\(^3\) says that in the Buddha’s time a vihāra had been erected on the spot where this shrine stood and that this vihāra had previously been dedicated to the Yakkha Udena. As the chaitya was situated in the eastern direction, we feel tempted to suggest that possibly it might have been so called because of its being in the direction of sun-rise.\(^4\)

**(b) THE GOTAMAKA CHAITYA**

It was situated in the south of Vaiśāli\(^5\) and was considered one of the beautiful spots of that town.\(^6\) The Buddha stayed there several times, particularly during the first years of his ministry.\(^7\) During one such stay he laid down the rule which allowed the monks the use of three robes; he himself felt cold during the night and had to wear extra clothing.\(^8\) The *Gotamaka-Sutta* was preached here.\(^9\)

The shrine was pre-Buddhistic and dedicated to a Yakkha named Gotamaka. A vihāra was later built on the spot for the Buddha and the monks.\(^10\)

The *Dīvyāvadāna*,\(^11\) in a list of noted places of Vaiśāli, speaks of a Gautama-nyagrodha (Chaitya). The reference is evidently to this chaitya. We have abundant references to tree-worship in Buddhist literature and art.

We do not know why this chaitya was so named. Accord-

---

6. E. g., D., II, pp. 102, 118.
ing to the Commentaries it was after a Yaksha. But we may not necessarily accept this explanation. The existence of a chaitya bearing the name Gautama has peculiar importance for the Vaiśālī-Videha region, especially because the priest Gotama Rahūgaṇa was associated with the colonisation of the territory east of the Sadāṁrā (i.e., Gandak) and the Gotamas acted as priests of the Videhaṇ kings. The Gautamas were famous Vedic teachers. It is possible these ‘Gautama’ scholars might have something to do with it. Again, the Gotamakas were a class of ascetics, enumerated in a list of such classes. Rhys Davids thinks that they were almost certainly the followers of some other member of the Śākya clan as distinct from the Buddha and suggests that it might have been Devadatta or possibly a Brāhmaṇa of Gotama gotra. We should not feel surprised if it is discovered that the Gotamakas had one of their seats at Vaiśālī. And if it is so, the chaitya might have something to do with them. It has also been suggested that the chetiya may have been called after the Kāla (Kapha) Gotama Nāgas of the Himālayas, but in the opinion of a Buddhist scholar the suggestion appears far-fetched.

(c) THE SAPTĀMRĀKA CHAITYA

The Sattambā or Sattambaka Chetiya (Skt. Saptāmraka Chaitya) was situated in the west of Vaiśālī.

---

1. See supra.
3. Šat. Br., I. 4. 1. 10 and XI. 4. 3. 20 (by implication); also Rām, I. 50. 6; 51. 1-2. One such Gautama had his wife Ahalyā (Rām, I. 48-49).
4. See Vedaṭa Index.
8. Vin., II, p. 109 (a list of four royal families of Nāgas).
9. S. A., III, p. 120 (says that all Nāgas have their young in the Himālayas).
10. D. P. P. N., I, p. 811. We have only pointed out the lines for tackling the problem and do not insist on any particular suggestion. It may be added in passing that the chaitya is generally associated with non-Aryan worship and for this reason the Gotamaka Chaitya may represent a fusion of non-Aryan and Aryan elements in the field of religion.
11. D., II, p. 102; Uḍāna, VI. 1 (refers to the beauty of principal Vaiśālīan chaityas); S., V, p. 259; A., IV, p. 309 (refers to the beauty of principal Vaiśālian chaityas); Diyaṭsaddāna, p. 201 (gives a list of noted places of Vaiśālī) etc.
It was so called because, in the past, seven princesses, daughters of Kiki, king of Banaras, left Rājagaha and fought for attainment at that spot. Possibly there were seven mango trees there lending their name to the shrine.

It was originally dedicated to some deity, but after the Buddha's visit to Vaiśāli, it became a place of residence for him.

(d) THE BAHUPUTRAKA CHAITYA

It was a shrine in the north of Vaiśāli. The Buddha is said to have stayed there. It was a pre-Buddhistic shrine and according to the Commentaries was a many-branched nigrodha tree where persons prayed to the deva of the tree for having 'several sons.' Hence its name.

(e) THE SĀRANDADA CHAITYA

It was a shrine of pre-Buddhistic worship at Vaiśāli; but its location is not exactly known. It was probably somewhere near the Kūṭāgāraśāla.

It was dedicated to the Yakkha Sārandada, but, later, a vihāra was erected on the site for the Buddha and his Order. Two of the most important sermons of the Buddha were delivered at this chaitya, viz., the seven things which would ensure the welfare of the Vajjians and prevent them from falling, and the five treasures in the world.

(f) THE CHĀPĀLA CHAITYA

The Chāpāla Chaitya was once the residence of the

1. Cf. names like Ambā, Ambikā and Ambālikā of the Mahābhārata.
3. Ud. A., p. 323, etc.
7. There was another Bahuputtaka-nigrodha on the road from Rājagriha to Nālandā (see D. P. P. N., II, p. 273 for references).
Yakkha Chāpāla, but, later, a vihāra was erected on the site for the use of the Buddha. It is stated that during the first twenty years of the Buddha’s ministry, he sometimes dwelt in the Chāpāla Chaitya.

It was here that the Buddha, three months before his Mahāparinirvāṇa, definitely decided to accede to the request of Māra that he should die. When he announced this decision the earth shook. This event might have happened on the full-moon day of Māgha, just three months before the Buddha’s Great Decease.

The name of the chaitya “is probably either from Chaḥpaḷā (Sans.), ‘a loose woman’, and thus alludes to the concubine spoken of by the pilgrims; or from chāpa ālāya (Sans.), ‘the bow-place where the bow was deposited’.”

(g) THE MARKAṬAHRAĐA CHAITYA

A chaitya was situated on the bank of the famous Monkey Tank. This might refer to the Kūṭāgāraśāḷā as the Divyāvadāna expressly states that the Kūṭāgāraśāḷā was situated on the bank of the Monkey Tank (Markaṭahraḍa-tīra) at Vaiśāli.

(h) THE KAPINAHYA CHAITYA

A chaitya of this name is also said to have existed at Vaiśāli at that time.

6. AMBAPĀLI-VANA

It was a grove in Vaiśāli planted with mangoes and was so called because it belonged to Ambapāli, the famous courtesan of Vaiśāli. It was presented by her to the Buddha and his Order during his last visit to that town at the conclusion of the meal to which Ambapāli had invited him. But both the

10. Viñ., I, pp. 231-233. But according to the Mahāvastu (I, p. 300) it was presented to the Buddha in his first visit to Vaiśāli.
Buddha and the monks seem to have stayed there previously during their visits to Vaiśāli.¹

The Buddha is stated to have preached some Suttas in the grove.² The Saṁyutta-Nikāya also records a conversation that took place between Anuruddha and Sāriputta during a stay in Ambapālivana.³

The identification of Ambapālivana is as knotty a problem today as it was in the times of the Chinese pilgrims, who were shown by their guides totally irreconcilable sites for the garden of Āmrapāli (Ambapāli). Fahien places the garden of Āmrapāli where we should expect to find it, a little to the south of the city, and he adds that it was situated to the west of the road from Pāṭaliputra. He does not mention any stūpa or monument as marking the site. Hiuen Tsiang was shown a stūpa on the alleged site of the garden, which he places at a short distance to the south of the “stūpa of the last look,” and consequently to the west of the city.⁴ Fahien explicitly records that “inside the city the woman Ambapāli built a vihāra in honour of the Buddha, which is now standing as it was at first.” As to the position of the garden, V. A. Smith feels that Hiuen Tsiang seems to have been misinformed and that Fahien correctly places it to the south of the city on the west side of the road from Pāṭaliputra.⁵

7. BĀLIKĀCHHAVI OR VĀLUKĀRĀMA

Bālikā, a lady of Vaiśāli, made over Bālikā-chhavi to the Buddha and his Order.⁶ This is evidently the same as the Bālikārāma of the Pali Buddhist books⁷ and may be identical with the Vālukārāma where a hundred years after the death of the Buddha the second Buddhist Council was held. Hiuen Tsiang places this about 2½ miles to the south-east of the city and says that the site was marked by a “great stūpa.”

¹. Thus according to D., II, p. 94 the Buddha was already in the grove before Ambapāli visited him; see also S., V, p. 301 which might refer to an incident before the Buddha’s last tour, because Sāriputta was still alive.
³. S., V, p. 301.
⁵. Ibid., p. 279.
⁷. Vinaya Texts, III, p. 408.
Fahien, with much greater probability, locates the Council stūpa close to the Kūṭāgāra or "double-galleried vihāra where the Buddha dwelt". The site of the Council hall was, therefore, according to the information given to the earlier pilgrim, close to the Aśoka pillar, which was probably erected there for that reason.\footnote{1}

8. BELUVAĞĀMAKA

It was a village near Vaiśāli, where the Buddha spent his last rainy season.\footnote{2} He fell grievously ill during this period, but, by a great effort of will, overcame his sickness. It was at this time that the Buddha, in answer to a question by Ānanda, said that he had kept nothing back from his disciples and had no special instructions for the Order to follow after his death. Each disciple must work out his own salvation.\footnote{3}

Ānanda is also mentioned as having stayed at Beluvāgāmaka after the Buddha's death. The householder Dasama of Aṭṭhakanagara sought him there, and their conversation is recorded in the Aṭṭhakanāgara-Sutta.\footnote{4}

Beluva was a small village, and when the Buddha was there the monks stayed in Vaiśāli. Beluva was just outside the gates of Vaiśāli\footnote{5} and was to the south of this city.\footnote{6}

The Theragāthā\footnote{7} states that Anuruddha died at Veluvaṅgāma in the Vajjī country. This probably refers to Beluvaṅgāma.\footnote{8}

9. KAPINACHCHANĀ

It was a locality probably near Vaiśāli, where lived the Thera Kappitaka, teacher of Upāli.\footnote{9} It was so called because

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1}{V. A. Smith, J. R. A. S., 1902, p. 281.}
\item \footnote{2}{This was ten months before his death (S. A., III, p. 198). According to the Commentaries (\textit{e. g.}, Uddāna-Aṭṭhakathā, 322; S. A., III, 172) the Buddha did not go straight from Beluva to Vaiśāli, but turned back to Sāvatthi.}
\item \footnote{3}{D., II, pp. 98-101. S., V, pp. 151 ff.}
\item \footnote{4}{M., I, pp. 349-353. A., V, pp. 342-347.}
\item \footnote{5}{S. A., III, p. 165.}
\item \footnote{6}{M. A., II, p. 571.}
\item \footnote{7}{Theragāthā, verse 919.}
\item \footnote{8}{Our account of Beluvaṅgāmaka is based on D. P. P. N., II, pp. 313-314.}
\item \footnote{9}{Pelanatthu, P. T. S., p. 50.}
\end{itemize}
monkeys and men used to dance there. Kapinachchanā may have been a name for the cemetery near Vaiśāli where Kappitaka lived.

10. KALANDAKAGĀMA

It was a village near Vaiśāli. It was the birth-place of Sudinna who is called Kalandakaputta on account of his native village and not of his father. This Sudinna became a monk, who, after being ordained, returned to his former wife and had relations with her, thus becoming guilty of the first Pārājikā offence. The son was called Bijaka, and so Sudinna came to be known as Bijakapitā and the mother Bijakamātā. Both Bijaka and his mother later left the world and became Arahants.

Buddhaghosha says the name of the village was given because of the squirrels who lived there. It should not be confused with Kalandakanivāpa, a woodland in Veluvana at Rājagriha.

(F) PROGRESS OF BUDDHISM IN THE VAJJİ COUNTRY

We now propose to review the progress of Buddhism in important centres in Vaijji excluding Vaiśāli. In this we shall proceed towards the north from the Ganges which formed the boundary between Magadhā and Vaijji.

(1) The Buddha and Buddhism at Ukkāchēla

Ukkāchēla was a place in the Vaijji country on the bank of the Ganges, on the road from Rājagriha to Vaiśāli and near

2. Vin., IV, p. 308.
8. This completes the list of Buddhist sites. Other important sites of Vaiśāli not connected with Buddhism but noticed or treated in this book are the Santhāgāra (the Parliament House), the Abhisheka-mangala-pushkariṇī (the Coronation Tank) and the Parivrājakārānas.
the latter.1 Buddhaghosha2 says that when the city was being built, on the day its site was marked out, fish came ashore at night from the river, and men, noticing them, made torches (ukkā) out of rags (chelā), dipped them in oil, and by their light caught the fish. On account of this incident the city was called Ukkāchelā (v. l. Ukkachelā, Ukkāvelā). Rahula Sankrityayana3 is inclined to identify this with Hajipur (in Muzaffarpur district) which is situated on the confluence of the Ganges and the Gandak. This seems to be correct because it is on the road from Magadha to Vaisāli and Śrāvasti and is opposite Patna.

The Buddha preached his Chāla-Gopaśaka-Sutta4 here in which he refers by way of the simile to the cowherds taking their cattle from Magadha to Videha after having crossed the Ganges.

Once while Sāriputta was staying at Ukkāchelā the Paribbājaka Śāmaṇḍaka visited him and asked him about nibbāna. Sāriputta explained to Śāmaṇḍaka the meaning of nibbāna and the way thereto.5

Some time later, after the death of Sāriputta and Moggallāna within a fortnight of each other,6 the Buddha came to Ukkāchelā on his way to Vaiśāli and at a gathering of the monks uttered high praise of the two chief disciples and spoke of the loss the Order had sustained by their death.7

(2) The Buddha and Buddhism at Koṭigāma

Koṭigāma was a village of the Vajjians.8 It was one gāsula distant from the Ganges.9 The Buddha went there from Sāvatthī and Bhaddiyanagara.10 It was a league from Payāga,11

3. Buddhaghosa, p. 483, n. In his Hindi translation of the Majjhima-Nikāya (Banaras, 1933) he says (p. 136, n.) “Possibly Sonepur or Hajipur (Bihar)”.
5. S., IV, pp. 261 ff.
6. The Aṭṭhakathā explains that Dharma-Senapati (=Sāriputta) died on the full moon day of Kārtika and Mahāmoggallāna fifteen days later on the uposatha of the black fortnight, i.e., amāvasyā (quoted in Buddhaghosa, p. 483, n.).
but if it is so, this Payāga must be situated either in the Vajji country or quite close to it and may be a place at or near Hajipur or Sonepur. Buddhaghosha says¹ that the village was so called because it was built near the dome (koṭi or thāpika) of Mahāpanāda’s palace. From the account of the last tour of the Buddha² we know that Koṭiγāma was one of the two halts, the other being Nādika, between the Ganges and Vaiśāli. “Travellers in India whose journey begins with the crossing of a great river are always glad to make their first halt as near as possible to the further bank of the river. The ancient town of Hajipur, which stands on the eastern bank of the Gandak river and the northern bank of the Ganges at a distance in a direct line of six or seven miles from Patna, is still the first halting-place for the traveller proceeding north from Patna. We may be quite certain that Koṭigrāma, the first camping-ground of the Buddha, was at or close to Hajipur”.³ The view seems to us reasonable. Jacobi⁴ finds it “highly probable that the Koṭiγāma of the Buddhists is identical with the Kuṇḍaggāma of the Jainas.” “Apart from the similarity of the names, the mentioning of the Nātikas, apparently identical with the Jhārīka Kshatriyas to whose clan Māhāvīra belonged, and of Sīhā, the Jaina, point to the same direction.”⁵ In our opinion, however, Koṭiγāma cannot be Kuṇḍagrāma, because the points of similarity are more apparent than real. Koṭiγāma was near the Ganges, while Kuṇḍagrāma was not so. The latter was quite close to or a part of Vaiśāli City, while there lay Nādika, an important camping-ground, between Koṭiγāma and Vaiśāli. The geographical situation cannot possibly be overridden by any other factor like similarity in names. Hence we feel that either the village is washed away by the Ganges or its name was changed in the Muslim period.⁶

2. Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta (Dial., II, pp. 94, 96, 97, 100).
5. Ibid.
6. Cf. John Christian, ‘On Some Names of Places in Bihar: Their Origin and History’, Calcutta Review, 1891, p. 40: “About 65 per cent of the villages in the Hajipur subdivision bear names of Muhammadan origin. Even the names of different mahallas, or wards, in the town of Hajipur (which was said, at one time, to be twenty miles across from east to west, and eight miles from north to south) have a Moslem ring, principally of Pathan origin.”
Koṭigāma was important in Buddhist literature because of the miracle of Bhaddaji in raising up the sunken palace of Mahāpanāda in the Ganges, that was seen by Nanduttara, a Brāhmaṇa of Koṭigāma. Here it was that the Vijjā-Sutta was preached to the Vajjians. During his last tour the Buddha crossed the river Ganges at Pātaligāma, went on to Koṭigāma, and remained in that village preaching to the monks. Hearing that the Buddha was there, Ambapāli and hosts of Lichchhavis came from Vaiśāli to visit him and Ambapāli gave him a meal. From Koṭigāma the Buddha went to Nādika.

(3) The Buddha and Buddhism at Nādika (Nāṭika)

Nādika or Nāṭika (the two more prevalent readings of the name) was a locality in the Vajji country on the highway between Koṭigāma and Vaiśāli. The name has many readings, e.g., Nādita, Nādika, Nāṭikā, Nāṭika and Nāṭika. The doubt as to the spelling of the name seems to have existed from quite early times, as the apparent confusion of the etymology leads us to believe. In his commentary of the Saṁyutta-Nikāya Buddhaghosha says that Nāṭika was so called because of its being a village of the Nātakas. In his commentary of the Dīgha-Nikāya the same writer says that the place was called Nādika because it was near the pond Nādikā. Rhys Davids thinks that Nādikā (plural) was a clan-name and Nādika (singular) the name of the clan’s village. Woodward also supports the reading Nādika, and suggests that the name is connected with nadi.

2. S., V, p. 431.
5. Mahāparinibbāṇa-Sutta.
10. M. A., II, p. 424 definitely states that the name of the pond was also Nādikā.
Where was Nādiaka or Nāṭika situated? V. A. Smith makes a reasonable suggestion with regard to it: "Lālganj, situated twelve miles from Hājipur and eight from Basār, is now the principal village intermediate between those two places, and Nadiyāgrāma should be looked for in the vicinity of Lālganj". He further hopes that careful local enquiry would probably find the names Koṭigrāma and Nadiyāgrāma surviving in slightly modified forms.

Nādiaka or Nāṭika, though presumably inhabited by the Jñāṭrika Kṣatriyas to which clan Mahāvīra belonged, cannot be identified with Kuṇḍapura because Kuṇḍapura lay in the north while Nāṭika lay between Koṭigāma and Vaisāli and therefore south of the Lichchhavī capital. It may be suggested that while at Kṣatriya-Kuṇḍapura all kinds of Kṣatriyas lived, at Nāṭika only the Jñāṭris or Jñāṭrikas lived and thus lent their name to the locality. If the suggestion is accepted, it has to be admitted that the Jñāṭrikas too, like the Lichchhavis, were interested in river-trade.

The Buddha first went to Nāṭika in the course of one of his tours, and the inhabitants, being greatly attracted by him, built for him a residence entirely made of bricks (gīṇjakā), hence its name (Gīṇjakāvāsāthā). Later residences were also built for the monks, complete with all requirements. The bricks were evidently a special architectural feature and this confirms the belief that buildings were generally of wood. The "Brick Hall" was, however, not designed for the Buddha and his monks alone, for we find mention of members of other sects staying there, e.g., the Paribbājaka Sābhiya Kāchchāna. The building was probably a public resting place for all kinds of travellers.

If the Suttas preached by the Buddha at a particular place be a guide to knowing the progress of Buddhism there, we may say that Buddhism made more progress at Nādiaka than at Koṭigāma or even Ukkāchelā. Probably the facility provided

2. Rahula Saṅkṛitiyayana’s contention that Nādiaka was "probably modern Jethardi, Māsrakī, District Saran" (Majhīma-Nākāya, Hindi, p. 127) has no basis. He says so because he wants to identify the Jñāṭrikas with the modern Jethariyā Brahmanas (Purāṇottaravibhāsālati, pp. 107-114) and thus already presumes what he has to prove. On another occasion (Buddhacharyā, p. 493, n. 2) he equates Nādi kā with Ratti Pargana of Muzaffarpur district.
by the Giṅjakāvasatha ("Brick Hall") to the Buddhist preachers might have been a factor for this, because in the matter of nearness to a river, all places occupy this advantage. Another favourable factor for Nāṭika seems to be its nearness to Vaiśālī, which became a stronghold of Buddhism. The existence of Gosinālavanadāya, a sāl forest (cf. Mahāvana, the "Great Forest", near Vaiśālī), provided a place of solitude so necessary for pious meditations.

The Buddha stayed at Nāṭika several times during his visits. In the Giṅjakāvasatha the Buddha preached the Chūla-Gosinā-Sutta,1 the Janavasabha-Sutta,2 and several discourses on maravasati,3 also the sermons to the Elder Sandha of the Kachchānagotta4 and the Elder Kachchāyana.5 There were other Suttas6 also on different topics which were preached at Nāṭika. Mention may also be made of a discussion between Sabhiya Kachchāna and Vachchhagotta.7

The Buddha also visited Nāṭika on his last journey, while on his way to Kusinārā, and was staying there on the day that he accepted Ambapāli’s hospitality and her gift of the Ambapāli-ambavana.8 It was evidently during this stay that Ānanda questioned the Buddha as to the lot of various pious inhabitants of Nāṭika who had been zealous followers of the Buddha’s teaching. Among them several are mentioned by name—the monk Sālha, the nun Nandā, the lay disciple Sudatta, the devout lady Sugatā, the lay disciples Kakudha, Kālingī, Nikaṭa, Kaṭissabha, Tuṭṭha, Santuṭṭha, Bhadda and Subhemā. The Buddha tells Ānanda of their destiny, and informs him that more than fifty devout men in Nāḍika also had a similar fate, that more than ninety devout men of Nāḍika had become Sākadāgāmins and more than five hundred devout men of Nāḍika Sotāpannas. He then proceeds to proclaim the discourse which has become famous: the Dhammādāsa (Mirror of

5. S., II, pp. 153 ff. See also S., II, p. 74; IV, p. 90.
7. S., IV, pp. 401 ff.
Truth).\(^1\) The *Janavasabha-Sutta*,\(^2\) which was also preached at Nāṭika, is evidently based on this incident and is probably an elaboration of the same.

In the *Giṅjakāvasatha, Janavasabha* and *Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttas*\(^3\) the Buddha is represented as having answered questions regarding the destiny and the rebirth of several residents of Nāḍika. “Does this perhaps mean that the people of Nāḍika were more interested in this problem than the people of other places?”\(^4\)

Near Nāḍika or Giṅjakāvasatha was Gosīṅgasālavanadāya, a sāl forest, which was a solitary place useful for meditation. Here it was that the *Chūla-Gosiṅga-Sutta*\(^5\) was preached by the Buddha, The *Mahā-Gosiṅga-Sutta*,\(^6\) preached at Gosīṅgasālavanadāya,\(^7\) was also done probably here. There was one Gosīṅgasālavanadāya near Vaiśālī also.\(^8\) Hence it may be suggested that either the Gosīṅgasālavanadāya forest was situated between Nāḍika and Vaiśālī or a part of the Mahāvana forest (which extended to the north of Vaiśālī) was also given this name\(^9\) due to its peculiar characteristics in which case there would be two Gosīṅgasālavanadāya forests in the Nāḍika-Vaiśālī region.

(4) The Buddha and Buddhism at Places North-West of Vaiśālī

One special feature of the life of the Vajjian State was the existence of many important places along the Ganges and the Gaṇḍaka rivers. We have already seen cases like Ukkāchelā, Koṭiṅgāma and Nāḍika, till we arrive at Vaiśālī. Even beyond Vaiśālī in the north-western direction the area was dotted with

---

1. D., II, pp. 91 ff (Mahāparinibbāṇa-Sutta). S., V, pp. 356 ff (Giṅjakāvanatha-Sutta) also records what is evidently the same incident. Two additional names, Asoka and Asokā, occur in the Sāvityuttas passage.
3. See the two preceding notes.
7. Location of this is not indicated.
9. Both the forests are indicated as close to each other (ibid.).
such places. The *Mahāparinibbāṇa-Sutta*, which preserves
the account of the last year of the Buddha’s life, mentions
five such places, viz., Bhanḍagāma, Hatthigāma, Ambagāma,
Jambūgāma and Bhoganagara. It is difficult to identify them,
but it may be presumed that these villages or towns were named
after the things they abounded in, e.g., stores or pots, elephants,
mangoes, blackberries and things of amenities (or named after
the Bhoga clan, one of the clans inhabiting the Vajjian territory).
One thing, however, which appears to be almost certain, is that
these places were situated either on or close to the Gaṇḍaka
river.

We shall now take up each place one by one.

1. **BHAṆḌAGĀMA**

This was a Vajjian village between Vaiśāli and Hatthi-
gāma and near the former. The Buddha visited it during his
last tour, and while there he talked to the monks on four condi-
tions which lead to the nibbāṇa: righteousness, earnest thought,
wisdom and freedom.¹

2. **HATTHIGĀMA**

This was a village on the road from Vaiśāli to Bhoga-
nagara.² It is described as a village of the Vajjians.³

It was famous as the residence of Ugga Gahapati, who,
among the householders, was declared by the Buddha to be the
best of those who waited on the Order.⁴ On his father’s death
he was appointed to the post of Seṭṭhi.

Once when the Buddha went to Hatthigāma during
a tour and was staying in the Nāgavanuyyāna there, Ugga
came to the pleasance and heard the preaching of the Buddha
after which he devoted his life to looking after members of the
Saṅgha. All monks became recipients of his gifts.⁵

The Buddha once stated that Ugga was possessed of eight
special and wonderful qualities.⁶

4. A., I, p. 23 (with f. n.).
The Saṁyutta-Nikāya records a visit paid to the Buddha by Ugga at Hatthigāmaka. He asked the Buddha why it was that some beings attained full freedom in this very life, while others did not. Because of grasping, said the Buddha.

On his last journey the Buddha again rested in the village.

It appears from the name that there were many elephants in the village and in the nearby forest. There was a Nāgavana as well here belonging to Ugga where the Gahapati first met the Buddha and was converted.

3. AMBAGĀMA

This village was situated on the road from Vaiśālī to Kusinārā and was visited by the Buddha in the last journey of his life.

As the name indicates, the village seems to have abounded in mango trees.

4. JAMBŪGĀMA

Further north-west to Ambagāma lay Jambūgāma which was visited by the Buddha in the last year of his life.

The name may suggest that there were many trees of blackberry here.

5. BHOGANAGARA

It was a village in the Vajji country where the Buddha stayed on his last journey in the Ānanda Chetiya. In this chālitya, which had originally been dedicated to a Yakkha named Ānanda and was later converted into a Buddhist vihāra, the Buddha preached a sermon on the four Mahāpadesa (the “Great Authorities”).

5. Ibid.
From Bhoganagara he went on to Pāvā. As we cannot identify Bhoganagara, we are unable to say at what ghat in Champaran district the Buddha crossed the Gaṇḍaka to enter the Malla country. Bhoganagara was one of the places passed by Bāvari’s pupils on their way to Rājagriha. It lay between Pāvā and Vaiśālī.

(G) THE BUDDHA’S LAST ASSOCIATIONS WITH VAIŚĀLĪ

As stated before, the Buddha passed some time in the last year of his earthly life at Vaiśālī and in the Vajji country. His last rainy season was spent here. Again, it was at Vaiśālī that he announced his coming death. He left this city with a deep sigh and handed over his alms-bowl to the bemoaning Lichchhavis. He died at Kusinagara on the full-moon day of the month of Vaiśākha.

The Lichchhavis of Vaiśālī claimed a share in the earthly remains of the Buddha after the latter’s death. They got a share which was taken to Vaiśālī. A cairn was made over the remains of the Exalted One and a feast was celebrated.

Hiuen Tsiang, the Buddhist pilgrim from China, who visited this place a little over 1100 years after this event, gives the following account of the Buddha’s Relic Stūpa erected by the Lichchhavis at Vaiśālī:

“To the south-east of this last spot is a stūpa; this was

2. He might have crossed the ghat which is near Bettiah or Bagaha; because only these two ghats appear to be more important today than the rest.
4. Detailed in the *Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta* and the Commentaries.
8. This is mentioned by Faurein (*Buddhist Records*, I, p. lii).
11. This refers (*ibid.*) to a saṅghārāma of the Sārmatiya school, which was “north-west of the royal city (*precincts*) 5 or 6 li”, and two stūpas that were close to it (“by the side of it” and “to the east of this”).
built by a king of Vaiśāli. After the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, a former king of this country obtained a portion of the relics of his body, and to honour them as highly as possible raised (this building).  1

"The records of India state: In this stūpa there was at first a quantity of relics equal to a "kōh" (ten pecks). Aśoka-rāja opening it, took away nine-tenths of the whole, leaving only one-tenth behind. Afterwards there was a king of the country who wished again to open the stūpa, but at the moment when he began to do so, the earth trembled, and he dared not proceed to open (the stūpa)."  2

In March, 1958, "a flat low stūpa was excavated by the late Dr. A. S. Altekar, who identified it with one of the original relic-stūpas of the Buddha built by the Lichchhavis"  3 in the first quarter of the fifth century B.C.

1. "The Lichchavis of Vaiśāli obtained a share of the relics of Buddha, and raised over them a stūpa. The scene found at Śāñchi (pl. xxviii. fig. 1, Tree and Serpent Worship) probably refers to this stūpa and its consecration."—Foot-note by Beal (ibid., foot-note no. 72).

2. After this Hiuen Tsang describes (ibid., pp. 67-68) the famous stone pillar which we quote here in order to indicate the exact location of the Buddha's Relic Stūpa at Vaiśāli: "To the north-west is a stūpa built by Aśoka-rāja; by the side of it is a stone pillar about 50 or 60 feet high, with the figure of a lion on the top. To the south of the stone pillar is a tank."

3. Krishna Deva and Vijayakanta Mishra, Vaiśāli Excavations: 1950 (Vaiśāli, 1961), p. 2. Also noticed in Indian Archaeology, 1957-58, pp. 10-11. For A. S. Altekar's articles on the discovery of the stūpa of the Lichchhavī see Buddha-Relics and its analysis see The Indian Nation (Patna), April 12, 1958, The Searchlight (Patna), April 17, 1958, The Hindustan Times (Delhi), May 11, 1958 (Sunday), the Aryāvarta (Patna), May 18, 1958 (Sunday), The Illustrated Weekly of India (Bombay), July 13, 1958 and Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Buddha Jayanti Special Issue, Vol. II, pp. 501-511 (article entitled 'The Corporeal Relics of the Buddha'), esp. pp. 505-511 where the recent find at Vaiśāli has been discussed. The find-spot is in village Harpur and is to the north of the Kharasuna Pokhar which is believed by the local people to have been the Coronation Tank of the Lichchhavis.
CHAPTER XVI

MAHĀVĪRA AND JAINISM IN THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

Jainism is closely associated with Vaiśālī in its early history, especially because Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara and the main promoter of Jainism, was born at Kuṇḍapura near Vaiśālī. We do not propose here to present a detailed biography of Mahāvīra as it is well-known.¹ Instead, we would take up here only three things in detail, viz., the date of Mahāvīra, the identification of Mahāvīra’s birthplace and the progress of Jainism in the Vaiśālī region in the life-time of Mahāvīra.

THE DATE OF MAHĀVĪRA

The date of Mahāvīra, like that of the Buddha, occupies a very important place in ancient Indian chronology; but it has not attracted as much attention of scholars as the date of the Buddha. Indeed, after Jarl Charpentier considered the problem in the Indian Antiquary of 1914 and the Cambridge History of India, Volume I, in 1922, H. C. Seth was the only scholar to take it up seriously in recent times and suggest a new date based on the Buddhist tradition.² We intend to suggest here a new date for Mahāvīra but it is not completely new in the sense that it is based on the Buddhist tradition. We shall put this date to suitable tests with a view to examining its correctness. These tests will also, however, be based mainly on the Buddhist tradition itself which has rightly come to be regarded as very reliable for ancient Indian history.

Generally speaking, two dates of Mahāvīra’s death hold the field. They are:—


². See infra for references.
THE DATE OF MAHĀVĪRA

(1) 527 B. C. (Hoernle,1 Guérinot),2 and
(2) 467 B. C. (Jacobi,3 Charpentier).4

(A) The date 527 B. C. is based on the tradition recorded by Merutuṅga, a famous Jaina author, who flourished in the fourteenth century. He gives as a basis for an adjustment between the Vīra and Vikrama eras the famous verses, first quoted by Bühler5 and after him discussed by Jacobi. The English translation of the verses, which is taken from Bühler, is as follows:—

"Pālaka, the lord of Avanti, was anointed in that night in which Ārhat and Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra entered Nirvāṇa. (1).

"Sixty are (the years) of king Pālaka, but one hundred and fifty-five are (the years) of the Nandas; one hundred and eight those of the Mauryas, and thirty those of Pūsamitta [Pushyamitra]. (2).

"Sixty (years) ruled Balamitra and Bhaṇumitra, forty Nabhovāhana. Thirteen years likewise (lasted) the rule of Gardabhilla, and four are (the years) of Śaka. (3)."

Thus there was a gap of 60+155+108+30+60+40 +13+4=470 years between the death of Mahāvīra and the end of Śaka rule (i.e., victory of Vikrama).

This date (or 528 B. C. according to those authorities who regard 58 B. C. as the starting point of the Vikrama era) is wholly rejected by Charpentier on the following grounds:—

1. "The Jainas themselves have preserved chronological records concerning Mahāvīra and the succeeding pontiffs of the Jaina church, which may have been begun at a comparatively early date. But it seems quite clear that, at the time when these lists were put into their present form, the real date of Mahāvīra had already either been forgotten or was at least doubtful" (p. 155).

6. Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, pp. 155-156. [These points are found in a developed form in Ind. Ant., 1914.]
2. “The traditional date of Mahāvīra’s death on which the Jainas base their chronological calculations corresponds to the year 470 before the foundation of the Vikrama era in 58 B.C., i.e., 528 B.C. This reckoning is based mainly on a list of kings and dynasties, who are supposed to have reigned between 528 and 58 B.C.; but

[a] the list is absolutely valueless, as it confuses rulers of Ujjain, Magadha and other kingdoms; and

[b] some of these may perhaps have—been contemporary, and not successive as they are represented” (p. 157).

3. “Moreover, if we adopt the year 528 B.C., it would exclude every possibility of Mahāvīra having preached his doctrine at the same time as Buddha, as the Buddhist texts assert; for there is now a general agreement among scholars that Buddha died within a few years of 480 B.C.” (pp. 155-156).

4. “Finally, both Mahāvīra and Buddha were contemporaries with a king of Magadha whom the Jainas call Kūnika, and the Buddhists Ajātaśatru; and he began his reign only eight years before Buddha’s death. Therefore, if Mahāvīra died in 528 B.C., he could not have lived in the reign of Kūnika” (p. 156).

H. C. Raychaudhuri furnishes some additional arguments for rejecting this date:

1. “In the first place, it is at variance with the testimony of Hemachandra, who places Mahāvīra’s Nirvāṇa only 155 years before Chandragupta Maurya” (p. 85).

2. “Again, some Jaina texts place the Nirvāṇa 470 years before the birth of Vikrama and not his accession, and as this event, according to the Jainas, did not coincide with the foundation of the era of 58 B.C. attributed to Vikrama, the date 528 B.C. for Mahāvīra’s death can hardly be accepted as representing a unanimous tradition” (p. 85).

If we study the details of the list of kings and dynasties provided by Merutuṅga, we find the following irregularities as well:

1. The reign-periods of certain dynasties and kings are completely unacceptable, e.g., a total of 155 years has never been

allowed to the Nandas by any tradition. With a view to defending the Jaina-tradition, it may be argued that possibly the list indicates the reign-periods of kings and dynasties who ruled over Ujjain and not Magadha. But even in that case, such a long period for the Nandas cannot be defended. 1

2. The Great Satrap Nahapāna, who is usually identified with Nabhovāhana of the tradition, flourished after Vikrama according to competent authorities. Inclusion of such a post-Vikrama figure in this Jaina tradition renders it all the more valueless.

3. As is well-known, the story of Vikrama and the end of Śaka rule is of much later growth. Kielhorn 2 long ago proved that the connection of the era commencing 57 B. C. with a king Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, who perhaps never existed, was not established till a very late date, the first mention of 'Vikrama Saṁvat' being made in an inscription at Dholpur of Saṁvat 898=A. D. 842. Hence any tradition which incorporates this story must be used with great caution.

(B) The second date of Mahāvīra's death, i.e., 467 B. C., is based on a tradition recorded by the great Jaina author Hemachandra (A. D. 1088-1172), who says that 155 years after the liberation of Mahāvīra Chandragupta became king (Sthavirāvalīcharita, Parisīshṭaparvan, VIII. 339). As pointed out by Charpentier, 3 who, like Cunningham and Max Müller, believes that the Buddha's nirvāṇa took place in 477 B. C. (and not in 487 B. C. as we believe), this date has some good points in its favour:—

1. The Buddha (d. 477 B. C.) and Mahāvīra (d. 467 B. C.) become contemporaries.
2. Ajāṭāsatru becomes the contemporary of both the teachers.
3. This is in keeping with the Jaina tradition of Hema-

1. "Not only is the number of years (155) allotted in the gathas to the reign of the Nandas unduly great, but also the introduction of Pālaka, lord of Avanti, in the chronology of the Māgadha kings looks very suspicious" (Jacobi, Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu, p. 8).


3. Ind. Ant., 1914.
chandra that there was a gap of 155 years between the death of Mahāvīra and the accession of Chandragupta Maurya.

[Be it noted that according to the Jaina tradition the accession of Chandragupta Maurya took place in 312 B.C., a date not regarded as correct by scholars for the accession of Chandragupta Maurya.]

4. According to the Jaina tradition, the Jaina pontiff Sambhūtavijaya died exactly in the year after Chandragupta’s accession, or 156 after Vīra, which may after all perhaps be the very same year as Hemachandra says that the one hundred and fifty-fifth year had passed (gata). Bhadrabāhu, the successor of Sambhūtavijaya, died fifteen years later. All Jaina tradition from Hemachandra downwards gives 170 after Vīra as the year of Bhadrabāhu’s death. This would be 297 B.C. if the date 467 B.C. is accepted for Mahāvīra’s death; and all Jaina tradition also brings Bhadrabāhu into the closest connection with Chandragupta in whose reign the date 297 B.C. falls.

5. The Kalpasūtra was finished 980 years after Mahāvīra, but in another recension the number is 993. The commentaries, all going back to the old chāṇḍi, refer this date to four different events. One such event is the public recitation of the Kalpasūtra before King Dhruvasena of Ānandapura whose reign lasted from A.D. 526 to A.D. 540. Thus we find a most remarkable coincidence, for 993–467 = 526, or just the year of Dhruvasena’s accession to the throne of Valabhi.

6. The Jaina creed is called in Buddhist literature chāturyāma, ‘consisting in four restrictions’. But Mahāvīra enforced five great vows upon his followers. From this Charpentier concludes that Mahāvīra did not finally fix his doctrine of the five vows before a somewhat later date, when the Buddha was already out of any connection with him.

7. Bimbisāra is the main ruler in the Buddhist canonical texts, and Ajātasatru does not appear so very much there. In the Jaina canon Kuṇika plays a far more important rôle in the life of Mahāvīra. This may point to a later period of Ajātasaṭru’s reign.

Although the date 467 B.C. (suggested long ago by Jacobi

1. See S.B.E., Vol. 50 (Index), p. 99, for the references regarding the Buddha’s frequent meetings with Bimbisāra.
and strongly supported by Charpentier) has good points in it, it presents two very serious difficulties:—

1. Firstly, this "date does not accord with the explicit statement in some of the earliest Buddhist texts that Mahāvira predeceased the Buddha" (H. C. Raychaudhuri). Charpentier also knows that this date is "contradicted by a passage in the Buddhist Dīgha-Nikāya" which tells us that Nigantha Nātapaṭṭa—the name by which the Buddhists denote Mahāvira—died before Buddha. This assertion is, however, in contradiction with other contemporaneous statements, and forms" for him "no real obstacle to the assumption of the date 468 B.C." (C. H. I., I, p. 156). He adds that he considers "this evidence too strong to be thrown over on account of this passage in the Pāli canon" (I. A., 1914, p. 177).

For several reasons it is very difficult to agree with Charpentier:—

(a) The Jaina tradition was collected and reduced to writing much later and hence it is not as reliable as the Buddhist tradition.

(b) Even the Jaina tradition is not unanimous about the date of Mahāvira's death. There are several traditions about this, which rather shake our belief in them.

(c) The insertion of Vikrama and the Śakas in the Jaina tradition strengthens our suspicion.

(d) The Buddhist tradition is more reliable as it was reduced to writing very early. Moreover, due to its comparatively more reliability, it has been used in the reconstruction of ancient Indian history. Hence, there should be no valid objection to its use in determining the date of Mahāvira.

2. Secondly, Charpentier's calculation is based on the assumption that the Buddha died in 477 B.C. This date has since been discarded and the date of the Buddha's death has been fixed at 487 B.C. as this is the date arrived at on the basis of the Cantonese tradition, the Mahāvamsa and the inscriptions of Asoka. In order to discredit the tradition of the

3. This has been admirably pointed out by S. N. Pradhan (op. cit.) and need not be repeated here.
Mahāvīra that Aśoka was formally crowned 218 years after the death of the Buddha, Charpentier had to take recourse to an utterly untenable argument saying that "the 218 years did not refer originally to the abhisheka, but to the completion of the conquest of Kaliṅga or to the first conversion, or to both these events" (I.A., 1914, p. 170).

There are some other theories as well about Mahāvīra's date which we may notice in passing.

(C) S. N. Pradhan\(^1\) holds the date 480 B.C. (=325+155) or 477 B.C. (=322+155) for the death of Mahāvīra, accepting Hemachandra who says that Chandragupta became king 155 years after the death of Mahāvīra.

(D) "Certain Jaina writers assume an interval of eighteen years between the birth of Vikrama and the foundation of the era attributed to him, and thereby seek to reconcile the Jaina tradition about the date of Mahāvīra's Nirvāṇa (58+18+470=546 B.C.) with the Ceylonese date of the Great Decease of the Buddha (544 B.C.). But the suggestion can hardly be said to rest on any reliable tradition. Merutuṅga places the death of the last Jina or Tīrthaṅkara 470 years before the end of Śaka rule and the victory and not birth of the traditional Vikrama" (H. G. Raychaudhuri, An Advanced History of India, p. 86).

(E) "Certain Jaina. Sūtras seem to suggest that Mahāvīra died about sixteen years after the accession of Ajātaśatru and the commencement of his wars with his hostile neighbours. This would place the Nirvāṇa of the Jaina teacher eight years after the Buddha's death, as, according to the Ceylonese Chronicles, the Buddha died eight years after the enthronement of Ajātaśatru. The Nirvāṇa of the Tīrthaṅkara would, according to this view, fall in 478 B.C., if we accept the Cantonese reckoning (486 B.C.) as our basis, and in 536 B.C., if we prefer the Ceylonese epoch.

"The date 478 B.C. would almost coincide with that to which the testimony of Hemachandra leads us, and place the accession of Chandragupta Maurya in 323 B.C., which cannot be far from the truth. But the result in respect of Mahāvīra himself is at variance with the clear evidence of the Buddhist canonical texts which make the Buddha survive his Jātṛika rival."\(^{1}\) *Ibid.*, p. 243.
"The Jaina statement that their Tirthaṅkara died some sixteen years after the accession of Kūṇika (Ajātaśatru) can be reconciled with the Buddhist tradition about the death of the same teacher before the eighth year of Ajātaśatru if we assume that the Jainas, who refer to Kūṇika as ruler of Champā, begin their reckoning from the accession of that prince to the viceregal throne of Champā, while the Buddhists make the accession of Ajātaśatru to the royal throne of Rājagriha the basis of their calculation" (H.C. Raychaudhuri, p. 86).

(F) In the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1917, S.V. Venkateswara wrote an article entitled 'The Date of Vardhamāna' (pages 122-130) in which he suggested "the date 437 B.C. or 470 of the Ananda Vikrama era" as the date of the nirvāṇa of Vardhamāna, "the founder of modern Jainism". His view is based on the *Sampranavasavadatta* of Bhāsa wherein the Sanskrit dramatist "introduces Pradyota as seeking the hand of Darśaka's sister in marriage for his own son" (p. 129). The reign of Darśaka as accepted by Venkateswara is 437-413 B.C. Thus Chanḍa Pradyota was alive at the beginning of the reign of Darśaka. Jaina tradition is to the effect that Vardhamāna died on the same day as Chanḍa Pradyota of Avanti. Thus "the founder of the Jaina faith must have seen Darśaka's reign (i.e., 437-413 B.C.), if it be true that both Vardhamāna and Chanḍa died about the same time" (pp. 124-125).

This view can be easily refuted on the basis of what has already been said.

(G) H. C. Seth suggests 488 B.C. as the date of Mahāvīra's death on the basis of the Buddhist tradition, assuming 487 B.C. as the date of the Buddha's death. As he says, "The great difficulty in accepting 468 B.C. as the date for Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa will be that it will place Mahāvīra's

death several years after that of Buddha. The traditions preserved in the Buddhist Pali canon clearly tell us that Nigantha Nataputta, i.e., Mahavira, died at Pavâ a little before Buddha.¹ Jacobi and Charpentier have rather lightly set aside this old Buddhist tradition” (p. 820).

“The traditional chronology of the Śvetāmbara Sect of the Jainas given in the Tepāgachha Paṭṭavali and Merutuṅga’s Vīchāraṅgṛiṣṭi, which has been made familiar by European scholars like Bühler, Jacobi and Charpentier, puts Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa 470 years before the Vikrama era (pp. 817-818).

“All the Jaina traditions assign 40 years of reign to Nahavāṇa or Nahapāṇa, whose reign therefore lasted upto 605 years (430 between Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa and Vikrama+135 of Vikrama’s dynasty+40 of Nahavāṇa) after Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa” (p. 834). Now his main argument is as follows:—

“Nahavāṇa is in all probability, as is generally believed by modern historians, the same as Nahapāṇa, the Mahā-Kshatrapa of Kshaharāta family, who is mentioned in several inscriptions and a large number of whose coins is also discovered. .... The modern historical researches put Nahapāṇa in the period after the commencement of the Vikrama era. .... If we take out 40 years of Nahavāṇa from 470 years, the interval given in these traditions between Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa and the commencement of the Vikrama era, the difference between these two important events will be 430 years. This will give (430+58) 488 B.C., as the date of Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa. This will place Mahāvīra’s death about a year before that of Buddha, who died, as suggested above, in 487 B.C. These two dates will reconcile most of the Buddhist as well as the Jain traditions about these two great religious teachers” (pp. 831-832).

We fully agree with him that whatsoever date we accept, the Buddha and Mahāvīra must be shown contemporaries, otherwise the date cannot be correct. But we suggest a modification in it:

The Christian year changes in our Pausha. This may

¹. Dīgha-Nikāya, III, pp. 117, 209; and Majjhima-Nikāya, II, pp. 243 ff. We are told here that while Buddha stayed at Sāmagāna, the report was brought to him that his rival had died at Pāvâ, and that the Nirgranthas, his followers, were divided by serious schisms. According to Jaina traditions also Mahāvīra died at Pāvâ [H. C. Seth].
be applicable to B.C. dates as well. If we say that Mahāvīra died in 488 B.C. and the Buddha died in 487 B.C., seemingly there is a difference of one year between these two events. But really speaking, there is a difference of 6½ months only; because Mahāvīra died in the month of Kārtika in 488 B.C., the year changed in Pausha and 487 B.C. began from that month and in Vaiśākha of the same year (487 B.C.) the Buddha died. From Buddhist literature we know that some time, evidently more than one or two years, passed between the deaths of the two teachers, because it is recorded that the Buddha passed his last rainy season (evidently in 488 B.C.) at Vaiśālī. So 488 B.C. as the date of Mahāvīra's death will have to be given up and we should see if we can find out a date of Mahāvīra's death somewhere near that, which is in keeping with other details.

After a comparison of the details of the lives of the Buddha and Mahāvīra, especially the places where they spent their rainy seasons, we have come to the conclusion that Mahāvīra died in 490 B.C. (November) and that he had been born in 561 B.C. (April). He was alive for 71 years and 64 months. The Buddha was born in 567 B.C. (May) and he died in 487 B.C. (May). He was alive exactly for 80 years.

The point which induced us to try to find out the correct date of Mahāvīra is this:

In the Buddhist Tripitaka literature (M., II. 3. 7) it is stated in most unequivocal terms that one particular rainy season was spent at Rājagriha by the Buddha as well as Mahāvīra and five other heretical teachers. Scholars so far have not paid serious attention to it. Had they done it, they would have been able to find out the correct date of Mahāvīra. Charpentier also knew this passage and certain other passages of the same type. On page 126 (foot-note 29) of the Indian Antiquary for 1914, he says—"The Majjh. Nik. II, p. 2 sq. tells us how the six heretical teachers once spent the rainy season in Rājagriha at the same time as Buddha. Mahāvīra spent fourteen of his varṣās there according to Kalpasūtra § 122." But he, too, ignored it. This passage, as a matter of fact, provides us with another means from the Buddhist side (besides the one indicating that Mahāvīra predeceased the Buddha) to arrive at the correct date of Mahāvīra.

We proceeded to find out the date of that specific rainy
season and consulted the lives of the Buddha and Mahāvīra, viz., *Buddhacharyā* (in Hindi) by Rahula Sankrityayana (2nd ed., Banaras, 1952) and *Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra* (in English) by Muni Ratna-prabha Vijaya, Vol. II, Parts I and II (Ahmedabad, 1948 and 1951) respectively. According to the former the date of the Buddha is 563 B.C.—483 B.C. and according to the latter the date of Mahāvīra is 597 B.C.—526 B.C. We have, however, followed only the years of the lives of these teachers with regard to particular events and not the dates of these events in terms of B.C. years offered by the two above-mentioned writers. We were surprised to see that we could find out the particular rainy season in which both the Buddha and Mahāvīra were at Rājagṛīha. This was done in the following way:

In *Buddhacharyā*, which is a systematised collection of the Hindi translation of the selected passages from ancient Buddhist literature, especially *Tripiṭaka* literature, it is stated (p. 248) that Lord Buddha spent his 17th rainy season (after enlightenment) at Rājagṛīha; and then follows the Hindi translation of *Mahāsakuludāyi-Sutta* (M., II. 3. 7) in which it is said (p. 249) that on that particular occasion both the Buddha and Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta spent their rainy season at Rājagṛīha. Taking 567 B.C. as the date of the birth of the Buddha this comes to 516 B.C.

On the basis of the life of Mahāvīra written by Muni Ratna-prabha Vijaya who has closely followed the early traditional literature on the subject we prepared the list of places where Mahāvīra spent his rainy seasons after leaving his home (with dates). We took 561 B.C. as the date of the birth of Mahāvīra and found that he spent his rainy season in 516 B.C. at Rājagṛīha. This was his 16th rainy season in his ascetic life (i.e., after leaving his home which event took place in December of 532 B.C. according to our calculation). In the rainy season of 513 B.C. also both the Buddha and Mahāvīra were at Rājagṛīha. So the date 561 B.C. as the date of the birth of Mahāvīra is able not only to show that the Buddha survived Mahāvīra but also to make both the teachers spend the same rainy season at Rājagṛīha. This is highly useful inasmuch as it also confirms the statement in the Buddhist literature and shows that Pāli texts are not ‘fancy and invention.’
Below we propose to show that if in Buddhist literature the Buddha and Mahāvīra have been shown as living at the same place at a particular time, we get confirmation from the life of Mahāvīra, too, about it pointing out that he was actually at the same particular place at that time. As Charpentier also collected, though for a different purpose, some examples of this situation when the Buddha and Mahāvīra were living at the same place or in the same locality, we shall begin this examination with the passages pointed out by Charpentier (I.A., 1914, pp. 126-128).

1. "The well-known introduction to the Śāmaññaphalasutta (D. I. p. 47 sq.) telling us how king Ajātaśatru of Magadha paid visits to one after another of the six heretical teachers Pūraṇa Kassapa, Makkhali Gosāla, Ajīta Kesakambala, P.uḍha Kachchhāyana, Sañjaya Belaṭhiputta and Nigañṭha Nātaputta to hear their doctrines, and at last discontented with all he had learnt took refuge with Buddha, may be a little exaggerated, as it is not very credible that Ajātaśatru saw seven great teachers after each other in one single night. But the main content of it is undoubtedly true, as much as we can control the facts told concerning the doctrines of at least two of the teachers, Gosāla and Nātaputta, by comparison with Jaina writings. Moreover, the Jaina writings, e.g., the Aṣṭapāṭikā-Sūtra § 39 sq., tell us of visits paid by king Kuniya or Koṇiya (Ajātaśatru) to Mahāvīra, and although there are no facts from which to conclude that it is the same visit as that alluded to by the Dīgha-Nikāya, there are sufficient instances to prove that the imagination of Ajātaśatru paying visits to Mahāvīra was quite familiar with Jaina writers" (pp. 126-127).

This visit of Ajātaśatru to the Buddha took place in 491 B.C. according to our calculation, because Rahula Sankrityayana put it at 487 B.C. (ibid., p. 426) taking 483 B.C. as the date of the death of the Buddha. The rainy season of 491 B.C.

1. Passages where Nāṭ(h)aputta is merely mentioned without anything being told about him are for instance CV. V, 8, 1; D. N. II, p. 150; M. N. I, pp. 126, 250; II, pp. 2 ff; he is called in Buddhist Sanskrit Nirgrantho Jñātiputraḥ, e.g., Dīghan. p. 143; Mahānāma, I, pp. 253, 257; III, p. 383 [Charpentier, p. 126, f. n.].

2. The visit of Ajātaśatru is said in D. to have taken place in the full moon of Karṣṭikā (about Nov. 1) after the end of the rainy season [Charpentier].
was passed by the Buddha at Śrāvasti. This was his 42nd rainy season after enlightenment. So this Buddhist reference means to say that sometime in the last month (i.e., Kārtika) of the chāturmāṣya the Buddha came to Rājagriha. The example of the Buddha’s leaving his chāturmāṣya place on the Āśvina Pūrṇimā (the full-moon day of Āśvina, Mahā-pravāraṇā day) or later is furnished by Sankrityayana on page 82 of his book. [This was the Buddha’s 7th rainy season (526 B.C.) which had been passed at Trayastrimśa.]

Thus Buddhist literature says that there was a meeting between the Buddha and Ajātaśatru at Rājagriha in the full-moon night of Kārtika. But what about Mahāvīra? Ajātaśatru mentions before the Buddha (Sankrityayana, p. 430) that he had been to Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta as well and had held a discussion.

Coming to Mahāvīra, as is well-known, he passed his 42nd rainy season (which was his last rainy season) at Madhyamā Pāvā where he died. This, according to our calculation, took place in 490 B.C. From the life of Mahāvīra (Vol. II, Part II, page 658) we know that “Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra lived at Rājagriha Nagara during the rainy season of the forty-first year of his ascetic life.” The date of this rainy season will be 491 B.C.

Thus it was possible for Ajātaśatru to meet the Buddha at Rājagriha after having met Mahāvīra (at Rājagriha).

2. “In Majjhima Nikāya I, p. 93 sq., Buddha tells his relative, the Śākya prince Mahānāman, of a conversation which he had once had with some Nirgranthha ascetics in the neighbourhood of Rājagriha. These disciples of Mahāvīra praised their master as all-knowing and all-seeing, etc.; and there is nothing remarkable in this, for the claim of possessing universal knowledge was a main characteristic of all these prophets, Mahāvīra as well as Gosāla, Buddha as well as Devadatta” (p. 127).

This story is given in detail by Sankrityayana under ‘Chāla-dukkhakkhandha-Sutta’ on pages 212-216 and the reference by the Buddha to the Nirgranthas of Rājagriha is given on page 214. The date of the event of this Sutta is given by Sankrityayana as 514 B.C. which is equivalent to 518 B.C. if we regard 487 B.C. as the date of the death of the Buddha. The age of the Buddha is given as 49th year which is equivalent to 519 B.C.
(May) to 518 B.C. (May). Thus this event might have happened sometime between May, 519 B.C. and May, 518 B.C.

Now from the life of Mahāvīra (Vol. II, Part II, pp. 141, 200) we know that he passed his 13th rainy season after leaving home (or 1st rainy season after enlightenment) at Rājagriha. The date of this according to our calculation is 519 B.C. (July-October), taking 561 B.C. as the date of Mahāvīra’s birth.

Thus we see that it was possible that sometime in 519 B.C. (either in May-June or July-October) the Buddha contacted at Rājagriha (at Kālaśilā near Rishigiri) some Nirgranthas who told him that Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta was all-knowing. Very possibly, as we have seen above, Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta (Mahāvīra) was himself residing there in the locality, although the text does not make it necessary.

3. “Moreover, there are other instances in the Pāli Canon where Mahāvīra is praised in the same way by his followers; so

[a] in Majjh. Nik. II, 31, where Sakuludāyi in Rājagriha, [b] ibid., II, 214 sq., where some Nirgrantha monks, and
[c] in Aṅguttara I, 220, where the Lichchhavi prince, Abhaya, in a conversation with Ānanda in Vesāli, eulogize Nāṭaputta in the same way. But all these passages speaking in a quite familiar way of Nāṭaputta, his doctrines and his followers seem to prove, that the redactors of the Buddhist canonical writings had a rather intimate knowledge of the communication between Buddhists and Jainas in the lifetime of Gotama and Mahāvīra” (p. 127).

Of the three passages above, we have already considered the first one. This is the occasion when both the Buddha and Mahāvīra passed the same rainy season at one and the same place i.e., Rājagriha. This event took place in 516 B.C. according to our calculation as shown above. The other two passages are not relevant for our purposes.

4. “The passage in the Mahāvagga VI, 31, 1 sq., speaking of the meeting in Vesāli of the general Siha, who afterwards became a lay-disciple of Buddha, with Nāṭaputta has been

1. The passage is repeated in Aṅg. Nik. IV, p. 180 sq. [Charpentier].
discussed by Professor Jacobi in S. B. E. 45, p. xvi. sq. . . .” (p. 127).

The passage is very important as in this it is expressly stated that both the Buddha and Mahāvīra were at Vaiśālī at that time.

The Hindi translation of the Siha-Sutta (A., VIII. 1. 2. 2) has been given by Sankrityayana on pages 138-140. He gives the date of this event as 515 B.C. which is equivalent to 519 B.C. according to our calculation. The Buddha spent his 13th rainy season at Chāliya Parvata (p. 137) and 14th rainy season as Śrāvasti (p. 158, f. n.). The date of the 14th rainy season is 519 B.C. (July-October) according to our calculation.

But where was Mahāvīra in the year 519 B.C.? He passed his 13th rainy season at Rājagrīha (Life, Vol. II, Part II, pp. 141, 200) in 519 B. C. (July-October) according to our calculation and 14th rainy season at Vaiśālī (Life, Vol. II, Part II, p. 231) in 518 B. C. (July-October). From the Life (page 200) again we know that “Soon after the rainy season, Śrāṇaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra left Rājagrīha, and went in the direction of Vidsha”. Then Muni Ratnaprabha Vijaya mentions Brāhmaṇa Kuṇḍagrāma (p. 201) and Kshatriya Kuṇḍagrāma (p. 206) as the places visited by Mahāvīra. All these places were suburbs of Vaiśālī. The only place outside the Vaiśālī area visited by Mahāvīra between his 13th and 14th rainy seasons was Champā (page 227).

Thus combining both the Buddhist and the Jain traditions we can say that both the Buddha and Mahāvīra were at Vaiśālī in November-December, 519 B. C. and that the conversion of Siha to Buddhism also took place at the same time. It may further be added that this was the first visit of Mahāvīra to Vaiśālī after his enlightenment (May, 519 B. C.). That is why the Jaina tradition mentions the conversion of Rishabha-datta, Devānandā, Jamāli and Priyadarśanā to Jainism on this occasion. But it is silent about the conversion of Siha, who was a Nirgrantha, to Buddhism, as it did not like to record such defeats.

5. “. . . and also the well-known Upāli-Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya (I, p. 371 sq.). Here it is related at considerable length, how Upāli, who was a lay follower of Nātaputta, went to see Buddha at a time when the two teachers
dwelt at Nālandā in order to try to refute him on matters of doctrine. But this attempt had only a scanty result; for Buddha soon converted Upāli, and made him his disciple. So Upāli went back to his house in Rājagriha, and told his door-keeper no more to admit the Nirgranthas. When Mahāvīra afterwards came with his disciples to see him, Upāli declared to his former teacher the reason of his conversion, and eulogised Buddha, his new master... but then and there hot blood gushed forth from the mouth of Niggaṇṭha Nātaputta, since he was not able to stand the praise of the Venerable One" (p. 127).

The Upāli-Sutta is also highly important, because the event took place at Nālandā when both the teachers were there.

Rājagriha and Nālandā are close to each other just like Vaiśāli and Vāṇijyagrama or Champā and Prisṭha Champā. That is why in the § 122 of the Kalpasūtra where totals of rainy seasons passed at different places are indicated, these are shown jointly and not separately. Thus it has been stated therein (quoted in Life of Mahāvīra, Vol. II, Part II, pages 690-691) that Mahāvīra passed 3 rainy seasons at Champā and Prisṭha Champā, 12 rainy seasons at Vaiśāli and Vāṇijyagrama and 14 rainy seasons at Rājagriha and Nālandā¹. This joint mention is significant.

Coming to the Buddhist tradition, Rahula Sankrityayana mentions in his Buddhacharyā that the Buddha spent his 42nd rainy season at Śrāvasti (page 413, f. n.). The date of this will be 491 B. C. according to our calculation. From the next page we find the Hindi translation of Upāli-Sutta (pp. 414-423) with its scene at Nālandā. The date given is 487 B. C. which is equivalent to 491 B. C. according to our calculation. The year given is 77th year of the Buddha’s life. This will be May, 491 B. C. to May, 490 B. C. according to our calculation. Thus it appears that the event took place between November, 491 B. C. and May, 490 B. C. as shown above.

Turning to the Jaina tradition about the itinerary of Mahāvīra, we have to enquire as to where Mahāvīra was at this

¹. In the §122 of the Kalpasūtra Mahāvīra is said to have spent fourteen rainy seasons in Rājagriha and the suburb (bahirika) of Nālandā. This was a famous place even with the Jainas, cp., e.g., Sūtrakṛtāṅga II, 7 (S. B. E. XLIV, 419 sq.) [ Charpentier, p. 127, f. n.].
time: whether he was in the Rājagṛīha-Nālandā area or away from it.

From the *Life of Mahāvīra* (Vol. II, Part II, pages 60, 658) we know that Mahāvīra was at Rājagṛīha (or, in the Rājagṛīha-Nālandā area, to be more exact and in keeping with the tone of the *Kalpasūtra* § 122) from November, 492 B.C. to the early months of 490 B.C. This is evident from the following quotations:

“Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra lived at Mithilā Nagarī during the rainy season of the fortieth year of his ascetic life” (page 649). [Date according to our calculation-July-October, 492 B.C.]

“Soon after the close of the rainy season Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra left Mithilā and went in the direction of Magadha-daśa. Coming to Rājagṛīha Nagarā, the Worshipful Lord put up at Guṇaśila Chaitya outside the town” (page 650). [Date—from November, 492 B. C. onwards.]

“Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra lived at Rājagṛīha Nagarā during the rainy season of the forty-first year of his ascetic life” (page 658). [Date-July-October, 491 B. C.]

“Even after the close of rainy season, Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra lived at Rājagṛīha Nagarā, for a long time” (page 658). [Date—from November, 491 B. C. onwards for some months.]

From Rājagṛīha he went to Apāpā Nagarī or Pāvāpurī (pages 664, 682) where he breathed his last in November, 490 B. C. (according to our calculation).

Hence the event narrated in the *Upālisutta* is rendered more probable due to the presence of the two teachers in the Rājagṛīha-Nālandā area in the period from November, 491 B.C. to the early months of 490 B.C.

6. “In the *Abhayakumārasutta* (M. N. I, 392 sq.) it is stated that prince Abhaya was asked in Rājagṛīha by Nīgaṇṭha Nātaputta to go to Buddha, and put to him the question, whether it was advisable or not to speak words agreeable to other people. By this a trap was to be laid out for him; for if he answered ‘no’ he would, of course, be wrong, and if he answered ‘yes’, Abhaya ought to ask, why he had in such fierce terms denounced Deva-datta and his apostacy” (p. 128).

Charpentier adds that “too much weight should not be attached to this passage” but we are unable to agree with him.
The date of the event of this Sutta is given as 487 B.C. by Sankrityayana (p. 424) which is equivalent to 491 B.C. according to our calculation. The scene of this Sutta is Rājagṛiha where both the Buddha and Mahāvīra are shown as present. We have already shown above that Mahāvīra was at Rājagṛiha from November, 492 B.C. to the early months of 490 B.C. He passed his rainy season of 491 B.C. also at Rājagṛiha. Thus there is nothing impossible in it.

7. "..... Saṅy. Nīk. IV, 322 sq. where we are told that Buddha and Nātaputta were staying in Nālandā at the same time during a severe famine; when the latter asked his lay-follower the squire (gāmāṇi) Asibandhakaputta (cf. ibid., p. 317 sq.) to go to Buddha and ask him, whether he deemed it right to have all his monks there at that time devouring the food of the poor people" (p. 128, f. n.).

The story of Asibandhakaputta has been narrated on pp. 103-105 by Sankrityayana. It indicates that both the Buddha and Mahāvīra were at Nālandā at the time when there was a famine there. The date of the event is given as 518 B.C. which is equivalent to 522 B.C. according to our calculation. Just above the story is mentioned the fact that the 11th rainy season of the Buddha was passed in the Brähmaṇa village of Nālā or Nāladā (p. 103). The date of this rainy season according to our calculation is 522 B.C. Thus if Sankrityayana is strictly followed, the event took place sometime after the rainy season, i.e., in November-December, 522 B.C.

Coming to the Jaina tradition, we find that Mahāvīra passed his 10th rainy season at Śrāvasti (Life, Vol. II, Part I, 472) in 522 B.C. (according to our calculation). After the rains he travelled to other places. "Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra then went to Rājagṛiha Nagara. There Iśānendra (Indra of Iśāna devaloka) came, and worshipped the Lord. After making inquiries about Bhagavān’s health, he went away" (Life, Vol. II, Part I, p. 491). Thus Mahāvīra is also at Rājagṛiha, i.e., in the Rājagṛiha-Nālandā area at the same time.

The seven passages analysed so far are pointed out in the article of Charpentier. While reading Buddhacharyā of Sankrityayana we have come across certain other passages as well in which the Buddha and Mahāvīra are shown at the same place at a particular time. One such is given below:—
8. From the Chūla-Sakuludāyi-Sutta (M., II. 3. 9) we know (Buddhacharyā, pp. 262-267, esp. p. 263) that there was a conversation between Sakula-Uḍāyi and the Buddha at Rājagriha in which a reference was made by Sakula-Uḍāyi to Mahāvīra. The date of this event as given by Sankrityayana is 512 B.C. which is equivalent to 516 B.C. according to our calculation. We have already proved above that in 516 B.C. both the Buddha and Mahāvīra passed their rainy season at Rājagriha. [The text in the Sutta, however, does not make Mahāvīra’s presence at Rājagriha necessary.]

Thus my conclusion is that in case the Buddha’s date is regarded as 567-487 B.C. the date of Mahāvīra should be:—

Birth: 561 B.C. (April),
Death: 490 B.C. (November).\(^1\)

Here we would like to point out a mistake usually committed by many. When the date of the death of Mahāvīra is indicated, people find out the date of his birth by adding 72. This is wrong. Mahāvīra was alive for 71 years 6 months and 17 days, i.e., approximately for 72 years. If we add 72, we actually give him a life of \(72\frac{1}{2}\) years, i.e., one year more than the real length of his life. It happens in this way. Suppose the date of his death is 490 B.C. If we add 72 to this in the usual manner, the date of birth comes to 562 B.C. Now Mahāvīra was born in April and died in November. So from April, 562 B.C. to November, 490 B.C. will be 72 years and 7 months while the real length of his life is 71 years and about 7 months. Hence we should add only 71 in order to find out the date of his birth.

THE BIRTHPLACE OF MAHĀVĪRA

Although there is no controversy among the mature scholars regarding the identification of Mahāvīra’s birthplace which is Vaiśālī, the Jaina community, or more correctly its common section, is still to be convinced of it. According to the Śvetāmbara section the birthplace of Mahāvīra is Lachhuār or Lachhwād in the southern part of Monghyr district (south of the Ganges) near Lakhisarai

---

\(^1\) In case the Buddha’s date is regarded as 566-486 B.C., the date of Mahāvīra in my opinion will be 560-489 B.C.
Junction. The Digambara section regards Kuṇḍalpur, a village two miles from Nālandā, as the birthplace of the Lord. Both the views are evidently wrong. But they are placed (especially the first is placed) with considerable veneration whenever an occasion arises.\(^1\) Hence we propose to devote some space to this very important aspect of Jaina history.

In our opinion the problem can be met in three ways, *viz.*, by giving opinions of reputed scholars (European as well as Indian), by placing arguments based on the ancient Jaina scriptures, and by giving extracts from the ancient Jaina literature to show that Mahāvīra was born at Kuṇḍapura near Vaisālī in the Videha country.

Both European and Indian scholars are unanimous in regarding Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaisālī as the birthplace of Mahāvīra. We quote below the opinions of some

---

\(^1\) In 1948 an article of mine in favour of Vaisālī was published in *Homage to Vaisālī*, entitled ‘Vaisālī, the Birthplace of Lord Mahāvīra’ (pp. 85-90). This had already been separately published as *Identification of Mahāvīra’s Birthplace* (Vaisālī, 1947). A Hindi version of this was also issued (Vaisālī, 1948). Two writers then wrote articles in favour of Lachhwaḍ in the *Āryakatha* (a Hindi daily from Patna) of the 11th April and 12th June of 1949 respectively. I replied to these in the *Hukār* (a Hindi weekly from Patna) of the 5th June, the *Yogi* (another Hindi weekly from Patna) of the 17th June and the *Āryakatha* of the 24th July, 1949. The first writer of the *Āryakatha* then wrote a second article in the *Āryakatha* of the 27th December, 1949; but as it contained no new point, I did not consider it necessary to reply to it. Four years later, when I published my *Vaisālī ki Jāhānā* (Patna, 1953), I included in it the grounds of regarding Vaisālī as Mahāvīra’s birthplace, his close association with this place and reasons as to why the Jainas gradually forgot Vaisālī. In the same year the first writer just referred to contributed an article to the All-India Oriental Conference (Ahmedabad Session) on this topic. Hence I got an article of mine on this controversy published in *Brahmachārī Pratidā Chāndābhāti-Abhinandana-Grantha* (Arrah, 1954), pp. 669-676. My article in *Homage to Vaisālī* and especially a Hindi book *Vaisālī* (Delhi, 1947) written by Vijayendra Suri Ji and published earlier aroused considerable interest among the Jainas of Gujarat and a Jaina Muni named Muni Darshan Vijay Ji Tripuri wrote a book entitled *Kṣatriyakundā* (Ahmedabad, 1950) in Gujarati in favour of Lachhuar. His arguments have been met in my Hindi article published in *Śrīmad-Rājendra-Sūri-Saṃsāra-Grantha* (1957) and more elaborately in Vijayendra Suri Ji’s revised *Vaisālī* (published both in Gujarati and Hindi in 1958 from Bombay) and *Tīrthāṅkara Mahāvīra*, Vol.I (Bombay, 1960). The present work seeks to furnish at one place all types of evidence on the issue of Mahāvīra’s birthplace. The success of our efforts made in this direction during the last few years has come to be recognised and a recent writer says that because of this “certain sections of the Swetambaras and the Digambars appear to accept Vaisālī to be the birthplace of Mahavira Swami” *Jainism in Bihar*, Patna, 1956, p. 14.
of them:—

1. Hermann Jacobi, while discussing the birthplace and parentage of Mahāvīra in his Jaina Sūtras, Part One (S. B. E., Vol. 22, Oxford, 1884), says (pp. x-xiii):—

“The Jainas, both Svetambaras and Digambaras, state that Mahāvīra was the son of King Siddhārtha of Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma. Kuṇḍagrāma is called in the Ācharāṅga Sūtra a Satā-nivesa, a term which the commentator interprets as denoting a halting-place of caravans or processions. By combining occasional hints in the Baudhāya and Jaina scriptures we can, with sufficient accuracy, point out where the birthplace of Mahāvīra was situated; for in the Mahāvagga of the Buddhists we read that Buddha, while sojourn ing at Kotiggāma, was visited by the courtezan Ambapāli and the Lichchhavis of the neighbouring capital Vesāli. From Kotiggāma he went to where the Nātikas (lived). There he lodged in the Nātika Brick-hall. From there he went to Vesāli, where he converted the general-in-chief (of the Lichchhavis), a lay-disciple of the Nirgranthas (or Jaina monks). Now it is highly probable that the Kotiggāma of the Buddhists is identical with the Kuṇḍaggāma of the Jainas. Apart from the similarity of the names, the mentioning of the Nātikas, apparently identical with the Jātrika Kshatriyas to whose clan Mahāvīra belonged, and of Siha, the Jaina, point to the same direction. Kuṇḍagrāma, therefore, was probably one of the suburbs of Vaiśālī, the capital of Videha. This conjecture is borne out by the name Vesālie, i.e., Vaiśālika given to Mahāvīra in the Sūtra-kṛtāṅga I, 3. Vaiśālika apparently means a native of Vaiśālī; and Mahāvīra could rightly be called that when Kuṇḍagrāma was a suburb of Vaiśālī.

“Siddhārtha’s wife Trīṣāḷā was sister to Chetaka, king of Vaiśālī. She is called Vaidchī or Videhadattā, because she belonged to the reigning line of Videha....We are enabled to understand why the Buddhists took no notice of Chetaka, as his influence was not very great, and besides, was used in the interest of their rivals. But the Jainas cherished the memory of the maternal uncle and patron of their prophet to whose influence we must attribute the fact, that Vaiśālī used to be a stronghold of Jainism, while being looked upon by the Buddhists as a seminary of heresies and dissent”.
The same authority, writing about Mahāvīra in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 7 (New York, 1914), p. 466 (s. v. Jainism), says:—

“He was a Kṣatriya of the Jhāta clan and a native of Kuṇḍagrāma, a suburb of the town Vaiśāli (the modern Basārh, some 27 miles north of Patna). Kuṇḍaggāma and Vāniyaggaṁa, both suburbs of Vesāli, have been identified by Hoernle with the modern villages, Baniyā and Basukunda”.

2. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, in whose masterly address delivered to the Asiatic Society of Bengal on the 2nd February, 1898 a convenient summary of the Jaina traditions with reference to the original sources will be found, in his English translation of the *Uvāsagadāso* (Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta, 1888) has clearly shown that Vaiśāli is the birthplace of Mahāvīra. He says (note 8, pp. 3-5):—

“Vāniyagāma, Skr. Vāniyagrāma; another name of the well-known city of Vesāli (Skr. Vaishāli), the capital of the Licchāvi country. In the Kalpa Sūtra, § 122, it is mentioned separately, but in close conjunction with Vesāli. The fact is, that the city commonly called Vesāli occupied a very extended area, which included within its circuit, besides Vaiśāli proper (now Besārh), several other places. Among the latter were Vāniyagāma and Kuṇḍagāma or Kuṇḍapura. These still exist as villages under the names of Baniyā and Basukunda. Hence the joint-city might be called, according to circumstances, by any of the names of its constituent parts. Under the name of Kuṇḍagāma, the city of Vesāli is mentioned as the birthplace of Mahāvīra, who hence is sometimes called Vesāli or the ‘man of Vesāli’.... Mahāvīra’s father, Siddhattha, was the chief of the Nāya-clan, resident in the Kollāga suburb of the city of Vesāli or Kuṇḍagāma”.

3. Vincent Arthur Smith, the famous historian, also believes that Vaiśāli was the birthplace of Mahāvīra. In his article entitled ‘Vaiśāli’ published in J. R. A. S., 1902 (pp. 267-288) he says (pp. 282-283, 286-287) :—

“According to Jain tradition, Vaiśāli consisted of three distinct portions, Vaiśāli proper, Kuṇḍagāma, and Vāniyagāma, besides the Kollāga suburb. Vaiśāli proper has been sufficiently identified as being represented by Bisāligaṁ and an indeterminate portion of the other extensive ruins. The village of
Baniyā (with the adjacent Chak Rāmdās) is almost certainly the representative of Vāniyagāma. The lands of the village contain "extensive mounds", and some ten years ago two statues of Jain Tirthankaras, one seated, the other standing, were discovered about eight feet below the surface, and 500 yards west of the village. Vāniyagāma was the residence of Mahāvīra, the great prophet of the Jains, and this discovery of Jain images strongly confirms the identification suggested by the name. Kollāga is probably now represented by the village situated close to the Monkey Tank called Kolluā or Kolhuā, on the eastern side of which a large mound exists. Kuṇḍagāma, the Brahman section of Vaiśāli, may be represented by the hamlet called Basukund."

The same authority, writing in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 12 (New York, 1921), pp. 567-568 (s.v. Vaiśāli), says:—

"The ancient city of Vaiśāli was equally sacred to the Jains and the Buddhists long ago. It is now represented unquestionably by the village named Basār or Basārh (not Besarh or Bāsārh as in nearly all books), situated in the Hajipur subdivision of the Muzaffarpur District of the Bihar and Orissa Province, in 25° 99' N. and 85° 8' E. The identity of Vaiśāli with the group of remains associated with the village of Basārh is conclusively proved

(i) by the survival of the ancient name with only slight modifications;

(ii) by geographical bearings taken from Patna and other places;

(iii) by topographical details as compared with the description recorded by Hiuen Tsiang (Yuan Chwang), the Chinese pilgrim in the 7th century; and

(iv) by the finding on the spot of sealings of letters inscribed with the name Vaiśāli. The documents, which were addressed to officials and other residents, have totally disappeared. The sealings found number about 1000, of which two or three bear the name of the town.

"Few places in India have stronger claims upon the veneration of both Jains and Buddhists. Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, commonly spoken of as the founder of the Jain Church, belonged to a noble family of Vaiśāli, where he was born and
spent all his earlier life. After he had entered upon the ascetic career, he is said to have resided in his native town or the immediate neighbourhood for twelve rainy seasons, during which travelling was unlawful for persons of his profession. The Jain scriptures often mention Vaiśāli. The archaeologists have not sought for Jain remains on the site, and nothing in their reports would lead the reader to suppose that the Basārh area was the birthplace of Jainism, as it is known to the moderns."

4. Giving an account of 'Excavations at Basārh' in *Archaeological Survey of India Annual Report* for 1903-04 (Calcutta, 1906) T. Bloch says (p. 82):—

"Mahāvīra, the last of the Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras, is called *Vesāli*, "a native of Vaiśāli", in the Jaina scriptures and it is also related there that his birthplace, Kuṇḍagāma, lay in Videha. Videha and Tirabhuuki, however, are used almost synonymously by ancient authors. An identification of Vaiśālī with a place outside the borders of Tirhut, therefore, appears *prima facie* very unlikely, the more so when there is an ancient site in Tirhut which fulfils all the necessary requirements."


"Some two thousand years ago in Besārh the same divisions existed as would be found today; and there in fact, the priestly (Brāhman), the warrior (Kṣatriya), and the commercial (Baniyā) communities lived so separately that their quarters were sometimes spoken of as though they had been distinct villages, as Vaiśāli, Kuṇḍagrāma, and Vaiṣṇīyagrāma. Strangely enough, it was not in their own but in the Kṣatriya ward that the man was born who was to be the great hero of the Baniyā, and who was to found amongst these commercial people a religion which, with all its limitations, yet made one of the most emphatic protests the world has ever known against accounting luxury, wealth, or comfort the main things in life. It seems almost paradoxical also that the warrior caste should produce the great apostle of non-killing. He was afterwards known from his 'exploits as Mahāvīra—the great hero—but his earliest name he derived from his birthplace, being known simply as
Vaisāliya, ‘the man of Vaisāli’ (the main ward of the town).”¹


“Just outside Vaisāli lay the suburb Kuṇḍagrama—probably surviving in the modern village of Basukūṇḍ—and here lived a wealthy nobleman Siddhārtha, head of a certain warrior-clan called the Jñātrikas. This Siddhārtha was the father of Vardhamāna Mahāvīra.”


“Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, their last leader, is identifiable on strong grounds with Nigantha Nata-putta (Nirgrantha of the Jnatrika clan) of the Buddhist Pitakas and Buddha’s contemporary... Mahāvīra...is said to have been a Kshatriya (like all the rest of the 24 Jinas) of Vaishali, 27 m. north of Patna.”

8. The writers in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (*e.g.*, Jacobi and Smith, both already quoted above) also hold that Mahāvīra belonged to Vaisāli.


Let us now consider the views of some important Indian scholars.

10. Sarvpalli Radhakrishnan in his *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I (first pub. London, 1923, Indian ed. 1940) says that “Vardhamāna was born at Vaisāli about 599 B. C.” (p. 291) and that “the Nātaputta of Pāli Buddhist literature is Vardhamāna” (p. 292).


¹. The same writer says on p. 28 of that book:—“It is only through the labours of European scholars like Jacobi, Hoernle and Bühler that Mahāvīra’s historical existence has been proved. It seems strange that the Jainas should still be dependent on the labours of scholars of another faith and speech for all they know about their greatest hero!”
"Mahāvīra, the last prophet of the Jains, was a Kṣatriya of the Jnāta clan and a native of Vaisālī (modern Basarh), 27 miles north of Patna. He was the second son of Siddhārtha and Triśalā."

12. Rahula Sankritayana in his *Darśana-digdarśana* (Allahabad, 1944) says (p. 492) that Vardhamāna Jñātiriputra (Nātaputta), the founder of Jainism, was one of the teachers who flourished in the time of the Buddha. He was born in the Jnātṛi clan at Vaisālī (modern Basarh, 27 miles north of Patna), the capital of the ancient Vajji republic (Muzaffarpur district in Bihar). Further he says that Vardhamāna’s father was a member of the republican Senate (Gaṇa-Samsthā).


“It is another name for Vaisālī (modern Besarh) in the district of Mozaffarpur (Tirhut); in fact, Kuṇḍagāma (Kuṇḍagrāma) now called Basukunḍa was a part of the suburb of the ancient town of Vaisālī. Under the name of Kuṇḍagāma, the city of Vaisālī is mentioned as the birthplace of Mahāvīra, the Jaina Tirthaṅkara, who was also called Vesālie or the man of Vesāli. Mahāvīra or Vardhamāna was the son of Siddhārtha, a chief or “king” of Kuṇḍapurū, by his wife Triśalā, who was a sister of Cheṭaka, king of Vaisālī.”

14. B. C. Law, speaking about Mahāvīra, says (*Mahāvīra: His Life and Teachings*, London, 1937, p. 19):—“He was born in the town of Kuṇḍanagara, a suburb of Vaisālī and an important seat of the Jnātṛikas. He was therefore called Vesālie (Vaisālika),—a citizen of Vaisālī.” Elsewhere (*Tribes in Ancient India*, Poona, 1943, p. 298) also he says:—“There are reasons to believe that Mahāvīra was a native of a suburb of Vaisālī.”

Let us consider the views of some Jaina scholars as well.

15. Jagmanderlal Jaini, one of the earliest Indian writers on the subject, says that Mahāvīra “was born in the family of a ruling Kshatriya chief of the Nāya clan in the republic of Vaisālī (modern North Behar), in the town of the same name (hence he is called also Vaisālika), at the

16. Chimanlal J. Shah in his Jainism in North India, 8oo B. C.-A. D. 526 (Longmans, Green and Co., 1932) says (pp. 23-24):—

“Mahāvīra is believed to have been born of Triśalā, near the town of Vaiśālī, nearly twenty-seven miles north of Patna. His father, Siddhārtha, seems to have been a chieftain of Kuṇḍagrāma village, and his mother, Princess Triśalā, was the sister of the chieftain of Vaiśālī, the capital of Videha, and was related also to Bimbisāra, king of Magadha.”

17. Kalyanavijaya Ji Gani has written a life of Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra (Śāstra-Saṅgraha-Samiti, Jalor, 1941) in which (introduction, pp. xxv-xxviii) he shows that Mahāvīra was born at Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaiśālī in Videha.

18. Vijayendra Suri Ji has written Vaiśālī (1st ed., Delhi, 1947; 2nd revised and enlarged ed., Bombay, 1958) and Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra, Vol I (Bombay, 1960), wherein he gives strong arguments for accepting Kuṇḍagrāma or Kuṇḍapura near Vaiśālī (Muzaffarpur district) as the real birthplace of the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara.

19. Sukhlal Ji Sanghavi, while delivering his presidential address at the ninth Vaiśālī Festival in 1953, declared that Vaiśālī, being the birthplace of Mahāvīra, was the Mecca and the Jerusalem for the Jainas and that neither Lichchhavī (the so-called Kshatriyakunḍa) near Lakhisarai nor Kuṇḍala-grāma near Nālandā was Mahāvīra’s birthplace (Vaiśālī ki Mahimā, Patna, 1960, pp. 83-84).

20. Hira Lal Jain, while delivering his presidential address at the eleventh Vaiśālī Festival in 1955, said that Kuṇḍapura or Kshatriya-kunḍa, a part of Vaiśālī, was the birthplace of Mahāvīra (Vaiśālī ki Mahimā, pp. 94-95). Elsewhere (Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, Calendar 1955-1960, Muzaffarpur, 1961, pp. 80-84; also pp. 79-80) where he has quoted our A Scheme for the Vaisali Institute of Post-graduate Studies, and Research in Prakrit and Jainology, Vaiśālī, 1952, p. 17) he has furnished arguments from Jaina scriptures and other sources to prove his point.
21. Jagdish Chandra Jain, in his *Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jain Canons* (Bombay, 1947), opines that "Kuṇḍapura was the birthplace of Mahāvīra" and that "it is identified with modern Basukund which was a suburb of ancient Vaiśāli" (p. 297). Also, "Vaiśāli is identical with modern Basarh in the Muzaffarpur district of Bihar" (p. 354).

22. Muni Ratna-prabha Vijaya, who has written a detailed biography of Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra (Vol. II, Parts I and II, Ahmedabad, 1948 and 1951), says (ibid., Vol. II, Part I, p. 53) that "Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra, the last Tīrthaṅkara", came out of "the womb of Kshatriyāṇī Triśālā of Vāsishṭha gotra, wife of Kshatriya Siddārthaka of Kāśyapa gotra belonging to the clan of Jāṭṭri Kshatriyas" and residing in "the Kshatriya part of the town of Kuṇḍagramā."


24. K. Bhujbali Sastri is of the view (vide his Hindi article entitled 'Bhagavān Mahāvīra ki Janma-bhūmi' published in *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, Vol. 10, 1943, pp. 60-66) that Vaiśāli (modern Basarh) is the birthplace of Bhagavān Mahāvīra.

25. Nemichandra Sastri of Arrah has no doubt in his mind about the birthplace of Mahāvīra which in his opinion is Vaiśāli (*B. P. Chandābāī-Abhinandana-Grantha*, Arrah, 1954, p. 626).

Of the Jaina scholars quoted above, two, viz., Vijayendra Suri Ji and Kalyanavijaya Ji Gani, have placed certain strong arguments before the Jaina world in their respective Hindi books. Those of the former are:

1. The present site, which is called Kshatriyakunḍa and is placed near Lichchhuḍ, is in the Monghyr district. In historical times this formed part of Aṅga or Modāgiri and not of Videha. Hence this place cannot be the birth-place of the Lord.

---

2. Modern Kṣhatriya-kuṇḍa is situated on the mountain, while there are no references to mountains in connection with ancient Kṣhatriyakunḍa in the (Jaina) scriptures. As there is no mountain in the vicinity of Vaiśālī, the possibility of its having been the birthplace of the Lord increases.

3. Near the present Kṣhatriyakunḍa there is a nālā which is not the Gaṇḍaki. The Gaṇḍaki river flows near Vaiśālī even today.

4. In the (ancient Jaina) scriptures Kṣhatriyakunḍa is shown near Vaiśālī, while Vaiśālī is not situated near the present site (of Kṣhatriyakunḍa-Lichchhuad).

5. The Videha country is to the north of the Ganges, while the present Kṣhatriyakunḍa (near Lichchhuad) is to the south of the Ganges.

6. Near the present site of Vaiśālī (represented by the village Basarh) there are villages like Bania, Kamanchhapa-gashti and Kolhua. Kṣhatriyakunḍa is known as Basukund and is near Vaiśālī. It was here that the three of the principal events of the Lord’s life had taken place.

7. The Archaeological Department (of the Government of India) also regards this Basukund as the real Kṣhatriya-kunḍa.

8. The local people also regard this (Basukund) as the place where the Lord was born¹.

These are sound arguments and do not require any commentary.

Kalyanavijaya Ji also has advanced certain arguments based mainly on the geography of the peregrinations of Mahāvīra, e.g., (a) nearness of Kollāka-Saṁniveśa to Mahāvīra’s birthplace (there is no Kollāka-Saṁniveśa near Lichchhuad); (b) situation of Śvetavikā² to the west of Videha (and not

¹. At Basukund there is a plot of land with an area of two acres which is regarded as sacred on account of being the actual birthplace of Lord Mahāvīra and remains uncultivated and inviolate for this reason. The land has now been donated to the Bihar Government and a memorial to Mahāvīra is to be established there whose foundation was laid by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the President of the Indian Republic, on the 23rd April, 1956. See in this connection the address of R. R. Divakar delivered on that occasion, now published in Vaiśālī ki Mahimā (Patna, 1960), pp. 100-101, esp. 101 (Hindi version on p. 146); also see pp. 118-119 (address of Badri Nath Varma on the same occasion).
². Sutta-Nipātā, verse 1012.
near Lichchhuvad) and the necessity of crossing the Ganges after coming from Śvetavikā side in order to reach Rājagriha (one has not to cross the Ganges while travelling from Lichchhuvad to Rājagriha as both are on the southern side of this river).¹

Here are some points showing very close association of Mahāvīra and Jainism with Vaiśālī-Kuṇḍapura of the Videha country:—

1. Mahāvīra was born at Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma which was situated in Videha² or in the River-Country³ (i.e., Tirabhukti).

2. He was called Videha, Videhadatta (given by Videha), Videhajātya (born in Videha) and Videhasukumāra (a good son of Videha)⁴.

3. He passed thirty years of his early life in Videha before the renunciation of the world.⁵

4. His mother, Trisalā Kshatriyāṇi, was the sister of Chetaka, the Lichchhavi chief of Vaiśālī, and is called Videhadattā⁶ which means that Vaiśālī lay in Videha⁷ in the opinion of the Jaina writers.

5. He was called Vesālie⁸ (i.e., a citizen of Vaiśālī: Vaiśālīya or Vaiśālikā) because of the close proximity of of Vaiśālī and Kuṇḍapura.⁹

6. He passed twelve rainy seasons of his ascetic life at

---

¹ Lack of space prevents us from going into details of these arguments for which see Kalyanavijaya Ji Gani, Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra (in Hindi), introduction.
² Extracts from Jaina scriptures are furnished later.
³ The term is explained later.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Kalpa-Sūtra, sūtra 110. Ācharāṅga-Sūtra, II. 15. 15. 17.
⁸ Sūtrakritiṣṭha, I. 2. 3. 22 (S. B. E., 45, p. 261). Uttarādhyanasūtra, VI. 17 (S. B. E., 45, p. 27).
⁹ The later commentators forgot the real meaning and interpreted it differently. In their opinion Viśālā was Mahāvīra's mother for which reason he was called Vaiśālīka (Sūtrakritiṣṭha with the commentary of Śāṅkakāchāryya, II. 3 quoted by Vijayendra Suri, Vaiśālī, 2nd ed., pp. 42-43 and Tīrthaśākara Mahāvīra, Vol. I, p. 83; also Abhayadeva's commentary on the Bhagavati-Sūtra, II. 1. 12. 2 quoted in Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, 3, p. 49 and Kshatriya Clans, p. 36). No harm, however, is caused if Viśālā here is interpreted in the geographical sense because Bhārata is usually said to be our mother.
Vaiśālī-Vañijyagrama.1 [No rainy season was spent at Lichchhuvad.]

7. He was a Nāya, a Nāyaputta and the moon of the Nāya family (Nāya-kulachanda).2

8. Buddhist literature also calls Mahāvira as Nātaputta and Nātaputta, i.e., a son of the Jāatīs or Jāatis or Jātātas.

9. The Jāatīs (pl. Jāatayāḥ) are specifically mentioned by the Buddhists in the Mahāvastu3 as administrators of extended territories, living among the Lichchhavis and comparable with the gods.

10. The village Nādika or Nātika near Vaiśālī seems to have been a village of the Jāatīs as explained by Buddha-ghosha.4

11. The Nirgranthas were an important element in the population of Vaiśālī as is illustrated by the story of Siha Senāpatī.5

12. After the death of Mahāvira the nine Mallas, the nine Lichchhavis and the eighteen gaṇarājas of Kāśi-Kosala instituted a festival of lamps to mark the occasion.6 It is significant that the Magadhīs and the Aṅgas are conspicuous here by their non-participation in this festival.

13. On a Vaiśālī seal belonging to the Gupta period the legend reads—'Vesālināmakunkuṇḍe Kumārāmahāyāthikaraṇa (syā)'.7 This Kunda is clearly related to Kshatriyakunḍa, because no other Kunda in the area is otherwise known.

14. Hiuen Tsiang, who visited Vaiśālī in the seventh century A.D., found the followers of the Nirgranthas to be “very numerous” at that place8.

15. “The village of Baniyā (with the adjacent Chak Rāmdās) is almost certainly the representative of Vañijyagama.

7. See the photograph of the seal in Homage, facing p. 81; also in A. S. I. A. R. for 1913-14, plate xivii (with an account on p. 134, seal no. 200).
The lands of the village contain “extensive mounds”, and some
ten years ago two statues of Jain Tirthaṅkaras, one seated, the
other standing, were discovered about eight feet below the
surface and 500 yards west of the village. Vāniyagāma was
the residence of Mahāvīra, the great prophet of the Jains
and this discovery of the Jain images strongly confirms the
identification suggested by the name”.

16. Kuṇḍagrāma is indicated as a Jaina tīrtha by
Jinaprabha Sūri in his book Tīrthakalpa which was completed
in A. D. 1332. An image of Vīra had been installed there.
This book also mentions Khatia-Kuṇḍaggāma-nayara (p. 108)
and Vesālī-Vāniaggāma (p. 110).

We now proceed to give extracts from the ancient Jaina
literature to show that Mahāvīra was born at Kuṇḍapura
near Vaiśālī in the Videha country.

Taking up Śvetāmbara scriptures first, we would like to
point out that we have already examined the evidence of the
Āchārāṅga-Sūtra (II. 15. 15, 17), the Sūtrakṛtāṅga (1. 2. 3.
22), the Kalpa-Sūtra (sūtras 110, 122, 128), the Uttarādhyāyana-
Sūtra (VI. 17) and the Bhagavati-Sūtra-Tīkā (II. 1. 12. 2) on
the question of the very close association of Mahāvīra and
Jainism with Vaiśālī-Kuṇḍapura of the Videha country.
Vijayendra Suri has shown that Kuṇḍapura, the birthplace
of Mahāvīra, has been mentioned in the following Śvetāmbara
works, viz., Āvaśyaka-Niryukti, Kalpa-Sūtra, Āvaśyaka-Sūtra
(Hāribhadra Ṭīkā), Mahāvīra-Chariyam of Nemichandra,
Mahāvīra-Chariyam of Guṇachandra Gaṇi, Paūma-Chariyam of
Vimala Sūri, Varaṇga-Chariyam of Jaṭāsima Nandi, and
Āvaśyaka-Chūrṇī (first and second halves). Of these, he has given
extracts from two works which we, too, quote below:

The Āvaśyaka-Niryukti (page 83, śloka 304) says:

kept in the newly constructed Jaina temple at Basarh seems to be one of
the two statues referred to by Smith. We do not know then what became
of the second one.
2. Ed. D. R. Bhandarkar and Kedarnath, Bibliotheca Indica,
Calcutta, 1943, pp. 8, 286.
3. Ibid., pp. 286-287.
81-82.
5. Vaiśālī, 2nd ed., pp. 41 and 36 respectively. Tīrthakara Mahāvīra,
Vol. I, pp. 82 and 77 respectively.
"अह वित्तुपकस्त तेनीपवरस्तकालम्मि।
हस्युतराहि जायो कूडगाेमे महावीरो ॥३०॥"

Nemichandra Sūri in his Mahāvīra-Chariyam (folio 26) says:—

"अति इह महर्षासे मञिघमदेससस मण्ड्यां परम।
सिरिकुडगामसयं बंगुयरस्यासीतिलदभवे ॥४७॥"

Let us now turn to Digambara scriptures.

Kuṇḍapura, the birthplace of Mahāvīra, is explicitly placed in the Videha country by certain Digambara Jaina texts which we quote below:—

1. Pūjyapāda of the 5th Vikrama century says in his Daśabhakti (p.116):—

"सिद्धार्थनूपरितनयो भारतवास्ये विदेशकुण्डपुरे।
देवं प्रियकारिण्यं सुस्वितान् संप्रदयनं विनु: ॥४॥"

2. Jinasena of the 8th Vikrama century says in Hari-vamśa-Purāṇa (I.2):—

"अव देवसौज्जलि विस्तारी जम्भुदीपस्य मार्थ।
विदेश हि विस्तार: स्वगङ्गमसम: विव: ॥१॥
तथाकुडगलनेष्टाहीनन्दिनीङ्गमण्ड्यः
सुहाम्बुः कुण्डमालाय नामना कुण्डपुरे पुरुषु ॥५॥"

3. Guṇabhadra of the 9th Vikrama century says in his Uttara-Purāṇa (74):—

"तद्धिनम् वषमासश्रवयुव्यानाकादानगमित्य।
भरोस्दिनम् विदेशः विषये भवनाज्जूजः ॥२५.१॥
राज: कुण्डपुरेरस्य वसुहारातत्थूः।
सप्तकोटीमन्नि: सादृः सिद्धप्यथ दिनं प्रति ॥२५.२॥"

—Page 460, Bharatiya Jnanapith ed.

The same writer says later in that book (75):—

"विदेशः विषये कुण्डसम्भवाय पुरि भूपति: ॥७॥
नायो नायकुलसूयः सिद्धार्थस्वर्जितिविधिमा:।
तस्य पुथारामवेत्त प्रियातो: प्रियकारिणी ॥८॥"

—Page 482, Bharatiya Jnanapith ed.

4. Dāmanandi says in his Purāṇa-Saṅgraha (MS.), folio 52a:—

"अवासिम ै महार्ते वचः विदेशसुः भुदियः।
आसीकुण्डपुरे नामना पुरुरुशरिपुम् ॥१॥"
5. Sakalakirti (who died in A.D. 1464) says in his *Vardhamana-Charitra* (VII):—

"अपेक्षा भारते लोम विदेशामिष सहस्करित:।
देशः सदरमसाैवः पिवेह इत्र राज्ये ॥ १ ॥

इत्याविद्यात्मनोपत्वदश्याममातरे पुरम्।
राज्ये कुण्डलाभिषयः..."..."..."..."...।

6. Asaga of A.D. 988 accepts in his *Vardhamana-Charitra* (XVII.61) that the birthplace of Mahāvīra is Kuṇḍapura but he does not indicate the territory:—

"उन्मिलितायकुशिता सहसा विदिता
युज्मयंभवितम्रत: प्रणोदमाश्च: ।

बष्टरामिनादसयस्तिनेतिसाधृष्टपञ्चमुच्छा
विषया युज्मयंधित कुण्डपुरे सुरेन्द्रा: ॥ ५ ॥

7. Jadi-Vasaha (Sk. Yati-Vrishabhha) of the sixth Vikrama century, author of *Tilaya-pamatti* (Sk. Triloka-prajñāpatri), says in that book (IV.549) that Vira was born at Kuṇḍala; but he, too, like Asaga of a later age, does not indicate the territory:—

"तिलचत्वारामिनादस्यिस्तिनेतिसाधृष्टपञ्चमुच्छा कुण्डले बीरो।
उत्सर्फमुग्निस्यल्लोकत्सितिमुखसेत्रेष्य: उपसो: ॥५४९॥"

Peculiarly enough, some Digambara books place Vaiśāli, whose chief was Cēṣṭaka, in Sindhu-vishaya or Sindhu-deśa:—

1. "सिंधवास्ये बिषये सुमुद्रशालिणगरेभवत।

चेतकाश्योंहतिविषयातो विनीत: परमाभॊंत: ॥ ३॥

—Uttarā-Purāṇa (75).

2. "सुभुक्ते सिन्धुदेशे वं भिषाला गनरी मता।

चेतपकाश्य: पतिस्तम्य सुभान्त महिमी मता॥

—Vimala-Purāṇa.

3. "भ्रम्नसन्नद्धाराते: सिन्धुदेशे ननहें।

विन्धुदेशाः सुभान्तसितोभाषालोकस्तुकक्रिया: (?) ॥ ॥

विषालश्चा पुरी: तत: बर्तनेश्वे शास्त्रमण्डिता।

—नन्दाश्चित्रान्तिन्द्रश्च देवनाभस्य पूरिष। ॥ ॥

1. Of these, No. 3 (second part) is quoted by Vijayendra Suri in his *Vaiśāli*, 2nd ed., p. 40 and *Trithektara Mahāśāstra*, Vol. I, p. 81 and No. 7 in B. P., Chandāśī-Abhisandana-Graetha, pp. 612, f. n. and 676, f. n.; the remaining six quotations are collected by K. Bhujballi Sastrī in *Jaina Siddhānta Bhaskara*, 10 (December, 1943), pp. 60-61, footnotes.
What may be the reasons of the Digambara Jaina scriptures saying that Vaisālī was in Sindhudeśa?

As evidently Vaisālī was not situated in Sindhudeśa, Kamta Prasad Jain suggests two reasons:—Firstly, it may be that the authors have equated Sindhudeśa with Vrijideśa; and secondly, there might have been a confusion especially because Ujjayinī in Avanti, too, was called Vīśālā and there was a Sindhudeśa in the adjoining territory for which reason it was called Sindhudeśa in the middle ages (8th to 15th centuries A. D.). The Digambara writers, K. P. Jain adds, lived more in the Ujjayinī side and hence they appear to have confused Ujjayinī (which was also called Vīśālā) for the real Vīśālā, little knowing that another Vīśālā, different from their own, existed in Eastern India; moreover, Vaisālī lay in ruins as we know from the account of Hiuen Tsiang, and this factor might have helped the Jaina writers in forgetting the real Vaisālī.

The vicissitudes of Vaisālī as a Jaina tīrtha and centre and the circumstances in which the Jainas came to forget the birthplace of their last Tīrthaṅkara constitute an important

1. These four quotations are collected by Kamta Prasad Jain in Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, 3 (September, 1936), p. 50, foot-note.
3. We suggest that Sindhudeśa literally means 'the Country of Rivers' and Tirabhukti, too, has a similar meaning, i.e., 'the Province situated on the Banks (of Rivers)'. We also know that from the Gupta period onwards Videha came to be known as Tirabhukti (cf. the legends on the seals which give this word, A. S. I. A. R., 1903-1904, p. 109). And in poetry synonyms are used without any hesitation. We are confirmed in our belief when we find that the Jaina Uttara-Purāṇa places the territory of Cheṭaka near Rājagṛha, the Magadhan capital—

"कथिचिन्तेको गल्ला ससैम्यो मागवथ पुरम्।
राजग्रहजगुः वालोवाने स्वातुपुरससरम्॥"

This means that these were neighbouring states.
topic of absorbing interest in Indian religious history and have not so far been investigated into in detail. From this point of view the known course of the Jaina history of Vaisāli (and for this reason, of North Bihar in general) may be divided into four parts as indicated below:—

I. Rise and Ascendancy: Circa 600 B. C. to C. A. D. 600 (twelve centuries).

North Bihar (including Vaisāli) occupied a prominent position in the earlier stage of the history of Jainism which made considerable progress in the life-time of Mahāvīra and in the reigns of Mahāpadma Nanda, Chandragupta Maurya and Samprati of Magadha. The late Śuṅga and the early Šaka-Kushāṇa periods (c. 150 B. C. to 100 A. D.) marked a phase of affluence and artistic activity on the site 1 of the Garh area of Basarh (Vaisāli), as its recent excavation indicates.2 Vaisāli was a prosperous provincial capital city in the Gupta period (fourth, fifth and early sixth centuries A.D.). This is proved by the marriage of Kumārādevī, a Lichchhavi princess, with Chandra-Gupta I, the first Gupta Emperor, the viruda ‘Lichchhavi-dauhitra’ employed by Samudra-Gupta, the product of this marriage, for himself, the numerous seals found at Vaisāli,3 the account of Fa-hien (A. D. 399-414), the Chinese traveller, its mention in an ancient Chinese source of A. D. 517,4 and the reports of excavations5 carried on here in 1903-04, 1913-14, February 1950 and since January 1958. It was a centre of trade, art, learning and corporate life.6 Followers

2. A. S. Altekar is of the view that ‘at about 100 A. D. there was a change in the bed of the Gandākha or one of its tributaries’ (J. B. R. S., Buddha Jayanti Special Issue, Vol. II, p. 506, f. n. 8). If it is so, this date assumes special significance.
4. Fan Fan Tā (chapters 43-55, 60-61), being a Chinese dictionary of Indian geographical names compiled in A.D. 517 from literature and accounts of travellers, ed. Raghu Vira (Lahore, 1943), mentions Vaissali and the adjoining region frequently. The references are too many to be indicated here.
of different religions lived here peacefully. Later it declined presumably due to the ravages of some invaders or natural calamity or calamities. "The Garh area was deserted after the Late Gupta Period, i.e., in C. 600 A.D."  

II. Gradual Decline: Circa A. D. 600 to C. A. D. 1400 (eight centuries).

When Hiuen Tsiang (A. D. 629-645), the Buddhist traveller from China, visited Vaiśālī in the seventh century A. D., he found that "the capital city of Vaiśālī (or, called Vaiśālī) is to a great extent in ruins." "There are several hundred saṅghārāmas, which are mostly dilapidated." About the position of Jainism in that town he says: "The followers of the Nirgranthas are very numerous." This is the last occasion when we have a definite proof of the existence of a good Jaina population at Vaiśālī. Proceeding to the subsequent period, there is evidence to show that images of Jaina Tirthaṅkaras were (made and) honoured here in what is usually called the Pāla period (C. 750-1200). Jaina writers like Jinasena (eighth Vikrama century) and Gunabhadra (ninth Vikrama century) know Kuśānapura to be in Videha.

But after this comes a period when the Jainas gradually forget their real tradition and the real birthplace of their prophet. Asaga of the eleventh Vikrama century mentions Kuśānapura, but does not say that it lay in Videha. Some Digambara Jaina works faintly remembered that Viśālā was

1. Ibid.
2. About Pāṭaliputra it is known that it perished probably towards the end of the sixth century A.D. due to "a terrific and unprecedented flood" of the Ganges and the Sone, "which has been described in a Jaina work called Tīṭṭhagālī Pāḷiṣṭhaya" (Motichandra, 'Some Jaina Traditions and Archaeology', Primi-Akhibandana-Grantha, Tikamgarh, 1946, pp. 230-240) [A. S. Altekar and Vijayakanta Mishra, Report on Kumrahar Excavations 1951-1935, Patna, 1959, p. 12]. Some such thing is possible in the case of Vaiśālī also.
3. Vaiśālī Excavations: 1950, p. 5. Strangely enough, Pāṭaliputra was deserted at the same time, i.e., towards the end of the sixth century A. D. "The excavations at Kumrahar...showed that the area was deserted from about 600 A. D. to 1500 A. D." (Altekar and Mishra, op. cit., p. 12). Also see p. 20: "In most of the sites of Kumrahar excavated by us, we did not get any signs of habitation from the 7th century A. D. to the 16th century."
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
THE BIRTHPLACE OF MAHĀVIRA

in Sindhu-vishaya or Sindhu-deśa. Thus to them Tirabhukti became Sindhu-vishaya. Madanakīrti, a Digambara Jaina of Ujjayini, describes twenty-six Jaina tirthas in his small poetical book called Śaṣānacchaluṣtriṃśikā, but Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma or Vaiśāli does not find a place there. Peculiarly enough, another person, of a foreign country and a different faith, visiting India almost exactly at the time when the above-noted author was writing his book, also does not mention the Nirgranthas (Jainas) of Vaiśāli. Dharmasvāmin (A. D. 1197-1264), a Tibetan monk pilgrim of Buddhist faith, who visited India in A. D. 1234-1236, passed through this place in the summer season of 1234 while proceeding to Magadha and in the same season in 1236 on his return journey from Vajrāsana (Bodh-Gaya) and Nālandā. When he “reached the city of Vaiśāli” in 1234, he was “told that the inhabitants were in a state of great commotion and panicstricken because of rumours (about the arrival) of Turushka troops.” He found a “stone image of the Ārya Tārā” and “a female lay-supporter was seen staying in the street.” But he does not say even a word whether there were Jainas or not. We are of the view that while some Buddhists were still there in the thirteenth century, there was probably no Jaina population worth the name left at Vaiśāli at the time. Still fewer Jainas might have remained there a century later when Jinarājamuni Sūrya recorded in his book Tīrthaṅkara (completed in A. D. 1332) that an image of Vira was at Kuṇḍagrāma.

1. See the article of Darbarilal Jain Kothiya on this book in Brahmacārīṇī Paṇḍitā Chandādī-Abhinandana-Graṅtha, Arrah, 1954, pp. 493-499. He places the writing of this book in A. D. 1228. I, however, feel that it could not have been written earlier than A. D. 1234, because it mentions the Muslim invasion and sack of Malwa, which event took place in that year (for an epigraphical corroboration of this event see Epigraphia Indica, 1957, pp. 145, 151, verse 45, lines 62-64); also, he was a junior contemporary of Paṇḍita Aśādīkara who wrote between A. D. 1228 and 1243.

2. See George N. Roerich (decipherer and translator), Chodar’s Biography of Dharmasvamin, a Tibetan monk pilgrim, with an introduction by A. S. Altekar (Patna, 1959). Chapter IV (“Stay at Vaiśāli”) deals with Vaiśāli (pp. 61-62). This city, which lay between the Ganges and Simraon or Simārakamapaṭṭana (called Pa-ta by the pilgrim), the capital of King Rāmasimhadeva (A. D. 1227-1285) of Tirhut, is not noticed at all in his return journey (Ch. XI, ‘Return to Tirhut’, p. 98).

3. Ibid., p. 61.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p. 62.
which place he mentions on two occasions in his book while giving lists of famous Jaina tirthas of the time. It is surprising that though this book contains fifty-nine chapters devoted to different tirthas, no independent chapter has been allotted by the Jaina author to the birthplace of his last Tīrthaṅkara.

What are, then, the possible reasons for this gradual decline of Vaiśālī as a Jaina tirtha and centre?

The destruction of the main city sometime in the sixth century A.D. and its desertion in C. 600 A.D. must have been a great death-blow to Vaiśālī. "Changes in the river-beds at Vaiśālī were frequent." This added fuel to the fire. Moreover, as Śrāvasti and Pāñcarāja also were in ruins, the trade-route from Śrāvasti to Pāñcarāja via Vaiśālī ceased to function actively. The commercial importance of the intermediate city passed away. This must have affected the mercantile Jaina community of North Bihar adversely. The decline in the economic prosperity (besides political reasons) must have been at least partly responsible for the migrations of Vaisalian people

1. Ibid., pp. 8, 286.
2. For these lists see ibid., pp. 8 (three śāoras), 282-287.
3. As testified to by Hiuen Tsiang.
4. As testified to by the archaeological excavation of the Garh area in February 1950.
5. A. S. Altekar, J. B. R. S..: Buddha Jayanti Special Issue, Vol. II, p. 506, f. n. 8. For example, we know from Trishastilalakāparuṣhascharitra (X. 4. 198-199) of Hemachandra Sūri (A.D. 1088-1172) that Vaiśālī Nagarī and Vānijākārama (=Vānijyārama) were situated on the Gaṅgakī (=Gaṅgā or Gaṅdakī) river in the time of Bhagavān (Mahāvīra) and probably in the time of that celebrated Jaina author himself who wrote to that effect; at present the river is a few miles away from these villages (called Basarh and Bania respectively). We do not know when exactly the changes occurred. It may incidentally be noted that the change in the course of the Sone river is dated in A.D. 1379 as mentioned by McGrindle in his India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian (see my Hindi translation, Megasthenes kā Bhārata-sthāpaṇa, Patna, 1951, p. 151, note).
6. Writing about Śrāvasti, the chief town of the kingdom of this name, Hiuen Tsiang says (Beal, Vol. II, pp. 1-2) — "The chief town is desert and ruined... Though mostly in ruins, still there are a few inhabitants... There are several hundreds of saṅghārāmas, mostly in ruin, with very few religious followers."
7. About Pāñcarāja (pura) Hiuen Tsiang says (Beal, Vol. II, p. 86) — "Now there only remain the old foundation walls (of the city). The saṅghārāmas, Deva temples, and stūpas which lie in ruins may be counted by hundreds. There are only two or three remaining (entire)."
to Nepal, 1 Burma, 2 and possibly Tibet and Ladak. 3

By far, the most important cause of the gradual decline of Vaisālī as a Jain tīrtha was a diversion of Jainism towards South and West India. “The centre of activities of its adherents” shifted “from the land of its birth, Bihar, to those of Karāṭaka, Andhra-desh, Tamilnad, Western India, Rajputana and Gujarāt, where it flourished under the patronage of the Cholās, Pāṇḍyās, Kalachuriś, Rāṣṭra-kūṭas and Solāṅkīś.” 4

The result was that the Jainas lost all contact with Vaisālī. They forgot their traditions about it. The Jain temple of Rajasthan and Gujurat and the patronage of this sect by the South and West Indian kings diverted their attention to that part of the country. The Jain munis and authors also concentrated their attention on that very side.

Simultaneously, there was growth of Buddhism in Eastern India (Bihar-Bengal region). This had been especially facilitated by the Buddhist universities of Nālandā, Vikramaśīlā, Udyanapura and Vajrāsana all of which were situated in South Bihar. Contrary to popular notions, North Bihar was not completely away from the main current of Buddhism. There were many Buddhist sites in North Bihar as well in the period 600-1200 A.D. They acted either as vihāras or as places of Buddhist worship where many images of the Buddhist religion have been discovered. More important of these sites, arranged district-wise, are as follows:—

Muzaffarpur—Kolhua in the Vaisālī area (a good image of the Buddha with an inscription of the Pāla period); Ponjha, a village two miles east of Goraul railway station (an image of the Buddha was found here three years ago—a new site,

1. The Lichchhavīs ruled in Nepal up to A.D. 879-880. For their history see D. R. Regmi, Ancient Nepal (Calcutta, 1950) and references given thereunder.

2. R. C. Majumdar, ‘Vaisālī and Greater India’, Homage, pp. 43-14, who says that Wethali (Vaisālī) in Arakan “was built in 789 A. D. by a king of the Gandra dynasty” (p. 43). Also E.I., 1957, pp. 103-109.

3. “The kings of Tibet and Ladak also trace their descent from the Lichchhavīs” (Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1924, p. 517).

not noticed so far).\(^1\)

Darbhanga—Chaugama, Paudaul, Jarahatiya, Andhra-
Tharhi.

Monghyr (north of the Ganges)—Naulagarh, Jayaman-
galagarh, Bihat, Samho. Of these, the first two\(^2\) are most
important, probably second only to Vaisālī (in North Bihar).

Saharsa—Mathahi, Mehis, Birpur, Srinagar.

Purnea—Gorodih.

Brahmanism also was not idle in North Bihar in this
period. There was great intellectual and philosophical activity
here. "An important cause for the development of the Nyāya
and Mīmāṁsā philosophies here might be that Mithilā was
under obligation to protect orthodox culture from the onslaught
of all heterodox schools of thought including Jainism and
Buddhism. This explains the rise of great Naiyāyikas and
Mīmāṁsākās between A. D. 700 and 1000\(^3\). The most
important names connected with the growth of Nyāya philos-
ophy in North Bihar are Udyotakara (A. D. 635), Vāchas-
pati Miśra (A. D. 841) of village Tharhi in Darbhanga district
and Udayana or Udayanāchārya (A. D. 984) of village
Kariyan in the same district; while those of Mīmāṁsā
philosophy are Kumārila Bhāṭṭa, Marṇāna Miśra, Prabhākara
and Murāri Miśra. Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya (13th century) of
village Mangrauni in the Darbhanga district founded the
Navya Nyāya school of Mithilā and was followed by a host
of other scholars. All of these defended Brahmansm vigorously
against heterodox and Buddhist criticism.

Possibly the Muslims at the time of the conquest of Bihar
and Bengal persecuted not only the Buddhists, but also the
Jainas if they might have been there.\(^4\) We have seen how in

1. See *The Indian Nation* of February 19, 1959, announcing the
unearthing of the Buddha's stone image.

2. The authorities of the Ganesh Dutt College, Begusarai, are
taking active interest in these sites and have published some bulletins also
relating to them.

3. *Bihar Through the Ages*, p. 336. For a brief and systematic
treatment of the development of Brahmanical philosophical schools in
North Bihar see pp. 336-339 (Nyāya and Mīmāṁsā Philosophies), 412-
415 (Nyāya Nyāya), 439-441 (Philosophical Literature in Sanskrit), 548
(work on philosophy in the Mughal period) of this book.

4. The Muslim persecution of the Jainas in Malwa has been referred to by two Jain authors, *viz.*, Madanakirti of the early thirteenth
century (*Śrīvatsakhaṇḍālakāvikīśā, stanza 34*) and Jinaprabha Sūri of the early
the time of Dharmasvāmin (A.D. 1234) the inhabitants of Vaiśālī "were in a state of great commotion and panic- 
stricken because of rumours (about the arrival) of Turushka 
troops." Not only that. "All the inhabitants had fled at 
dawn from fear of the Turushka soldiery." Later, "the 
soldiery left for Western India",2 to the relief of all. But 
it shows that the political condition was not conducive to a 
sense of security: At last, the Hindu state of Tirhut (North 
Bihar) was conquered by the Turki Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din 
Tughlaq of Delhi in A. D. 1324, which event must have 
invited Muslim preachers in a large number for propagation 
of Islam in North Bihar.

III. Complete Neglect: Circa A. D. 1400 to A. D. 
1948 (five and a half centuries).

The factors analysed above led to the complete neglect 
of Vaiśālī as a Jaina tīrtha.

Jainism and Buddhism were replaced in the Vaiśālī area 
by Islam. Sheikh Muhammad Qazīn3 (A. D. 1434-1495) 
of the Shuttari order preached Islam at Vaiśālī in the fifteenth 
century and his mausoleum was made on a high Buddhist 
stūpa in that village. This and the additional emphasis in the 
succeeding age on sea trade (from A. D. 1498 onwards) and 
the possible changes in the course of the Gaṇḍaka river 
making Vaiśālī distant from the river bank must have discou-
raged the Jainas from taking interest in Vaiśālī.

While Jainism was being completely cut off from North 
Bihar due to various circumstances in the thirteenth to fifteenth 
centuries, there seems to have occurred a new awakening in the 
Jaina world in South Bihar in this and the subsequent 
periods.4 The Rājgir-Pawapuri-Bihar Sharif area acted as 

fourteenth century (Tīrthakalpa, ch. 32, ‘Abhinandanadeva kalpa’). I owe 
this reference to an article in B. P. Chandābāi-Abhinandana-Grantha, pp. 497-
408.

2. Ibid., p. 62.
3. Maulvi Muhammad Hamid Kuraishi, List of Ancient Monuments 
Protected under Act VII of 1904 in the Province of Bihar and Orissa, Calcutta, 
4. This generalisation of ours is based on several inscriptions 
belonging mainly to the fifteenth and subsequent centuries found in Jaina 
shrines in South Bihar for which see Puran Chand Nahar’s volumes on 
Jaina Inscriptions (Jaina-Lekha-Saṅgraha). Strangely enough, not even one 
Jaina inscription is found north of the Ganges, which proves our thesis.
the centre of this activity. Rajgir (Rājagṛiha) had been a Jaina tirtha ever since the time of Mahāvīra. The Jaina associations of Pawapur or Pawapuri are traced to the beginning of the thirteenth century when an image of Śri Mahāvīra was installed there in A.D. 1203. Madanakīrti, writing in the second quarter of that century, mentions Pāvāpura (with its image of Śri Vira Jina) as one of the twenty-six Jaina tirthas of his time. Jina-prabhā Sūri of the next century (A.D. 1332) devotes two full chapters to Pāvāpuri in his book Tīrthakalpa, besides stray references in other parts thereof. Thus the position of Pawapuri as a Jaina tirtha, believed to be the place of Mahāvīra's nirvāṇa, had been well-established by the fourteenth century.

After the establishment of this nirvāṇa tirtha, the Jaina community, it appears, made frantic efforts to find out in the vicinity the birthplace of Lord Mahāvīra, the son of the Jātrika leader of Kshatriya-Kuḍapura or Kuḍalapura and the maternal son of a Līchchhavi chief. The Digambara Jainas found a village bearing the name Kundalpur near Nālandā. The Śvetāmbara Jainas found a village called Lachhwād or Lachhuār in South Monghyr. These came to be regarded as birthplaces by the respective sects concerned. Temples and dharmasālās were constructed and the Jaina public began to make pilgrimages to these spots. Thus the real birthplace was forgotten and other places came to be believed as birthplaces.

A suitable instance of the complete neglect of Mahāvīra's (real) birthplace is provided by a Śvetāmbara Sanskrit text called Tīrthamālā-chaityaavadana written by an anonymous Jaina writer probably in the seventeenth century A.D. The interest of this small poem, which consists of five stanzas only, lies in the list of ancient Jaina tirthas which it contains.

2. Tīrthakalpa, ch. 14 (p. 82), ch. 21 (pp. 107-159).
3. Ibid., pp. 8 (Apāpā), 41 (Pāvā), 282 (Pāpā), 287 (Apāpyān... Vītha).
5. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p. 63.
Their total number is seventy-six. Out of them some are mythological, while some others are hitherto unidentified. This long list does not include Vaisālī or Kuṇḍapura. Entire oblivion seems to have enveloped these genuine tirthas.


This complete neglect continued till the year 1948 when for the first time during the recent centuries the Jainas worshipped Mahāvīra at his birthplace, Vaisālī, on the 21st April (Chaitra 13) of that year, through the exertions of the Vaisālī Saṅgha, a cultural organisation founded on March 31, 1945. This has become a regular feature. Since its very inception the Saṅgha, though a non-sectarian institution, began a regular movement for the identification and revival of Mahāvīra’s birthplace and published literature in this connection. It was due to the efforts of this body that excavations were carried on at Vaisālī in February 1950 through money donated by Jaina philanthropists, and the Vaisālī Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsā came into existence and has been functioning since December 1, 1955, under the control and direction of the Government of Bihar. Vaisālī as a Jaina tīrtha and a cultural centre has been resurrected.

PROGRESS OF JAINISM IN THE VAJJÍ COUNTRY
IN THE LIFE-TIME OF MAHĀVĪRA

The fact that Vaisālī-Kuṇḍapura was the birthplace of Mahāvīra, the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara of Jainism, must have been a great factor for the spread of his cult in that area. It gave him local influence: he was a child of the soil and hence claimed its first attention. The Jāāṭrika clan, to which he belonged, seems to be wide-spread and not limited to

1. For the early history of this organisation see Homage to Vaisālī (ed. J. C. Mathur and Yogendra Mishra), Vaisālī, 1948, pp. 185-204; A Scheme for the Vaisālī Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Prakrit and Jainology, Vaisālī, 1952; and Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, Calendar 1955-1960, Muzaffarpur, 1961 (esp. pp. iv-xi dealing with ‘The Institute and the Vaisālī Saṅgha’ by J. C. Mathur).
3. The report has since been published.
Kuṇḍagramā (Kuṇḍapura). There were Jātis at Vāṇijyagramā. They appear to be inhabiting also a village called Nātika presumably after them. Mahāvīra's mother Trisalā was a sister of Cheṭaka, one of the Lichchhavi 'Rājās' of Vaiśāli. The Jainas cherished the memory of the maternal uncle and patron of their prophet, to whose influence we must attribute the fact that Vaiśāli used to be a stronghold of Jainism, while being looked upon by the Buddhists as a seminary of heresies and dissent. And Jainism was not a new religion for the people of the Vaiśāli area, because Mahāvīra's parents (and with them probably the whole clan of the Nāya Kshatriyas) are said to have been followers of the tenets of Pārśvanātha, the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara of Jainism. When Mahāvīra, who was taken to be the successor of Pārśvanātha, appeared, the members of his clan naturally became his devoted followers. Besides the magnetic personality of Mahāvīra, his preaching activity was also considerable. He did not allow his disciples to leave his school easily. That he explained Jaina doctrines at Vaiśāli is also attested to by Buddhist Tripitaka. In the Anguttara-Nikāya, III, 74, a learned prince of the Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli, Abhaya, gives an account of some Nigāṇṭha doctrines. The Jaina counterpart to these tenets can be collected from the Uttarādhyayana-Sūtra, XXIX, §§ 27, 37, 71 and XXXII, §§ 7, 34, 47, 60, 73, 86, 99. Another piece of information about Mahāvīra's preaching at Vaiśāli may be gathered from the Mahāvagga, VI. 31 (S. B. E., 17, pp. 106 ff) where we have the conversation between Siha, the general of the Lichchhavis, and Mahāvīra. The views propounded may be found in the Sūtrakritāṅga, 1. 12. 21 (S. B. E., 45, p. 319) and the Āchārāṅga-Sūtra, I. 1. 1. 4 (S. B. E., 22, p. 2). Mahāvīra spent no less than twelve

2. Buddhaghosha's statements, on which this hypothesis of ours is based, are quoted in D. P. P. N., I, p. 977.
3. Jacobi, S. B. E., 22, p. xiii. The Buddhists took no notice of Cheṭaka because his influence was used in the interest of their rivals (ibid.).
6. Illustrated by the story of Siha.
rainy seasons in Vaiśāli-Vānijyagrāma.1 This is significant because he got a good opportunity of preaching at one particular place his teachings among the people.2 The result was that many groups of people, e.g., Brāhmaṇas, Kshatriyas, Ugras and Lichchhavis3 and also the Nāyas of Vānijyagrāma4 entered the Jaina order. To the latter category belonged Ānanda5, a staunch follower of Mahāvīra. An important Nirgrantha of Vaiśāli was Sachchaka, who had two interviews with the Buddha as recorded in the Chūla-Sachchaka6 and Mahā-Sachchaka7 Suttas. He is addressed as Aggivessana, that being his gotra name. His parents were Nirgranthas, skilled debaters, who married at the suggestion of the Lichchhavis, because they were unable to defeat each other in argument8. Another influential Jaina at Vaiśāli was Siha who, according to Buddhist sources, later accepted Buddhism. It is stated that the chief patrons of Jainism in the time of the Buddha were Sihasenāpati in Vaiśāli, Upāligahapati in Nālandā and Vappa the Sakyān in Kapilavatthu.9 The chief centres of the Nirgranthas (Jainas) in the time of the Buddha seem to have been Vaiśāli and Nālandā, though they had settlements in other important towns, such as Rājagrīha.10

The respect in which Mahāvīra was held by the Lichchhavis is indicated by the fact that after the death of Mahāvīra11 at Pāvā the nine Mallakis (Mallas), the nine Lichchhakis (Lichchhavis) and the eighteen Gaṇarājas of

1. Kalpasūtra, sūtra 122. He spent 11th, 14th, 20th, 31st, 32nd and 35th rainy seasons of his 42 year ascetic life at Vaiśāli and 15th, 17th, 21st, 23rd, 28th, and 30th rainy seasons at Vānijyagrāma (see Śrāvaka Bhagavān Mahāvīra by Muni Ratnaprabha Vijaya, Vol. II, Parts I and II).
2. The Buddha spent only two rainy seasons at Vaiśāli (5th at Kūṭāgāraśāla and 45th at Beluvagāmakā).
5. The story of Ānanda and his wife Śivanandā is related in the Udāsagadāsa, II, pp. 7-9.
10. D. P. P. N., II, p. 64.
11. See an article on the tīthi of Mahāvīra’s death (which fell in the month of Kārtika) with original quotations by K. Bhujbali Sastrī in Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, 3, pp. 134-139.
Kāśi-Kosala instituted an illumination; for they said: ‘Since the light of intelligence is gone, let us make an illumination of material matter!’ One remarkable fact about this is that the Magadhās or the Aṅgas do not participate in the illumination festival; moreover, all the participants are republicans (whether they be of North Bihar or of Eastern U. P.).

2. The non-participation of Ajātaśatru (king of Magadha and Aṅga) shows that the place of the Lord’s death was not near Rājagṛiha, but in the Malla country, north of the Ganges, where the Mallas, the Lichchhavis and the Kāśi-Kosala Gaṇarājas assembled to pay their last respects to the Lord (see *Vaiśālī*, 2nd ed., pp. 87-88).
3. This is not the case with the participants in the distribution of the relics of the Buddha, because there we find Magadhan monarchs also claiming a share for themselves.
CHAPTER XVII

AJIVIKISM AND BRAHMANISM IN THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

We have so far reviewed the progress of Buddhism and Jainism in the Vaiśāli region. Now we propose to review other religious systems.

In order to complete the Śramaṇa religions¹ we may first take up Ajivikism here.

AJIVIKISM AND NAKED ASCETICISM

Vaiśāli seems to have played an important part in the evolution of the Ājivika religion and it was one of the principal seats of the naked ascetics who may be interpreted as free-lance Ājivikas or proto-Ājivikas,² if we do not accept them as the followers of Makkhalī Gosāla or members of the organised Ājivika sect.

The immediate predecessor of Gosāla, Ajjuṇa Goyamaputta, who is distinguished from his own predecessors by a gotra name or patronymic, is regarded by A. L. Basham³ as a real person, the period of whose life overlapped with that of Gosāla, and whose name was well-known to his contemporaries. According to the Bhagavati-Sūtra⁴ a particular soul passed from the body of a teacher (who is named) to the body of Ajjuṇa Goyamaputta at the Koṇḍiyāyana Chaitya outside Vesāli and remained incarnate in his body for seventeen years after which period it passed to the body of Gosāla Mankhaliputta (the founder of the historical Ājivika religion) where it remained for sixteen years. A. L. Basham feels tempted to identify this immediate predecessor of Gosāla with a Śākya teacher Arjuna of Kapila-

¹ The term 'Śramaṇa' religions (as distinguished from 'Brāhmaṇa' religion) connotes Buddhism, Jainism and Ājivikism.
² For these convenient terms see A. L. Basham, History and Doctrines of the Ājivikas (London, 1951), pp. 103, 107.
³ Ibid., pp. 32-33.
⁴ Bh. Sū. XV, 550, fol. 674.
vastu, mentioned in the *Lalitavistara* as the preceptor of the future Buddha. As a Śākya this teacher would belong to the Gautama gotra and his generation, according to the Buddhist tradition, was that immediately preceding the Buddha’s and therefore also that of Makkhali Gosāla. Thus probably the Śākya teacher became in his later life a wandering ascetic, teaching in the neighbourhood of Vesāli, where he came in contact with the young Gosāla, and strongly influenced his views. It has been suggested that even before Gosāla’s ministry the regions of Kāśi, Kosala, Magadha, Videha (including Vaiśāli) and Champā were the homes of peripatetic naked philosophers of the Ājīvika type who aimed at gaining the support of the populace, and very often obtained it.

That the Ājīvikas were at Vaiśāli is proved by a *Vinaya* story as well. While at Vaiśāli the Buddha’s followers found themselves with more food than they required and gave their surplus to those ascetics who accepted leavings. An Ājīvika who had been thus fed by the Bhikkhus was later overheard by one of them telling a fellow Ājīvika of the food which he had obtained from the “shaven-headed house-holder” (*munda-gahapatika*), Gotama. The Bhikkhus reported the matter to their Master, who forbade the distribution of surplus food to mendicants of other orders in future. This story may be the traditional explanation of a hardening and worsening of relations between the two sects, which perhaps took place in the Buddha’s life-time. Its implication is that the breach arose from the discourteous conduct of the Ājīvikas.

The *Pāṭika-Sutta* of the *Dīgha-Nikāya* mentions two naked ascetics who were residing at Vaiśāli, viz., Kandaramasuka and Pāṭikaputta. Kandara-masuka maintained seven life-long vows of which only the first was taken by the organised Ājīvika community. This is: “As long as I live I will be

2. D. P. P. N., s. v. Gotama.
3. *The Ājīvikas*, p. 34. Also see p. 44.
naked, and will not put on a garment" (Ṭavaj-jīvan uchelako... 
......). The formula Ṭavaj-jīvan, which precedes each of the 
seven vows, is regarded significant by Basham\(^1\) in whose opini-
on it suggests the possibility that the word Ājīvika may be 
derived from some such phrase as ā jīvat, "as long as life". 
This view was originally put forward by Kern and is now 
strongly supported by Basham.

Pūraṇa Kassapa, one of the six well-known teachers, con-
temnorous with the Buddha, had some influence over the 
Vaiśāli people because he was consulted by the Lichchhavis 
Abhaya\(^2\) and Mahāli\(^3\) and by the wanderer Vachchhagotta.\(^4\)

**BRAHMANNISM**

We do not possess much material on this subject. What-
soever material is available in Buddhist literature, depicts 
Brahmanism in general and not of any particular region like 
Vaiśāli. Generally speaking, we do not consider it proper to 
utilise here such material as it has no individuality and may be 
used for other regions with equal justification.

From what has been said already it is clear that in the 
Vajji country Buddhism and Jainism could make much head-
way. This, however, should not be construed to mean that 
there were no Brāhmaṇas at Vaiśāli at all. The truth is far 
from it. The northern part of the Vaiśāli city was called in 
Jaina literature Uttarā-Kshatriya-Kuṇḍapura while the southern 
was Dakshiṇa-Brāhmaṇa-Kuṇḍapura. This southern portion 
was either Vaiśāli proper or was situated between Kshatriya-
Kuṇḍapura and Vaiśāli proper. In Buddhist literature we 
come across many Brāhmaṇa disciples of the Buddha who be-
longed to Vaiśāli and it may not be out of place to mention 
here some known cases.

Kāraṇapāli was a Brāhmaṇa employed as superintendent 
of works by the Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli. One morning he saw 
Pīṅgiyāṇi evidently returning from somewhere and on enquiry 
learnt that he had been to see the Buddha. Having heard

2. S., V, p. 126.
3. S., III, p. 68.
praises of the Buddha from Piṅgiyāṇī, Kāraṇapāli knelt on the ground and expressed his homage to the Buddha.

Piṅgiyāṇī, mentioned above, was another Brāhmaṇa of Vaiśālī. On another occasion, he is present when 500 Līchchhavis come to pay honour to the Buddha at the Kūṭāgāra-śālā. The sight of the Buddha, sitting in their midst, outshining them all, inspires Piṅgiyāṇī and he bursts into song. The Līchchhavis give him 500 upper garments, all of which he presents to the Buddha.

Valliya Thera belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family of Vaiśālī. Much struck by the Buddha when he came to Vaiśālī, he joined the Order under Mahā-Kachchhāyana.

Dāsaka Thera was a learned Brāhmaṇa of Vaiśālī who entered the Buddhist Order for the purpose of studying the Doctrine.

Pañcha-sīlasamādāniya Thera belonged to a family of Mahāśāla Brāhmaṇas in Vaiśālī and became an Arahat at the age of five.

Rohini Therī was the daughter of a prosperous Brāhmaṇa of Vaiśālī. When the Buddha visited Vaiśālī, she heard him preach and entered the Buddhist Order.

The Kshatriya population was obviously more important than the Brāhmaṇa one in the body politic, because we hear that the Līchchhavis, the most important element in the Vajjījan Republic, were Kshatriyas. Other clans inhabiting the Vaiśālī region were also of the same stock.

Determined efforts were made by the Buddha and Mahāvīra to gain adherents from amongst the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas, the evidence for which has been supplied before.

No clear picture of the religious beliefs and practices of the four Brahmanical castes of the Vaiśālī region is available. We get names of Brahmanical (Vedic) gods in some Suttas

5. Apadāna, I, 76 ff.
7. Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta. Also see supra.
of the Dīgha-Nikāya, but as nothing is stated about the Vaiśāli region, we cannot say which of the deities were honoured in this particular area. On the basis of the physical characteristics of the country we may be fairly sure of two religious features of the Vaiśāli region, viz., sacred character of rivers like the Ganges and the Gaṇḍaka and worship of a particular type of stone, called śāligrāma, which is found in abundance in the upper part of the Gaṇḍaka river, also called Śālagraṃi and Nārāyaṇi for this reason. As is well-known, "the śāligrāma, a fossil ammonite taken as a symbol of Viṣṇu to be deposited among brahmin Lares and Penates, is generally understood to be from the Gaṇḍak river, for proper sanctity." Damodar Dharmanand Kosambi is of the view that "the custom may be as old as the ŚB passage" (Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, I. 4. 1. 14-17) which describes the Aryan method of land-clearing and settlement to the east of the Sadānirā ("always with water"), identified with the Gaṇḍaka. As the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, which is pre-Buddhistic, was completed "by 600 B.C., not counting occasional later interpolations" in it, we are led to think that the worship of the śāligrāma stone as a symbol of Viṣṇu was in existence in the Vaiśāli region in the great days of the Vajjian Republic and might have been an important contribution of the republican period to the Brahmanical religion of this part of the country.

Let us now turn to the monastic life.

In an important passage of the Aṅguttara-Nikāya we have the following list of religious sects, which were contemporaneous with the Buddha:—Ājīvikas, Nigaṇṭhas, Muṇḍasāvakas, Jaṭilakas, Paribbājakas, Maṇḍikas, Tedaṇḍikas, Aviruddhakas, Gotamakas and Devadhamnikas. Of these

2. Lares and Penates—Sanctities of home, household gods.
3. Damodar Dharmanand Kosambi, An Introduction to the study of Indian History, Bombay, 1956, p. 133, n. 5.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p. xvii.
the first two are already known and the third are stated by Buddhaghosha to be the same as the second. Perhaps some special subdivision of the Jainas is intended. The remaining seven appear to be Brahmanical sects. We are supported in our belief by Buddhaghosha in whose opinion Nos. 6-10 are followers of the Titthiyā, that is, the leaders of all schools that were non-Buddhist. And it is much to be regretted that the tradition had not preserved any better explanation of the terms than the vague phrases repeated by Buddhaghosha.

Coming to the Vaiśāḷī region, we find that of these Brahmanical ascetic systems the Parivrājakas had definitely a centre at Vaiśāḷī, their other centres being Śrāvasti, Rāja-griha and Champā. These ascetics and recluses (not otherwise classified) were teachers or sophists who spent their time wandering from place to place for the purpose of engaging in friendly, conversational discussions on matters of ethics and philosophy, nature-lore and mysticism. In most cases they are represented as having large followings, so that they were evidently regarded as distinguished teachers. We know on the authority of the Mahāvasuṭa that the Parivrājakas studied the Vedas also. The Pali Buddhist literature speaks of two classes of Parivrājakas, viz., Brāhmaṇa Parivrājakas and Aṅgaṭīthiya Parivrājakas (i.e., non-Brāhmaṇa or heretical Parivrājakas).

The Pali books mention halls erected for the accommodation of the Parivrājakas. At Vaiśāḷī there appear to be at least three specific halls or centres for this purpose:

1. Ekapanḍarika—This paribbajakārāma was the residence of Vachchhagota. It was near the Kūṭāgāraśālā in the Mahāvana of Vaiśāḷī. The Buddha went there to see

---

1. Dialogues, I, p. 221.
2. Ibid.
3. See two useful articles of B.C.Law in J. A. S. B. for 1918 and 1925 entitled ‘Wandering Teachers in Buddha’s Time’ and ‘Gautama Buddha and the Parivrājakas’ respectively.
8. So far we have made general statements concerning the Parivrājakas. Now we turn to the Vaiśāḷī region.
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Vachchhagotta and it was on this occasion that the *Tevijja-Vachchhagotta-Sutta* was preached. This Parivrājaka Vachchhagotta was a native of Rājagriha, but seems to have travelled widely, for we find him visiting the Buddha at Vaisāli, at Śrāvasti, and at Ānāthapindīka, in addition to his visits to Rājagriha. Buddhaghosha says that the place Ekapunḍarika was so called because in it grew a solitary white mango tree (*setambarukka*).

2. Pāṭikārāma—Here Pāṭika’s son used to live. It was a centre for intellectual discussions.

3. Tindukkhānu Paribbājakārāma—This dwelling of the Parivrājakas was the residence of Pāṭikaputta and others. Jāliya, another recluse, also visited it when he wanted to arrange a discussion between the Buddha and Pāṭikaputta at Vaisāli.

These appear to be only the most important centres and the existence of other Parivrājaka centres cannot be precluded.

These Parivrājakas visited several places in the Vajjī country and the *Samyutta-Nikāya* records a discussion which took place at Ānāthapindīka between the Parivrājakas Sabhiya Kachchhāna and Vachchhagotta on various questions, such as the existence of the Buddha after death, etc. Another Parivrājaka Sāmanḍaka visited Sāriputta at Ukkāchālā and questioned him on the nibbāna. The introductory portion of a *Jālaka* relates the story of four Lichchhāvi sisters, viz., Sachchhā, Lolā, Avavādakā and Paṭāchhārā, who adopted the Parivrājaka life and were defeated by Sāriputta at Śrāvasti.

8. *Ibid.* Jāliya was a Paribbājaka to whom the Buddha preached the *Jāliya-Sutta* (D., I, pp. 159-160).
The Jāṭilas also, though not so frequently, are met with in the Vajji country. Kappitaka Thera, who lived in Kapinachchanā near Vaiśāḷī,¹ was at one time a Jāṭila, with a large following of Jāṭilas.²

We do not know about the Gotamakas. But from the fact that there was a Gotamaka Chaitya at Vaiśāḷī, we may presume the existence of this sect at Vaiśāḷī. This is, however, merely a hypothesis.

From the Lalitavistara³ account of the Buddha’s travels after his renunciation of the world, we learn that he was entertained at the hermitage of the Brāhmaṇa woman Śākī, then at that of the Brāhmaṇa woman Padmā, and then by the Brāhmaṇa sage Raivata and by Rājaka, son of Trimanḍika, until he reached Vaiśāḷī and joined Āḷāra. This may indicate that there were many hermits in the Vajji country, especially in the Champakāraṇya area.

MISCELLANEOUS CULTS

The most important non-Aryan element in the religious life of republican Vaiśāḷī was the cult of Yakshas. The cult of Yakkhas (or Yakshas) seems to have arisen primarily from the woods and secondarily from the legends of seafaring merchants. The worship of trees and the spirits inhabiting them is one of the most primitive forms of religion.⁴ The Chaityas of Vaiśāḷī are regarded as places of Yaksha-worship.⁵

The Nāgas of Vesāḷī⁶ are mentioned in one context. We cannot say whether they were an ethnological group or worshippers of snakes (nāgas).

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

Some special features of Vajjian religious life are contained in the famous utterance of the Buddha giving the seven conditions for the welfare of the Vajjian republican state:—

5. By the famous commentator, Buddhaghosha (Dīlā., II, p. 80, notes 2 and 3).
"...—so long as they (i.e., the Vajjians) honour and esteem and revere and support the Vajjian shrines in town or country, and allow not the proper offerings and rites, as formerly given and performed, to fall into desuetude—so long as the rightful protection, defence, and support shall be fully provided for the Arahants among them, so that Arahants from a distance may enter the realm, and the Arahants therein may live at ease—so long may the Vajjians be expected not to decline, but to prosper."

These lines breathe complete religious toleration.

1. Chetiya, which the Sumangalavilasini explains as Yakka-chetiya.
CHAPTER XVIII

SOCIETY UNDER THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

SOCIAL CONDITION

As in the preceding age, the society during the period of the Vajjian Republic was divided into four principal classes which had further sub-divisions. These divisions appear to have been well-marked because many cities were named after castes or professions, e.g., Uttarā-Kṣhatriya-Kuṇḍāpura (after Kṣhatriyas), Dakṣiṇa-Brahmaṇa-Kuṇḍāpura (after Brāhmaṇas), Nāṭika (after Jīātis or Jīātrikas), Bhoganagara (after the Bhogas) and Vāpijyāgrāma (‘the village of commerce’). A passage in the Śaṭrakṛitiṅga names the following classes in this order—Ugras, Bhogas, Aikšvākas, Jīātris, Kauravas, warriors, Brāhmaṇas, Lichchhavis, commanders and generals. Other passages of the Jaina scriptures add (1) princes, artists and (2) Kṣhatriyas. These passages may be presumed to refer to the various classes of the Vajjian territory because of the mention of the Ugras, the Bhogas and the Lichchhavis. Artisans such as tailors, gold-smiths and jewellers must have been very much in requisition at the city of Vaiśāli to furnish the gay robes of 7707 rājās or nobles. Barbers are also referred to. There was a good Vaiśya population there. There was a Nāga population also at Vaiśāli.

High social differences and class distinctions were maintained which is proved not only by the three clear-cut divisions

1. S. B. E., 45, p. 399.
2. Ibid., p. 71.
3. Ibid., p. 321.
5. Law, Kṣhatriya Class, p. 70.
6. Jātaka No. 152 (Sīkāla-Jātaka) in Vol. II.
7. We know how Nābhāga’s descendants were de-Kṣhatriyized and became Vaiśyas.
of the Vaiśālī City but also by a Jātaka story\(^1\) which we may summarise here. A barber's son seeing a Lichchhavi girl dressed up fine and grand, like a nymph, fell in love for desire of her. He said to his father about this. He would not touch a morsel of food, but lay down hugging the bedstead. His father found him and said, "Why, son, don't set your mind on forbidden fruit. You are a nobody—a barber's son; this Lichchhavi girl is a highborn lady. You are no match for her. I will find you somebody else, a girl of your own place and station." But the lad would not listen to him or anybody else. At last he died. When this was reported to the Buddha, he narrated a story in which a jackal falling in love with a lioness told her of his love and lost life due to her eldest brother.

About the marriage rites of the Lichchhavis, it is said in the Tibetan books that there were rules restricting the marriage of all girls born in Vaiśālī, to that city alone. They state: \"The people of Vaiśālī had made a law that a daughter born in the first district could marry only in the first district, not in the second or third; that the one born in the middle districts could marry only in the first and second; but that one born in the last district could marry in any one of the three; moreover, that no marriage was to be contracted outside Vaiśālī.\"\(^2\)

A passage in the Bhikkhuni Vibhaṅga Saṅghādīdesa\(^3\) indicates that a Lichchhavi who wanted to marry could ask the corporation or the Lichchhavigaṇa to select a suitable bride for him. Violation of chastity was considered a serious offence among the Lichchhavis and the assembly would even give its consent to a husband's request that his unfaithful wife should be murdered.\(^4\) The Buddha himself was a great admirer of the female chastity of the Vajjians.\(^5\)

A strange custom is mentioned in a Buddhist text\(^6\) which says that the Vaiśālikas made a rule to the effect that daughters

1. Jātaka No. 152.
2. Rockhill, p. 62.
4. Ibid.
5. S. B. E., II, pp. 3-4 (Dialogues, II, p. 80).
of individuals should be enjoyed by gañas and should not therefore be married. This is unbelievable and the great beauty of prostitutes in this republican town might have led people to think like that. The fact that Vaisālī had this institution is attested to by the Mahāvagga as well where Ambapālī is mentioned as an instance. This institution was copied from Vaisālī and introduced at Rājagrha, the Magadhan capital.

The strength of the Lichchhavis lay in their great unity. If one Lichchhavi fell ill, all the others would visit him. The whole tribe would join in any ceremony performed in the house of a Lichchhavī, and they would all unite in honouring any distinguished visitors to their city.

They were fond of festivals and such activities. It is stated in the Dulas that there were continuous festivities among the Lichchhavis. Of them Chhaṇa and Sabbarattivāro were the most important. At the Sabbarattivāro or Sabbarattichāro festival, songs were sung, trumpets, drums, and other musical instruments were used, flags were flown, kings, princes and commanders-in-chief took part in the festival and spent the whole night in merry-making.

The Lichchhavis used to kill animals on the 8th, 14th and 15th days of the lunar months and eat their flesh.

The Lichchhavis were very handsome in appearance and very fond of brilliant colours in their dress and equipages. They were compared by the Buddha with the Tāvatimsa gods. They wore brilliantly coloured garments and rode in brightly painted carriages.

1. S. B. E., 17, p. 171.
2. Ibid., pp. 171-172.
5. S., I, p. 201.
7. Dipavādānā, p. 136. This was done as enjoined in the Dharmashastras.
8. Watters, II, p. 79.
The young men among the Lichchhavis were evidently fond of archery, for mention is made of large numbers of them roving about in the Mahāvana, with bows and arrows, the strings set, and surrounded by hounds. They were a martial people and fond of sport. Once at the Kūṭāgāraśīlā in Vaiśālī Ānanda saw Lichchhavi youths practising archery, shooting through even a small keyhole without a miss. The young Vajjians appear to have been in the habit of training elephants. The existence of forests like Mahāvana, Gosinīgasālavana and Avarapura-Vanasaṇḍa must have contributed much to such activities. Though prosperous and rich, the Lichchhavis do not appear to have lived in luxury and idleness. They are, on the contrary, spoken of as sleeping on straw couches, being strenuous and diligent and zealous in their service.

Theft was almost unknown among the Lichchhavis as a passage in the Vinaya-Piṭaka indicates.

The Lichchhavis disposed of their dead bodies either by cremation or by burial or by exposure. V. A. Smith thinks that this practice of exposure was borrowed from Tibet where it is prevalent. But this view has been successfully refuted.

EDUCATION

The Lichchhavi youths went to distant countries for education. We read of a Lichchhavi named Mahāli who went to Takshaśilā to learn śilpa or arts and returned home after completing his education. It is said that he in his turn trained as many as five hundred Lichchhavis who also, when educated, took up the same task and in this way education spread far and wide among the Lichchhavis.

1. A., III, pp. 75-76.
6. As skilful hardy archers, says the Commentary.
ECONOMIC CONDITION

If the traditional descriptions of Vaiśāli have any value, they seem to indicate that this city was opulent, prosperous and populous. It was well provided with food, the harvest was good, alms were easy to obtain, and one could very well earn one’s living by gleaning or through favour.  

We do not possess many facts of economic significance. But one remarkable custom was that the Lichchhavis used to take over the heirless property in their dominions.

Another source of income to the State was the tax collected at the gates of Vaiśāli. The income of the western gate which was one lac had been given to Mahāli. The figure (one lac), however, seems traditional.

Agriculture as usual was the chief occupation. But trade and commerce also appear to have played a considerable part in this republican State. River traffic and road traffic were particularly useful from this point of view. Vaiśāli was connected with the Ganges by the Gaṇḍaka. Sahajāti was on the river (? Ganges) and the Vajjiputtakas went there from Vaiśāli by boat. Although this refers to the second Buddhist council (387 B.C.), we may presume that the route was ancient. As a matter of fact, the Ganges formed one of the most important means of communication and trade for the districts through which it flowed, e.g., from Rājagriha to Vaiśāli? The Ganges had to be crossed between Rājagriha and Śrāvasti by boat; some of the boats belonging to the king of Magadha and others to the Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli which lay on the road from Rāja-

1. See the Mahāsagg (VIII. 1. 1. 1) in the Vinaya-Piṭaka and the Lalitavistara (ch. 3, p. 21).
2. The Chinese pilgrims who came much later testify to the productive character of the land.
5. “It is a common phenomenon in the career of Indian republics that when the republicans lost their political power, they still retained their commercial intelligence and turned into traders” (Hinda Politi, p. 54).
7. There lay a road from Vaiśāli to Rājagriha (Vin., II, pp. 210-211).
griha to Śrāvasti. There was a road which connected Ukkatthā (a town in Kosala near the Himalayas) with Setavvyā and with Vaiśāli. From Vaiśāli lay a direct road to Kapilavastu whence a number of Śākyas came to receive ordination from the Master who at that time was staying at the Kūṭāgāra hall in the Mahāvana. The pupils of Bāvari, when they proceeded from Śrāvasti, passed through Setavvyā, Kapilavastu, Kusinārā, Pāvā, Bhogānagara and Vaiśāli, while going to Rāja-griha.

1. Vin., II, pp. 159 ff. The route from Rāja-griha to Śrāvasti is stated in a late Buddhist Sanskrit text to be infested with thieves who used to rob the merchants of their merchandise (Dīpavāsanā, pp. 94-95).
2. Ukkatthā was thickly populated and had much grassland, woodland and corn (D., I, p. 87; D. A., I, p. 245).
7. For the account see Sutta-Nipāta, P. T. S., verses 976-1148 (esp. 1011-1015).
CHAPTER XIX

THE FALL OF THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

The sovereign Vajjian Republic was destroyed as the result of a war which Ajātaśatru (495-463 B.C.), the king of Magadha, waged against it.

CAUSES OF WAR

There were many causes of war between the Vajjian Republic and Ajātaśatru, some being primary and others contributory.

Ajātaśatru’s mother was Vaidēhī, i.e., a princess from Videha or Vaśālī (Chellana according to the Jaina tradition). Chellana’s father was Cheṭaka, the leader of the Vajjian Republic for a long time. But it cannot be expected that the man, whose greed for power and position did override even the natural instinct of regard for his father’s life, would show any tender feeling towards his mother’s relations.¹ On the other hand, he must have felt from the very beginning that the Lichchhavis formed the greatest bar to the realisation of his idea of Magadhan expansion, and we find him taking the dreadful resolve, “I will strike at these Vajjians, mighty and powerful² though they be, I will root out these Vajjians, I will destroy these Vajjians, I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin!”³

The objective of Ajātaśatru, as also of his father Bimbisāra, was to gain control of as much of the Ganges river system as possible.⁴ The importance of the rivers, in an India where

¹. Law, Kshatriya Clause, p. 130.
². According to the Commentator the Vajjians were mighty because of their power of union and practice in military tactics (Dialogues, II, p. 78, n. 2).
³. Dialogues, II, p. 78 (the same also in S. B. E., ii, pp. 1-2) Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta (beginning).
⁴. A. L. Basham, ‘Ajātasattu’s War with the Lichchhavis’, Proceedings of the Indian History Congress for Jaipur, 1951 (Calcutta, 1953), p. 40: “It may be possible to trace the same objective later, motivating the campaigns of Samudra Gupta, Saśānka, and Dharmapāla—the king in possession of the lower course aiming at control of the whole river system” (ibid.).
population was smaller, roads were bad, and jungle more widespread, need hardly be emphasized.\(^1\) Bimbisāra’s acquisition of Aṅga, with its wealthy river-port of Champā, where, if we are to believe the Pali accounts, an already flourishing trade with the south brought gold, jewels and spices, was perhaps a necessary preliminary to the further expansion of Magadha, providing the wealth with which he financed his policy of internal administration and his son (Ajātaśatru) his aggressive wars. Of these the war with Kosala seems to have given Magadha control of a further length of the river, while from the war with the Vajjis she gained a foothold north of the Ganges, and thus controlled both its banks.\(^2\)

It is perhaps significant that according to the Buddhist story the war with the Vajjis arose over a dispute in a river-port which was half controlled by Ajātaśatru and half by the Vajjis.\(^3\) In the Sumaṅgalavilāsini\(^4\) we find that there was a port near the Ganges extending over a yojana, half of which belonged to Ajātaśatru and half to the Lichchhavis and their orders were obeyed in their respective areas. There was a mountain not far from it and at the foot of the mountain there was a mine of precious gems or some fragrant material (gandhabhaṇḍa). Ajātaśatru was late in coming there and the Lichchhavis took away all the precious gems. When Ajātaśatru came and learnt that all the precious gems had been taken away by the avaricious Lichchhavis, he grew angry and left the place. This happened also in the succeeding year. He having sustained a heavy loss thought that there must be a fight between him and the Lichchhavis.\(^5\)

The Vajjians, it seems, attacked Ajātaśatru, king of Magadha, many times. They used to oust Pāṭaligāma people from their homes and occupy them for a month or half

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
5. Kshatriya Clans, pp. 131-132. P. H. A. I., pp. 211-212. D. P. P. N., II, pp. 781-782. We do not know where the said river-port was. Was the port Pāṭaligāma (see Udāna-Appakathā, P. T. S., p. 408)? There are rocks in the Ganges at two places, viz., (1) Jahangir near Sultanganj, between Monghyr and Bhagalpur, and (2) Colgong (Kahalgaon), east of Bhagalpur, both being in the Bhagalpur district. Was one of these rocks a point of contention?
a month.¹ This harassed the people of Pātaligāma and also Ajātaśatru. And so it was that in order to baffle the attempts of the Vajjians, two of his ministers, viz., Sunīdhā and Vassakāra, built a fort at Pātaligāma.²

The death of Bimbisāra (in 495 B.C.) seems to have given a further fillip to the already deteriorating relation between Magadha and the Vajjis. Bimbisāra had no doubt fought against the Vajjis, but after the treaty was made the friendly relations thus restored seem to have continued till the end of his life. One of his wives was from Vaiśālī (called Chellanā or Vaidehi) whose sons included Ajātaśatru (the Crown Prince), Halla and Vehalla. He had also a son, Abhaya, by Ambapālī, a courtesan of Vaiśālī. These factors helped in the maintenance of good relations. But Ajātaśatru was suspicious of his foster-brother, Abhaya, who had Lichchhavī blood in him and liked the Lichchhavis very much. At this time the Lichchhavis were gaining strength day by day and Ajātaśatru thought that if Abhaya sided with them it would be very difficult for him to cope with the Lichchhavis. So he made up his mind to do away with them.

That the relations between the Vajjians and Magadha deteriorated with the death of Bimbisāra is hinted at in Jaina literature. King Seniya Bimbisāra is said to have given his famous elephant Seyanaga (Sechanaka, the Sprinkler), together with a large necklace of eighteen strings of jewels, to his younger sons Halla and Vehalla born from his wife Chellanā, the daughter of 'Rājā' Cheṭaka of Vaiśālī. His eldest son Kuṇiya (Ajātaśatru), after usurping his father's throne, on the instigation of his wife Paūmāvai (Padmāvatī), demanded from his younger brothers the return of both gifts. On the latter refusing to give them up and flying with them to their maternal grand-father Cheṭaka in Vaiśālī, Kuṇiya, having failed peacefully to obtain the extradition of the fugitives, commenced war with Cheṭaka.³

¹. Buddhañacharyā, p. 491, n. 1 (Udāna-Aśṭakathā, VIII. 6).
². Dialogues, II, p. 92 (also in S. B. E., 11, p. 18).
PREPARATIONS FOR WAR

Ajātaśatru had long been making preparations in order to destroy the Vajjjians.

He thought it prudent to consult the Buddha on this point and with this end in view sent his minister Varshakāra to the Master. The Buddha apparently scorned the idea because instead of Varshakāra he spoke to his disciple Ānanda about the seven conditions of welfare which made the Vajjjians invincible. The Brāhmaṇa minister Varshakāra concluded that the Vajjjians could not be overcome by the king of Magadha; that is, not in battle, without diplomacy or breaking up their alliance. "And now, Goñama, we must go; we are busy and have much to do" said Varshakāra. "Whatever you think most fitting, O Brāhmaṇa" was the Master's reply.¹

Having learnt the secret of the strength of the Vajjjians Ajātaśatru planned his preparations in two directions. Firstly, he took up the military side. A fort was constructed at Pātaligāma, which was situated at the confluence of the Ganges and the Sone, by his ministers Sunidha and Vassakāra. When the Buddha was passing through this place on his last journey, he saw this thing going on.² Ajātaśatru improved his military tactics also by introducing the use of two new weapons³ into his army. Secondly, he made up his mind to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vajjjians and thus bring about their fall.⁴ The Aṭṭhakathā gives an account of the

---

1. Dialogues, II, pp. 78-81. For a new evaluation of this episode see Dev Raj Chanana, J. B. R. S., Buddha Jayanti Special Issue, Vol. II, pp. 363-371, article entitled ‘The Position of the Buddha in the Conflict between Magadha and the Vajjjis’. He believes “that the policy decided upon by the king was a direct consequence of the remarks of the Buddha himself,” because “the Buddha did not condemn war, did not say anything in favour of a policy of peace, of non-violence” (p. 365). He sees in the “spiritual emperor”, who wanted the cremation of his body to “be like the cremation of the body of a chakkavatti rāja” (p. 370), “partisanship towards the king” and “absence of neutrality” (p. 365) in the Magadha-Vajjian conflict, especially because even during his “last visit, the Buddha did not warn the Lichchhavis of the impending danger” (p. 365, cf. p. 367), though “he had nothing against the Vajjis in general, and against the Lichchhavis in particular” (p. 365).


3. See infra.

4. Cf. Gradual Sayings, IV, p. 12: “The Vajjians cannot be overcome in battle, but only by cunning, by breaking up their alliance".
Machiavellian tactics adopted by this Brāhmaṇa statesman of Magadha.¹

When the Vajjians knew that they had to face Magadhan imperialism, they, too, made preparations though of a different kind. In the Nirayāvaliṇyā-Sutta it is related that when Kūṇika (Ajātaśatru) prepared to attack Cheṭaka of Vaiśāli, the latter called together the eighteen gaṇarājas (chiefs of republican clans) of Kāśi and Kosala, together with the nine Mallakas and the nine Lichchhavis² and an alliance was concluded. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaiśāli are referred to in the Majjhima-Nikāya.³ H. C. Raychaudhuri thus finds no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jaina statement regarding the alliance between Kāśi-Kosala on the one hand and Vaiśāli on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātaśatru including the rulers of Kāśi-Kosala and Vaiśāli offered a combined resistance. The Kosalan War and the Vajjian War were probably not isolated events but parts of a common movement directed against the establishment of the hegemony of Magadha.⁴ The flames fused together into one big conflagration⁵ and gave rise to "a widespread league of the tribal peoples north of the Ganges, no doubt uneasy at the growing imperialist ambition" of the ruler of Magadha, and "determined to preserve their own

2. P. H. A. I., p. 212.
4. A. L. Basham (op. cit., pp. 39-40) has tried to offer a possible explanation of the eighteen gaṇarājas of Kāśi and Kosala that would link them with Viḍūḍabha's devastation of the Sākyas and his death soon afterwards. The drowning of Viḍūḍabha (who was the son and successor of Prasenajit of Kosala) immediately after his destruction of the Sākyas is interpreted by Basham as his being killed while trying to subdue other subordinate tribes in the eastern part of his kingdom. He suggests that these tribes, unwilling to accept Viḍūḍabha's suzerainty and incensed at his destruction of the Sākyas, took advantage of his death to throw off all allegiance, and allied themselves with the strongest tribal republic of the region, the Vaijjas or Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli.
5. The whole passage has been taken from Raychaudhuri (P. H. A. I., pp. 212-213) as it contains nice suggestions. He adds in a foot-note (p. 213, n. 1) that even Pradyota of Avanti made preparations to avenge the death of his friend Bimbisāra (D. P. P. N., I, p. 34).
constitutions and way of life, which they saw were seriously threatened.\textsuperscript{1}

**WAR BETWEEN VAISALI AND MAGADHA**

The war between the Vajjians and Ajātaśatru began and the *Nirayāvalīya* speaks of a great battle in which many of Ajātaśatru's brothers were killed.\textsuperscript{2} The story is continued by the *Bhagavati-Sūtra*, which speaks of two great battles. The first lasted ten days, and on each day the Magadhan army lost one of its generals, shot by Chetaka. On the eleventh day Ajātaśatru threw in a secret weapon, presented to him by the god Indra himself—a mahāśilākṣaṇā, which from its description seems to have been a great stone-thrower. This turned the scales. The second battle had a similar course, and Ajātaśatru's fortunes were turned in the nick of time by another wonderful weapon, a chariot-club (*rathamushala*), which caused great carnage.\textsuperscript{3} The story is carried yet further by the early medieval commentator Jinādāsa Gaṇī in his *Chārṇī* to the *Āvalyaka-Sūtra*. The ruling body of the confederacy described here and elsewhere in the Jaina scriptures as the nine Lichchhavis, the nine Mallakis and the eighteen tribal chieftains (gaṇarājas) of Kaśi and Kosala, broke up. The confederate chieftains went home, and Chetaka, forced to fight alone, retreated to Vaiśāli, where he was besieged for several years. The Lichchhavis had a living palladium in Kūlapālaka (or Kūlavāluka), a famous ascetic whose piety and austerities rendered the city impregnable. But Ajātaśatru lured him to break his vows by means of a beautiful prostitute, and so the city fell. Chetaka drowned himself in a well and the remnant of the Lichchhavis fled to Nepal.\textsuperscript{4} The story which is told very elliptically by Jinādāsa, is expanded\textsuperscript{5} in a

1. Basham, *op. cit.*, p. 40. The wording has been slightly modified to suit the context here.
Commentary to the Uttarādhayana-Sūtra quoted in the Jaina encyclopaedia Abhidhāna-Rājendra.1

The Buddhist and Jaina versions disagree in many important details. The Buddhist version means to say that the victory was achieved mainly because of the conspiracy of Varshakāra. The Jaina version on the other hand describes a protracted and difficult warfare. Reading in between the lines we are compelled to believe that “the easy victory superficially indicated by the Buddhist story was evidently preceded by a period of protracted and difficult warfare”.2

The Magadha-Vajjian War is important not only because it put an end to the mighty Vajjian Republic but also because in it Ajātaśatru is said to have made use of two new weapons viz., the mahāśilākanṭaka (mahāśilākanṭaka) and the rahamushala (rahamusala). The first seems to have been some engine of war of the nature of a catapult which threw big stones. The second was a chariot to which a mace was attached and which, running about, effected a great execution of men.3 In the acceptance of the historicity of the latter weapon (which was a battering ram) there is no difficulty. The catapult is more difficult however, in the opinion of Basham,4 because we have no record of the use of war-engines for the discharge of large missiles in Asia until the days of Alexander. Even then, Basham feels, the Jaina story may be taken to indicate that as in civil so in military affairs the Magadha of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru outstripped its contemporaries.

THE FALL OF THE VAJJIAN REPUBLIC

The Vajjian Republic was a very powerful organisation, but its enemy, Ajātaśatru, was very astute and cunning. He faced the Republic on both the diplomatic and military fronts. He was successful in sowing the seeds of disunion among the Lichchhavis through Varshakāra and on the strategic military

1. The Magadha-Vajjian War is given in brief by Basham (op. cit., p. 38) and in some detail by Muni Ratnaprabha Vijaya (Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāśiva, Vol II, Part II, pp. 463-473).
front he erected a fort at Pātaligāma and, if the Jaina version is believed, arranged to have two wonderful weapons which finally decided the issue. Some sort of degeneration must have set in earlier among the Lichchhavis because we find reference to their earlier austere habits and to their later fondness for soft pillows, long sleep and other luxuries. Their power and prosperity were probably also weakened by the plague and drought which had ravaged Vaiśāli. But the most important cause seems to have been the lack of unity which was a general weakness of ancient Indian republics and against which the Mahābhārata warned its readers. The result was inevitable. The independent Vajjian Republic ended, never to rise again to its pristine glory.


3. In view of the conflicting traditions of the Buddhists and the Jainas, it is difficult to determine the date of the fall of the Vaijjian Republic. We have tentatively taken 484 B. C., i.e., three years after the Buddha's last visit to Vaiśāli, on the authority of Buddhaghosa (D. A., II, p. 522).
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<td>Āṅguttarāpa, 136, 143</td>
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<td>Āṇṇatitthiya Parivṛjākas, 296.</td>
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Anuruddha, 101, 181-182.
Apāpā Nagari, 210. Also see Pawa.
Ārāḍa, 152. See also Alāra.
Arishta, 18.
Aritthajana, 101n., 102n.
Arjuna of Kapilavastu, 241.
Arjuna Pāṇḍava, 90, 99.
Ārāḥa (enthronement), 75.
Ārṣṭiśēna, 48.
Ārya, 104, 123.
Āryan, 35, 63, 108, 147.
Ārya Tārā, 231.
Asaga, 227, 230.
Asṭākula, 149.
Asṭāvakra, 80n.
Asia, 81, 262.
Asibandhakaputta, 211.
Āśmaka, 100.
Āśoka, 27, 47, 76n., 120, 132, 175, 182, 189n., 193, 199, 200.
Assam, 45n.
Āsura Kuṭrimba, 37.
Asuras, 25, 29.
Āśvamedha, 76.
Āśvina Pārśnīmā, 206.
Ativihūti, 16, 35-36.
Āṭṭhakanagara, 182.
Āṭṭhakula, 118-119.
Augrasainya, 75n.
Aurva, 38n.
Auttami-Manu, 79.
Avanti, 195, 197n., 201, 228, 260n.
Avarapura-Vanasaṇḍa, 253.
Avavādakā, 169, 247.
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‘Videharājā’, 121.
Videhas, 91, 106, 117, 121.
Vidūdabha, 260n.
Vidūratha, 25-26, 49-50, 79.
Vijaya, 45.
Vijayendra Suri, 123, 194n.,
213n., 220-221, 223n., 225,
227n.
Vikrama (era), 27, 195-197,
199-200, 202.
Vikramāditya, 197.
Vikramasīla, 233.
Vimala Koṇḍaṇña, 137, 166-
167.
Vimala Śūri, 225.
Vimalā Therī, 172.
Vimśa, 16-17, 32-33.
Vīra (=Mahāvīra), 198, 225, 227, 231.
Vīra (=Vīmśa, a king), 32.
Vīra (another king), 37.
Vīrā, 37-39, 80.
Vīra-bhadra, 37.
Vīra-chandra, 37.
Vīra era, 195.
Virudhaka, 120-121.
Viśākha, 169.
Viśāla-Kshetra, 12.
Viśāla Puri, 64, 72.
Viśālaputra, 12.
Viśnu, 12, 30n., 42, 66n., 245.
Viśṇupada Temple, 65.
Viśṇuvīddhas, 82.
Viśravas, 17, 57-63.
Viśvakarman, 60.
Viśva-karman Bhauvana, 75n.
Viśvāmitra, 71-72, 114.
Viśvavedin, 75n., 77.
Viśve-Devas, 44.
Viṣatha, 46.
Viṣhotras, 100.
Vivasvat, 15.
Vivirīśa, 16-17, 33-34, 81n.
Vivirīśaka, 33.
Vivirīśati, 33.
Vṛātya, 111, 112n., 123.
Vṛiddhaśarman, king of Kar-
ūsha, 89.
Vṛiddhaśarman, king of Kosala, 61-62.
Vṛiji-deśa, 228.
Vṛijika, 110-112, 120, 144.
Vṛijikā (the dialect of the Muzaffarpur district), 112n.
Vṛiji-rāṣṭra, 112.
Vṛishaparvan, 48.

W

Watters, 118n., 184n., 186n.
Weber, 2.
Windisch, 178n.
Winternitz, M., 5, 22n.
Woodward, 186.

Y

Yādava, 47n., 80, 88.
Yakkha Chāpāla, 180.
Yakkha Sārandada, 179.
Yakkha Udenna, 177.
Yakshas, 61, 178, 248.
Yama, 39n., 43n., 69, 70n.
Yamunā, 45, 69, 116.
Yamunāṭīrtha, 45.
Yaudhaya Republic, 147.
Yayāti, 36, 47n., 66n.
Yudhāṁśr ushti Augrasainya, 75n.
Yudhisīthira, 44, 100.
Yule, 11n.
## ERRATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9, line 2</td>
<td>MONRACHY</td>
<td>MONARCHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, n. 5</td>
<td>Gomati</td>
<td>Gomati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, line 16</td>
<td>inspite</td>
<td>in spite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71, n. 4</td>
<td>Karūśa</td>
<td>Karūśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75, line 3</td>
<td>that, when</td>
<td>that, When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79, line 18</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93, n. 4</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>Clans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108, line 22</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110, line 17</td>
<td>Pujāvaliya</td>
<td>Pujāvaliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123, n. 1</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127, line 29</td>
<td>Pujāvaliya</td>
<td>Pujāvaliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129, n. 6</td>
<td>Kāśi</td>
<td>Kāśi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174, n. 8</td>
<td>Dial.</td>
<td>Dial., II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183, n. 8</td>
<td>ites</td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188, line 28</td>
<td>ore</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191, line 2</td>
<td>gga</td>
<td>Ugga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191, line 3</td>
<td>ome</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193, n. 3</td>
<td>Lichchhav is</td>
<td>Lichchhavis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203, line 14</td>
<td>details</td>
<td>details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226, last but one line</td>
<td>श्रवासिन्</td>
<td>श्रवासिन्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226, last line</td>
<td>कुष्ठपुर</td>
<td>कुष्ठपुर्रे</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231, line 15</td>
<td>hewas</td>
<td>he was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list may not be regarded as exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrower No.</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Date of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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