

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY**

CALL NO. *934.012* *Dut*

D.G.A. 79

Ch. 29



THE
ARYANISATION OF INDIA

15496

BY

Nripendra Kumar Dutt, M. A.

Professor of History, Hooghly Government College



934.012

Dut

CALCUTTA
1925

CENTRAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 16496
Date..... 7/4/59
Call No. 934.012/Dut.

Published by the Author
Printed by—N. K. Basu
THE KRISHNA PRINTING WORKS
13, Mohendra Bose Lane, Shambazar,
CALCUTTA

To

The sacred memory of my mother,
Niroda Sundari Dutt



PREFACE

For the period following the rise of Buddhism in the sixth century B. C. Dr. Vincent A. Smith has prepared in his *Early History of India* a highway, which has placed the whole world of travellers in the field of ancient Indian history under a deep debt of gratitude. Unfortunately, for the pre-Buddhist period no such book has yet been published, which gives us an outline of the political history based on a workable chronological framework, without which no history of art, religion, or society, however immense the materials available, can be definitely given shape to, like flesh and blood without a skeleton. The result is that though no other period of Indian history has attracted the attention of so many scholars, and has such an immense mass of literature written upon it as the Vedic period, it yet remains one of the most bewildering periods of human history, the breeding ground of wildest theories and fantastic calculations. Besides, tradition as recorded in religious literature being the principal source of history for the period in question, prejudices run strong among the writers on the subject, between those who exaggerate the value of tradition and those who cannot judge anything of ancient India except in relation to, or by the standard of, Greek history.

The greatest stumbling-block in the way of a historian of this period is the difficulty of harmonizing the Vedic with Pauranic tradition regarding the order of kings and succession of events. It has been the practice of scholars generally to accept only the Vedic and reject the Pauranic tradition, and to declare that the Veda "stands quite by itself, high up on an isolated peak of remote antiquity." A notable exception is Mr. F. E. Pargiter, who, however, goes to the other extreme by attaching too much importance to Pauranic writings and unduly depreciating Vedic tradition. The work so far done is only preliminary, and arduous labours of scholars in collaboration are needed to carefully sift and co-relate the materials obtained from both the sources. For further light on the subject we must await the researches of

*Recd. from M/S. P. Bhatla Charji Book selling Agent, Calcutta - 3. on 1.4.59
for Rs. 20/-*

together within the same enclosures, nay, under the same roof," and that that place was Central Asia from where "the ancestors of the Indians and Persians started for the South, and the leaders of the Greek, Roman, Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic colonies marched towards the shores of Europe." Since then iconoclastic critics have appeared, and with the aid of the sciences of Comparative Ethnology and Archaeology have tried to tear to pieces the conclusions of Comparative Philology and to disprove the assumption of the philologists that a relationship of language implies relationship of blood. One of the most bitter critics of the Aryan Theory was Oppert, according to whom, "there are Aryan languages but there is no Aryan race." During the fourth quarter of the last century the pendulum continued swinging rapidly from one extreme to the other. To-day, however, though the noise of conflict is still heard, the dust raised by the clash of combatants has somewhat subsided, and the atmosphere has become sufficiently clear to enable one to take a dispassionate view of the whole thing.

Philologists since the times of Sir William Jones and Bopp have noticed that there is a great affinity between the Sanskrit, Iranian, Armenian, Slavonic, Lettic, Greek, Latin, Celtic, and Teutonic languages, and that this affinity is not due

Comparative
Philology.

to accident, or temporary contact, or mutual borrowing. Among the various members of this group of languages we find words with common roots for father, mother, brother, sister, daughter, son, father-in-law, and some other words denoting family relationship ; cow, horse, dog, waggon, yoke, door, mead, copper, etc. ; numerals up to ten and hundred ; pronouns like me, thou, he ; verbs like to be, eat, lick, stay, sew ; particles like inter, pra, pari. "It is," as Muir says, "precisely those words and forms which are the most primitive, the most fundamental, the most essential parts of each language which they have in common." Again this affinity is observed not only in simple words but in many grammatical rules, such as declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs. Hommel and Delitzsch seek to establish primitive relations between the Aryan and Semitic languages by identifying several Semitic roots with Aryan. But a few such words, as Taylor observes, "are not enough to base a theory on ; the phonetic resemblances may be accidental, or the words may be very early loan words due to Phœnician commerce...But even if these identifications be accepted, it would not suffice, as it would be also necessary to show an agreement of grammatical formative elements ; and it is universally admitted that in grammatical structure the Semitic

and Aryan languages differ fundamentally." Hence it is seen that no fundamental resemblance can be traced between any language of this group and the other languages of the world, such as Chinese, Arabic, Negro, Australian. From these the philologists have come to the conclusion that the ancestors of most of the modern European nations, the Persians, and the Indians (non-Dravidian) at one time must have lived together and spoken one language from which their modern languages are all descended. The name Aryan is often given to this family of nations, as the ancient Persians called themselves by that name, and the authors of the Rigvedic hymns are believed to have used that name to distinguish themselves from the aborigines. But as it is not known to have been used by the European members of the family, the word is sometimes used in a narrow sense to denote the Persian and Indian branches only, while words like Indo-European and Indo-German (taking the two extreme members of the group) have been coined to denote the whole family.

The philological arguments alone are not sufficient to establish the identity of races. The well-known anthropologist Broca points out that "races have frequently within the historic period changed their language without having apparently changed the race or type. The Belgians, for

instance, speak a neo-Latin language, but of all races who have mingled their blood with that of the autochthones of Belgium it would be difficult to find one which has left less trace than the people of Rome." Another good instance is the imposition of a neo-Latin dialect on a vast American Indian population in more recent times. Still comparative philology has some value if its deductions are supported by other evidences. Besides, it is generally seen that the conquerors, if they are civilized, impose their language on the conquered, whether it is in Belgium or in South America. The analogy proves our point that some bands of Aryans migrated to Europe, and conquering and mingling with the aboriginal peoples Aryanised them as their brethren did the Dravidians in India. It is hopeless to look for a pure Aryan race in the modern world.

The philological evidences which seek to establish the relationship between the Indians, the Persians, and the Europeans are supported to a certain extent by the coincidences which are observed in the mythologies of the Vedas, the earliest book of the Indians, and those of the Zend Avesta of Persia, and also, though in a smaller degree, in the mythologies of the ancient European nations. Scholars like Kuhn and Max Muller have identified the Erinyes of the Greeks

**Comparative
Mythology.**

and Aryan languages differ fundamentally.¹² Hence it is seen that no fundamental resemblance can be traced between any language of this group and the other languages of the world, such as Chinese, Arabic, Negro, Australian. From these the philologists have come to the conclusion that the ancestors of most of the modern European nations, the Persians, and the Indians (non-Dravidian) at one time must have lived together and spoken one language from which their modern languages are all descended. The name Aryan is often given to this family of nations, as the ancient Persians called themselves by that name, and the authors of the Rigvedic hymns are believed to have used that name to distinguish themselves from the aborigines. But as it is not known to have been used by the European members of the family, the word is sometimes used in a narrow sense to denote the Persian and Indian branches only, while words like Indo-European and Indo-German (taking the two extreme members of the group) have been coined to denote the whole family.

The philological arguments alone are not sufficient to establish the identity of races. The well-known anthropologist Broca points out that "races have frequently within the historic period changed their language without having apparently changed the race or type. The Belgians, for

instance, speak a neo-Latin language, but of all races who have mingled their blood with that of the autochthones of Belgium it would be difficult to find one which has left less trace than the people of Rome." Another good instance is the imposition of a neo-Latin dialect on a vast American Indian population in more recent times. Still comparative philology has some value if its deductions are supported by other evidences. Besides, it is generally seen that the conquerors, if they are civilized, impose their language on the conquered, whether it is in Belgium or in South America. The analogy proves our point that some bands of Aryans migrated to Europe, and conquering and mingling with the aboriginal peoples Aryanised them as their brethren did the Dravidians in India. It is hopeless to look for a pure Aryan race in the modern world.

The philological evidences which seek to establish the relationship between the Indians, the Persians, and the Europeans are supported to a certain extent by the coincidences which are observed in the mythologies of the Vedas, the earliest book of the Indians, and those of the Zend Avesta of Persia, and also, though in a smaller degree, in the mythologies of the ancient European nations. Scholars like Kuhn and Max Muller have identified the Erinys of the Greeks

Comparative
Mythology.

with the Saranyu of the Vedas, the Centaurs with the Gandharvas, Helios and Sol with Surjya, Eos with Ushas, Uranus with Varuna, Zeus with Dyaus, Jupiter with Dyaus pitar, the Slavonic Bogu with Bhaga, and Perkunus or Perunu with the Vedic Parjanya. The community of mythologies between the Indians and the Iranians is more strongly marked. Both had in their mythologies Yama, Trita, Mitra, Vayu, Sarva, Indra, Vitrahan, Nasatyas, Asura, etc., while both made Soma offerings in yajnas or sacrifices, and had common names for priests as hotri and atharvan.

There are some scholars who express doubts about the inheritance of any common mythological traditions by the Aryan-speaking nations because of the fewness of resemblances and of the discrepancies of mythologies even when there are resemblances of names. But they do not seem to take into account the long centuries which separate the Rigvedic hymns from the Greek, Latin, and Teutonic literatures from which we draw our materials, and still more, which separate these all from the proto-Aryan period. Again, mythological and theological conceptions are apt to change under external influences more quickly and radically than languages. How many ancient religious traditions are to be found in Christian Italy, Mahomedan Persia, or Buddhist Ceylon? We can easily imagine

how the mythologies of the semi-barbarous Aryan immigrants into Europe were influenced through contact with the aborigines on one hand and the Phœnician culture bearers on the other. Professor Rhys remarks in his Hibbert Lectures—"If the Aryans had attained to the idea of so transcendent a god.....there would be difficulty in understanding how, as the Dyans of Sanskrit literature, he should have become comparatively a lay figure, that as Tiu he should have been superseded by Woden and Thor among the Teutons, and that among the Gauls his pre-eminence should at anytime have been threatened by a Mercury.' The difficulty, however, disappears if we remember that considerable changes in mythology can take place among the same people living under different physical conditions. Thus, for instance, the Indians living in tropical climate would welcome the clouds and naturally give pre-eminence to the cloud god, while the people of North Europe would favour the sun god. The action of time and foreign influences also in modifying the mythologies of a people can be observed in India and Egypt, where the great gods of the early Indo-Aryans and Egyptians could not maintain their pre-eminence and sometimes even their existence in later times, and new gods and beliefs arose from time to time, sometimes quite in antagonism

to the old ones. In India Varuna and then Indra appropriated many of the attributes of the heaven god Dyaus, and in later times were themselves cast into the shade by Vishnu and Siva. The wonder is not the fewness of mythological resemblances between the nations of Europe and India, but that, inspite of centuries of separation and loss of contact before the days of Darius and Alexander, of the great differences in physical conditions and environments in which the different branches lived, and of the foreign cultural influences to which these semi-barbarous communities were exposed, such important resemblances can still be detected.

Ethnologists state that inspite of the intermixture of races which has gone on more or less at all times, and the tendency of individuals to vary under the effects of climate and environment, there has always been a tendency to revert to the primitive types, viz, (1) the Caucasian, with usually a fair skin, soft, straight or wavy hair, full grown beard, long or broad headform, narrow face, and well-shaped nose; (2) the Mongolian, with yellow or reddish complexion, coarse straight hair, scanty or no beard, broad head, broad and flat face with high cheek-bones, small and depressed nose, and slanting eyes; (3) the Ethiopian or Negroid, with black complexion,

**Comparative
Ethnology.**

black frizzly hair, long head, broad and flat nose, moderate beard, thick lips, large teeth, and long forearm. The Caucasians again are generally subdivided into (a) Indo-Germans or Aryans, (b) Semites, (c) Hamites or Berbers. Peschel and many other ethnologists are agreed by examining the head-form, nose, hair, skin, and other physical features of the Hindus (non-Dravidian) that they in common with the Persians and the Europeans belong to the Indo-Germanic group. This hypothesis of community of blood between the Indians and the Europeans is supported by evidences from the Vedas and the Epics, where the typical Aryan is described as a tall, generally fair-complexioned person, with narrow, prominent nose, good hair, large eyes, broad shoulders, and slim waist, features which even to-day are regarded in India as constituting an ideal physique.

In Europe three different types have been clearly distinguished—(1) the Nordic or Teutonic, tall, fair, dolichocephalic or long-headed, (2) the Alpine or Celto-Slav, fair, both short and tall, brachycephalic or broad-headed, (3) the Mediterranean, short, dark, dolichocephalic. Great acrimony is displayed in the discussion about the relationship of each of these types with the original Aryan stock, and is made more bitter by the national jealousy between the German and the French, the German

scholars like Posche, Penka, and Hehn generally claiming direct descent for the Teuton from the original stock and tracing the brachycephalic Celt to Turanian or Mongolian origin, while the Gallic scholars like Chavee, De Mortillet, and Ujfalvy representing the primitive Aryans as brachycephalic and assigning African origin to the dolichocephalic Teuton. The tendency, however, of modern scholars, as Feist in Germany and de Michelis in France, is to find a solution to this knotty problem by assuming that the primitive Aryans were not a pure race, but a mixture of different types, both dolichocephalic and brachycephalic, who in prehistoric times were welded together into a linguistic and cultural unity, as the present English have been formed from Iberians, Celts, and Teutons. In spite of such obvious physical differences, the Indo-Germans can be grouped together in a single division because we recognise a common racial stamp in the facial expression, the shape of the nose, the structure of the hair, partly also the bodily proportions, in all of which points they agree more with each other than with the other divisions.

From a comparative study of their social institutions it is found that there are many customary laws and social rules peculiarly common to the Hindus and the ancient Europeans, which

**Comparative
Sociology.**

raises a strong supposition, irrespective of other considerations, that they had a common origin. "It does not appear to me a hazardous proposition that the Indian and the ancient European systems of enjoyment and tillage by men grouped in village communities are in all essential particulars identical.....There is the arable mark divided into separate lots but cultivated according to minute customary rules binding on all.....There is the waste or common land, out of which the arable mark has been cut, enjoyed as pasture by all the community pro-indivisio. There is the village, consisting of habitations each ruled by a despotic pater familias. And there is constantly a council of government to determine disputes as to custom." (Maine, *Village Communities*). Havell also notices that "the description of the old English village communities in Schleswig and Jutland given by a well-known historian (J. R. Green), and the characteristics ascribed to the ancestors of the Anglo-Saxon race, correspond closely with what is known of the early Aryan settlements in India from their literary records and from traditional evidence." And the resemblance becomes more striking when we compare them "with the more ancient Dravidian communal system of India in which mother instead of father was the head of the family, hunting and robbing were the principal

means of subsistence instead of agriculture and cattle farming, and civilization more mercantile than agricultural." According to Senart, even in social organisation in which the Hindus with their caste system differ most from the European branches of the Aryan family there is a great resemblance between the Hindu system and those of the Greeks and the Romans in the earlier stages of their national developments, e.g. the gens, curia, tribe at Rome, family, phratia in Greece, and family, gotra, caste in India. Endogamous and hypergamous rights were not unknown in ancient Greece and Rome. The resemblance is greater between the Hindu system and the ancient Iranian division of society into four classes—priests, warriors, cultivators, and artisans—especially when we find that the rule of endogamy prevailed at least among the highest class, the Athravans, corresponding to the Brahmins of India.

"The offering of gifts to the gods in fire is Indo-European, as is shown by the agreement of the Greeks, Romans, and Indians. Indo-European also is that part of the marriage ritual in which the newly wedded couple walk round the nuptial fire, the bridegroom presenting a burnt offering and the bride an offering of grain; for among the Romans also the young pair walked round the altar from left to right before offering bread (far) in the fire. Indo-European, too,

must be the practice of scattering rice or grain (as a symbol of fertility) over the bride and bridegroom, as prescribed in the Sutras; for it is widely diffused among peoples who cannot have borrowed it. Still older is the Indian ceremony of producing the sacrificial fire by the friction of two pieces of wood. Similarly the practice in the construction of the Indian fire-altar of walling up in the lowest layer of bricks the heads of five different victims, including that of a man, goes back to an ancient belief that a building can only be firmly erected when a man or an animal is buried with its foundations." (Macdonell, Sanskrit literature).

If it be a fact that the ancestors of a large section of the people of Europe, Persia, and

**Is India the cradle
of the Aryans?**

India at one time lived in one place, spoke one language, and possessed one culture,

the question that naturally arises is where that original home of the Aryans was. The orthodox Indian opinion is that India has ever been the home of the Hindus, and that if the Persians and the Europeans have been proved to be related to the Hindus, presumably they must have migrated from India. *Apparently* this point of view seems to be correct because it is in India that the earliest known Aryan literature, the Vedas, was composed and exists, and that the modern Hindu religion and social

structure are directly descended from the Vedic institutions. This opinion gains additional force when it is stated that nowhere in Indian literature, not even in the Vedas, is there any tradition recorded about any immigration from abroad, such as exists among peoples who are known to have migrated from one country to another.

The current opinion among European scholars is that India could not be the home of the undivided Aryans. (1) "It is nowise probable that the migrations which have peopled so large a part of the globe should have commenced at its southern extremity, and have been constantly directed from that point towards the north-west. On the contrary, everything concurs to persuade us that the colonies set out from a central region in divergent directions." (Schlegel, *Essais*).

India not the original home.

(2). "None of the phenomena of speech, customs, or ideas observable among the other cognate nations indicate an Indian origin. Of the countries which were anciently occupied by the great Indo-Germanic family India was the most peculiar, and differed the most widely from the others, and it would be unaccountable that no trace of these Indian peculiarities should have been preserved by any of the other Indo-Germanic races in later times, if they had all

originally dwelt in India." (Lassen, *Indian Antiquities*). A comparison of the Aryan languages leads us to believe that the early Aryans, wherever they might have lived, were familiar with the birch, the pine, and also probably the oak and willow, trees which do not generally grow in the plains of India; with snow and ice, but not with hot summer; and certainly not with the elephant, the lion, the tiger, the banian tree, and rice, things peculiarly characteristic of the Indian soil. To the Rigvedic Indians the elephant first appears as a strange animal, which they called a beast (*mriga*) with a hand (*hastin*), while in later times when the novelty of the animal had gone it was commonly known as *hastin* only.

(3). At one time it was believed that the Vedic language was the parent stock from which the different Aryan languages were sprung, and that the Vedas being known to have been composed in India the different Aryan-speaking peoples must have migrated from India. But philology has proved that Latin and Greek, and even the old Iranian language were not the daughters, but younger sisters, of the Vedic language, and that all of them were descended from a parent stock of which there is no literature extant. For instance, Latin and Greek have preserved some forms of inflection which are more archaic than those preserved in the

Vedas. Again, there are some roots, nominal and verbal, in which the Indian language appears to have lost the original form of the word, while it has been preserved in Greek and Latin, or both. An example is the Sanskrit word tara, a star, which seems to have been originally stara, a form which has been preserved in the Greek aster and astron, in the Latin astrum, as well as in the Zend stara. Further there exist a number of Sanskrit nouns, which must have been derived from radicals which in their verbal form are not discoverable even in the Vedas. (Muir, Sanskrit Texts II.)

(4) During the Rigvedic period the Indo-Aryans were evidently confined to the Punjab and the Gangetic Doab, because while almost all the rivers of North-west India and even Afghanistan are frequently mentioned, and the highest regard shown to the Indus and the Saraswati, the Rigvedic hymns are silent with regard to any place or river name beyond the Ganges, and even the famous Ganges is mentioned directly but once. That even the Punjab could not be the original home of the Aryan people is proved by the fact that during the Rigvedic period even in that land the Indo-Aryans were surrounded by peoples, Dasyus, Dasas, Rakhas, with whom they had very little in common, either in physique, language, or creed, and with whom they were carrying on ceaseless wars

of extermination. The Dasyus were the natives of the soil, whose towns and fortresses were captured and properties seized by the aggressive Indo-Aryans and who were gradually being pushed away from the country. It is improbable, if we assume the Aryans to be autochthonous in India, that two such entirely different types of people should have ever been living in the same limited area and developing on their own lines without any intermingling. Besides, the Vedic Aryans at that time seem not to have been very numerous, and even the Punjab, not to speak of the other parts of India, must have been very thinly peopled. Why then should a large number of them emigrate to the less hospitable lands in Persia and Europe while vast fertile fields and pleasanter climate remained in their own immediate neighbourhood in the Indian Peninsula? The expansion of the Aryans over Eastern and Southern India took place in comparatively recent times. The diffusion of the Aryans from the Punjab gradually but steadily towards the interior also leads to the conclusion that they came from the north-west.

(5). It is true that the Indian literature does not contain any distinct reference to a migration from a northern home. But there are passages here and there which appear in a way to point to the tradition of a foreign

origin. (a) Expressions like *Tokam pushyema tanayam shatam himah*, May we cherish a son and progeny a hundred winters (Rig. I.64.14.), and *Pushyema sharadah shatam jivema sharadah shatam*, May we see, may we live, a hundred autumns (Rig VII. 66. 16), might be reminiscent of the colder regions from which they had come, where the winter conditions having prevailed for the greater part of the year, the winter or autumn became synonymous with the year. (b) In Rig I. 30. 9 Indra is invoked to come from "the ancient abode," which might mean the ancient home of the Aryans, and connected with this is the tradition that Indralaya or the abode of Indra lay to the north of the Hindu-kush, as is mentioned in the Amarakosha and Sabdaratnavali. (c) Uttarakuru, the traditional Elysium of the Hindus, and Meru, the abode of their gods, lie far to the north. Why should they locate these places outside India far to the north unless they had memories of a northern home of their own? (d) The knowledge of long polar days and nights, and horizontal movements of stars in the polar regions, as shown in their description of Meru and its denizens (Tait. Brahmana III. 9. 22. 1; Mhbh. Vanaparba ch. 163; Manu I. 67), has led some scholars to point to the polar regions as the cradle of the Aryan people. (e) Tilak points out that in the Rigveda great prominence is

given to the goddess Ushas (dawn), who is celebrated in about twenty hymns of the finest quality, and mentioned more than three hundred times, and that the period of dawn is divided in the Vedic literature into several parts with elaborate and intricate rites prescribed for each part. All these are out of all proportion to the short-lived and evanescent dawn of the Indian zone, and though Tilak has not been able to successfully establish his theory of an Arctic home of the Aryans from this and other points, we may agree with him that the Indo-Aryans came from a land where the morning twilight was of greater duration than in India.

(f) In Kaushitaki Brahmana VII. 6. the language of the northern regions is said to be a model one, which might refer to the Aryan tongue being spoken in its purity in their original home in the north.

(6) In the first Fargard of the Vendidad where Ahura Mazda, the great god of the Iranians, is described as having created the different countries, including Hapta-Hendu or the Punjab, one after another, it is stated that Airyanavaejo, which was created first of all, had long winters, and that the ancestors of the Iranians started in their migrations from that country. Thus the Iranians, who are closely associated with the Indo-Aryans, point not to India or Hapta-Hendu but to Airyanavaejo, which could not

have been a part of India, as their original home.

If India be not the cradle of the Aryan race, where is that? The question has not yet been satisfactorily answered. There is

**Central Asian
Theory.**

the greatest diversity of opinion among scholars, and various countries, e.g. Central Asia, North Africa (Sergi, Zaborowski), South Russia (Benfey), North Germany (Kossinna, Hirt), Scandinavia (Penka, Rhye), Hungary (Giles), Eastern Europe (Fligier), Northern Europe (Cuno), North Pole (Warren, Tilak), Central and West Germany (Geiger), have been contended for as the primitive habitat of the Aryans with arguments which are more or less shadowy and inconclusive. Of these the Central Asian Theory was advocated by such eminent scholars of the last century as Rhode, Schlegel, Pott, Lassen, Jacob Grimm, Pictet, Max Muller, Schleicher, Mommsen, Sayce, Hale, and is even now more current and presents fewer objections than any other. It would, therefore, be not inappropriate to give a summary of their main arguments here.

(1) The almost continuous extension of the Aryan-speaking peoples from the Brahmaputra to the Atlantic naturally leads one to assume that there must have been a primitive centre of dispersion, and because of all the Aryan dialects Sanskrit and Zend may be

considered to have changed the least while Celtic in the extreme west has changed the most, the presumption is that the lands now occupied by Sanskrit and Zend must be the nearest to the primitive home. (Sayce, *Science of Languages* II).

(2) This hypothesis is supported by the Iranian tradition in the *Zend Avesta* which says that the first creation of man took place in *Airyana-vaējō*, from which the Iranians spread over more than a dozen countries before reaching Persia. Now as most of these places are situate in or about Central Asia, *Airyana-vaējō* or the original abode of the Iranians is believed to have existed somewhere between the Caucasus and the Oxus.

(3). Sayce observes that the above tradition agrees with the finding of Comparative Philology that the early Aryan home was a cold region, "where trees like birch and pine grew, and where winter was familiar with its snow and ice."

(4) Here in Central Asia are found all the physical elements which zoologists and philologists demand for the great specialisations in language and culture made by the primitive Aryans before their dispersal, their numerous population with cows and horses—a vast plain undivided by lofty mountains or deserts or impassable forests, a temperate climate, and abundance of food both for men and cattle.

(5) In the absence of any common words for sea and salt in the different Aryan languages it is inferred that the undivided Aryans lived in an inland country.

(6). In later times it was Central Asia which was the breeding place of the numerous Tartar hordes which overflowed into Persia, India, the Euphrates valley, and even Europe, as the Aryans had done several milleniums ago.

(7). A Babylonian tablet about 2100 B. C. indicates that the horse was a recent acquisition among the ass-using folk of Babylon, and describes it as "the ass from the east", or "from the mountains." "Its arrival here is commonly referred to that irruption of fresh peoples from Iran or beyond, who founded the barbarian Kassite (Aryan) dynasty of Babylon; as there is no reason to believe that the great plateau of Iran itself was even then in much better condition than now to support an indigenous pastoral civilization, it is probable that this irruption originated further to the north-east,.....and that it is to be connected, in its significance, if not precisely in date, with the irruption of Aryan-speaking folk into India from the same northern reservoir, and with that westward outflow of the 'tumulus folk' across the Dneiper, which broke up the painted-ware culture of Tripolje and penetrated through Galacia into Bohemia, and through the Balkan

lands into North-west Asia Minor." (Cambridge Ancient History I. p. 107).

(8). E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1909, l. 2, discussing the original home of the Indo-Europeans remarks (p. 800) that the discovery of Tocharish (a language spoken in north-eastern Afghanistan), a language belonging apparently to the centum (Western and European) group, overthrows all earlier conceptions as to the distribution of the Indo-Germans and gives weight to the hypothesis of their Asiatic origin." (Keane and Haddon, *Man: Past and Present*. p. 441)

One of the principal argument urged against the Central Asian theory is that the dreary Central Asian steppes could not find subsistence for a numerous community as the proto-Aryans must have been before their dispersal. To this it may be said that the climate of Central Asia and Eastern Persia has undergone a material change for the worse even in historical times. Geologists like Blandford and Vredenburg have proved that the rainfall in Central Asia has fallen off greatly in comparatively modern times making vast areas uncultivable and practically uninhabitable. (Mem. Geol. Survey of India XXXI pt. 2). Kirman is now an almost desert country with very scanty rainfall. But Strabo in the first century B. C. describes it as a fertile and well-

European races than the people of any other part of India. It may seem strange that the people of the Punjab, which is the gate of India, have been able to retain for thousands of years their original Aryan type in spite of being exposed to countless waves of invasion by various races from the north and west. But we are to remember that the climate has considerably changed in Central Asia, Afghanistan, and Beluchistan since the Aryans first invaded India. The rainfall has greatly fallen off, the rivers and streams have slowly dried up, and desert claims as its own the once fertile lands. It is now not possible for a tribal migration across the north-western frontiers of India. The road is practically closed except to swiftly moving troops in comparatively small numbers who can no doubt fight and conquer, but cannot effect any appreciable change in the racial characteristics of the people of India.

According to the late Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle, after the first stream of Aryan invaders had settled in the Punjab a second band from Central Asia, finding the usual route by the Kabul valley barred, pushed their way through Gilgit and Chitral, keeping close to the northern mountains, and entered like a wedge into the Midland country or Madhyadesha

*Hoernle's Theory of
Second Invasion.*

(which extended from the Himalayas on the north to the Vindhya on the south, and from Sirhind in the Eastern Punjab on the west to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna on the east). There they split asunder the first immigrants, and forced them outwards in three directions, to the east, south, and west. It was among the second group on the Saraswati, Jumna, and Ganges that sacerdotal rites and caste system were more fully developed, which distinguish the classical Brahmanic from the earlier Rigvedic culture. Hence we find that the Punjab, though it was the earliest Aryan settlement in India, was in later times regarded as unholy land and the people as barbarians. In the Mahabharata the Punjabese are regarded as the offspring of Pishachas or demons. On the other hand, the land between the Saraswati and the Drishadvati, Brahmavarta, is described as the most sacred, the next in importance being Brahmarshidesha which extended as far the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna (Manu, II. 17-19).

Hoernle's theory has received the weighty support of Sir George Grierson and Sir Herbert Risley, and bears the stamp of official recognition of the Government of India. Sir George Grierson, who as Director of the Linguistic Survey

Hoernle's Theory
supported.

of India possesses a unique knowledge of the languages spoken in the different parts of India, finds on careful examination that there are radical differences between the Western Hindustani, which is spoken in its purest form in the Gangetic Doab, in an almost pure form in the Eastern Punjab, and in a modified form in Oudh, Rajputana, Gujarat, and Central India, and the dialects of the Outer Band, namely, Kashmiri, Sindhi, Mahratta, Behari, Bengali, Assamese, Oriya, dialects which are all more closely related to each other than any of them to the language of the Midland. "In fact, at an early period of the linguistic history of India there must have been two sets of Indo-Aryan dialects—one the language of the Midland, and the other the group of dialects forming the Outer Band. From this it has been argued, and the contention is entirely borne out by the results of the ethnological enquiries, that the inhabitants of the Midland represent the latest stage of Indo-Aryan immigration." Sir Herbert Risley supports this theory as otherwise "it is difficult to account for the marked divergence of type that distinguishes the people of the Eastern Punjab from the people of Western Hindustan. If there had been no second and distinct incursion coming in like a wedge behind the original colonists, no such sharp contrast would now be discernible. One type would

melt into the other by imperceptible gradations, and scientific observation and popular impressions would not occur, as they do, in affirming that a marked change takes place somewhere about the longitude of Sirhind—a name which itself preserves the tradition of an ethnic frontier. Nor is this the only point in favour of Dr. Hoernle's hypothesis. That theory further explains how it is that the Vedic hymns contain no reference to the route by which the Aryans entered India or to their earlier settlements on the Indus; and it accounts for the antagonism between the eastern and western sections and for the fact that the latter were regarded as comparative barbarians by the more cultured inhabitants of the Middle-land." (*People of India*, pp. 54-55).

Mr. C. V. Vaidya in his *Epic India* seems to find in the Pandavas and their kinsmen the later Aryan immigrants, and thinks that the Kurukshetra war marks the victory of the newcomers over the old. The custom of polyandry, which is represented by Yudhishthira as "our family custom," seems to distinguish them from the Kurus in whose family there was no such practice, and accords very well with the hypothesis that the later immigrants, travelling by a very difficult route, could bring with them few women, and so had to practise polyandry, and also to mingle more freely with the aboriginal

of India possesses a unique knowledge of the languages spoken in the different parts of India, finds on careful examination that there are radical differences between the Western Hindustani, which is spoken in its purest form in the Gangetic Doab, in an almost pure form in the Eastern Punjab, and in a modified form in Oudh, Rajputana, Gujarat, and Central India, and the dialects of the Outer Band, namely, Kashmiri, Sindhi, Mahratta, Behari, Bengali, Assamese, Oriya, dialects which are all more closely related to each other than any of them to the language of the Midland. "In fact, at an early period of the linguistic history of India there must have been two sets of Indo-Aryan dialects—one the language of the Midland, and the other the group of dialects forming the Outer Band. From this it has been argued, and the contention is entirely borne out by the results of the ethnological enquiries, that the inhabitants of the Midland represent the latest stage of Indo-Aryan immigration." Sir Herbert Risley supports this theory as otherwise "it is difficult to account for the marked divergence of type that distinguishes the people of the Eastern Punjab from the people of Western Hindustan. If there had been no second and distinct incursion coming in like a wedge behind the original colonists, no such sharp contrast would now be discernible. One type would

melt into the other by imperceptible gradations, and scientific observation and popular impressions would not occur, as they do, in affirming that a marked change takes place somewhere about the longitude of Sirhind—a name which itself preserves the tradition of an ethnic frontier. Nor is this the only point in favour of Dr. Hoernle's hypothesis. That theory further explains how it is that the Vedic hymns contain no reference to the route by which the Aryans entered India or to their earlier settlements on the Indus; and it accounts for the antagonism between the eastern and western sections and for the fact that the latter were regarded as comparative barbarians by the more cultured inhabitants of the Middle-land." (*People of India*, pp. 54-55).

Mr. C. V. Vaidya in his *Epic India* seems to find in the Pandavas and their kinsmen the later Aryan immigrants, and thinks that the Kurukshetra war marks the victory of the newcomers over the old. The custom of polyandry, which is represented by Yudhishthira as "our family custom," seems to distinguish them from the Kurus in whose family there was no such practice, and accords very well with the hypothesis that the later immigrants, travelling by a very difficult route, could bring with them few women, and so had to practise polyandry, and also to mingle more freely with the aboriginal

population than the earlier conquerors, which accounts for such a sudden divergence in physical type between the people of the Punjab and those of the Gangetic valley. The Pandava brothers, too, had little distaste for marriage with girls of the aboriginal races, Rakshasa or Naga.

Hoernle's theory, however, has not passed unchallenged. Prof. Rapson writing in the Cambridge History of India I (p. 45) observes, "This theory is made improbable by the physical difficulties of the route suggested, and some of the arguments adduced in its favour are demonstrably mistaken. There is no such break of continuity between the tribes of the Rigveda and the peoples of the later literature as it presupposes.....Both of the facts mentioned above—the abrupt transition from the Indo-Aryan to the Aryo-Dravidian type, and the extension of Aryan influence from Brahmavarta to Brahmarshidesha—are best understood if we remember the natural feature which connects the plain of the Indus with the plain of the Ganges. This is the strait of habitable land which lies between the desert and the mountains. Its historical significance has already been noticed. It is in this strait that the decisive battles, on which the fate of India has depended, have been fought; and here too we may suppose that the progress of racial migrations

Hoernle's Theory
criticised.

from the north-west in prehistoric times must have been checked. Both politically and ethnographically it forms a natural boundary. In the age of the Rigveda the Aryans had not broken through the barrier, though the Jumna is mentioned in a hymn (VII.18.19) in such a way as to indicate that a battle had been won on its banks. It was only at some later date that the country between the Upper Jumna and Ganges and the district of Delhi were occupied.....The epoch of Indo-Aryan tribal migration was definitely closed. It was succeeded by the epoch of Indo-Aryan colonisation."

Prof. Chanda in his *Indo-Aryan Races* tries to demolish Hoernle's theory and set up a theory of his own. "To explain the peculiar position of the mixed or intermediate Indo-Aryan languages, Grierson assumes that the population and power of the Midland increased and its armies and its settlers carried its language to the Eastern Punjab, Gujarat, and Oudh. But the Vedic, the Pali-Buddhist, and Pauranic literatures preserve no tradition relating to the conquest and annexation of Usinara on the one hand, Kosala and Kasi on the other, by the Kurus, Panchalas, Matsyas or Vasas. According to the Aitareya Brahmana (VIII. 14) while the kings (rajas) of the Middle country—of Usinara, Kuru, Panchala, and Vasa—were

consecrated to "kingdom" (rajyaya), in the eastern country (prachyam disi) the rulers (rajas) of the eastern peoples—of the Kosalas and Videhas—were consecrated to empire (samrajyaya). This seems to indicate that at the time of the composition of this Brahmana the rulers of the East were much more powerful than the rulers of the Middle country. The dynasties and clans that held sway contemporaneously in the Middle and Outer countries of Northern India according to the Brahmanas and the Upanishads survived down to about a century after Buddha. ...The tide of conquest, when it started, started not from the west but from the east—from Magadha," by the Sisunagas, the Nandas, the Mauryas, and the Guptas. "It was not, therefore, the conquering armies of the Midland, but the armies and settlers from Magadha and other Outer countries that carried their languages to Oudh and other places where mixed languages are now spoken." After thus criticising the theory of Hoernle and Grierson Chanda goes on to propound a new theory, according to which later Aryan invaders of the brachycephalic Celtic type finding the greater part of Upper Hindustan in possession of the dolichocephalic Vedic Aryans found their way some to the lower Gangetic plain across the tableland of Central India, and

some into the Kathiwar Peninsula and the Deccan, thus occupying the Outer countries from Kashmir to Bengal. This theory, however, as Barnett remarks, seems on the whole less probable than the other. It does not account for the predominance of long-head in the Punjab, the change of head-form towards broadness from the Punjab to the Gangetic valley, and the gradual, not sharp, change in head-form and nose-shape from the Jumna to the lower Gangetic valley, and also for the anthropometric diversities between the peoples of Kashmir, the Punjab, Sind, Gujarat, Maharastra, and Bengal, though they are said to belong to one race.

The problem of a second invasion still remains a puzzle. It is not unlikely that the Indo-Aryans did not come all at one time and by one route only.

Second Invasion Theory not necessary. Some seem to find evidences in the Rigveda of the tribes Yadu and Turvasha coming by sea. We are told in Rig. VI. 20. 12, "O hero (Indra), thou broughtest in safety over the sea (samudra) Turvasha and Yadu," though the word samudra is interpreted by many scholars as meaning not sea but a mass of waters only. But it is almost impossible to disentangle the descendants of the later immigrants, if any, from those of the earlier in the greater part of the country. In order to

find an explanation for the cultural difference between the peoples of the Inner and Outer Bands we have a clue in some Epic and Pauranic traditions. The Anus, one of the Rigvedic tribes living in the Punjab, are said to have been divided into two branches, one the Usinaras with their offshoots, the Yaudheyas, Kekayas, Madrakas, Sivis, Sauviras and others, ruling in the Punjab and Sind, and the other the Titikshus under the sons of Bali ruling over Bengal, East Behar, and Orissa (Anga, Vanga, Kalinga, Pundra, Suhma). Or in other words, the Aryan conquerors of Eastern India came mostly from the Punjab and not the Midland country. The differences in physical type between the Punjab and the Eastern countries are not so unusual as to be incapable of being explained by the ordinary effect of Dravidian and Mongolian influences upon a thinning stream of Aryan conquerors. In Northern India, I agree with Risley that the tendency towards broad-head was the result not so much of the immigration of brachycephalic Aryan tribes as of the admixture of Mongolian blood, which becomes more pronounced as one goes farther to the east. The statement of the late Dr. Smith, even if we do not agree with him as regards the extraction of the Sakyas and the Lichchhavis, seems true that the Mongolian element played a more

important part in Northern India than is generally realised. Besides the cephalic and nasal indices, a blue patch in the lower sacral region of the new born, which is characteristic of the South Mongol races (Keane and Haddon, *Man Past and Present* p. 164), betrays Mongolian strain in many a child even among the higher classes in the lower Gangetic valley. The differences in language between the Midland group and the Outer group can be easily explained if we remember that the Brahmanic literature and institutions as distinguished from the Rigvedic grew up in the Kuru-Panchala country, while the people of the Punjab remained backward or primitive. So there were two types of culture—the older of the Punjab and the later of the Midland. It is the former type which with the Anus spread to Eastern India and with the Yadus to the Deccan. Later the Midland culture began to conquer its way to the west through Malwa, Rajputana, and Gujarat, while on the east, in Videha, Kasi, and Oudh, it somewhat receded before the conquering armies of Southern and Eastern Behar.

The only case which still baffles the anthropologists is the Mahratta people with their broad heads. The modern pure Dravidians are long-headed, and the Vedic Aryans too are believed to have been long-headed, and so also

Except in
Maharashtra.

are the Pre-Dravidian Munda and Mon-Khmer races. How then to account for the broad head of the Mahratta? According to Chanda the second stream of Aryan people who encircled the first group on three sides belonged to the brachycephalic Celtic type. Without going so far as to assume a ring of cognate races belonging to one type from one end of India to the other, we can agree with him in the assumption that a tribe of Aryans of the Celtic type came and settled in the Mahratta districts only. At least this is more probable than Risley's theory of Scytho-Dravidian origin of the Mahratta people because it seems unlikely that the Scythian invaders could come through the dreary north-western frontiers, and through the Punjab, Malwa, Gujarat to the Mahratta country in such large numbers as to be able to strongly influence the ethnic characteristics of the vast Aryo-Dravidian population already settled there; or than Dr. Barnett's too bold assumption (*Antiquities of India* p. 32) that "the Dravidian blood vanished in that of the old native stocks (Munda and Mon-khmer races) in most districts, but preserved some of its old characteristics in the Mahratta country (traditionally Dravidian)." If we remember that broad-headed Aryan-speaking peoples are to be found in Persia and Afghanistan and that there was frequent

intercourse between the Persian Gulf and the western coasts of India even in prehistoric times, it is not difficult to conceive of a migration of broad-headed tribes, either Aryan of the Celtic type, or mixed Aryan and South Semitic, or Aryanised aborigines, from Iran to Western India (like that of the Parsees in historical times) at a time when the native Dravidian population was not very dense and when the Vedic Aryans had not extended their influence beyond the Nerbudda. So when the latter came and imposed their culture, the population had already received an indelible stamp of the brachycephalic type, which was kept alive by the likely influx of small groups from the Persian Gulf from time to time in the wake of commerce and colonisation. So instead of the name Scytho-Dravidian given by Risley we may call the Mahratta type Irano-Dravidian.* According to most scholars,

* "Overlooking later Mongolo-Turki encroachments, a general survey will, I think, show that from the earliest times the whole of this region (Irania) has formed part of the Caucasian domain; that the bulk of the indigenous populations must have belonged to the dark, round-headed Alpine type; that these, still found in compact masses in many places, were apparently conquered, but certainly Aryanised in speech, in very remote prehistoric times by long-headed blond Aryans of the Iranic and Galchic branches, who arrived in large numbers from the contiguous Eurasian steppe, mingled generally with the brachy aborigines, but also kept aloof in several districts,

including Grierson and Rapson, the Pishacha languages in the north-western frontier districts were evolved through contact between the Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages. It is well-known that at one time one form of Pishacha language prevailed in the Mahratta country, which too lends colour to the hypothesis of Iranian element in the Mahratta blood. Again, the name Rattikas or Rattas of the people of the country which was in use at least as early as the time of Asoka sounds very similar to that of the warrior class of Iran, Rathaesthas.

where they still survive with more or less modified proto-Aryan features.....Both *Iranic* and *Galchic* are thus rather linguistic than ethnic terms, and so true is this that a philologist always knows what is meant by an *Iranic* language, while the anthropologist is unable to define or form any clear conception of an *Iranian*, who may be either of long-headed Nordic or round-headed Alpine type," (Keane and Haddon, *Man Past and Present* pp. 541—542).

According to F. v. Luschan (*The Early Inhabitants of Asia*), the primitive people of Western Asia were brachycephalic and dark.

Seligman (*The Physical Characters of the Arabs*) has shown that the Semites of Southern Arabia are predominantly brachycephalic, the cephalic index ranging from 71 to 92, with an average of about 82.

CHAPTER III.

DATE OF INDO-ARYAN INVASIONS.

In order to construct a workable chronology of the Vedic period we must first ascertain the approximate dates of the celebrated grammarian Panini, and of the adoption of writing for the expression of the Sanskrit language. We know definitely that Patanjali, the great commentator on Panini's grammar, lived in the middle of the 2nd century B. C. Between Patanjali and Katyayana, the great critic commentator, there arose a large number of grammarians, authors of Varttikas and Karikas, such as Bharadvajiyas, Saunagas and others, who have been noticed in Patanjali's book, and hence we may reasonably put Katyayana two centuries earlier, in the middle of the 4th century B. C. Now that is exactly the time assigned to Katyayana by Indian tradition according to which he was minister to a Nanda king.* We cannot, however, accept

* Mr. Jayaswal (Indian Antiquary XLVII p. 138) seems to find in Katyayana's note *Sakaparthivadnamupasanakhyanam* on Panini II. 1. 60. a reference to the Arsacidæ kings of Parthia, and so assigns Katyayana to the latter half of the third century B.C. But if the word Saka here was used to denote a race, Patanjali, who from his date was expected to

the story of the Kathasaritsagara, written in the 12th century A. D., about the defeat of Panini by Katyayana, except as an allegory to describe the extremely learned and destructive criticism of Katyayana's Varttikas upon Panini's book. Against that tradition may be set another in the recently discovered drama Padmapravritakam by Sudraka, which contains a character, Katyayana, which is evidently a caricature of the famous grammarian, and makes him a contemporary not of Panini, but of a descendant of his. That Panini was anterior to, and not a contemporary of, Katyayana is indicated by Patanjali's reference of Panini as a Rishi, who "sees" (pashyati) i. e., to whom is revealed a particular rule, as distinguished from what others like Katyayana "say" (bakshyati). Secondly, had they been contemporaries, Panini's Sutras, about half of which had been attacked by Katyayana, could not have survived the very learned and bitter criticism of the rival, and gained universal fame as the greatest authority in grammar. "How could India," Goldstucker

be more acquainted with the Sakas, could not have explained it as Sakabhoji, vegetable-eating and Bhattoji Dikshit as Sakapriya, fond of power. If, however, the word Saka must be made to denote a proper name, there is no necessity to go to Persia, as Saka was quite a common name among the Vedic Indians, e. g., Sakadasa Bhaditayana of the Vamsa Brahmana, Sakayana of Kathaka Samhita,

observes, "resound with the fame of a work which was so imperfect as to contain at least 10,000 inaccuracies, omissions, and mistakes (as pointed out by Katyayana) ?.....If he had bungled along, as he must appear to have done, had he been a contemporary of Katyayana,—not he, but the author of the Varttikas, would have been the inspired Rishi and the reputed father of the Vyakarana." This perplexity vanishes if we assume that Panini and Katyayana belonged to different periods, and that the supposed mistakes or omissions were not really so, but were due to the fact that many grammatical forms and words and meanings of words which were current in the time of Panini had become obsolete or incorrect in the time of Katyayana, and that words and grammatical forms unknown to Panini had come into use in the time of his critic. The omission of Panini to deal with such peculiar words as Pandya, Chola, Kerala, which necessitated the making of supplementary rules by Katyayana, can only be explained by the assumption that in Panini's time the Indo-Aryans had not come into touch with Southern India. Thirdly, some Karikas and Paribhashas can be traced in the work of Patanjali which had been written before the time of Katyayana but certainly after that of Panini. Fourthly, there is an indirect reference to Panini being regarded as of distant past in Katyayana's Varttika

Tulyakalatvat on Panini's rule *Puranaprokteshu brahmanakalpesu* (IV. 3. 105). Under these circumstances it is not unreasonable to place Panini a century and a half earlier than Katyayana, i. e. in about 500 B. C. This date is not irreconcilable with the reference in Panini's book to *Yavanani* or Greek writing (IV. 1. 49) and to female Sramanas, probably Buddhist nuns (II. 1. 70), the Gandhara country having been conquered in about 516 B. C. by Darius with the aid of Greek officers like Skylax from Ionia and Caria, and Gautama Buddha having passed away about 543 B. C. (Smith, *The Oxford History of India*, p. 48). Goldstucker's argument for referring Panini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *Nirvano vate* (VIII. 2. 50) is not conclusive because Panini either dealt with the root meaning of the word nirvana without caring for technical meanings, or more probably deliberately ignored Buddhism. "Doubtless this (*Yavanani*) means Greek (Ionian) writing, but it does not necessarily follow that the word dates from after the invasion of Alexander. Indeed the probability seems to me against this being the case. For it is certainly remarkable that Ionian should be the name given to the Greeks if first made known to India through the invasion of Alexander, whose army was certainly in no conceivable sense Ionian." On the other

hand, we know that the Persians under Cyrus came into touch first with the Ionian Greeks after the fall of Croesus (546 B. C.), and that the first Greek resistance to Darius came from the Ionians who burned Sardis about 500 B. C. "If it is borne in mind that Panini was a native of Gandhara according to Hiuen Tsang, a view confirmed by the references in his grammar, it will not seem far-fetched to consider that it was most probably from the older tradition that the name Yavanani was derived." (Keith, *Ait. Aranyaka*, p. 23.).

According to Buhler writing was introduced into India about 800 B. C. "The palaeo-
Writing in India. geographical evidence of the Asoka inscriptions clearly shows that writing was no recent invention in the third century B. C., for the most of the letters have several, often very divergent forms, sometimes as many as nine or ten. A considerable length of time was, moreover, needed to elaborate from the twenty-two borrowed Semitic symbols the full Brahmi alphabet of forty-six letters. This complete alphabet, which was evidently worked out by learned Brahmins on phonetic principles, must have existed by 500 B. C. according to the strong arguments adduced by Prof. Buhler. This is the alphabet which is recognised in Panini's great Sanskrit grammar." (Macdonell, *Sanskrit*

Literature, pp. 16, 17). Again, the manner of Asoka's address to the people direct, the employment of local dialects in his inscriptions, and the locations of the inscriptions, all indicate a wide-spread literacy of the people in the third century B. C., a thing impossible of attainment in such a vast country as India in less than five centuries. Further, we know that the Kharosti script had been a product of Darius' conquest of the Indus valley at the end of the sixth century B. C. If by that time the Brahmi script had not been fully developed in India the Kharosti script must have spread widely over the country instead of remaining confined to the Persian province only. All these prove that writing must have been adopted for the expression of the Sanskrit language in the 8th century B. C. at the latest.

Every student of the Vedic literature knows that it is divided into two parts—the earlier part, the *Sruti* or revealed literature consisting of the four Vedas and the *Brahmanas* including the *Aranyakas* and the *Upanishads*; and the later part, the *Smriti* or literature based on tradition, written in the form of *Sutras*, the most important of which are the six *Vedangas*. Again the *Sruti* literature falls into three clearly sundered groups—(1) the original Vedic hymns,

*Divisions of
Vedic Literature.*

the bulk of which are to be found collected in the Rîgveda ; (2) the later compilations and classifications of the hymns as in the three other Vedas, and the elaborate commentaries on the Vedic hymns to explain the mutual relation of the sacred text and the ceremonial, especially in connection with the great sacrifices, as in the Brahmanas proper ; (3) the development of the philosophical ideas as in the Aranyakas and the Upanishads, which generally come at the end of the Brahmanas. From an examination of language and thought too we find that the Upanishads generally succeeded the Aranyakas, which in their turn succeeded the Brahmanas proper. Of course a clear line of demarcation is not possible between the period of the Brahmanas and the period of the Aranyakas and Upanishads, and there are instances of a Brahmana, or parts of a Brahmana, being a later production than many of the Aranyakas and Upanishads. But these are exceptions, which do not nullify the general three-fold divisions of the Brahmana period.

The Sutras presuppose the existence of the Brahmanas, whose complicated system of theology and ceremonial they sought to simplify. The dogmas and beliefs embodied in the Sutras and their language which stands midway between the language of the Brahmanas and the classical Sanskrit

prove their continuity without any break from the Brahmana literature. Max Muller and his followers including Macdonell and Keith fix B. C. 600 to 200 for the Sutra period. But the beginning must be pushed back by at least two centuries. (1). The Sutras in their composition show a freedom which is hardly conceivable after the period of Panini, and so a great many of them must have been composed and the literature standardised before 500 B. C. (2). The Sutras in their inception were intended to satisfy the needs of a system of oral instruction in all branches of knowledge, and in their form point to an origin at a period when writing was not known, i.e. before the 8th century B. C. (3). The Sutra style had been so long established in the country and so possessed the minds of the literary classes that the early Buddhist writers in the 5th century B. C. could not get rid of it, but made a useless imitation of this style in their books, sometimes with ludicrous effect. (4). Between Panini and Yaska, the famous author of Nirukta, there must be an interval of at least two hundred years if we take into account the great changes in language and the great development of grammar which had taken place, and the considerable number of important grammarians who had arisen during the intervening period. On no account, therefore, we can put Yaska later than 700 B. C.

And Yaska's book is not certainly the earliest work of the Sutra period. Thus the beginnings of the Sutra period may be reasonably dated about 800 B. C.

This date, B. C. 800, may then be taken as marking the end of the Brahmana period, which preceded the Sutra period. That this is a fair estimate can be judged from a consideration of the relations between the philosophical doctrines of Gautama Buddha, of the Sankhya school and of the Upanishads (Keith, *Ait. Aranyaka*, pp. 47-49). Gautama Buddha flourished in the 6th century B. C. His teachings presuppose the Sankhya school of philosophy. "It is I think correct to assume that these doctrines are descended from a Sankhya view of existence which fell into pessimism by its unsatisfactory dualistic metaphysics. However open to criticism Jacobi's detailed derivation of the doctrines of Buddhism from the Sankhya may be, yet it is clear that it was from the Sankhya that Buddhism derived its theory of the soulless entity which yet goes through transmigration" (Keith). The Sankhya doctrines are to a great extent criticisms on and supplements to the Upanishad doctrines, and show a more developed thought than the latter. The development of Sankhya might have begun in the 8th century B. C., and it

**Brahmana
Period.**

is therefore that we do not meet with any but indirect mention of the Sankhya system in the Upanishads, and that also in the latest ones. Buddhist tradition too allows a respectable distance of time between Kapila, the founder of the Sankhya system, and Gautama Buddha. Moreover, as the beginnings of the Sutra writing are anterior to Panini and as the language of the Upanishads is more archaic than even the language of the Sutras, the end of the Brahmana period may be believed to be about three hundred years before Panini's time. Again, the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas, and the Upanishads betray not the slightest trace of any knowledge of writing, and must, therefore, belong to a period before 800 B. C. Some of the Upanishads like the Maitrayaniya may be of later date, but the bulk of them were composed before 800 B. C.

If we calculate back the length of the Brahmana period from 800 B. C. we can arrive at the beginning of the Brahmana period and the end of the Mantra or hymn period. The immense mass of Brahmana literature extant, which again is only a fraction of what has been lost, as appears from the numerous names and quotations from Brahmanas unknown to us occurring in works extant; the number of stages which are clearly perceptible in the domain of

thought spreading over the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas and the Upanishads ; the rise of so many different schools of thought and ritualism ; and the endless genealogical lists of teachers can hardly be accommodated within a space of less than five or six hundred years. This estimate will appear not liberal if we take into consideration the fact that the Brahmana literature represents a period of intellectual decadence after the creative energies of the Indo-Aryan mind had exhausted themselves by the end of the hymn period, and that, therefore, the progress of thought was comparatively slow. Besides, we know that in ritualism and philosophy a people, unless subjected to strong external influences, makes progress at a much slower rate than in other fields of literary activity. Again, as Winternitz justly observes, "a written literature can develop in a shorter time than one that is only handed down by word of mouth, when each single text requires generations of teachers and disciples in order to be preserved at all." So the estimate of two or three hundred years for the Brahmana period made by Max Muller, Keith and others does not seem reasonable. Indeed, Max Muller himself admits that "the chronological limits assigned to the Sutra and Brahmana periods will seem to most Sanskrit scholars too narrow rather than too wide." All these considerations

may well lead us to find the beginning of the Aranyaka compositions at about 1200 B. C. and that of the Upanishad at 1000 B.C.

That the above estimate is nearer the mark is proved by the absence of any mention of the epoch-making Kurukshetra war, of the Pandavas, the heroes of the Mahabharata, and of Arjuna, except as meaning the god Indra, in the Brahmanas, which indicates their composition, at least of the bulk of them, before the Kurukshetra war, which, according to the calculation of Mr. Pargiter from Pauranic genealogical lists, took place about the middle of the 10th century B. C. Moreover, according to the Puranas, there is the space of 1050 years between Mahapadma Nanda (about 400 B.C.) and Parikshit (Pargiter, Kali Age, p. 58), and if we assume the latter to be Parikshit I, who is mentioned in the Atharva-veda, Aitareya Brahmana and Satapatha Brahmana, instead of Parikshit II, the grandson of Arjuna, we reach the 15th century B.C. for the beginning of the Brahmana period.*

* Dhritarastra of the Brahmanas was not identical with Dhritarastra, the ancestor of the Kuru-Pandavas, the former being a king of Kasi who was defeated by the Kurus. Similarly, Parikshit and Jaramejaya of the Brahmanas were the ancestors and not descendants of the Pandavas. The identification of the Vedic Parikshit with the son of Abhimanyu (*Political History of Ancient India*) by Prof. H. C. Ray Choudhury, which goes against the findings of Macdonell and Keith (*Vedic*

"Another and, at first sight, more promising attempt has made to fix a date from internal evidence. It has been argued by Jacobi on the strength of two hymns in the Rigveda that

Index, Vol. I. p. 494) and of Pargiter (Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 114), does not seem probable. The Vishupurana (IV. 20. 1) makes the four brothers, Janamejaya, Srutasena, Ugrasena, Bhimasena, sons of Parikshit I and ancestors of the Pandavas. It is always risky to attempt the identification of kings or the fixing of their dates from an examination of their teacher-priests' names. Identity of names does not necessarily imply identity of persons. Different persons of the same name but living in different times were often confused in later writings. Besides, there could not be want of motives in later times on the part of the authors belonging to rival families and schools to associate a certain teacher-priest with a famous king of old so as to enhance the prestige of a particular priestly family or a particular school, and to ascribe the authorship of well-known doctrines and theories to particular persons which might shed lustre upon their descendants or disciples. The Vamsas or genealogies of teachers, from which Prof. Ray Choudhury draws his materials, were often composed long after the actual composition of the books in which they are included. The commentators never enter into any explanation of these Vamsas, as doubtless they regarded them as later and not very reliable writings. The Vamsa appended at the close of the tenth book of Satapatha Brahmana differs from the general Vamsa of the entire Brahmana at the close of the fourteenth book in not referring the work to Yajnavalkya, but to Sandilya and Tura Kavaheya. In the Khilakanda of the Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad Uddalaka is represented as the teacher of Yajnavalkya, while in the Yajnavalkyakanda Uddalaka is treated with as scant courtesy by Yajnavalkya as is shown to the other Brahmanas who are put

the year then began with the summer solstice, and that at that solstice the sun was in con-

to silence by the hero of the book, and there is not the slightest indication that one was the pupil of the other.

An excellent instance of the confusion which arises from the identity of names may be cited. "One Suka had a daughter Krtvi or Kirti, who married Anuha king of South Panchala and was mother of king Brahmadata. The other was Vyasa's son, far later. It will be shown in chapter XIII that Brahmadata was a contemporary of the Kaurava king Pratipa, and that his great great grandson Janamejaya was a contemporary of Pratipa's great grandson Bhishma and of Prsata (Drupada's father). Bhishma was of about the same age as Satyawati, the maiden mother of Vyasa, for he was a youth when his father married young Satyawati; hence Vyasa was younger than Bhishma, and his son Suka was therefore at least a generation later. From Brahmadata's grandfather Suka down to Vyasa's son Suka there were therefore some six generations. The ksatriya genealogies and traditions keep the two Sukas distinct, but the brahmanical vamsas in their attempt to construct Vyasa's family identify the two, give Vyasa's son Suka a daughter Kirtimati, say she was Anuha's queen and Brahmadata's mother, and so make Brahmadata great grandson of Vyasa, thus displacing Anuha and Brahmadata from their true position to one some six generations later." (Pargiter, *Anc. Ind. Hist. Trad.*, pp 64-65). There are numerous instances to show that persons who were widely separated in time are brought together as contemporaries in later writings. The Santiparva says that Bhishma learnt dharma from among others Bhargava Ghyavana, and Rama Jamadagnya, as if these three lived in the same age. According to Pargiter, there were several Yajnavalkyas, Jaiminis and Vaisampyanas (*Ibid.*, Chapter XXVII). So it is difficult to fix the chronological position of a king from his association with the name of a particular sage, unless there are corroborative evidences.

junction with the lunar mansion Phalguni. Now the later astronomy shows that the lunar mansions were, in the sixth century A. D., arranged so as to begin for purposes of reckoning with that called Acvini, because at the vernal equinox at that date the sun was in conjunction with the star Piscium. Given this datum, the precession of the equinoxes allows us to calculate that the beginning of the year with the summer solstice in Phalguni took place about 4000 B. C.....It (the argument) rests upon two wholly improbable assumptions, first that the hymns really assert that the year began at the summer solstice, and, second, that the sun was then brought into any connexion at all with the Nakshatras, for which there is no evidence whatever. The Nakshatras are, as their name indicates and as all the evidence of the later Samhitas shows, lunar mansions pure and simple" (Cambridge History of India I, pp. 111-112). But more definite is a notice in the Kaushitaki Brahmana (XIX. 3), which is repeated in the Jyotisha, that the winter solstice took place at the new moon in Magha. Though scholars are not all agreed in accepting the assumptions involved (Keith, Rigveda Brahmanas Translated, p. 49), the objections are not as strong as in the previous case, and we may with some justification accept the results obtained from this datum. The results, however, vary from 1391 to 1181.

B. C., and fit in with our estimate of the Brahmana period. The cumulative effect of all the above considerations is practically decisive of a date for the beginning of the Brahmana period about the middle of the second millenium B. C. *

Max Muller assigns 400 years to the composition and compilation of the Samhitas, **Rigvedic Period.** "under the supposition that during the early periods of history, the growth of the human mind was more luxuriant than in later times, and that the layers of thought were framed less slowly in the primary than in the tertiary ages of the world".† This is no doubt an underestimate, and considering the great variety of the contents of the Rigveda, which again is only a small remnant of a vast

*Keith (*Aitareya Aranyaka*, pp. 21 seq) argues from work to work, taking the lower limit in each case—"Panini, who cannot well be dated later than 300 B. C.," "Yaska, who can hardly be brought down lower than 550—500 B.C.," and so on. But he does not assign any reason why these dates can not be pushed back by two centuries. Again, he fixes the date of the *Aitareya Aranyaka* as between 700 and 600 B. C., and admits that the "upper date may perhaps be pushed further back" (p. 50), yet he sticks to the lower date.

† That Max Muller himself regarded his chronology as tentative is expressed in his *Gifford Lectures on Physical Religion* (1890) where he says: "Whether the Vedic hymns were composed 1000 or 1500 or 2000 or 3000 years B. C. no power on earth will ever determine."

hymn literature most of which has been irretrievably lost, the perceptible changes in language which had taken place during the hymn period, distinguishing the earlier from the later strata of hymns, the references in the Rigveda itself to "sages of olden times" and "old hymns being clothed in newer garbs," "hymns composed in the old way," the period of composition alone of the Rigvedic hymns must have extended over many centuries and may be fixed from 2000 to 1400 B. C. One of the reasons of Max Muller for adopting a later date for the Rigvedic period is that he observes a coincidence in language between the Vedic hymns and the Avestan Gathas similar to that between the Homeric Greek and the Classical Greek, and he dates the Gathas from the sixth century B. C. But the difficulty is that there is yet no agreement among scholars about the date of the earliest Gathas. According to Dr. Moulton, "the traditional date (of Zoroaster, 660-583 B. C.) is a minimum, but there are strong reasons for placing Zarathustra and his Gathas some generations earlier still." Again, the comparison between the development of language from the Vedic hymns to the Gathas and that from the Homeric Greek to Classical Greek is not fair. The period in question is the most eventful in the history of Greece, when the rapid political and commercial

growth of the Greeks exercised a great influence upon the development of their language, and conditions were certainly different in India and Persia. And even at the same time Attic Greek was further from the primitive Hellenic language than Doric or Aeolic. The changes of literary Greek from the Attic days down to the present day have been much less rapid. In any case, it is to be feared that we attain from such a comparison no result of value for Vedic chronology.

"We do not hesitate to assign the composition of the bulk of the Brahmanas to the years 1400-1200 B. C., for the Samhita we require a period of at least 500-600 years with an interval of about two hundred years between the end of the proper Brahmana period. Thus we obtain for the bulk of the Samhita the space from 1400-2000. If we consider the completely authenticated antiquity of several of the sacred books of the Chinese, such as the original documents, of which the Shu-king or Book of History is composed, and the antiquity of the sacrificial songs of the Shi-king, which all carry us back to 1700-2200 B. C, it will certainly not be surprising that we assign a similar antiquity to the most ancient parts of the Vedas." (Haug, *The Aitareya Brahmana*).

"An estimate (i. e. of Haug) which, if we take everything into account, is certainly not

too high, and which has the greatest claims to probability, is that of Whitney *OL St.* 1, 21, and elsewhere, of 2000-1500 B. C. the first half of the second thousand years B. C.;" (Kaegi, *The Rigveda*).

"The close relationship between the language of the Vedic Samhitas on the one hand and Avesta and old Persian on the other does not allow us to date the beginning of the Vedic period back into a hoary age of many thousands, to say nothing of millions of years B. C.

On the other hand, the facts of political, religious and literary history require a period of at least a thousand years and probably more between the earliest hymns of the Rigveda, and the latest parts of the old Upanishads and the rise of Buddhism." (Winternitz).

When the bulk of the Rigvedic hymns were composed the Indo-Aryans had not advanced much beyond the Jumna, were having a deadly struggle with the natives of the soil, and evidently had not entered India very long ago. At the same time we must allow sufficient time for the practically thorough occupation of the Punjab, and the loss of memories about any outside home as is revealed in the hymns. If the bulk of the hymns were composed between 2000-1400 B. C., we shall not be very wrong if we believe that the Aryans began to enter into India about

Date of Indo-Aryan Immigration.

2300 or 2200 B. C. Let us see if there are any other evidences to support this hypothesis.

Pargiter points out in his *Dynasties of the Kali Age* that according to Pauranic accounts there were 30 Paurava, 29 Ikshaku

Evidences of the Puranas.

and 37 Magadhan kings in the interval between the Kurukshetra

war and the accession of Mahapadma Nanda. "Here we have safer ground, for the number of kings in a dynasty was a much simpler matter and more easily remembered than figures of the lengths of reigns and dynasties; and this information about ten contemporary dynasties eliminates peculiarities and extravagances about single dynasties and enables us to make prudent calculations by means of averages of all ten." (Pargiter, *Anc. Ind. Hist. Tr.*, p. 180). By calculating backward from the date of Mahapadma (about 400 B. C.) at the rate of 18 years for an average reign, an average obtained by comparing more than 20 genealogical tables of Asia and Europe,* one arrives at the date 950 B. C. approximately for the Kurukshetra battle. Moreover, Jaina traditions represent the Tirthankara Aristanemi as a contemporary of Krishna Vasudeva, and if we assume an interval of two hundred years, which seems on general grounds reasonable, between the Tirthankaras, Mahavira,

* 30 Andhra kings reigned for 450 years, and 20 Vijaynagar kings for 250 years.

Parsvanath, and Aristanemi, we get the tenth century B. C. as the date of Aristanemi and so of Krishna and of the Kurukshetra war.

"If we should seek to make an estimate of the ages before the battle, it would be prudent to take a smaller length for the average reign, because only one line, that of Ayodhya, is practically complete, while there are gaps in the other dynasties so that there is little scope for taking medium averages of all the dynasties and eliminating peculiarities." (Pargiter, *Anc. Ind. Hist. Tradition*, p. 183). In the absence of any checking means it is impossible to find out additions, omissions, and overlappings. Even in historical times the mention of the Andhra dynasty as succeeding the Kanva dynasty and the inclusion of the Sakya family and the Pradyota family in the dynasties of Kosala and Magadha respectively in the Puranas gave rise to not a little confusion among the earlier investigators. So it is better to take a lower average, say 12 years, for the period before the Kurukshetra war. Now as the Puranas give 93 kings to the Ikshaku dynasty from Ikshaku the founder to Brihadbala, the contemporary of the Kurukshetra war, the approximate date of Ikshaku and the foundation of the dynasty may be supposed to be about 2100 B. C. Of the princes of the Ikshaku dynasty known to the Vedic hymn-makers are

Mandhatri, Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Tryaruna, etc., princes who number according to the Puranas from the twentieth to thirtieth in descent from the founder, and who, therefore, may be believed to have flourished in the 19th and 18th centuries B. C. This also gives a clue to Vedic chronology, and, if we suppose Ikshaku to be the leader of an important, but not necessarily the earliest, Indo-Aryan group of settlers in India (as Cerdic or Ida in England), a clue to the date of the coming of the Indo-Aryans.

About the middle of the 20th century B. C., according to Dr. H. R. Hall, a tribe of men known as the Kassites or Kossaeans with Surias (Sanskrit Surjyas) and Maryttas (Sanskrit Marut) as their principal gods and speaking an Aryan dialect conquered Babylon and ruled there till the middle of the 13th century B.C., when they were overwhelmed by the Assyrian king Tukultiniv. About the same time another Aryan tribe established themselves to the north-west in the upper valley of the Euphrates under the name of Mitanni. Their kings bore names like Artatama, Dusratta (Sanskrit Dasaratha), etc., and worshipped the gods Mitra, Varuna, Indra, Nasatyas. They remained in power till the middle of the 14th century B.C. when they were conquered by the Hittites. As regards the

**Aryans in
Western Asia.**

powerful Hittites or Khatti of Asia Minor, who for several centuries terrorised both Egypt and Mesopotamia, it is still not certain to which race they belonged. The suggestion has been made that their language, which unfortunately has not yet been deciphered, bears certain Indo-European characteristics. Anthropologists like Von Luschan are inclined to connect the Hittites with the Alpine race or the Celto-Slav peoples of Europe. Hall points out that "the Hittite deities are often accompanied by animals in quite Indian fashion, and sometimes stand upon them. ...It may be that it was a feature borrowed from Aryan religion." These Hittites, who were either Aryans or Aryanised natives, but certainly not Semites, appear for the first time in history in the 20th century B. C., when they were powerful enough to attack Babylon. In the Tell-el-Amarna inscriptions we find such Aryan names of princes as Artamanyu, Subandu, Suwardata, Sutarna, Jasadata and so forth, who ruled in Palestine and Syria in the 15th century B.C., but who had not been there before the 20th century B. C., as we know from the Romance of Sinehu and the inscriptions of the Middle Kingdom of Egypt. Even after their downfall in Mesopotamia and Syria the Aryans survived in the east, and one of their family, the Medes, remained long a thorn in the side of Assyria until the overthrow of the latter and the estab-

lishment of the Medo-Persian empire in Western Asia.

From the history of Egypt too we learn that the period from the 20th to the 16th century B.C. was one of great turmoil and disturbances in Western Asia, when strange peoples appeared dislodging or conquering the old ones, and old kingdoms tottered and fell like houses of cards. The rapidity and violence of these irruptions, far exceeding in extent and effect all earlier movements of which we have any knowledge, were probably due to the use of the horse by the invaders both as steed and as milk-giver to annihilate distance and commissariat difficulties. The Egyptians and the Babylonians became acquainted with the horse only after these barbarian invasions. The picture presented is similar to that which Europe witnessed in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. on the appearance of the Hun hordes and the rising of the barbarians. The fate of Rome befell Egypt too, and Egypt lay groaning and bleeding under the heels of the conquering barbarians from Asia from the 18th to the 16th century B. C. These barbarians, the Hyksos or Shepherds as the Egyptian historians call them, were, so far as is known, a mixed Semitic people from Syria who being pushed from behind by new men, and probably mingled with them, played a part in the history of

Egypt almost similar to that of the Goths in Roman history under the pressure of the Huns. But, unlike the Romans, the Egyptians were not yet rotten to the core, and after two centuries of sufferings succeeded in shaking off the barbarian yoke and establishing the mighty New Kingdom, which once more advanced upon Syria and the Euphrates punishing and enslaving their erstwhile conquerors. It is then when the veil of darkness is lifted by the conquering marches of the Thutmoseses that a new scene presents itself to us in the 15th century—Aryan dynasties ruling practically over the whole of Western Asia from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, in Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and, if we accept the Hittites as Aryan, in Asia Minor. But as in Egypt so in Mesopotamia the barbarian conquerors imposed themselves upon a highly organised and numerous community with a hoary civilization behind them, and, therefore, could not long maintain themselves against a revival of national feeling. The Semites soon found a champion in the king of Assyria who put an end to the Aryan rule in Babylon. Then between the two grindstones of Egypt and Assyria the smaller Aryan rulerships in Western Asia were crushed out of existence. Thus all Aryan trace was lost in Syria and Mesopotamia and the Semite there became as supreme ever.

Now what do all these signify? First of all, the names of their gods Surjya, Mitra, Indra, Nasatya suggest a very close affinity with the Vedic Indians and very little with the other branches of the Aryan family. It is certain that they separated themselves from the Indo-Aryan branch in the time of the Rigveda when the older gods like Dyaus, Ushas of the Indo-European period were passing into the background and the later gods like Vishnu and Siva had not become important. Indra is a typical god of the Rigvedic Indians. The word Nasatya is truly Rigvedic. So the time of the appearance of the Kassites and the Mitannians, i. e. the 20th century B. C., must fall within the Rigvedic period. And consequently the Rigvedic period, which is believed to have lasted for five or six hundred years, could not have begun earlier than 2500 B. C., and ended later than 1500 B. C. Again, we know that the split between the Indians and the Iranians took place in the early Vedic, if not in the pre-Vedic, period, and that in consequence there was such bitterness caused that the Iranians deliberately changed the Vedic gods into demons. If, as some scholars assert, the Kassites and the Mitannians betrayed in their dialects close relationship with the Iranians, the fact that they still worshipped Vedic gods and had not in their language changed *s* into *h* showed

that the Indo-Iranian split had either not occurred in the 20th or 21st century B. C., or, if it had, not much before that time.

From all these above considerations we may infer that the Aryans began to pour into India about the middle of the third millennium B. C. The recent finds of the Archaeological Department at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa prove the existence of a civilisation in the Punjab and Sind, which was not Aryan in characteristics, but allied to the Sumerian of about 3000 B. C. (Illustrated London News, October 1924). As it has been suggested from a comparison of their physical types, burial customs, and matriarchal systems* that the Sumerians belonged to the Dravidian stock, it is quite reasonable to believe that in the early part of the third millennium B. C. the Aryans had not come and driven away the Dravidians from the Punjab.

* Prof. Morgan in his *Ancient Society* and Prof. Sayce in his *Babylonians and Assyrians* show that in Sumerian times the woman was the head of the family.

CHAPTER IV
EXPANSION OF THE INDO-ARYANS
—THE DASYUS.

✓ From the geographical names mentioned in the Rigveda we learn that the Indo-Aryans were at that time in possession of parts of Afghanistan, the Punjab, Kashmir, parts of Rajputana and Sind, and had advanced as far as the Ganges. Some twenty-five streams are mentioned, of which the principal are the Sindhu (Indus), Vitasta (Jhelum), Asikni (Chenab), Parushni (Ravi), Vipasha (Beas), Satudru (Sutlej), Kubha (Kabul), Suvastu (Swat), Krumu (Kurram), Saraswati, Drishadvati, Yamuna, and Ganga. The Himavanta or Himalayas were well-known to the hymn-makers, but not the Vindhya and the Nerbudda, showing that they had not advanced as far as these. Another evidence of their unacquaintance with the eastern countries is that the tiger, a characteristic animal of Eastern India, is unknown, and that rice too is little known. The important river Ganges is mentioned directly but once, and probably marked the easternmost limit of the Indo-Aryan advance. Though some of the Vedic hymns were composed on the banks of the Indus, e.g. the hymns

Extent of Arya-land in the Rigveda.

to Ushas, which, if composed in India, must have been done in the western Punjab, where the dawn is comparatively a glorious phenomenon, yet the centre of Rigvedic life lay to the east, on the banks of the Saraswati, where the bulk of the hymns were composed, and which river was regarded as the most sacred and superseded in importance even the Indus.

During the period of the later Samhitas and the Brahmanas the Indo-Aryans had spread

over the land as far as the Vindhya on the south, and the confines of Bengal on the east, and in some points had penetrated into the Deccan on the western side by way of Malwa and Gujarat. The centre of life shifted eastward, and comprised the whole country between the Saraswati and the confluence of the Ganges and Jumna, which is called Madhyadesha or Middle Country. While the eastern regions like Kosala (Oudh), Kasi (Benares), and Videha (N. Behar) are brought under Aryan influences and come into prominence, the Punjab and the western countries correspondingly recede in importance, and their tribes and their customs receive but scant respect in the Brahmana literature.

(1). In the Satapatha Brahmana (I.4.1.14-17) there is a curious legend of Mathava the Videgha carrying the sacrificial fire (i.e. sacrificial worship of the Brahmins) from the banks

of the Saraswati over Kosala as far as the Sadanira (modern Gandak), and after crossing it, laying the foundation of a settlement which came to be known as Videha after the name of the tribe to which Mathava belonged. The story probably indicates how the country as far as the Sadanira was conquered in one sweep, how the progress was checked for a while, and how slowly an Aryan colony, Videha, was founded across the river.

(2). In a well-known hymn of the Atharva-veda (V.22) takman or fever is delivered over to the Gandharis, the Mujavants, the Angas, and the Magadhas. The Vedic Aryans had at that time evidently come into collision with the non-Aryan tribes, Angas and Magadhas. The Magadhas are associated in chapter XV of the same book with Vratyas (i. e. nomadic peoples with strange languages and laws). The Angas and the Magadhas were still resisting the Aryans, and hence the great indignation of the author. On the other hand, this passage shows that the Brahmanical culture of the Indo-Aryans of the Middle Country has already led them to despise their more primitive brethren of the west in the Indus valley.

(3). In the Aitareya Brahmana (VII. 18) Viswamitra speaks of the Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras, Pulindas, and Mutibas as living on the borders of the Aryan settlements. Of these the

Andhras, Sabaras and Pulindas are known from the Mahabharata and the Puranas to have been tribes of the Deccan, and the Pundras are known in historical times to have their home in Bengal. In modern times the Andhras are the Telegu-speaking people of the Deccan, the Sabaras are still found in a savage state on the frontiers of Orissa, and the Pundras have developed into the Pod caste of Bengal.

(4). In the Aitareya Aranyaka (II.1.1) the Vangas, Vagadhas and Cheras are called birds, i.e. non-Aryans speaking languages which were not intelligible to the Aryans. The Vangas were certainly the inhabitants of Vangadesha or Bengal, the Vagadha is either a misreading or different reading of the word Magadha, and the Cheras are known to be a wild tribe of the Vindhya regions.

(5). The Kaushitaki Upanishad (VI. 1.) gives a list of the principal Aryan tribes living in India, viz, the Usinaras, the Vasas, the Matsyas, the Kurus, the Panchalas, the Kasis, and the Videhas. The land of the Usinaras in the eastern Punjab and the land of the Videhas in North Behar marked the western and eastern boundaries respectively of the Indo-Aryan world of the time. The western Punjab and the trans-Indus lands by this time had come to be regarded as barbarian.

(6). Vidarbha, or modern Berar, is mentioned

in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana (II. 440), and a Bhima, prince of Vidarbha, in the Aitareya Brahmana (VII. 34. 9), proving that the Aryans had during the Brahmana period penetrated into the Deccan as far as Berar.

Thus before the close of the Brahmana period in about 800 B. C. the whole of Northern India as far as South Behar had been conquered, and the Aryans had begun to penetrate into the Deccan where at least one kingdom, that of Vidarbha, had been established. The process of conquest and colonisation is clearly observed in Behar.

During the period from 800 B. C. to 500 B. C. the whole of Northern India had been practically Aryanised, though the Indo-Aryan Expansion from 800 to 500 B. C. process was still incomplete in the outlying parts, Sind, Kathiwar, Gujarat on the west, and Bengal and Kalinga (Orissa) on the east. The Punjab had farther fallen from orthodoxy and in the estimation of the Brahmins. Little headway was made in the Deccan, where, besides Vidarbha, one or two settlements had arisen on the Godavery. Anga and Magadha had been completely brought within the circle of Indo-Aryan politics and culture.

(1). Baudhayana quotes older authorities to state that the people of Sindhu, Sauvira, and Surastra were of mixed origin, and also

directs that any one travelling to the countries of the Kalingas, Pundras, Vangas, and Arattas (Punjab) must perform a purificatory sacrifice.

(2). In the Ramayana Dasaratha is advised by his priest Vasistha to invite among others the kings of Anga, Magadha, Sindhu, Sauvira, and Surastra to his horse sacrifice. There are mentions in the book of Kalinga and Vidarbha, but the knowledge shown about the geography of the Deccan and Southern India is very scanty, most of the area being called Dandakaranya, which was inhabited by Rakshasas and Banaras, i.e. various non-Aryan communities.

(3). Panini is acquainted with the names of Kachchha (Cutch), Kalinga, and Asmaka (on the Godavery), but evidently not with the names of Pandya, Chola, Kerala, as otherwise he could not have failed to give explanations of the formation of such peculiar words, a task undertaken by his commentators in later times.

(4). For the period just before the rise of Buddhism (i. e. the seventh century B. C.) we know from the Nikayas, which are assigned

* It is always unsafe to refer to the epics for the geography of the epic period, as they received considerable additions and modifications in later times. In this respect the Mahabharata is worse than the Ramayana, and so I abstain from referring to it for the political geography of the period.

by scholars like Rhys Davids to a time not much later than Gautama Buddha, that the following were the principal nations in India—Anga, Magadha, Kasi, Kosala, Vajji, Malla, Chedi, Vamsa, Kuru, Panchala, Machha, Surasena, Assaka, Avanti, Gandhara, Kamboja. Vanga and Kalinga are not mentioned, though the latter name finds a place in the list in later Buddhist Texts.

(5). From the Chronicles of Ceylon it is learnt that about the time of Gautama Buddha's birth Bejoy Sinha, a prince of Bengal, conquered Ceylon and settled there. The Chronicles were composed about one thousand years after the event, and so we cannot rely much on this tradition to show that Bengal had been Aryanised in the 7th century B.C.

At the time of Alexander's invasion, i.e. in the latter half of the 4th century B.C., the Aryan influence had spread over the whole of India, including the extreme south, and Ceylon.

(1). Katyayana's explanations with regard to the words Pandya, Chola, and Kerala, supplementing the rules of Panini, show that the Aryans had come into contact with these peoples of Southern India during the time intervening between Panini (about 500 B.C.) and Katyayana (about 350 B.C.)

(2). The accounts in the Arthashastra of Kautilya, the well-known minister of Chandragupta, giving details of trade dealings in the products of such countries as Vanga, Pundra, Sindhu, Tamraparni (Ceylon), and the Tamil countries of the south, show that all parts of India were bound to each other by ties of commercial relations and intimately known to each other.

(3). The Aryan influence had so much spread in Southern India that, according to Megasthenes (about 300 B.C.), the Pandyas called themselves the descendants of a daughter of the Indian Hercules or Krishna. The name Madura or Mathura of the Pandya capital lends colour to this tradition, as Mathura in Northern India was connected with the Yadavas and the early life of Krishna, who belonged to the Yadava family.

A good deal of confusion seems to have arisen over the words Arya and Dasyu as they were used in the Rigveda. This is due not a little to the fact that the original distinction between the two in course of time became lost and Vedic commentators in later times attached fanciful meanings to them. Yaska explains the word Arya as Iswaraputra, son of God, and Sayana explains it as one who is learned and performs the sacrifices, and the word Dasyu as a demon.

**Characteristics
of Dasyu.**

In later literature Arya came to mean noble, and Dasyu a robber. But even then the original meaning sometimes peeps out, as in words like Arya-dharma and Aryavarta. The Manusmriti preserves clear traces of the word Arya being used to denote a distinct race. Thus in the tenth book it is said, "All who are born outside the castes produced from the head, arm, thigh and foot of Brahma, whether they speak Aryan or Mlechchha languages, are known to be Dasyus." Again, "A person begotten on a non-Aryan woman by an Arya is an Arya in qualities, while it is certain that a person begotten on an Arya woman by a non-Aryan is a non-Aryan." In order to find out the original meanings of the words we should look into the Rigveda itself instead of depending on commentators who wrote hundreds of years after the composition of the hymns. The manner in which the two words are used at once suggests a contrast and distinction between two species. Thus in Rig I.51.8 Indra is invoked to distinguish between the Aryas and those who are Dasyus." In I. 103. 3 "Cast thy dart, Thunderer, at the Dasyu, increase the Arya's might and glory, Indra." In X.86.19 Indra says, "I come looking about me and distinguishing the Dasas and the Aryas." In I.100.18 Indra is said to have destroyed the Dasyus and shared their lands with the whites, and in II.11.18 "disclosed

the light to light the Arya, and on the left hand sank the Dasyu." In II.11.19 the Arya gains wealth subduing with the help of Indra the foes, the Dasyus. In X.83.1 Manyu is invoked to help the worshippers to successfully fight their enemies, whether Arya or Dasyu. From these and many other passages it becomes clear to us that the word Arya and Dasyu originally bore different meanings from those suggested by later commentators. In some places, however, the terms are applied to celestial foes, demons, and not mortals, but that is a secondary meaning. Evidently the hymn-makers were Aryas who worshipped Indra and other gods and prayed for the destruction of their foes, the Dasyus. That these Dasyus or Dasas were men of a different type, with different physical characters and institutions, is obvious from their being described as "black-skinned," "devoid of religious rites," "of different rites," "of imperfect speech", "noseless" or flat-nosed, "rawflesh-eaters," etc. In Rig X.22. 8 the Rishi says, "We live in the midst of the Dasyu tribes who do not perform sacrifices, nor believe anything. They have their own rites, and are not entitled to be called 'men.' O Thou Destroyer of enemies, annihilate them and injure the Dasas." Yet the Dasas were not savages and mean foes of the Aryas. There are many references to their fortresses of stone, their wealth, their powerful

tribes and kings. The combined efforts of Indra and Agni demolish ninety fortified towns (purah) ruled over by the Dasas (III. 12. 6). In VIII. 40. 6 Indra is invoked to humble the Dasa and distribute his accumulated treasure among His worshippers. There was a Dasyu king, Krishna, who lived on the banks of the Jumna, and harrassed the Aryas with ten thousand followers (VIII. 85. 13—15). The Dasas are sometimes called "mayaban", i.e. possessed of magical power or stratagem. The Aryas were often hard-pressed and in their distress had to invoke the assistance of their gods for victory.

Who were these Dasyus or Dasas? Hillebrandt seems to think the word Dasa originally Dravidians. denoted the Dahae people of the Caspian Steppes, who gave much troubles to the Aryans in Iran, and so came to signify a foe, a robber, in which sense it is used in the Rigveda. Whatever might have been the original meaning of the word, it is certain that the word, except where it is not used to denote a celestial foe, is used in the Rigveda to denote a different race of men, evidently natives of the soil as the Aryans have been shown to have come to India from outside. What race or races of men were these Dasas? There are strong reasons to think that many of those whom the Aryans encountered in the Indus and Ganges valleys were Dravidians.

(1) Their physical characteristics, as given in the Rigveda, namely, black skin and flat nose, agree with those of the modern Dravidians.

(2) That the Dravidians at one time lived in the Punjab and neighbouring countries is inferred from the existence of a Dravidian-speaking tribe, the Brahui, in Beluchistan, which is the last remnant of an once prevailing Dravidian population of Northern India, and not the survival of a Dravidian colony from the distant Deccan, "as a remote mountainous district may be expected to retain the survivals of ancient races while it is not likely to have been colonized."

(3) The changes which the Aryan language underwent in India even when the Aryans were confined to Northern India betray strong Dravidian influences and support the inference that the aboriginal Dasyus and Rakhas whom the Indo-Aryans met in the Punjab and elsewhere were mostly of the Dravidian race. Thus the chief point which distinguishes the Vedic language from the Avestan and other Indo-European languages is the presence of a second series of dental letters, the so-called cerebrals. "These play an increasingly important part in the development of Indo-Aryan in its subsequent phases. They are foreign to Indo-European languages generally and they are characteristic of Dravidian." (Cam. Ind. Hist). "The lingual

consonants are essential component elements of a large number of primitive Dravidian roots, and are often necessary, especially in Tamil, for the discrimination of one root from another; whereas in most cases in Sanskrit, the use of cerebral consonants instead of dental, especially the use of the cerebral *ṃ* instead of the dental *m*, is merely euphonic"—(Caldwell). Again, the presence of good many Dravidian words in classical Sanskrit and even in Vedic language, not to speak of modern dialects of Northern India, is well-known. Thus the word *Matachi* which occurs in the *Chhandogya Upanishad* (I. 10. 1.) is nothing but a Sanskritised form of the Dravidian word *midiche*, meaning a locust. And this *Upanishad* was composed at a time when the Indo-Aryans had scarcely entered the Deccan. Words like *Khatta*, couch or cot, *Kukkura*, dog, *Keyura*, bracelet, *Markata*, monkey, and many others have been traced to Dravidian origin (Caldwell, *Dravidian Languages*, pp. 567—579). The Bengali language is indebted for a no small portion of its vocabulary and structural peculiarities to Dravidian languages. Thus the commonplace words like *Khoka* (son), *Talu* (scalp), *Nola* (tongue), *Meye* (daughter), *Minmin* (glimmering), *Pillei* (child), and plural suffixes *guli* and *gula* have come from Dravidian sources. Even in Hindi, many words of Dravidian origin can be traced, such as *jhagra*, *ata*, etc.

Hence there cannot be any doubt that the Dravidians once constituted the main elements of the population of Northern India before the Aryanisation was effected. (Bhandarkar Lectures).

(4). The Dravidian influence is traceable in religion too. The Rigvedic religion is an almost pure Aryan religion, as a comparison with the rites and ceremonies of the Iranians and ancient Europeans would reveal. Of the many innovations which the religion received in later times the most important are beliefs in spells and magic, phallus-worship and snake-worship. Of these the first is a characteristic of any demon-worshipping religion, and cannot be precisely traced to Dravidian origin alone, though we know that the religion of the Dravidians even as late as the beginning of the Christian era was a form of demon-worship. But the other two can with more precision be traced to the Dravidians in whose religion they played a prominent part. The Rigvedic Indians hated the phallus-worshippers, Sisinadevah, which evidently referred to the Dasys (VII. 21. 5), and their god Indra killed the Serpent-demon Ahi (I. 103. 2).

(5). The absence of any reference in the Rigveda to the story of the Deluge, which is vaguely mentioned for the first time in the Atharvaveda, and later more fully described in

the Satapatha Brahmana, raises a suspicion that it was not a part of the Indo-Aryan mythology during the Rigvedic period. The story except in minor details shows wonderful resemblance to the story of the Deluge as was current among the Sumerians and their cultural successors, the Semites. Now the current opinion, which is strengthened by the recent discoveries at Mahenjo Daro and Harappa in the Indus valley, is that the Sumerians and the Dravidians belonged to the same stock, and so we may believe that the Deluge story, whether it referred to the submerging of the continent of Lemuria or not, originally existed with those peoples, from whom it was borrowed by others. This belief finds support from an examination of the details of the story in the Sanskrit literature. The two principal elements in the story are the *mina*, fish, and *nira*, water, and, curiously, both these words are of Dravidian origin (Caldwell, pp. 43, 571, 573). The word for fish, *Matsya*, occurs only once in the Rigveda, though various kinds of animals, birds and insects, are so frequently mentioned (Macdonell, Sanskrit Literature, p. 143), while fish played an important part in the mythology of the Sumerians, and also in the pre-Vedic Punjab, as evidenced by the recent discoveries of fish representations there. Again, Satyavrata Manu, the Indian Noah, is called in the Bhagavata

and other Puranas "the lord of Dravida." Further, in the accounts of the Deluge, as given in the Matsya Purana, of all the rivers only the Nerbudda, and not the more famous Ganges, Jumna, Saraswati, or Indus, is preserved at the Dissolution, and the mountain Malaya in the extreme south is mentioned as the scene of Manu's austerities and of the apparition of the fish. (Muir, Sanskrit Texts I, p219).

(6). The use of matronymic surname is almost unknown among the Rigvedic sages and kings, while patronymic is frequent, as in Purukutsa Gairikshit, Kakshivant Ausija, Sudasa Paijavana. But the frequent use during the Brahmana period of matronymic surname, as in Satyakama Jabala, Mahidasa Aitareya, Prasniputra Asurivasin, Sanjiviputra, Krishna Devakiputra, along with patronymic, as in Dhritarastra Vaichitravirya, Tura Kavasheya, Para Atnara, indicates a growing influence upon the Aryan society even while in the Gangetic valley of the matriarchal Dravidian system.

From all these we may conclude that the Dasas or Dasyus, who stubbornly, though unsuccessfully, resisted the Aryan *Pre-Dravidians* invasions of the Punjab and the Gangetic valley, were predominantly Dravidian in culture. At the same time we must not think that the Dravidians were the only natives of Northern India at that time. Anthropometry

has revealed a large Mongolian admixture in the blood of the people of Eastern India and also, to a smaller extent, of the upper Gangetic valley. We know that immigrations from the side of Thibet and Burma have taken place in historical times. But then the people of Northern India, the descendants of Aryan conquerors and Dravidian or Dravidianised natives, had become so settled that no appreciable change could have been effected in type by the newcomers, who could not, as Risley observes, descend much below the mountain heights except in North-eastern Bengal and Assam. So in order to explain the tendency towards broad-head in Northern India we must assume that a good percentage of the native population of the Gangetic valley, especially near the Himalayan ranges, at the time of the Aryan invasions were Mongolian in blood. Side by side with, and more important than, the Mongolian element was another, which may be called the oldest of the Indian population, the Munda-Monkhmer race. Thurston, an authority on the subject, says: "It is the Pre-Dravidian aborigines, and not the later and more cultured Dravidians, who must be regarded as the primitive existing race.... These Pre-Dravidians are differentiated from the Dravidian classes by their short stature and broad (platyrrhine) noses. There is strong ground for the belief that the Pre-

Dravidians are ethnically related to the Veddas of Ceylon, the Toalas of the Celebes, the Batin of Sumatra, and possibly the Australians." (The Madras Presidency, pp. 124-125.) But by the time of the coming of the Aryans they had been conquered by the Dravidians, who formed the ruling classes against whom the Aryans generally fought, and had mostly become Dravidianised in culture. To-day the Gonds and the vast majority of the Pre-Dravidian tribes speak Dravidian languages, which they must have adopted before the coming of the Aryans, while few like the Bhils speak Aryan dialects, and fewer still like the Mundas have retained anything like their primitive language. Hence it is that the main influence upon the conquering Aryan culture is found to be Dravidian, and not Mongolian or Munda. There were different strata of culture among the mixed native population, from that of the Dravidian Dasyu chiefs, who lived in towns and fortresses, had an advanced political system, and in intelligence were not inferior to the Aryans, to that of the savage tribes with filthy habits, ugly features, nomadic life, still not advanced beyond the hunting and fishing stage, men who were given the names of Nishada, Chandala, etc. by the Aryans, and were regarded as untouchables even at a time when the restrictions regarding marriage and food had

been very slight among the Aryan folk. They had been as it were the Sudras of the Dravidian society, and when the Dravidians themselves were reduced to the position of Sudras by the conquering Aryans the older Sudras descended to the position of Panchamas or fifth varna. The Pauranic description of the Nishadas as "black like crow, very low-statured, short-armed, having high cheek bones, low-topped nose, red eyes and copper-coloured hair, living in hills and forests," (Padma Purana II. 27. 42-43; Bhag. Pur. IV. 14. 44; Mhb. XII. 59. 94-97), agrees more with what we know of the Gonds, Bhils, Oraons, Mundas, etc. than with that of the more cultured Dravidians. (Chanda, Indo-Aryan Races).

CHAPTER V

NATURE OF ARYAN COLONISATION.

From what we have already said it would appear that the first wave of Indo-Aryan invasion was in the nature of a tribal migration from the side of Afghanistan, when a vast horde with their women, children and cattle entered India, and at once began an exterminating war with the natives of the soil, like the Anglo-Saxons in South-eastern Britain about three thousand years later (the parallelism would have been more apt had the Britons belonged to a non-Aryan stock). Their knowledge of harder metals and horse-riding, together with their superior physical strength, gave them a great advantage over their foes. But the latter in spite of their disadvantages offered, like the Britons, a very stout, though unavailing, resistance to the invaders, and many *Anderidas* were witnessed on the soil of the Punjab, as hinted in *Rigveda* IV. 16.13, where *Indra* is said to have killed fifty thousand black foes, and VII. 5.3, where fire is said to have pierced the citadel of the enemy, when the black people came out pellmell through consternation and distress, leaving all their belongings. Those who escaped

the fire and sword of the invaders must have fled to the east and south leaving a clean country to them as far as the modern Sirhind, where the Indus plain ends and Gangetic plain begins. This is the first stage of the Indo-Aryan colonisation, when, like the Anglo-Saxons in South-eastern Britain, the invaders made a clean sweep of their foes and received very little admixture of native blood, as is evident from the prevailing Indo-Aryan type in the Punjab even in modern times. Very few of the Rigvedic hymns can be traced to this period.

When the bulk of the hymns were composed, the second stage had begun. The Indo-Aryans

had been thoroughly settled in the Punjab and had lost touch with their kinsmen abroad. In

In the Madhyadesha.

their new home different tribes had settled in the different parts of the country, and, besides fighting with the Dasyus, had begun to fight among themselves for supremacy. The force of bursting flood had abated no doubt, but was still strong enough to impel the Indo-Aryan chieftains towards the east and south-east conquering fresh lands from the aborigines. The number of conquerors, however, was not sufficient to effectively occupy the conquered lands, and as specially the conquerors felt the need of women and labourers in their new settlements the

original ferocity and the ruthless policy of extermination were to a certain extent modified. They began to make slaves, mostly of the wives and children of the fallen natives. Even in the Rigvedic period towards its close the word *Dasa* gradually came to be synonymous with a slave, as in the proper name *Divodasa*, "the slave of heaven." In the next period the word *Dasi* regularly denoted a female slave. Slaves, sometimes in large numbers, are often alluded to in the Rigveda, and to the native slaves may be attributed the marked Dravidian influence upon the Vedic language.

Whether it was a later immigration of Indo-Aryans who could not on account of the difficult route bring their womenfolk with them and so had to marry Dravidian wives in the Gangetic regions—as is the theory of Hoernle, supported by Grierson and Risley—or, as is more probable, it was the natural expansion of the Indo-Aryans from the Punjab after the tribal immigration had ceased from outside, and was more of conquest than of colonisation, the fact remains that in the Gangetic regions the Indo-Aryans received a large admixture of Dravidian blood, which accounts for the lower stature, darker complexion, and broader nose of the Gangetic Indian than those of the Punjabese. In the later Rigvedic period the original hatred of the conquerors towards the

natives had so far abated that it was not rare that treaties and alliances were made and one or more Indo-Aryan tribes allied themselves with Dasa chiefs against the foes of their own race. A Dasa tribe, the Simyu, was among the foes of the famous Sudas in the battle of the ten kings (VII. 18.5). A priest celebrates the generosity of a Dasa chief, Balbutha (VIII. 46.32). In short, the scene presented by the Rigveda is not much unlike that of the Heph-tarchic period of English history, when the Anglo-Saxons were no more coming from the Baltic shores, were settled under different tribal chiefs in different parts of the country from which the British elements were practically wiped out, were still encroaching upon British lands and winning victories, like those of Deorham and Chester, but absorbing more and more British blood as they advanced more and more towards the west, and not unoften making alliances with British chiefs like Cadwallon in their own intertribal wars. By the end of the Rigvedic period the Indo-Aryans had advanced as far as the Ganges and were engaged in subjugating the country between the Jumna and the Ganges. The principal tribes still lived to the west of the Jumna. But in the next period we find that the more important of the tribes were planted in the land between the Saraswati and the Ganges.

Thus it is seen that there was a marked contrast between the Indo-Aryan settlement in the Punjab and that in the Gangetic regions as far as North Behar. While in the Punjab it was a settlement en masse by clearing the country thoroughly of all non-Aryan elements, in the Gangetic regions it was a matter of conquest in which the non-Aryan system was destroyed, their fighting forces broken, and their women and children enslaved. But even in the latter the predominant element was Aryan. Aryan tribes like Panchala, Vamsa, Chedi, Kosala, Videha settled themselves as rulers and absorbed the native population. Yet in this process of absorption the Indo-Aryan social system underwent a great change. It may be paradoxical to hear that the more contact there was between the Aryan and the non-Aryan the greater was the barrier imposed against their mingling. In the Punjab, where the non-Aryan element was practically wiped out, there was no danger of the purity of Aryan blood being affected, and so we do not find any regulations in the Rigveda forbidding intermarriage between an Aryan and a Dasyu, between a master and a slave, though, of course, such intermarriages must have been rare because of the hatred and contempt with which the conquerors regarded the natives. But the case became otherwise in the Gangetic regions. There were numerous

non-Aryans still in the country both as slaves and enemies, and if free intercourse were not checked, the danger was the swamping of the conquerors by the conquered. The question was the same as that of colour in the modern European colonies in Africa and America. Two courses were open to the Indo-Aryan conquerors, either to exterminate the natives wholesale, or to Aryanise them but with a careful eye to prevent themselves being barbarised in the course of their work. They adopted the latter policy and solved their difficulty by evolving the caste system. Already there were three classes in the Indo-Aryan society in the Punjab—the priest, the ruler, the cultivator and artisan. To these a fourth class, that of the slaves or Sudras, was added, and eventually a fifth, the Nishada, comprising the savage peoples of the hills and forests. While there were still free intercourses between the first three classes, there was a barrier raised between the first three and the fourth, not to speak of the fifth. Thus the non-Aryans were given a status in society and prevented from extermination, but they were not to spoil the purity of their rulers' blood. It was all right in theory, but it ran the risk of almost breaking down in practice. While you allow the Aryans and the non-Aryans to live together in society you can not altogether prevent intercourse, say, between

the masters and the female slaves, especially among the ordinary people. Thus the Vaisya caste become largely affected by non-Aryan blood, and less so were the Kshatriya* and the Brahmin. Hence the caste system became rigid in the Gangetic plains, which gave a new turn to the Indo-Aryan social organisation. The Punjabee Aryan was not so circumstanced and so could not keep pace with the social changes which were going on in the Madhyadesha, and in course of time came to be regarded as unorthodox. Again, the Brahmins becoming more and more exclusive devoted more time to the elaboration and development of their ritualism, on which rested their claims to superiority and power. So the rites and ceremonies became extremely elaborate, complicated and mechanical, and tended to make the cleavage between a Brahmin and a layman still greater. Hence the Madhyadesha or the Upper Gangetic regions evolved the peculiar Brahmanical religion and social structure, and became the model country for all ages.

The story of the conquest of Magadha, Anga, Vanga, Pundra, Kalinga, etc. was altogether different. There were **In Eastern India.** powerful non-Aryan communities in these lands (which are named after them) who are mentioned as independent in some of the

*The Vedic Kshatriya meant a member of the ruling or princely class and not an ordinary warrior.

Brahmanas. How these conquests were made is not known to us. But this much we know that no powerful Aryan tribe settled and absorbed the conquered in any considerable part of these lands. Let me again draw an analogy from English history. We know how the two Wales' were conquered, how to the main Celtic population a sprinkling of Anglo-Saxon blood was added, how the population and the social structure remained in the main Celtic. Magadha was something like the March land where the absorption of the conquerors' blood was more than in other parts. The non-Aryans of Eastern India were no doubt conquered, and, so far as their language and religion were concerned, Aryanised, but they had not become slaves en masse of their conquerors as in the upper valley of the Ganges, and had not wholly lost their old tribal and social organisations. We hear of the same Vangas, Pundras, Kalingas, etc. in historical times as before their conquest in the later Vedic period. Even in language, such as in the modern Bengali dialect, the Dravidian traces are to be found to a greater extent than in the languages of Upper India. In social structure Eastern India could never adapt itself to the models of the Madhyadesha, and hence we find the population mainly divided between the Brahmins and the Sudras with no intermediate castes between them.

The fact that Eastern India was imperfectly Aryanised partly accounts for the rise of the two great protestant religions, Jainism and Buddhism, in that quarter about the time when the process of conquest was still going on. The protests against the Brahminical hierarchy and rituals so boldly preached by Mahavira and Gautama Buddha in Behar can easily be interpreted as a reaction against the imposition of Brahminical belief and institutions upon a not very willing people, conquered but not vanquished. Hence it is why we find Behar as the earliest land to accept the new creeds, and as the last stronghold of Buddhism before it finally disappeared from India. It is here in Eastern India that we find the development of the un-Vedic Tantric religion, and here that Islam which knocked itself in vain against the Brahminical sacerdotalism of the Madhyadesha found the greatest number of converts.

The non-Aryan protest did not spend itself up only in religion and social matters. Mahapadma Nanda rose as their champion to overthrow the rule of the Kshatriya families in Magadha. He was admittedly of Sudra or non-Aryan origin, and he so terribly punished the Aryan ruling classes that he has been described in the Puranas as "the exterminator of the Kshatriya race like a second Parasurama." Certainly he did not do so in the interest of the

Brahmin caste, as in that case the Brahmin writers of the Puranas would not have poured their choicest invectives upon him, and the whole period of Nanda rule would not have been omitted from the Calendar (Ananda era). Such was the havoc he caused among the Kshatriya families of the Gangetic valley that the Brahmins could only overthrow his family by setting up another Sudra, Chandragupta Maurya. For a time, of course, Chandragupta acted under the influence of his patron Brahmin minister, Kautilya or Chanakya, but it is very probable that he too in his later life dissociated himself from Brahminism and became a convert to Jainism. And it was his grandson Asoka who by vigorously espousing the cause of Buddhism gave the greatest blow which Brahminism had yet received in India. Only four centuries ago another strong attack against Brahminical hierarchy and ritualism was made by Chaitanya in Bengal. The spirit of protest is still strong in the Bengalee blood, which manifests itself from time to time, as in the Brahma Samaj Movement of only half a century ago. But in spite of these actions and reactions the non-Aryan in Eastern India has been slowly and unconsciously drawn within the octopus clutches of Brahminism, and to-day no Bengalee would like to regard himself as any but descended from the pure Aryan stock.

With regard to Northern India it may be said with more or less truth that the Aryanisation was effected principally through conquest. But the case *In the Deccan.* seems to be entirely different in the south. Of course there were migrations of Aryan tribes or families from Northern India who established themselves as conquerors over the native population in some parts of the country. Thus we learn from the Brahmanas that the Bhojas ruled in Vidarbha or Berar, from the Arthashastra that the Bhojas once ruled over the Dandaka or Maharashtra country, and from the Jagayyapeta inscriptions that an Ikshaku dynasty governed in the Kistna District in the third century A. D. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar holds that the Pandyas were emigrants from the Muttra District. Yet on the whole the process of Aryanisation was carried on mostly by peaceful means. The route from Northern India to the Deccan across the hilly and forest regions of Chota Nagpur and the Central Provinces being extremely difficult, the Aryan stream gradually thinning the more it moved from its base in Upper India, and, above all, the Dravidian community in possession of the Deccan being too strong to be forcibly subjugated, most parts of the Deccan remained practically independent under their own Dravidian rulers. But it cannot be said that to-day the Tamil country

is less Aryan in sentiment than other parts of India. Who, then, brought the Aryan culture to the Dravidians of Southern India ?

If we may believe in the tradition as recorded in the Epics, the Rishis or Brahmin sages took a most prominent part in the diffusion of Aryan culture in the south often at considerable risks to their lives. Thus when Rama went to the south he found in many places the asramas or hermitages of Brahmin sages far away from Aryan land and constantly harrassed by the Rakshasas or the native non-Aryans. These Aryan missionaries did not resort to physical force, and went on with their work with the utmost patience, courage and unselfishness. In course of time some of the non-Aryans must have been attracted by their superior wisdom and virtuous lives, and become their worshipful allies. Thus, though the Rakshasas in general were in hostile opposition to Brahminical institutions, not so was Vibhisana, brother of Ravana, nor were the Banaras or Kiskindhya, one of the non-Aryan tribes. Among such missionary sages the most prominent was Agastya, who was met by Rama in a hermitage to the south of the Vindhya. He became so successful in spreading culture among the Dravidians of Southern India that in later times he came to be regarded by the Tamil people as the founder of their language and to be

known as Tamirmuni or Tamilian sage. (Bhandarkar Lectures).

In the Deccan, therefore, there are three different shades of Aryan permeation. In the first place are the Maharastra country and Berar. They were conquered, and Indo-Aryan ruling families, chiefly of the Yadu tribe, settled there, imposing their tongue and creed upon the mass of Dravidian population, who had been already conquered by brachycephalic tribes probably from Iran. The latter formed the upper classes in the land, and when it was conquered by the Indo-Aryans were entirely amalgamated with them. Hence we see that the higher classes, the Brahmins and the ruling castes, are more brachycephalic, but in other respects, as in nose form, tallness and complexion, approximate more to the people of the Gangetic valley than the mass of the people who approximate more to the Dravidian type. (Risley, *People of India*, Appendix IV).

In the second place comes the Telegu-speaking or Andhra country. This land did not long remain under Aryan rule, but being exposed to Aryan influences from two sides, Berar and Kalinga, became Aryanised not only in creed but also to a certain extent in language. The bulk of the population is almost pure Dravidian, but the language has about a third of its vocabulary derived from Aryan roots. Most of the

borrowed words relate to abstract or scientific and religious terms, which supports the tradition of the missionary work by Brahmin sages. That the contact was slight is proved by the fact that the words relating to common-place things and ideas are mostly Dravidian, and that the grammatical rules are entirely different from those of Sanskrit, and this in spite of the well-known fact that "when an Aryan tongue comes into contact with an uncivilized aboriginal one, it is invariably the latter which goes to the wall" (Grierson), a fact which is amply corroborated by the cases of imperfectly Aryanised Bengal, Assam and Maharashtra.

Still more free from Aryan influences is the Tamil country. Even as late as the times of the Mauryas the ordinary religion of the Tamilians was a form of demon-worship, and Brahminism had not made much headway among them. The first great Aryan influence came with the spread of Buddhism and Jainism together with their literature from Northern India, and by the time these two religions gave way to Hinduism the creed of the Tamil land had been practically Aryanised, and Brahminical institutions laid on a solid foundation. The language, however, has not been much influenced. It contains a very small number of Sanskrit words, and a Tamil composition is regarded as refined and classical not in proportion to the amount of

Sanskrit it contains but in proportion to the absence of Sanskrit. It is worthy of note, too, that while in other parts of India the authors were mostly Brahmins, most of the compositions in classical Tamil literature were the works of Sudras. While the Telegu-speaking peoples might have received a sprinkling of Aryan blood, the Tamilian non-Brahmins are almost all of pure Dravidian origin. The Brahmins in general still retain memories of their immigrations from the north and have jealously guarded themselves against contact with the natives.

There are, however, evidences that the Aryan influences were stronger in the Deccan in the first few centuries of the Christian era than in modern times. Thanks to the conquest of the Deccan by the Mauryas and the spread of Buddhism there, a Prakrit dialect obtained wide currency even in those parts where Dravidian languages are spoken at the present day. Thus Asoka's Minor Rock Edicts found in the Chitaldurg District, the donative inscriptions in some Buddhist stupas in the Kistna District (150 B. C. to 200 A. D.), the Malavalli stone inscription in the Kanarese country, and some copperplate grants of the Pallava kings of Kanchi, all prove that an Indo-Aryan dialect, Prakrit, in which these inscriptions are written was the official language and was at least intelligible to all classes of people in many parts of even

Southern India. The instructions of Asoka were intended for all classes of men, high and low, and must have been couched in a language which was generally understood. The donations mentioned in the stupa inscriptions of Kistna concerned even such low-class people as leather-workers. One of the Pallava charters issues instructions not only to the higher officials but to ordinary free holders and even cowherds. Such was the Aryan influence in Southern India at that time that Aryan proper names were used not only by many rulers, as the Pallavas of Kanchi, but even among the lower classes, as in the Kistna inscriptions. The spread of Aryan language and ideas and the infiltration of Aryan blood had been steadily proceeding, and there was every likelihood that Southern India would be as much Aryanised as Bengal or Maharashtra, and that the Dravidian culture would be completely lost except where it was incorporated in the conquering one. But the failure of the northerners to maintain their political suzerainty over the south for a considerable length of time, the rise of strong Dravidian powers like the Andhras, the Pallavas, the Cholas, who instead of submitting to Aryan rule even carried their victorious arms into the north, and, above all, the Mahomedan conquest of Northern India which destroyed the fountain-spring of Aryan colonisation and inspiration,

not only checked the progress of Aryanisation but even caused the loss of some vantage ground which had been won by the Indo-Aryans in the south. Hence there is a greater self-assertion of the Dravidian in modern times.

CHAPTER VI
TRIBES AND KINGDOMS OF
THE RIGVEDA.

The most important of the Rigvedic tribes seems to be the Bharatas, who in afterages have given the name to the whole country, Bharatavarsha or India.

Bharata. They were settled in the country between the Saraswati and the Jumna, and fought both against their Aryan rivals on the west and non-Aryan foes on the east. Their princes are found sacrificing on the Saraswati, on the Drishadvati, on the Apaya, in the land which afterwards became celebrated as Kurukshetra. The victories of the Bharata princes and the poetical fame of their Rishis together served to acquire for the cult of the Bharata people a kind of acknowledged supremacy. Agni is Bharata, i.e. belonging to the Bharatas. Bharati is the protecting deity of the Bharatas, in connection with whom the sacred river Saraswati is constantly mentioned.

The next in importance were the Purus, who lived on either side of the Saraswati and were neighbours and rivals of the Bharatas. In later Rigvedic times these two rival tribes became thoroughly amalgamated, and under the name of Kuru,

Puru.

a name not directly mentioned in the Rigveda, became the chief bearers of the Vedic culture during the later Vedic period. According to Pargiter, who follows the Epic and Puranic tradition, the Purus and the Bharatas were two branches of one family who were engaged in rivalry when some of the Rigvedic hymns were composed. They were united under Samvarana and his son, the famous Kuru, who gave the name to his family and also to the people. (Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 281).

There was a comparatively unimportant tribe known as the Krivi, who at first might have lived on the Indus and the **Krivi, Srinjaya.** Chenab, but later moved to the east across the Jumna to the land which afterwards became known as Panchala (S. P. Br. XIII. 5.4.7). Closely connected with the Bharatas was the tribe of Srinjaya, who lived in the neighbourhood of the Bharatas, probably in the Panchala country, i.e. the modern Rohilkhand tract.

Among the allies of the Purus against the Bharatas were the Anus who dwelt on the Parushni or Ravi, and the kindred **Ar, Druhyu,** Druhyus who lived to their west, **Yad, Turvasha.** and the two allied tribes of Yadu and Turvasha, who lived in the southern Punjab, and probably further south as the traditional

home of the Yadavas in the Epics and Puranas lay from Gujarat to Muttra.

Another people were the Matsyas whose wealth drew upon them an attack of the Turvashas (Rig VII. 18.6). The

Matsya. riches of the Matsyas, especially their wealth of cows, made them victims even in Epic times of predatory raids by the Trigarttas and the Kurus. We know that in later times the Matsyas lived in the neighbourhood of the Surasenas of Mathura to the west, i.e. in modern Alwar and Jaypur, and that was probably their home even in the Rigvedic age.

Among the lesser tribes were the Alinas, Pakthas and Bhalanases, all living in the frontier regions. In the later Rigvedic period two peoples, who played rather important parts in the Brahmana and Epic periods, first come into notice—the Chedis who dwelt in the land between the Jumna and the Vindhyas, and the Usinaras in the neighbourhood of the Saraswati. The Chedi king Kasu is praised in a Danastuti (VIII. 5.37-39). He seems to be a very powerful king who made a gift of ten rajas as slaves to his priest. In the Pauranic tradition the Chedis are represented as an offshoot of the Yadus, and the Usinaras of the Anus, and there is nothing in the Rigveda to indicate that the Chedis or the Usinaras were a tribe and not a clan.

Among the Dasa tribes were the Kikatas, Simyus, Ajas, Yakshus, and Sigrus, who were

Dasa Tribes. mostly inhabitants of the Gangetic valley, and were contesting the advance of the Bharatas towards the east and south-east. Individual Dasa kings were Ilibisha, Dhuni, Chumuri, Sambara, Varchin, Dribhika, Rudhikra, Anarsani, Sribinda, etc., some of whom later received demoniacal attributes and became celestial foes of Indra and other gods.

A curious people were the Panis, who are described in the Rigveda as "greedy like the
Pani. wolf," "extremely selfish," "niggardly," "non-sacrificing," "of cruel speech," "Dasyus" (VII.6.3). They were also notorious cattle-possessors (i.e. wealthy, cattle constituting the main wealth and currency of the time), and cattle-lifters, and the name is often used to denote a class of demons who withheld the water of the clouds like cows from the Aryans. The word seems to live in such Sanskrit words as Panik or Vanik (merchant), Panya (merchandise), Bipani (shop), etc., from which we may infer that the Panis were the merchants par excellence in the Rigvedic age. Their patron god seems to be Vala, whom Indra pierced when he robbed the Pani of his cows (Rig I.62.4; X.67.6). One of their kings was Brihu (VI.45.3f). The phonetic resemblances of the words Pani

and Punic, Vala and the Phoenician god Baal, Brihu and Baberu or Babylon, together with their peculiar characteristics and the fact of their being chased back towards the west (VII.6.3), may well tempt us to identify the Panis with the Phoenicians, who formerly lived near the Persian Gulf and traded in the Arabian Sea before their migration to the Mediterranean coast.

Divodasa, "the servant of heaven," the Atithigva, "the sacrificer of cows for guests," was

Divodasa. a great king of the Bharata tribe,* who successfully fought against the Purus, Yadus and Turvashas on one hand, and the Dasa chief Sambara, the Panis etc. on the other. He was the patron of the priestly family of the Bharadvajas, the authors of the sixth book of the Rigveda.

His descendant was the famous king Sudas, son of Pijavana. At first Sudas' priest was Viswamitra, who himself was a scion of

Sudas. the Kusika family of the Bharata tribe (Ait. Br. VII. 17—18), and who led him to victories on the Vipasha and Satudru, as described in the third book of the Rigveda, the whole of which is attributed to the Viswamitra

* For the identification of the Tritans with the Bharatas see Oldenberg, *Buddha*, pp. 405-406, Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index* I.p.363.

family. But for some reason or other, probably on account of the superior Brahminical knowledge of the Vasisthas (Kath. Br. XXXVII. 17. 117 ; S. P. Br. XII. 6. 1. 38), Sudas appointed Vasistha in place of Viswamitra as his priest. Hence arose the long and bitter rivalry between the two families, and the imprecations uttered by Viswamitra (Rig III. 53. 21—24). The Vasisthas in the seventh book of the Rigveda pray for the prosperity of Sudas and celebrate his glorious victories on the Parushni over the ten allied tribes, the Purus, Yadus, Turvashas, Anus, Druhyus, Alinas, Pakthas, Bhalanases, Sivas, and Vishanins. Such was the bloody and decisive victory that the Anu and Druhyu kings fell in the battle, and so also probably Purukutsa, the Puru king, whose wife was reduced to great distress, from which she was afterwards relieved by her son Trasadasyu. Sudas also turned his victorious arms against the non-Aryan tribes, the Ajas, Sigrus and Yakshus, who were united under a king, Bheda, who attacked the kingdom of Sudas from the east while probably the latter was fighting against his Aryan foes on the west. Sudas quickly returned and defeated them with great slaughter on the Jumna. Sudas was not only a great warrior but also a scholar, as tradition credits him with the composition of the hymn 133 of the tenth book. All this while Viswamitra had not remained

idle. He was assisted in acquiring more Brahminical knowledge by the priestly family of Jamadagni, to whom he expresses his indebtedness in Rig III. 53. 15—16. He then began to accuse Vasistha of various heinous crimes, which the latter denies on oath in Rig VII. 104. 12—16. Yet Viswamitra seems to have regained ascendancy in the Bharata court. According to the Taittiriya Samhita (Ashtaka VII) and the Kaushitaki Brahmana (4th Adhaya) the sons of Sudas killed a son of Vasistha and were destroyed by the indignant father. Manu is evidently mistaken when he charges Sudas instead of his sons with outrages committed upon Brahmins (VII. 41). Vasistha probably effected the destruction of the family of Sudas with the help of the Purus, as henceforth the Puru kings like Trasadasyu, Trikshi, Kurusravana, Upamastavas, etc. come into more prominence. This fact can be traced in the confused accounts in the Mahabharata (Adiparva, verses 3725-37) of the Puru king Samvarana being assisted by Vasistha in recovering his power and defeating his enemy, the Bharata king of Panchala. Samvarana's son was the famous Kuru after whom his family and the people ruled by him came to be known. Curiously, the names of Bharata and Puru were merged in the name Kuru within a few generations from Sudas and

Trasadasyu, as is found in the later Samhitas and the Brahmanas.

A later king is Santanu for whom Devapi performed a rain-inducing sacrifice (Rig X. 98).

**Santanu and
Devapi.**

The Mahabharata and the Puranas describe Santanu as the Kuru king of Hastinapur and the grandfather of the Pandavas, and Devapi as his elder brother who became an ascetic (Adiparva, 3750 ; Vishnu Purana IV.20.7). Weber (Indische Studien, I.203), however, considers that the Santanu and Devapi of the Mahabharata and the Puranas cannot be the same persons as those alluded to in the Rigveda, because their father was Pratipa, not Rishitishena as mentioned in the above hymn, and because it is doubtful whether a prince who was so near to the Mahabharata war in point of time could have been named in a Rigvedic hymn. There is nothing in the Rigveda to indicate that Devapi was a prince.

CHAPTER VII
LATER DEVELOPMENTS OF
TRIBES AND KINGDOMS.

During the period of the later Samhitas and the Brahmanas the Bharatas and the Purus have disappeared as separate tribes and are found united under a new name, Kuru. Reminiscences, however, of the past greatness of the Bharata tribe are met with here and there, as in the accounts in the Satapatha Brahmana (XIII.5.4.11-12) of Bharata Dauhshanti who performed a horse sacrifice and defeated his enemies on the Ganges and the Jumna. The first great Kuru king is Parikshit (a descendant of Kuru according to Epic and Pauranic traditions), who is mentioned in the Atharvaveda (XX.127.7-10), and in whose reign, it is said, the Kuru kingdom flourished exceedingly. "Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples, the god who is above mortals, of Vaisvanara Parikshit! Parikshit has procured for us a secure dwelling when he, the most excellent one, went to his seat. (Thus) the husband in Kuru land, when he founds his household, converses with his wife.

... "What may I bring to thee, curds, stirred

drink or liquor? (Thus) the wife asks her husband in the kingdom of king Parikshit.

"Like light the ripe barley runs over beyond the mouth (of the vessels). The people thrive merrily in the kingdom of king Parikshit." (Bloomfield, Atharvaveda, pp. 197-198).

A son of his was Janamejaya, whose horse sacrifice is celebrated in the Satapatha Brahmana (XIII.5.4.) and Aitareya Brahmana (VIII. 21), and whose brothers Ugrasena, Bhimasena and Srutasena by the same sacrifice purified themselves of the sin of Brahmin killing. The capital of Janamejaya was Asandivanta. This Parikshit—Janamejaya must not be confused with the descendants of the Pandavas. It seems that the main Kuru line fell into distress after Janamejaya and remained in darkness for several generations until a descendant of his, the famous Pratipa, revived the power and greatness of the family (Mhb. V. 148.5053). Hence in most places in the Puranas the names of the kings between Janamejaya and Pratipa are omitted from the genealogies. From Pratipa to the Pandavas the history of the Kurus is unchequered.

Closely allied to the Kurus were the Panchalas, a composite tribe as the name shows.

Kuru-Panchalas. According to the Satapatha Brahmana the older name for the Panchalas was Krivi, and according to the

Mahabharata the Srinjayas were connected with the royal family of North Panchala. We may, therefore, believe that the Krivis and Srinjayas of the early Vedic period and three other tribes, who cannot be clearly traced, together formed the later Panchala people. The Kuru-Panchalas are described in the Brahmanas as the models of good form, their kings as the greatest sacrificers, and their priestly class the most learned in the knowledge of the Vedas. "Speech sounds higher here among the Kuru-Panchalas." The later Samhitas and the Brahmanas seem mostly to have taken definite form in the land of the Kuru-Panchalas. In the Rajsuya ceremony as described in the Yajurveda the king is presented to the people as that of the Kurus or Panchalas or Kuru-Panchalas. Of the Panchala kings we hear of Kraivya, Sona Satrasaha, Durmukha, a great conqueror, and Pravahana Jaivali, a philosopher king of the Chhandogya and Brihadaranyaka Upanishads.

The Matsyas seem to have occupied an important position, though within a limited space, during the Brahmana period. One of their kings, Dhvasan Dvaitavana performed a horse sacrifice where there is the lake Dvaitavana (S.P.Br.XIII,5.4.9). The well-known sage, Gargya Balaki lived for sometime among them (Kaus. Br. IV. 1). Their activities, however, remained confined to alliances and rivalries

with the neighbouring powers like the Kuru-Panchalas, the Surasenans and the Chedis, and did not operate on the wider stage of Aryavarta, unlike those of the Kurus, Kosalas, Yadus and others. In the Mahabharata war the Matsyas were one of the secondary powers who led their hosts to the assistance of the more important combatants.

To the east of the Kuru-Panchala land lay the realms of Kosala and Videha. A family of **Kosala-Videha** princes bearing the name of Ikshaku is known from the Rigveda (X.60.4), and it is likely that the ruling dynasty of Kosala may have been descended from this family. "In the Panchavimsa Brahmana mention is made of Tryaruna Aikshaka who is identical with the Tryaruna Traivrishna of the Brihaddevata and with Tryaruna Trasadasyu in the Rigveda. The connection of Trasadasyu with the Ikshakus is confirmed by the fact that Purukutsa was an Aikshaka, according to Satapatha Brahmana. Thus the Ikshaku line was originally a line of the Puru kings." (Vedic Index). Epic and Pauranic traditions describe the royal dynasty of Videha as a branch of the Ikshaku dynasty of Kosala, Nimi the founder of the former being a son of Ikshaku. The tradition, as recorded in the Satapatha Brahmana, about the founding of the kingdom of Videha by Videgha Mathava accompanied by his priest Gotama Rahugana, appears to be more

reliable, though the existence of a king by name Nimi may be assumed, from the occurrence of the name Nami Sapyā the Videhan in the Vedic Texts. Probably Nimi was the founder not of the kingdom but of the greatness of the kingdom. Even without accepting the Panranic traditions we may find evidences in the Brahmanas to show that the Kosalas and the Videhas were allied tribes and that there was some rivalry existing between the Kosala-Videhas and the Kuru-Panchalas. Sometimes Kosala and Videha were united under one rule, as under Para Atnara Hairanyanabha (S.P.Br.XIII.5.4.4). It is said that the sage Jala Jatukarnya was the priest of the Kosalas, Videhas and Kasis at one time (Sankhayana Sruta Sutra XVI.29.5), which indicates at least a temporary league. Brahminism was not as strong in Kosala as in the Kuru-Panchala land, as is revealed in the verdict given by the people in favour of their king against his priest (Jaiminiya Brahmana III. 94-95). It appears from all these that the Aryan tribes who occupied Oudh and North Behar might or might not be a branch of the Kuru-Panchalas, but it is certain that politically and to some extent culturally there was some difference and rivalry between the eastern group of Kosala, Videha and Kasi, and the western group of Kuru-Panchala, Matsya, Surasena, etc.

Some uncertainty exists with regard to the Kasis. Pauranic tradition traces the descent of the Kasi dynasty from the Panrava **Kasi.** king Nahusha, grandson of Pururavas, and thereby connects the Kasis with the Kuru-Panchalas. But whatever might have been their origin, we find in the Brahmanas and the Upanishads that the Kasis were more allied to the Kosala-Videhas and were often fighting against the Kuru-Panchalas. Dhritarashtra Vaichitravirya, king of Kasi, was defeated by the Kuru king Satadika Satrajita with the result that the Kasis down to the time of the Satapatha Brahmana ceased to keep up the sacrificial fire (S. P. Br. XIII. 5.4.19).

That there is some consistency in the Pauranic traditions can not be denied when we learn from them that not only the Kasis **Magadha.** but the Aryan colonists of Magadha, at least the royal family, belonged to the Kuru-Panchala tribes. It is said that the first conquest was made by Amurtarayas, a younger son of Kusa, king of Kanyakubja or Kanouj, and descended from Pururavas. Afterwards Vasu, a descendant of king Kuru, conquered the country and gave it to his eldest son, Brihadratha, the founder of the famous Barhadratha dynasty.

In the Puranas tribal names are often

inserted in the genealogies under the disguise of eponymous ancestors, and we may believe in the relationship of such and such tribes when their eponymous ancestors are descended from a common father. Thus Puru, Anu, Druhyu, Yadu, Turvasha are the eponymous ancestors of the five allied tribes of the Rigveda. There is nothing in the Rigveda to indicate any blood relation between these tribes. Of these the Anu and Druhyu, the Yadu and Turvasha are sometimes mentioned as pairs, indicating closer relations between the two. But for the time being these five tribes were in confederacy against the powerful Bharatas. Probably this fact accounts for the statement in the Puranas that the five eponymous heroes were brothers, being the sons of the mythical king Yajati. Yajati, it is said, divided his kingdom among his five sons, Puru receiving the middle region, Anu north, Druhyu west, Yadu south-west, and Turvasha south-east. The Pauranic location of the tribes, if we put the Purus on the Saraswati, accords well with what we know from the Rigveda.

Of these five tribes the Purus, as we have seen, united with the Bharatas and other tribes and became the founders of the famous Kuru-Panchala tribes. It is also likely that the ruling families of Kosala,

**Eponymous
Ancestors.**

Anu.

Kasi and Magadha belonged to this stock. The Anus were divided into two branches, Usinara and Titikshu. The Usinaras in course of time were subdivided into Usinara proper, Yaudheya, Madraka, Kekaya,* Sauvira, etc., the tribes whom we find in occupation of the Punjab and Sind in more recent times. From Titukshu descended after several generations the famous king Bali, who divided his territories among his five sons, Anga, Vanga, Kalinga, Pundra and Suhma. Thus the Puranas under the disguise of fables, mythical kings and eponymous ancestors seek to connect the tribes of the Punjab and the Aryan colonists of the eastern countries, Anga (E. Behar), Vanga (E. Bengal), Pundra (N. Bengal), Suhma (W. Bengal), Kalinga (Orissa), all belonging to the Anu stock of the Rigveda. This tradition accords very well with the findings of Grierson as to the near relations of the dialects of the Punjab and the eastern provinces as distinguished from those of the Midland.

In the Rigveda we find the Druhyus living to

* From the Ramayana (II. 68. 19-22; VII. 113-114) we learn that the Kekaya country lay between the Beas and the Gandhara country. Asvapati, a king of Kekaya in the Upanishad period, is a famous person, who taught a number of well-known Brahmin scholars the principles of the knowledge of Brahma (Chhandogya Upanishad V. 11. 4 et seq.).

the west of the Anus, i.e. in the Indus region.

Druhyus. The Puranas make Gandhara, an eponymous king, a descendant of Druhyu, showing that the Druhyus inhabited the Gandhara land. Unlike the other tribes the Druhyus did not seek to expand towards the interior of India. Their way towards the east and south-east was barred by the Anus. Hence they sent their overflowings to the countries to the west and north-west, a fact recorded in the Puranas which tell us that the hundred sons of Pracheta, a later descendant of Druhyu and Gandhara, established themselves as kings in the Mlechchha countries to the north.

The Turvashas lived, according to Pauranic tradition, to the south-east of the Purus. In

Turvashas. the Brahmana period they have practically disappeared from history. The Satapatha Brahmana (XIII. 5. 4. 16) suggests that they formed one of the elements of the composite Panchala tribe. The Puranas declare that the Turvashas were merged into the Purus as their last king Marutta adopted the Puru king Dushyanta as his successor. Anyway, the Turvashas were absorbed by the Kuru-Panchalas.

Unlike their old allies, the Turvashas, the Yadus displayed a remarkable power of growth

Yadus. and expansion, and became in the Epic age no mean rivals of the Kurus and the Ikshakus. Out of the

confused accounts, different versions, wrong arrangements and omissions of the different Puranas one fact stands clear, viz., that the Yadus in course of time branched off into the Yadavas, Satvatas, Haihayas, Kukuras, Bhojas, Andhakas, Chedis, Vrishnis and other smaller clans. For the history of the Yadus we have to depend entirely on the Puranas as the names of Yadu kings except the Bhojas are almost unknown to the Samhitas and the Brahmanas. Of the important Yadu kingdoms may be mentioned the Haihaya kingdom of Mahismati or Malwa, Kukura kingdom of Surasena or Muttra,* Vrishni kingdom of Dwaraka in Kathiwar, Bhoja kingdom of Marttikavata in Rajputana, Yadava kingdom of Vidarbha or Berar (otherwise known as the Bhoja kingdom, the name Bhoja being often applied to the Yadus in general), Chedi kingdom to the south of the Jumna (till its conquest by Vasu Chaidya the Paurava). From Kautilya's Arthasastra we know that the Bhojas at one time ruled in the Dandaka or Maharasta country, probably supplanting a small Ikshaku colony there, the remembrance of which gave origin to the eponymous king

* The country obtained its name from Surasena, son of Satrugna, who had conquered it from the Yadava king Lavana of Madhu's family. The Yadavas seem to have regained it after Surasena's death. Mathura is a corruption of Madhupura.

Danda, a son of Ikshaku. In short, we see that the Yadus prevailed over practically the whole land from the Gulf of Cambay and the Godavery to the Jumna.

The Haihayas were the Mahrattas of the Epics during the Treta age. It seems that at first the Pauravas attained supremacy in the Middle Country and that that period of their greatness is associated in the Puranas with such mythical kings as Pururavas, Ayu, Nahusha and Yajati. After the death of Yajati the Paurava kingdom was broken up into small principalities, and the kingdom of Oudh rose to supremacy under its kings, Yuvanasha and his son Mandhatri. Under Mandhatri and his sons, one of whom was Muchukunda, the Ikshakus conquered the country as far as the Punjab on one side and the Nerbudda on the other. The Haihayas, who were settled in Malwa, and who were pressed under the heels of the Ikshakus, soon rose against them, and taking advantage of the weakness of Muchukunda's successors, not only cleared their country of the enemies but, like the Mahrattas under Baji Rao, boldly appeared in the Gangetic regions, and fell upon the small kingdom of Kasi. They ravaged and conquered it and made it their base for raiding Northern India. The greatest king of the Haihaya dynasty was Arjuna, son of

Haihayas-
Treta Age.

Kritavirya, who is known as a Samrat and a Chakravartin. He defeated and took prisoner a Ravana* or a Dravidian king, who had come northward on conquest. He, like Balaji Rao, extended his conquests from the Nerbudda to the Himalayas overruling the kingdom of Oudh. In his pride of power he began to oppress the Brahmin family of Bhargava who dwelt in the lower region of the Nerbudda. The Bhargavas fled to the Gangetic Doab, and with a view to avenge themselves on the Haihayas entered into matrimonial alliances with the royal families of Kanouj and Oudh. Arjuna raided Jamadagni Bhargava's hermitage, and in the melee which took place both of them were killed. Jamadagni's son, the terrible Parasurama, swore vengeance and with the assistance of the princes of Oudh and Kanouj, both of whom were suffering from the raids of the Haihayas, defeated and killed many of the enemies. The Haihaya power, like that of the Mahrattas after the third battle of Panipat, received a set-back, but was not crushed. The central power was destroyed, and on its ruins rose five powers in five different centres—Vitihotra, Saryata, Bhoja, Avanti, Tundikera, all of whom were collectively known as Talajanghas

* Ravana is probably not a personal name but a Sanskritized form of the Tamil word *iraiyan* or *iraiyan*, 'God, king, sovereign, lord.' (Pargiter, *Anc. Ind. His.* Trad. p. 242).

from the name of the grandson of Arjuna. This confederacy of Haihaya powers gradually recovered from the great blow inflicted by Parasurama and again began their raids into Northern India. The kingdom of Kanouj fell, and Bahu, king of Oudh, was compelled to leave his capital and take shelter in the hermitage of Aurva Bhargava, where he died. The Haihayas then attacked the eastern kingdoms of Vaisali and Videha. But Vaisali was fortunate enough to have three generations of very able princes at the time, Karandhama, Aviksit and Marutta, who successfully repulsed the Haihaya attacks. The Kasi kings, too, who had been carrying on a long struggle from the eastern portion of their territory, attained some success, and Pratardana and his son Vatsa even annexed the district of Kausambi, which was thence named the Vatsa country.

Meanwhile Sagara, son of Bahu, had reached manhood and made careful preparations to fight the Haihayas. He defeated them, regained the throne of Oudh, and soon established his supremacy in Northern India. He then invaded the territories of the Haihayas and crushed their power so effectively that we do not hear of them till long afterwards. He advanced as far as Vidarbha, whose king had to buy peace by giving his daughter in marriage

*Ishakus and
Yadavas.*

with him. After Sagara's death Oudh failed to maintain her suzerainty over the vast empire built up by him, and though from time to time kings like Dilipa, Raghu, Aja, Dasaratha went out on conquering expeditions and achieved some successes, yet on the whole the Oudh kings confined themselves to their own territories. The Yadavas of Vidarbha availing themselves of the friendship of Oudh gradually extended their power over a part of the Haihaya country and over the Chedi country. Meanwhile the Paurava realm, which had been overthrown in Mandhatri's time,* regained its independence and the land from the Saraswati to the Ganges came under the rule of Paurava princes from different centres, one of which was Hastinapur. The Yadavas stepped into the place of the Haihayas and established several kingdoms in the land from the Jumna to the Gulf of Cambay, the more important of which were Surasena and Dwaraka.

* We find in the Ramayana (I.13.21-28) that Vasistha advised Dasaratha, king of Ajodhya, to invite the kings of Mithila, Kasi, Kekaya, Anga, Magadha, Sindhu, Sauvira, Surastra etc., but did not mention any king of the Middle Country. This passage is cited by some scholars to prove that there was cultural difference between the kingdoms of the Outer Band and those of the Middle Country. But it need not be interpreted in that way, and the meaning becomes clear if we remember that the Kuru-Panchala land was directly subject to the king of Oudh.

After the death of Rama, the hero of the Ramayana, the power of Oudh began to decline and the centre of political activity shifted to the Kuru-Pandavas --Dwapara Age. Panchala country. The Kurus and the Pandavas were certainly the most powerful princes of their time and their domestic quarrels brought the whole of India from one extremity to the other into the vortex of blood in the Kurukshetra war. Almost all the ruling families suffered so much that for a long time after there was a spirit of stupor in the country and the wars and rivalries of the succeeding generations bespeak only pettiness and weakness of the contending parties. Kshatriya India could never recover from the awful carnage of the Kurukshetra war.

During the following age, though the Ikshaku and Kuru lines of kings continued to rule in their respective realms, the kingdom of the future was Magadha, the Prussia of Aryavarta, and detailed dynastic tables are given in the Puranas of these three kingdoms only, the other kingdoms being incidentally mentioned. Shortly after the Kurukshetra war it seems that a non-Aryan tribe, the Nagas, established themselves at Takshasila or Taxila and attacked the grandson of the Pandavas, Parikshit II, who was killed. His son Janamejaya III was a vigorous

ruler, who defeated the Nagas but failed to annihilate their power. In the reign of Nichakshus, the fourth in descent from Janamejaya, Hastinapur (in the Meerut District), the Kuru capital, was destroyed by an inundation of the Ganges. This, together with the pressure of the barbarians from the north-west, compelled the Kurus to transfer their headquarters to Kausambi (near Allahabad). One of the latest kings was Udayana the Vatsaraj, who was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha. He is a favourite hero of later romance writers. His descent from the Bharata family is attested to by Bhasa in the *Svapnavasavadatta*. He was the son-in-law and also a rival of Pradyota, king of Avanti. He was at first unfriendly to the Buddhist preachers, one of whom he tortured in a fit of drunken jealousy by having a sack of brown ants tied to his body. But afterwards he repented and professed himself a disciple of the tortured monk. The dynasty came to an end with Kshemaka, the fourth in descent from Udayana. Kautilya writes in the 4th century B. C. that the Kurus were governed by a republican constitution. The existence of the Kurus can be traced as late as the time of king Dharmapala of Bengal (800 A. D.), who installed Chakrayudha on the throne of Kanouj in consultation with the Kurus among others.

About the time of Gautama Buddha's birth the most prominent of the kingdoms of Western India was Avanti, the Vrishni kingdom of Dwaraka having been ruined by fratricidal

Avanti.

strifes after the Kurukshetra war.

The Vrishnis, however, reappear in history as one of the powers which arise on the ruins of the Maurya empire in the second century B. C., and continue their fitful existence till at least the time of Bana (7th century A. D.), who mentions them in his *Harshacharita*. The smaller branches of Surasena and Asmaka were in dependent alliance with the Pradyota kings of Avanti. Pradyota, whose father Punika seems to be a usurper, was the most powerful prince of his time. He pressed hard Udayana the Vatsa king and threatened Ajatasatru, the powerful king of Magadha, who is said to have fortified his capital shortly after the death of Buddha in anticipation of an attack by the Avanti king.

The most notable figure of the age which followed the decline of the Kuru kingdom was

Janaka, the famous king of Videha.

*Janakas of
Videha.*

There were so many Janakas in the dynasty of Videha that the family was called Janakavamsa (*Vayu Pur.* 89, 23). But the most celebrated of them was the one who is mentioned in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* as the patron of Uddalaka Aruni

and Yajnavalkya. The memories of the greatness of the Kurus were still fresh in men's minds, and their fate was discussed as a subject of controversy in the court of Mithila, the capital of Videha. A rival of Yajnavalkya asks the question, "whither have the Parikshitas gone?" to which the latter quickly replies, "Thither where all Aswamedha-sacrificers go" (Br. Up. III). Janaka is called a "Samrat" or one greater than a king, and in Asvalayana Srauta Sutra (X. 3. 14) is mentioned as a great sacrificer. His court was thronged with learned Brahmins from the western countries (i. e. the Middle Country), whose discussions materially contributed to the growth of the Upanishad philosophy. "The king of the east, who has a leaning to the culture of the west, collects the celebrities of the west at his court much as the intellects of Athens gathered at the court of Macedonian princes." (Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 398). Both according to Kautilya's Arthashastra and Nimi Jataka, the last king of Videha was Kalara or Karala Janaka who brought destruction on himself and his family by making a lascivious attempt on a Brahmin maiden." By the time of Gautama Buddha (600 B. C.) the Videhas had become a member of the well-known Vajjian confederacy of republican states of North Behar, of which the Licchhavis of Vaisali were the head.

The small kingdom of Kasi continued its existence for several centuries after the Mahabharata war, often under the sway of the Kuru king of Kausambi. **Kasi-Kosala.** But it seems to have asserted its independence and for a time played a prominent part on the stage of Northern India. Under its most famous king Brahmadata it carried on successful wars against the then most powerful state of Kosala, which was compelled to acknowledge his suzerainty. For four generations the two kingdoms fought with varying results, but eventually the greater resources of Kosala wore out the power of Kasi, which was completely subjugated by Kamsa, king of Kosala. With the decline of Vatsa and the conquest of Kasi, Kosala became the dominant power in Northern India, which position it retained till the time of Prasenajit, a contemporary of Gautama Buddha. The Sakyas, the people of Gautama Buddha, as well as other republican tribes of the Nepal regions, were vassals of the Kosala king. Shortly after the death of Prasenajit Kosala was conquered by Ajatasatru, king of Magadha. By the time of the Nandas (400 B.C.) the Kurus, the Ikshakus, the Avantis, the Vajjis, the Kasis, all had been swallowed up by the Magadhan empire.

APPENDIX I

Orthodox Indian Pundits relying on the authority of Paganic traditions maintain that the Vedic Aryans had ever been living in India, which is the centre of the earth, that the other civilizations of the world are only offshoots of the Indian civilization, and that the age of the Vedas must be counted by millions of years (Durgadas Lahiri, Prithivir Itihasa I). All the arguments and theories of European scholars have not been able to undermine their beliefs, and, though unable to produce counter-arguments of a rational character, they have remained ensconced in the scepticism born of ignorance and false pride. When, however, Dr. Abinav Chandra Das in his Rigvedic India entered the lists to fight the European scholars with modern weapons instead of simply citing the authority of the Sastras, there rose at once a chorus of joy from the orthodox and he was acclaimed as the champion of their cause. Because of his advocacy of the old beliefs of the Pundits and his arguments to demolish the modern theories regarding the origin of the Aryan folk, their primitive home, and the date of the Rigveda, his book has caught popular fancy and hardened the prejudices of the Pundits. For the benefit of ordinary Indian readers I shall discuss at length his theories and the data on which those theories are based, and thereby indirectly deal with the orthodox school of which he is regarded as the mouth-piece.

The principal argument of Dr. Das is that there are references in the Rigveda to four seas, as in IX.33.6, and to seismic disturbances of great intensity, as in II.12.2, which prove that those

hymns were composed at a time when the Punjab was surrounded by seas almost on all sides, in Central Asia, Sind, Rajputana, and the Gangetic valley, and when the earth was still passing through the Tertiary era. It is assumed that the Punjab had become long habitable when the Gangetic valley was still a sea. Now geologists assume the existence of two seas side by side, the Gangetic trough and the Indus trough, which were gradually filled up by alluvium brought by the Ganges and the Indus respectively. As the alluvial deposit in the Punjab generally is of smaller thickness than in the Gangetic valley, it is suggested that the former was older than the latter. But it is also found that some parts of the Indus trough, as at Ludhiana, have "a depth which is comparable with, and possibly quite as great as, that of the much broader trough in the Gangetic region." In other words, when the Gangetic region was a sea, the eastern Punjab too was a sea, and the Vedic Saptasindhava (land of the seven rivers) was a misnomer. Secondly, it has not been calculated as to how much older even the western Punjab land was than the Gangetic region, whether the difference in age between the two lands was sufficient for the purpose of the birth of lower mammalia and then of man (it is assumed by Dr. Das that the Aryan was autochthonous in the Punjab), and of the gradual evolution of man from his primitive condition unaided by any external influences to the civilized state of the Vedic age, i.e. whether the Punjab land was older than the Gangetic region by hundreds of thousands of years. Thirdly, we know that the Gangetic sea had become land in Miocene times (Ency. Brit. XII, p. 736). So according to Dr. Das's hypothesis, the Vedic hymns referring to the four seas and the eastern and

western seas must have been composed at least in Miocene times, if not in Oligocene and Eocene, or at least two million years ago. Now it is a matter of dispute among geologists and anthropologists as to whether man lived in Miocene times (Keith, *The Antiquity of Man*). Even if we admit that man existed in Miocene times, it was not man as we understand him to be, but man in the embryonic stage, nearer to the ape than to modern man, as is proved by the human bones so far discovered of the pliocene and even early pleistocene periods. Even Professor Rutot, the great champion of the theory of extreme antiquity of man, has to assume that "Man was in a state of stagnation throughout the ages which witnessed the rise and fall of whole genera of other mammals." Under these circumstances Dr. Das would have us believe that in the Punjab the Vedic Aryans had passed through the palaeolithic and neolithic stages, and were in the Iron age with a highly developed civilization even in the Miocene period. Again, we are asked to believe that the Vedic Aryans were an iron-using people in the Punjab hundreds of thousands of years ago, and though it is admitted that they had trade relations with other peoples near and far, the use of iron remained confined to them and did not spread anywhere beyond their land till only about 3000 B. C. in China and about 1500 B. C. in Western Asia and Egypt, though the Babylonians and the Egyptians had already far advanced in civilization, and their ruling classes, if we agree with Dr. Das, had been colonists from India.

Dr. Das agrees with Tylor that some of the hymns were composed about 4500 B.C. (p 48), but states that the early hymns were composed in Miocene times. In other words, the Rigvedic

age covered about a million years. It is of course admitted that the hymns were not composed at the same time, and that the composition and collection must have taken rather a long time. Now how to measure that length of time? Competent scholars have come to the conclusion that the Rigvedic age lasted for about 500 years. What is in hymns like Rig VII. 95. 2 and X. 136. 5 which demonstrates their extreme antiquity? Are the thoughts very different, are the gods and goddesses different, is the mode of prayer different from those of the so-called later hymns like those composed in 4500 B.C.? Again, comparatively old as the hymns of the Rigveda may be, even the earliest hymns represent thoughts, manners and customs, which are not so different from those of the Brahmanic or Epic period that we can separate them from the later literatures even by thousands, not to say of hundreds of thousands of years. Further, whatever changes might take place in the language during the whole Rigvedic period, there are no fundamental differences observed between the languages of any two hymns and the whole literature in spite of stages of development constitutes one type. Now this type is not so different from the old Persian of the 6th or 7th century B.C. and from the classical Sanskrit literature of the 4th century B.C. that we can believe, whatever allowances might be made for stagnation of language, that the Rigvedic literature was distant from these literatures by even three thousand years. So from the linguistic and sociological points of view the theory of Dr. Das seems absurd (Winternitz).

In order to prove his theory Dr. Das has had recourse to all sorts of ingenious explanations about Dasas, Rakshas, Panis, and the origins of western nations. One of the arguments urged

against the Indian origin of the Aryan race is that in the Rigveda we find a struggle going on between the Aryans and the Dasyus who had strong cultural and physical differences, and that it is improbable that two such distinct types of men had been living and developing in the same land without intermingling. To this it is replied by Dr. Das that the Dasyus and the Rakshas were not non-Aryans, but "either Aryan nomads in a savage condition, or Aryan dissenters from the orthodox Vedic faith." The black skin is explained away as being used in a spiritual sense, noselessness or ill-formed nose as indicative of imperfect speech, and so forth. Now he admits that the Dasas and Rakshas had different gods, different religious rites, different dialects, and different ways of living from those of the Vedic hymn-makers, and seeks to explain these radical differences by assuming that while one section of the Aryan race had been highly civilized another section remained still in a savage, nomadic state. We can realise the weight or otherwise of this assumption if we recollect that the Vedic Aryans had already reached a high level of civilization in Miocene times, and for hundreds of thousands of years had been fighting with their nomadic brethren without in any way improving them, and that in a limited area like that of the Punjab. These savage nomads then, it is said, were expelled from the country and mingling with the Turanians in Central Asia went to settle in Europe. As the Aryan-speaking Europeans are known to have been not iron-using when they went to settle there, and as the absence of any common root for the word "sea" in their languages proves that their forefathers had no knowledge of sea, it is assumed by Dr. Das that the nomadic Aryans in the Punjab born of the same stock as the Vedic Aryans and in close contact

with them for hundreds of thousands of years were still ignorant of the use of metals, and, nomadic as they were, were ignorant of the existence of seas which, it is stated, surrounded the country on four sides. The assumptions and inferences are a little too bold to be accepted. To explain away the Iranian tradition of their origin in Airyana Vaejo Dr. Das assumes that as the Iranians had quarrelled with the Indians they were reluctant to point to Saptasindhu as their original home. But one would have been convinced if the name of Saptasindhu had been altogether omitted from the list of countries created by Ahura Masda. But the name stands there, and also the description as to how the climate of the place, which had been at first good, was changed.

Dr. Das holds that the Deccan peninsula had been inhabited by the Dravidians from time immemorial, but that there being no land connection between the Punjab and the southern continent, they did not come into contact with the Aryans. But those authorities which he has quoted to prove the existence of the Gangetic trough state that even when the Indus trough had not been filled there was a tongue of solid land separating the two seas. Certainly this narrow strip of land had considerably widened, if we look to the depth of alluvial deposit on and near the Delhi Ridge, when the Punjab became terra firma. How can he then assume the existence of a sea entirely cutting off the Vindhya regions from the Punjab?

Now let us examine the data which have led Dr. Das to these astounding conclusions. The first is that in Rig VII. 95.2 the Saraswati is said to flow from the mountains into the sea. To explain this one need not go back to the time when Rajputana

was a sea. It might imply either that the Saraswati met the Indus and the united waters flowed into the sea or that the Saraswati was an independent river flowing into the Arabian Sea. Even as late as the time of Alexander a large part of Lower Sind was still under water and the Indus delta was considerably higher up than the present position. So it is not difficult to imagine that in Rig-Vedic times the Indus delta was still higher up and the Saraswati was an independent river. In fact, the old bed of the Saraswati-Sutlej (Hakra) can even now be seen for a considerable length through the Bhawalpur state, which does not prove that "the disappearance of the Saraswati was synchronous with that of the Rajputana sea."

Dr. Das lays considerable stress upon the reference to four seas, as in Rig IX. 33.6. That the four seas are more imaginary than real is apparent from the fact that unlike the rivers and the mountains the seas have got no names of their own in the Rigveda. I agree with Dr. Das in holding that the Aryans while in the Punjab were acquainted with the Arabian Sea. For one sailing upon the vast expanse of the sea it is not unnatural to think it limitless and surrounding the land on all the four sides. Whatever might have been the cause, the Indians of the Epic period regarded the world as consisting of seven islands and seven concentric rings of seas. Can any one at the present time try to locate the seven seas surrounding the seven islands relying upon the old tradition? The Rigvedic mention of the four seas only shows the origin of the later and more developed Puranic tradition. The sight of sunrise and sunset from on board a ship by the hymn-makers, associated with the conception of four seas surrounding the land, can well account for the description of the sun dwelling in

the eastern and western seas, as in Rig X. 136.5. Moreover, there is ample justification for modern scholars saying that the word Samudra (sea) in the Rigveda was often figuratively used to mean the vast, limitless expanse of the sky, and that the reference to eastern and western seas in connection with the rising and setting of the sun was used to mean nothing but eastern and western sky.

"Another evidence of the antiquity of the Rigveda and the Aryans of Sapta-Sindhu," says Dr. Das, "is the reference in some of the hymns to extensive seismic disturbances, causing upheavals and depressions of land and frequent earthquakes of great intensity." As for instance, in Rig II. 17.5, "By his strength he (Indra) fixed the *wandering* mountains; he ordained the downward course of the water." Evidently, as Dr. Das himself admits, the wandering mountains here means clouds which were at first made motionless and then made to pour down waters. In Rig II. 12.2, "He who fixed firm the earth that staggered; who made the moving mountains rest; who spread the spacious firmament; who consolidated the heaven; he, men, is Indra." Dr. Das forgets that the meanings of many words changed from the Vedic to the classical literature. He makes a muddle by translating *prakupitan parvatan* as angry mountains, thereby thinking it as referring to volcanic eruptions. If he had cared to consult Sayana and other commentators he would have found that *prakupitan* means here not angry but moving from the original meaning of the root *kup*, to move. The allusion is as follows (cf. Maitr. Sam. 1.10.13)—"The mountains are the eldest children of Projapati. They had wings. They flew about and descended whenever they liked. The earth thus tottered. Indra cut off their wings,

and made fast the earth by means of them." Thus by no stretch of imagination can any of the passages quoted be made to refer to any "extensive seismic disturbances," characteristic of the Tertiary era.

The fourth evidence, according to Dr. Das, is that as Indra was one of the oldest gods of the Aryans, and as the great exploits of Indra are said to have taken place on the banks of the Saraswati, that place must have been the primitive home of the Aryans. The same argument with respect to the old god Zeus and his residence on the Olympus would lead one to the conclusion that the Hellenes were autochthonous in Greece. Besides, Indra is certainly not one of the oldest gods of the Aryans as he can not be traced beyond the Indo-Iranian period.

The fifth evidence is "that the total absence of the mention of the Deluge in the Rigveda proves the period of the composition of the hymns to be anterior to that event", and the Deluge is said to be nothing but the raising of the Rajputana sea-bed by volcanic action and consequent flooding of the Punjab. Dr. Das himself admits the weakness of argumentum ex silentio. He says that the Atharvaveda "is admittedly a later work than the Rigveda," and also agrees with Tilak that some of the Rig hymns were composed about 4500 B. C. So it follows from his own argument that the Deluge or the upheaval of the Rajputana sea-bed, which is not mentioned in the Rigveda but is in the Atharvaveda, must have taken place sometime after 4500 B. C. Will geologists agree? Cannot a better explanation be found for the absence of reference to the Deluge in the Rigveda? The story of the Deluge was probably borrowed from the Dravidians, and hence its absence in the Rigveda (See ante pp. 80-81).

The copious rainfall in the Punjab, which, as Dr. Das says, is alluded to in the Rigveda, was, according to him, an evidence of a very ancient date of the Rigveda, when there were seas on all sides of the Punjab. But it is not necessary to go back to prehistoric times to explain more abundant rainfall in the Punjab. When Alexander came, the Punjab as well as large parts of Beluchistan and Eastern Persia had not become so dry and hot (Vredenburg, Mem. Geo. Surv. Ind. XXXI. pt 2). There were an equable climate and good forest growths sustained by copious rainfall. Without difficulty Alexander succeeded in building up a large navy out of the trees that grew on the banks of the Hydaspes (Jhelum), a thing which is impossible at the present time on account of the drier climate which prevails. Then and also at the time of Arab invasions there was dense population in the lower Punjab and Sind, which implies that the soil had not become so desertlike as it is at the present day.

Lastly, one of the evidences of the Indian origin of the Aryans is "that the Soma sacrifice was admittedly the oldest sacrifice among the Aryans and the genuine Soma plant grew nowhere else excepting the Himalaya and Saptasindhu." First, the Soma sacrifice was certainly not the oldest sacrifice among the Aryans, as no such word or sacrifice can be traced in the European languages and mythologies. It belonged to Indo-Iranian period, but not to Indo-European. Secondly, it is not known that the real plant did not grow anywhere else than the Himalayas and Saptasindhu. It is certain that the plant grew best in cold regions like the Himalayas, and did not grow as well when the Aryans attempted to grow it on the banks of the Indus and the Saraswati. Hence a regular trade had to be carried on

in Soma plant from the Himalayas, and curiously, the trade was in the hands of the barbarians. In other words, instead of proving the Punjab origin of the Aryans, the Soma references, if they prove anything, only prove the contrary, as certainly the custom of Soma sacrifice could not originate in a country where the plant did not grow so well, and as the place where it grew well was inhabited not by Aryans but by barbarians. Do they not fit in more properly with the theory that the Aryans originally lived in a cold country where Soma was an indigenous plant, and that when they came to the Punjab they could grow only plants of an inferior quality on the hotter Punjab soil, and had to depend for good quality upon the Himalayan products, which were beyond their reach, but which were brought down to them by the barbarous hillmen ?

APPENDIX II

Mr. E. E. Pargiter relying on Pauranic traditions has propounded in his learned book *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* three startling theories which tend to upset all the theories and inferences of the Vedic scholars, and which, if proved, would compel a complete rewriting of the ancient Indian history. His first theory is that the word Aila, the patronymic of Pururavas, is the same as the word Arya or Aryan and that the history of the growth of the Aila family is that of the expansion of the Indo-Aryan race. Now the first thing which passes beyond our comprehension is that while the Vedic rishis always distinguished themselves as Aryas why Pururavas is called the Aila (Rig X. 95.18) and not Arya. The word Aila is never used either in the Rigveda or in later literature as denoting a race as the word Arya did. A more reasonable explanation of the word can be obtained from the story of the Deluge in the Satapatha Brahmana, where Ila, from whom the Aila or Lunar family is derived, personifies, as the name denotes, the sacrificial offering made by Manu.

Secondly, we cannot agree with his views that the Ailas or Aryans entered India through the mid-Himalayan region and at first established themselves in Pratiasthan, near Allahabad, from whence they gradually spread towards the north-west and eventually to Persia and Mesopotamia. There cannot be any question about the tribal immigration of the Aryans into India which was powerful enough to influence not only the languages of the country but also to a great extent the ethnical type. Now is or was it possible for a numerous community to come to India

by way of the mid-Himalayas? The physical difficulties are insuperable. Again, why should the Aryans, when they came, choose to settle not in the upper Gangetic valley, but traversing a long way and rounding a large part of the so-called non-Aryan kingdom of Ajodhya or Oudh ultimately settled near Allahabad?

Thirdly, it is inferred by Mr. Pargiter that in the time of the Rigveda the Aryans had already spread over the greater part of Northern India. The chief difficulty in accepting this is that the geography of the Rigveda is confined only to the north-western parts of India. Mr. Pargiter would not accept any argumentum ex silentio, and cites the instance of the banyan tree which could not have been unknown to the Indo-Aryans but which is not mentioned in the Rigveda. Though the tree is not mentioned by name in the Rigveda, it appears to have been known as its characteristics are recognised. The sister tree *Asvattha* occurs in the Rigveda (*Vedic Index*). The analogy would have been convincing if there had been any hymn in the Rigveda addressed to the principal trees, and the banyan not included in the list. But that is not the case. While there are especial *nadi-stutis* or hymns addressed to rivers, it is significant that the names of no river beyond the Ganges are mentioned. Again, while very small rivers of the Punjab are repeatedly mentioned the river Ganges, on which, according to Mr. Pargiter, the Aryans were first settled, is directly mentioned only once. The Rigveda, according to him, was composed long after the Aryans had been settled in the Gangetic valley and even after the king Bhagiratha with whom the name and sacredness of the river are associated in the Puranas. And yet the hymn-makers would not pay due respect to the river, while the river Indus,

which is said to be far away from the scene of Vedic life, is repeatedly addressed to with reverence. While even such a small river as Savastu or Swat or a remote district like Gandhara does not escape notice, it is strange that such large rivers as Nerbudda and Chambal, such a large mountain as the Vindhya, and the homes of the famous Haihayas, who, it is said, had established their greatness before the Rigvedic time, and who were related to the Pauravas and connected with the hymn-making Bhargava family, are not mentioned at all. The argumentum ex silentio cannot be easily disposed of in this case.

One of the chief arguments of Mr. Pargiter against the theory of the advance of the Indo-Aryans from the north-west is that "the list of rivers in Rigveda X. 75 is in regular order from the east to the north-west—not the order of entrance from the north-west, but the reverse." There is nothing strange in it if we remember that most of the hymns were composed on the eastern side of the river Saraswati, and that, therefore, the hymn-maker commences from the easternmost limit and traverses towards the known north-west.

"Moreover," says Mr. Pargiter, "these conclusions are entirely supported by the evidence of language, as set out by Sir G. Grierson." How? Mr. Pargiter makes the Kuru-Panchalas or the inhabitants of the Middle Country, the Yadus of Western India and the Deccan, and the Anus of Bengal and the Punjab related to one another, all being of the stock of Puruvas. In other words, he goes entirely against the conclusions of Grierson about the fundamental difference between the Midland Indo-Aryan language occupying the Gangetic Doab and the band of Outer languages occupying Kashmir, the Punjab, Sind, the Maratha country, Orissa, Behar, Bengal and Assam.

Mr. Pargiter's second theory is that the Vedic hymns were composed long after the Aryans had established themselves over the greater part of India, and that Sudas of Rigvedic fame was a king of North Panchala, who lived posterior to most of the kings of Pauranic fame, as Bharata, Daushyanti, Harischiandra, Sagara, Raghu, Dasaratha, Rama, Kartavirya Arjuna, Pratardana, etc. Now, it has been shown in the previous paragraphs that the Vedic hymns of which Sudas is a hero could not have been composed when the Indo-Aryans had advanced beyond the Ganges and the Vindhya, and hence the Vedic Sudas could not have been posterior to kings like Sagara, Arjuna and Rama whose exploits are mostly associated in the Puranas with Oudh, Malwa and the Deccan. Secondly, the Vedic Sudas is distinctly called the son of Pijavana, while the father of the Pauranic Sudas is Chyavana-Panchajana. Mr. Pargiter says, "Panchajana appears to be a mistake for the Vedic Pijavana." How can we believe it to be a mistake when we know that Pijavana as the father of the Vedic Sudas is known to Yaska, the Mahabharata, and even Manu. Evidently, the Puranas speak of a different Sudas who is the son of Chyavana. Thirdly, the names of about a score of tribes, both important and unimportant, are mentioned in the Rigveda in connection with Sudas as friends and foes, including the Turvashas who, according to Mr. Pargiter, had long ceased to exist. Had he been the same as the Pauranic Sudas, on no account could the names of the Ikshakus, the Videhas, the Sarvatas, the Bhojas, the most important of the tribes of the time, fail to be prominently mentioned. Of course the Yadus are mentioned, but the Pauranic Yadus had been split up into so many branches and covered so extensive an area from the Godavery to the Jumna that they could

not be the same as the R̥gvedic Yadus, just as the word Teuton is not used to-day to denote any political power, such as the English, the Austrian, the Dane, each of which possesses a separate entity of its own. From all these it is clear that the Pauranic Sudas is a different person from the Vedic Sudas. Mr. Pargiter himself warns us against hasty conclusions drawn from sameness of name. "Sameness of name was well-known among kings and princes, for it is expressly declared that there were a hundred Prativindhyas, Nagas, Hailhyas, Dhritarastras, Brahmahattas, Paulas, Svetas, Kasis and Kusas, eighty Janamejays, a thousand Samabindus and two hundred Bhismas and Bhimas; also that there were two Nalas, one king of Ajodhya and the other the hero of the 'Story of Nala'. So there were two famous Arjunas, Kartavirya and Pandava, and a third in R̥gveda I. 22, 5. The genealogical lists in chapter XII show that other names were not uncommon, such as Divodasa, Srujaya and Sahadeva; and the number of duplicates is very large." (Anc. Ind. Hist. Tr. p. 130). Again, he points out that "there were thus two Purukutsas with sons named Trasadasyu. Those of Ajodhya were well-known, as even the Satapatha Brahmana shows. Those in the R̥gveda were apparently Puru kings and probably belonged to some minor dynasty descended from Bharata." So why should we be led to believe in the identity of the Vedic and Pauranic Sudases simply because both had as their ancestors, though not immediate, Vadhryasa and Divodasa? The names of Mudgala and Srujaya occur in the R̥gveda, but there is nothing to prove that they were connected by relationship with Sudas. So it is very difficult to prove the identity of the two Sudases on these slender bases, especially when there are very strong arguments to the contrary. It would be at

easier to hold that the Sudas dynasty of the Rigveda was remembered in later times, and that some kings of the North Panchala dynasty adopted the well-known names of the Vedic dynasty, and that later writers sometimes attributed to the Panchala dynasty some of the facts relating to the Vedic dynasty, as they did with regard to Pajjavana Saudasa and Kalmasspada Saudasa (Ibid. p. 209).

Similarly, there is no harm in believing that kings like Pururavas, Bharata, Nahusha, Mandhatri, Ajamidha, etc., mentioned in the Rigveda might have been historical persons. But we cannot associate them with the localities and dynasties which are assigned to them in the Puranas. If they existed, they must have reigned somewhere in the Punjab and in the early Vedic or pre-Vedic period. Either there were kings in the well-known dynasties who bore these names and were confused by later writers with the earlier ones, or these names which had become legendary in later times were put in the genealogies to add to the glories of the dynasties by connecting them with those famous heroes, as was often done in more modern genealogies. "How these pedigrees have been elaborated, even at a comparatively late date, by court poets who sought to magnify the the ancient lineage of their lord, may sometimes be seen at a glance. For example, in the genealogy of the Ikshvaku of Kosala the immediate predecessors of Prasenajit, the contemporary of Buddha, are Sakya, Suddhodana, Siddhartha, and Rahula. That is to say, the eponymous hero of Buddha's clan, Buddha's father, Buddha himself, and his son have all been incorporated in the dynastic list of the kings of Kosala." (Cam. Ind. Hist. I. p. 306). Even in historical times we find, for instance, one Vikramaditya

appropriating the stories of several kings of different times. Moreover, Bloomfield in his *Rigveda Repetitions* (p.634) warns us against putting absolute trust on later traditions, as embodied in books like *Anukramanika*, assigning such and such hymn to such and such person, unless corroborated by internal evidences. On the other hand, the Pauranic kings cannot all be called mythical, the descriptions regarding some of them at least being so realistic inspite of exaggerations.

One thing strikes me as important. It is about a century after the Kurukshetra war that the "past" and its traditions are closed and the "future" begun. I agree with Mr. Pargiter that at that time the old traditions were collated and put in a definite form. Formerly, perhaps, the traditions remained scattered in different forms in the mouths of the Sutas or bards, and as the system of writing was not in use, the genealogies often got confused, especially with regard to the distant past, and were sometimes spurious. We may believe that when the collection took place every effort was made to critically examine the existing traditions. But still a good deal of confused and false matters escaped detection and were embodied in the collection. This collection then became stereotyped, and was the principal source of later Epic and Pauranic traditions. The false matters, along with the genuine, thus obtained wide currency, and cannot be regarded as true because of repetitions in different books, which are all inheritors of the same stock.

The third theory of Mr. Pargiter is that the Ikshakus of Ajodhya were a non-Aryan people and that Brahminism was first an institution of the non-Aryans, which was adopted and modified by the Aryans. The theory is impossible on the very face of

it. As regards the Ikshakus, what do the philologists, ethnologists and tradition say? According to Sir G. Grierson, the people of Ajodhya stand nearer in relation to the people of the Gangetic Doab, who, according to Mr. Fargiter, are descended of the pure Aila stock, than the people of Behar, Bengal, Berar, the Punjab, who are said to be descendants of the family of Pururavaa. According to Sir H. Risley, the people of Ajodhya betray less non-Aryan characteristics than the people of eastern and southern provinces. This is the more striking as, according to Mr. Fargiter, the kingdom of Ajodhya was never subjugated by the Ailas, and retained its greatness till the time of Ajatanatru and Gautama Buddha, and even then the conquest was made not by the pure Aryans of the Gangetic Doab but by the mixed Aryans of Magadha. What does tradition say about the Ikshakus? Though Mr. Fargiter is such a vigorous champion of tradition and seeks to build up his theory on tradition, he ignores all traditions, Brahmin and Kshatriya, as regards the origin of the Ikshakus. First, almost all traditions agree in making Ikshaku a son and Pururavaa a grandson of Manu, thus making them related to each other. The only passage in the Rigveda where the word Ikshaku occurs indicates the relationship of Ikshaku with the Purus. If we are to reject the common descent of the Ikshakus and the Purus from Manu, how can we accept the common descent of Puru, Yadu, Turvasha, Anu and Druhyu from Yajati, who is as mythical or as historical as Vaivasvata Manu? Again, though tradition calls such Aryan kings as Madhu, Kamaa, Jarasandha, etc. Danavas or non-Aryans, how many of the Ikshaku kings are called by such names? In the Rigveda we find mention of many Dasyu kings and tribes, but it is surprising that

there should be no mention of the Ikshakus in that connection, though hundreds of hymns were composed by the Vasishtas, who, according to Mr. Pargiter, had been connected with them from the beginning.

Mr. Pargiter seems to think that a vast mass of Pauranic tradition relates to pre-Vedic history, and that the Rigveda is a comparatively recent composition which contains many non-Aryan ideas and institutions and even hymns disguised in Aryan garb. "The fact that those earliest Manva (non-Aryan) hymns appear now in Sanskrit does not disprove their non-Aryan origin, for they would naturally have been Sanskritized in course of time, as has been noticed above with regard to non-Aryan names" (p. 313). Here, too, Mr. Pargiter ignores the almost unanimous tradition that the Rigvedic hymns were among the earliest creations of Brahma. With the exception of a few possibly later hymns, it is admitted by European scholars as well as Indian tradition that the hymns in general are of extreme antiquity, so far as India is concerned, much earlier in point of time than the so-called Treta age from which time the traditional history begins. Even the solitary statement in the Puranas (Vayu 57, 39f; Brahmanda II.29.43; Matsya 147, 40f), quoted by Mr. Pargiter to show that the Rigveda was not one of the earliest creations, more disproves than proves his conclusions. For it is said there that the mantras or hymns were put together (not composed) at the beginning of the Treta age. His attempts to prove the comparatively recent age of the Rigveda mostly turn on the question of the identity of the Rigvedic Sudas and the North Panchala Sudas and of the correctness of the place assigned to him in the genealogical tables. Unfortunately, when the pre-

misses are more than doubtful the conclusions cannot be accepted as true.

When it is stated that the Indo-Aryans received the Brahminical institution and even hymns from the conquered non-Aryans, it is assumed that they adopted the principal religious rites also. It is improbable that the Aryans retained their own religious rites, but selected non-Aryan priests, and not only entrusted them with the custody of their religion but made them the highest class in society. So if they selected their priests from among non-Aryans it must be that they had accepted the creed of those people, the proper practices of which were little known to them and which, therefore, necessitated the services of non-Aryan priests. For the Indo-Aryans to have received their creed and priesthood from the conquered non-Aryans is by itself too big an assumption, especially when it is known that the Indo-Aryan tongue and social institutions practically ousted the non-Aryan in Northern India. Moreover, if the Indo-Aryans had borrowed the Brahminical creed from the non-Aryans, the religious literature of the Indo-Aryans like the Vedas and the Brahmanas must have contained a large percentage of non-Aryan words and phrases. The Europeans in accepting Christianity have absorbed a large number of Hebrew words in their literatures. Similarly, the Dravidians in Southern India have with the religion borrowed a good many words of the Aryan language. The Mahomedans in India and elsewhere use good many Arabic words. But it is strange that, though the Brahminical institution is said to be a borrowed one and many of the hymns to have been composed by non-Aryan priests, there are so few non-Aryan words even in the earliest Sanskritized Brahminical literature, the Vedas. Further, is the religion of the Rigveda so fundamentally different

from that of the Indo-Europeans, both in ideas and mythologies? Which part of the Vedic religion can be called foreign to Aryan genius? Again, if the conquerors had adopted the creed of the conquered, why are the latter called in the Rigveda "devoid of religion," "without religion," "unsacrificing," and "godless"? The Vasisthas are regarded by Mr. Pargiter as the non-Aryan priests to the Ikshaku kings, who joined the Ailas when the latter had conquered the greater part of Northern India. "In fact, in the Ganges-Jumna doab, the region specially occupied by the Ailas, it is not until Dusyanta's and Bharata's period that any brahman became connected with them as priests" (p. 310). And the Vasistha family for the first time came into connection with the Ailas in the time of Paijavana Sudas (p. 207). Now let us see what we can learn about these Vasisthas from the Rigveda itself. Practically the whole of the VIIIth book of the Rigveda is the composition of the Vasisthas. Though they are said to have been connected with the Ikshaku family from the earliest times, is it not surprising that in the whole book there is not a single mention of the Ikshakus? Again, if there can be traced any difference as to creed between the so-called non-Aryan Vasistha and Aryan Viswamitra of the time, it is that Vasistha is a special worshipper of Varuna (Rig VII. 88), who is called his father (Rig VII. 33.11), and Viswamitra of Agni, to whom alone about half the number of hymns composed by the Viswamitra family are addressed. Now if there be any god besides Dyans in the Vedic mythology who can claim to belong to the Indo-European period, i.e. before the separation of the European and Indian branches of the Aryan family, it is undoubtedly Varuna. Then though himself a non-Aryan, Vasistha utters bitterest imprecations against

the Rakshas, a name which, as Mr. Pargiter knows, was given by the Indo-Aryans to non-Aryans (p. 290) and evil spirits. He invokes Indra and Varuna to kill the Dasa enemies of Sudas. Moreover, in the hundreds of hymns addressed by the Vasiṣṭha family, how many words and ideas are there which can be traced to non-Aryan sources? On the contrary, scholars like Max Müller regard Vasiṣṭha as "the very type of the Arian Brahmin."

It has been shown that at one time the Dravidians formed the main population of Northern India before the coming of the Aryans. If that be so, the non-Aryan Ikshakus must have been either Dravidians or Mongolians, who might have shared lands with the Dravidians. Now we know that Brahminism is not an indigenous institution among either of these races, as can be seen from the existing institutions of the survivors in the north and south, or outside India. Of course, there were medicine men among all savage races, but there was no Brahmin caste. If the Brahminical institution had been a pre-Aryan one in India we must expect to find its survival, even in a corrupt form, among one or other of the various non-Aryan races of India. But unfortunately there is nothing of the sort, no Brahminical hierarchy, no Brahminical yajna or sacrifice. On the contrary, we find that the chief enemies of the Brahminical institutions were the Dasas or Dasyus of the R̥gveda and Rakshasas of the Ramayana and the Puranas.

The chief argument of Mr. Pargiter is that the earliest Brahmin families were all attached to non-Aryan courts, as the Vasiṣṭhas in Ajodhya, Chyavanas in the Saryata country, the Usanas-Sokras at the Daitya court, the Agastyas in the Deccan, and that the earliest Aila kings had no priests, and were rather antagonistic to the Brahmins (pp. 304-305). The first part of his argument stands

only on the supposition that the Ikshakus and the Saryatas were non-Aryans, which has been proved to be untenable. The second part is based on the traditional list of kings who were enemies of, and were destroyed by, Brahmins. In this list are to be found Pururavas and Nahusha, the first and third king of the Aila dynasty. But are they the only kings who were the enemies of the Brahmins? In the list of such bad kings as given in Manu (VII, 41) we do not come across the name of Pururavas, but we find the names of Vena and Nimi along with Nahusha. Vena was of the race of Atri (Harivamsa, V.), and Nimi was a son of Ikshaku, i.e. both of them were, according to the classification of Mr. Pargiter, non-Aryan. Another name is that of Sudas, who is called in Manu the son of Pijavana, but who is really Kalmasapada Saudasa, an Ikshaku king, who destroyed the sons of the priest Vasistha. Thus it is seen that enmities with Brahmins were not a monopoly of the Aila kings. Again, the Viswamitras are held to be of the Aila race. How is it that long before the Aila kings came into connection with Brahmin priests, which is stated to be in the time of Dusyanta, a scion of the Aila family had become so Brahminised that he exercised equal influence with their hereditary priests, the Vasisthas, at the Ikshaku courts of Trisanku and Harischandra?

I fully believe that Hinduism owes a large part of its substance to Dravidian influences, and it is difficult to say whether in its modern form it is more Dravidian than Aryan. I can concede that some of the prevailing cults, of Phallic Siva, Radha-Krishna, Ganesha, Naga, etc., betray strong Dravidian characteristics. But as regards the Vedic religion one cannot believe that it is a Dravidian creed, only modified by Aryan influences. Rather, the Vedic institutions are Aryan in the main foundation, but absorbing more and more Dravidian ideas and practices as the Aryans advance more into the interior of the country. It is likely that in the transformation of the Vedic religion into modern Hinduism the original Aryan basis has been largely buried under non-Aryan superstructure, but that is a different topic and has nothing to do with Mr. Pargiter's hypothesis of the Dravidian origin of Vedic Brahminism.

INDEX

- Abhinavayii, 50.
 Acvini, 53.
 Aeolic, 56.
 Afghanistan, 16, 23, 26, 36, 66, 85.
 { Africa, 20, 90.
 { African, 10.
 Agustya, 96, 151.
 Agni, 76, 102, 150.
 Ahura Mazda, 19, 134.
 Aikshaka, 113.
 Aila, 140, 147, 150-52.
 Airyanavaejo, 19, 21, 134.
 Aitareya Aranyaka, 43, 47, 54, 69.
 Aitareya Brahmana, 50, 56, 68, 70, 111.
 Aja, 105, 107, 123.
 Ajamidha, 145.
 Ajatasatru, 126, 128, 147.
 Alexander, 8, 42, 72, 135, 138.
 Alinas, 104, 107.
 Allahabad, 125, 140, 141.
 Alpine, 9, 37, 38, 61.
 Alwar, 104.
 Amarakosha, 18.
 { America, 5, 90.
 { American, 5.
 Amurtatayana, 115.
 Ananda era, 94.
 Anarani, 105.
 Anderida, 85.
 Andhaka, 119.
 Andhra, 59, 68, 69, 97, 100.
 Anga, 34, 68, 70-2, 91, 117, 123.
 Anglo-Saxon, 11, 85, 86, 88, 92.
 Ami, 34, 35, 103, 107, 116-18, 142, 147.
 Anuba, 52.
 Amukramanika, 146.
 Apaya, 102.
 { Arab, 38, 138.
 { Arabia, 38.
 { Arabian, 106, 135.
 { Arabic, 4, 149.
 Aranyaka, 44, 45, 48-50.
 Aratta, 71.
 Arctic, 19.
 Aristonemi, 58, 59.
 Arjuna, 50, 120-22, 143. See also Kartaviryas.
 Armerian, 2.
 Arsacidae, 39.
 Artamanyu, 61.
 Artatama, 60.
 Arihasastra, 73, 95, 119, 127.
 Arun: Uddalaka, 126.
 { Arya, 66, 73-76, 140.
 { Aryan, 1-7, 9, 10-23, 25-32, 34, 38, 57, 60-3, 64-5, 67-70, 72-4, 76-7, 79, 81-4, 89, 102, 105, 107, 114-15, 117, 124, 129-31, 133-41, 143, 146-52.
 Aryadharna, 74.
 Aryavarta, 74, 113, 124.
 Aryo-Dravidian, 30, 36.
 Asandivanta, 111.
 { Asia, 58, 62, 63, 131.
 { Asiatic, 23.
 Asia Minor, 25, 61, 63.
 Asikni, 66.
 Asuka or Asuka, 71, 72, 126.
 Asuka, 38, 43, 44, 94, 99, 100.
 { Assam, 82, 98, 142.
 { Assamese, 28.
 { Assyria, 61, 63.
 { Assyrian, 60, 65.
 Asura, 6.
 Asurivastu, 81.
 Asvalayana Smriti Sutra, 127.
 Asvapati, 117.
 Aswamedha, 127.
 Atharvan, 12.
 Atharvaveda, 50, 68, 79, 110, 111, 137.
 Athens, 127.
 Atlantic, 20.
 Atri, 152.

- Attic, 56.
 Aurova Bhargava, 122.
 Ausija Kakshivant, 81.
 Australian, 4, 83.
 Austrian, 144.
 Avanti, 72, 121, 125, 126, 128.
 Avesta, 5, 55, 57, 77. See also
 Zend.
 Avikahit, 122.
 Ayodhya, 59, 123, 141, 144, 146,
 147, 151. See also Oudh.
 Ayu, 120.

 Baal, 106.
 { Baberu, 106.
 { Babylon, 22, 60, 61, 63, 106.
 { Babylonian, 22, 62, 65, 131.
 Bahu, 122.
 Baij Kao, 120.
 Balaji Kao, 121.
 Balbutha, 88.
 Bali, 34, 117.
 Balkan, 22.
 Baltic, 88.
 Bana, 126.
 Banara, 71, 96.
 Bahadratha dynasty, 115.
 Barnett, 33, 36.
 Batin, 83.
 Baudhayana, 70.
 Beas, 66, 117.
 { Behar, 34, 35, 67, 69, 70, 89,
 93, 114, 117, 127, 142, 147.
 { Behari, 28.
 Bejoy Sinha, 72.
 { Belgian, 4.
 { Belgium, 5.
 Beluchistan, 26, 77, 138.
 Benares, 67. See also Kasi.
 Bensley, 20.
 { Bengal, 33, 34, 67, 69, 70, 72, 82,
 94, 98, 100, 117, 142, 147.
 { Bengalee, 94.
 { Bengali, 28, 78, 92.
 Berat, 69, 70, 95, 97, 119, 147.
 See also Vidarbha.
 Berbers, 9.

 Bhaga, 6.
 Bhagavata Purana, 80, 84.
 Bhagiratha, 141.
 Bhalanases, 104, 107.
 Bhandarkar, 79, 95, 97.
 Bharadvaja, 106.
 Bharadvajyas, 39.
 { Bharata, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108,
 110, 116, 125, 144, 145, 150.
 { Bharata Daushanti, 110, 143.
 Bharatavarsha, 102.
 Bharati, 102.
 Bhargava, 52, 121, 122, 142.
 Bhasa, 125.
 Bhattoji Dikshit, 40.
 Bhawalpur, 135.
 Bheda, 107.
 Bhills, 83, 84.
 Bhima, 70, 144.
 Bhimasena, 51, 111.
 Blissna, 52, 144.
 Bhoja, 95, 119, 121, 143.
 Blanford, 23.
 Bloomfield, 111, 146.
 Bogu, 6.
 Bohemia, 22.
 Bopp, 1, 2.
 Brahma, 74, 117, 148.
 Brahmadata, 52, 128, 144.
 { Brahmara, 19, 31, 32, 44, 51, 53,
 54, 56, 67, 70, 81, 92, 95, 104,
 108, 110, 112, 114, 115, 118,
 119, 149.
 { Brahmanc, 27, 35, 132.
 { Brahmancical, 68, 91.
 Brahmamda Purana, 148.
 Brahmputra, 20.
 Brahmarsihdesha, 27, 30.
 Brahmavarta, 27, 30.
 Brahmi, 43, 44.
 { Brahmui, 12, 43, 67, 70, 91, 92,
 94, 96-9, 108, 111, 117, 121,
 127, 147, 151, 152.
 { Brahmuncical, 93, 94, 96, 98, 107,
 108, 149, 151.
 { Brahmuncism, 94, 98, 114, 146,
 151, 152.
 Brahmio Sama, 94.

- Brahmi, 77.
 Bribu, 105, 106.
 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, 57,
 112, 126.
 Brihadbala, 59.
 Brihaddevata, 113.
 Brihadratha, 115.
 (Britain, 85, 86.
 } British, 88.
 } Briton, 85.
 Broca, 4.
 Buddha, 32, 42, 48, 72, 93, 106,
 125-28, 145, 147. See also
 Gautama.
 Buddhism, 42, 47, 57, 71, 93,
 94, 98, 99.
 Buddhist, 6, 42, 46, 48, 72, 99,
 125.
 Buhler, 43.
 Burma, 82.

 Cadwallon, 88.
 Caldwell, 78, 80.
 Cambay, Gulf of, 120, 123.
 Caria, 42.
 Caspian Steppes, 76.
 (Caucasian, 8, 9.
 } Caucasian, 37.
 Caucasus, 21.
 Celebes, 83.
 (Celts, 1, 10.
 } Celtic, 2, 27, 37, 36, 37, 92.
 Celto-Slav, 9, 61.
 Centaurs, 6.
 Central Asia, 2, 20-3, 26, 130,
 133.
 Central Provinces, 95.
 Cerdic, 60.
 Ceylon, 6, 72, 73, 83.
 Chairanya, 94.
 Chakrayudha, 125.
 Chambal, 142.
 Chanakya, 94.
 Chanda, 31, 32, 36, 84.
 Chandala, 83.
 Chandogya Upanishad, 78, 112,
 117.
 Chandragupta, 73, 94.

 Chavee, 10.
 Chedi, 72, 89, 104, 113, 119, 123.
 Chenab, 66, 103.
 Cheras, 69.
 Chester, 88.
 (China, 131.
 } Chinese, 4, 56.
 Chitaldurg, 99.
 Chitral, 26.
 Chola, 41, 71, 72, 100.
 Chota Nagpur, 95.
 Christian, 6.
 Christian era, 79, 99.
 Christianity, 149.
 Chumuri, 105.
 Chyavana, 52, 143, 151.
 Comparative Ethnology, 2, 8.
 Comparative Grammar, 1.
 Comparative Mythology, 5.
 Comparative Philology, 1, 2, 5, 21.
 Comparative Sociology, 10.
 Cophu, 25. See also Kabul and
 Kubha.
 Croesus, 43.
 Cuno, 20.
 Cutch, 71.
 Cyrus, 43.

 Dahae, 76.
 Daitya, 151.
 Danastuti, 104.
 Danava, 147.
 Danda, 120.
 Dandaka, 95, 119.
 Dandakaranya, 71.
 Dane, 144.
 Darius, 8, 42, 43, 44.
 Das, Dr. Abinashandra, 129-38.
 Dasa or Dasyu, 16, 17, 73-7, 79,
 81, 85, 86-9, 105, 132, 133,
 147, 151.
 Dasaratha, 60, 123, 145.
 Dasi, 87.
 Dashshanti Bharata, 110, 143.
 Deccan, 33, 35, 67, 69-71, 77-8,
 95, 99, 134, 142, 143, 151.
 Delhi, 37, 134.

- Delitzsch, 3.
 Deluge, 79-81, 137, 140.
 De Michélis, 10.
 De Mortillet, 10.
 Deorham, 88.
 Devakiputra Krishna, 81.
 Devapi, 109.
 Dharmapala, 125.
 Dhvasan Dvaitavana, 112.
 Dhritarashtra, 50, 81, 115, 144.
 Dhuni, 105.
 Dilipa, 123.
 Divodasa, 87, 106, 144.
 Dnipet, 22.
 Doab Gangetic, 16, 28, 121, 142, 147, 150.
 Doric, 56.
 Dravida, 81.
 Dravidian, 5, 11, 34-7, 65, 76-84, 87, 92, 96-101, 121, 134, 137, 149, 151, 152.
 Drishika, 105.
 Drishadvati, 27, 66, 102.
 Druhya, 103, 107, 116-18, 147.
 Drupada, 52.
 Durnukha, 112.
 Dushyanta, 118, 150, 152.
 Dvaitavana, 112. See also Dhvasan.
 Dwapara, 124.
 Dwaraka, 123, 126.
 Dyaua, 6-8, 64, 150.
 (Egypt, 7, 61-3, 131.
 (Egyptian, 7, 62, 63, 131.
 Elysium, 18.
 (England, 60.
 (English, 10, 11, 88, 92, 144.
 Eocene, 131.
 Eos, 6.
 Epic, 9, 29, 34, 96, 103, 104, 110, 113, 118, 120, 132, 135, 146.
 Erinya, 5.
 Ethiopian, 3.
 Euphrates, 22, 60, 63.
 Eurasian, 37.
 (Europe, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 20, 22, 58, 61, 62, 133.
 (European, 4, 5, 9-14, 23, 26, 79, 90, 129, 133, 138, 148-50.
 Feist, 10.
 Fligier, 20.
 (France, 10.
 (French, 9.
 Gairikahit Purukutsa, 81.
 Galacia, 22.
 Galchic, 37, 38.
 Gallic, 10.
 Gandak, 68.
 (Gandhara, 25, 42, 43, 77, 117, 118, 142.
 (Gandharis, 68.
 Gandharvas, 6.
 Ganesha, 152.
 (Ganges, 16, 25, 27, 30, 31, 66, 67, 76, 81, 88, 92, 110, 123, 125, 130, 141, 143, 150.
 (Gangetic, 16, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 81, 82, 86, 87, 91, 94, 97, 105, 120, 121, 130, 134, 141, 147, 147.
 Gargya Balaki, 112.
 Gauls, 7.
 Gautama, 42, 47, 48, 72, 93, 125, 28, 147. See also Buddha.
 Geiger, 20.
 (German, 1, 9.
 (Germany, 10, 20.
 Gifford Lectures, 54.
 Giles, 20.
 Gilghit, 26.
 Godavery, 70, 71, 120, 143.
 Goldstucker, 40, 42.
 Gonds, 83, 84.
 Gotama Rahugana, 113.
 Goths, 63.
 (Greece, 1, 12, 55, 137.
 (Greek, 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 15, 16, 25, 47, 43, 55, 56.
 Green, J. R., 11.
 Grierson, Sir George, 27, 31, 32, 38, 87, 98, 117, 142, 147.
 Grimm, Jacob, 20.
 Gujarat, 28, 31, 53, 35, 36, 70, 104.
 Guptas, 32.
 Haddon, 23, 35, 38.
 Haihaya, 119-23, 142, 144.

- Hairanyanabha, 114. See also
Para Atnara.
- Hakra, 135.
- Hale, 20.
- Hall, H. R., 60, 61.
- Hamites, 9.
- Hapta-Hendu, 19. See also
Sapta-Sindhava.
- Harappa, 65, 80.
- Harischandra, 143, 152.
- Harivansa, 152.
- Harshacharita, 126.
- Hastinapur, 109, 123, 125.
- Haug, 56.
- Havell, 11.
- Hebrew, 149.
- Hehn, 10.
- Helios, 6.
- Hellenes, 137.
- Heparchy, 88.
- Hercules, 73.
- Hilbert Lectures, 7.
- Hillebrandt, 76.
- { Himalayas, 27, 66, 121, 138,
139, 141.
- { Himalayan, 82, 139, 140.
- { Himavanta, 66.
- Hindi, 78.
- Hindus, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18.
- Hinduism, 98, 152.
- Hindukush, 18.
- Hindustan, 28, 32.
- Hindustani, 28.
- Hitt, 20.
- Hittites, 60, 61, 63.
- Hinon Tsang, 43.
- Hoernle, A. F. K., 26, 27, 29-32,
87.
- Homerie, 55.
- Hommel, 3.
- Hura, 63.
- Hungary, 20.
- Hydaspes, 138. See also Jhelum.
- Hyksos, 62.
- Iberians, 10.
- Ida, 60.
- Ikshaku, 58-60, 95, 113, 118-20,
124, 128, 143, 145-8, 150-2.
See also Alakhaka.
- Ila, 140.
- Ilibisha, 105.
- { India, 7-9, 11-20, 22, 25-30, 32,
34-7, 40-45, 57, 60, 65-7, 69,
73, 76-9, 81-2, 85, 91-100,
102, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126,
128, 129, 131, 133, 140-3,
148-51.
- { Indian, 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11-17, 19,
39, 40, 61, 64, 73, 77, 79, 82,
103, 121, 129, 133-35, 138,
140, 145, 148, 150.
- { Indo-Aryan, 7, 16, 17, 19, 25,
28, 39, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41, 49,
57, 60, 64, 66-8, 70, 77,
78, 80, 84-91, 97, 99, 101,
140-43, 149, 151.
- { Indo-European, 4, 12, 23, 61,
64, 77, 138, 150.
- { Indo-German, 4, 9, 10, 23.
- { Indo-Germanic, 9, 14.
- { Indo-Iranian, 65, 137, 138.
- { Indra, 6, 8, 12, 33, 50, 60, 64,
74-6, 79, 85, 105, 136, 137, 151.
- { Indralaya, 18.
- { Indus, 16, 25, 29, 30, 44, 66-8,
70, 71, 76, 80, 81, 86, 103,
118, 130, 134, 135, 138, 141.
- { Ionia, 42.
- { Ionian, 42, 43.
- { Iran, 22, 37, 38, 76, 97.
- { Irama, 37.
- { Iraman, 2, 6, 12, 15, 11, 21, 38,
64, 79, 134.
- { Iramic, 37, 38.
- { Irano-Dravidian, 37.
- { Islam, 93.
- { Iswaraputra, 73.
- { Italy, 6.
- Jacobi, 47, 51.
- Jugayyapeta, 95.
- Jaimini, 52.
- Jaiminiya Brahmana, 114.
- Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana,
70.

- Jainn, 58.
 Jainism, 93, 94, 98.
 Jamadagni, 108, 121.
 Jamadagnya Rama, 52.
 Janaka, 126, 127.
 Janamejaya, 50-2, 110-11, 124-5, 144.
 Jarasandha, 147.
 Jasadata, 61.
 Jayaswal, 39.
 Jaypur, 104.
 Jhelum, 66, 138.
 Jones. Sir William, 1, 2.
 Jumna, 27, 31, 57, 66, 67, 76, 81, 88, 102, 103, 104, 107, 110, 119, 120, 123, 143, 150.
 Jupiter, 6.
 Jutland, 11.
 Jyotisha, 53.
 Kabul, 25, 26, 66. See also Kubha.
 Kachchha, 71.
 Kaegi, 57.
 Kakshivant Ausija, 81.
 Kalara, 127.
 Kali Age, 50, 58, 124.
 Kalinga, 34, 70-2, 91, 92, 97, 117.
 Kalmasapada Saudasa, 145, 152.
 Kamboja, 72.
 Kama, 128, 147.
 Kamrese, 99.
 Kanchi, 99, 100.
 Kanauj, 115, 121, 122, 125.
 Karva, 59.
 Kanyakubja, 115.
 Kapila, 48.
 Kurala, 127.
 Karandhama, 122.
 Karikas, 39, 41.
 Kartavirya, 143, 144.
 { Kashmir, 33, 66, 142.
 { Kashmiri, 28.
 Kasi, 31, 35, 50, 67, 69, 72, 114, 115, 117, 120, 122, 123, 128, 144.
 Kassite, 22, 60, 64.
 Kasi, 104.
 Katiaka Samhita, 40.
 Kathasaritsagara, 40.
 Kathiwar, 33, 70, 119.
 Katyayana, 39-42, 72.
 Kaurava, 52.
 Kausambi, 122, 125, 128.
 Kaushitaki Brahmana, 19, 53, 108, 112.
 Kaushitaki Upanishad, 69.
 Kautilya, 73, 94, 119, 125, 127.
 Keane, 23, 35, 38.
 Keith, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 54, 106, 131.
 Kekaya, 34, 117, 123.
 Kerala, 41, 71, 72.
 Kharosti, 44.
 Khatti, 61. See also Hittite.
 Kikata, 105.
 Kirman, 23.
 Kirtti or Krtvi, 52.
 Kiskindhya, 96.
 Kistna, 95, 99, 100.
 Kosala, 31, 32, 59, 67, 68, 72, 89, 114-16, 128, 145.
 Kossaeans, 60. See also Kassite.
 Kosamma, 20.
 Kraivya, 112.
 Krishna, 58, 59, 73, 76, 81, 152.
 Kritavirya, 121.
 Krivi, 103, 111, 112.
 Krumu, 66.
 Kahatriya, 91, 93, 94, 124, 147.
 Kshemaka, 125.
 Kubha, 25, 66. See also Kabul.
 Kuhn, 5.
 Kukura, 119.
 Kurrum, 66.
 Kuru, 29, 31, 50, 69, 72, 102-4, 108-11, 113, 115, 118, 124, 125, 127, 128.
 Kuru-Panchala, 35, 111-16, 118, 123, 124, 142.
 Kuru-Pandava, 50, 124.
 Kurukshetra, 29, 50, 58, 59, 102, 124, 126, 140.
 Kurusavana, 108.
 Kusa, 115, 144.
 Kusika, 106.

- Lahiri, Durgadas, 129.
 Lassen, 15, 20.
 Latin, 2, 6, 15, 16.
 Lavana, 119.
 Lemuria, 80.
 Lettice, 2.
 Lichchhavis, 34, 127.
 Ludhiana, 130.
 Lunar family, 140.
 Luschan, 38, 61.

 Macdonell, 13, 43, 46, 50, 80, 106.
 Macedonian, 127.
 Machha, 72.
 Madhu, 119, 147.
 Madhupura, 119.
 Madhyadesha, 26, 67, 86, 91-3.
 See also Midland.
 Madraka, 34, 117.
 Madura, 73.
 Magadha, 32, 58, 59, 68-72, 91-3,
 115, 117, 123, 124, 126, 128,
 147.
 Magha, 53.
 Mahabharata, (8, 27, 50, 69, 71,
 84, 108, 109, 111-13, 128, 143).
 Mahapadma Nanda, 50, 58, 93.
 { Maharashtra, 35, 35, 95, 97, 98,
 100, 119.
 { (Maharatta, 28, 35-8, 120-1, 142).
 Mahavira, 58, 93.
 Mahidasa Aitareya, 81.
 Mahismati, 119.
 Mahomedan, 6, 100, 149.
 Maine, 11.
 Maitrayani Samhita, 136.
 Maitrayaniya Upanishad, 48.
 Malavalli, 99.
 Malaya, 81.
 Malla, 72.
 Malwa, 35, 36, 67, 119, 120, 143.
 Mandhatri, 60, 120, 123, 145.
 Mantra period, 48.
 Mana, 18, 27, 80, 81, 140, 147.
 Manusmriti, 74, 108, 143, 152.
 Manva, 148.
 Manyu, 75.
 March, 92.

 Maritikavata, 119.
 Marut or Maryttas, 60.
 Marutta, 118, 122.
 Matachi, 78.
 Mathava, 67, 68.
 Mathura, 73, 95, 104, 119.
 Matsya, 31, 69, 80, 104, 112-14.
 Matsya Purana, 81, 148.
 Maurya, 32, 94, 98, 126.
 Max Muller, 1, 5, 20, 46, 49, 54,
 55, 151.
 Medes, 61.
 Mediterranean, 9, 63, 106.
 Medo-Perman, 62.
 Megasthenes, 73.
 Meerut, 125.
 Mercury, 7.
 Meru, 18.
 Mesopotamia, 61, 63, 140.
 Midland, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34,
 35, 117, 142. See also Ma-
 dhyadesha.
 Miocene, 130, 131, 133.
 Mitanni, 60, 64.
 Mithila, 123, 127.
 Mitra, 6, 60, 64.
 Mlechchha, 74, 118.
 Mohenjo Daro, 65, 80.
 Mommsen, 20.
 { Mongol, 35.
 { Mongolian, 8, 10, 34, 35, 87,
 83, 151.
 Mongolo-Turki, 37.
 Mon-Khmer, 36, 82.
 Morgan, 65.
 Moulton, 55.
 Muchukunda, 120.
 Mudgala, 144.
 Muir, 3, 16, 81.
 Mujavant, 68.
 Munda, 36, 82, 83.
 Mutinus, 68.
 Myer, E., 23.

 Naga, 30, 124, 125, 144, 152.
 Nahusha, 115, 120, 145, 152.
 Nakshatra, 53.
 Nala, 144.

- Nanda, 32, 39, 50, 58, 93, 94, 128.
 Nasatyas, 6, 60, 64.
 { Negro, 4.
 { Negroid, 8.
 neo-Latin, 5.
 Nepal, 128.
 Nerbudda, 37, 66, 81, 120, 121,
 142.
 Nichakshma, 125.
 Nikayas, 71.
 { Nimi, 113, 114, 132.
 { Nimi Jataka, 127.
 Nirukta, 45. See also Yaska.
 Nishada, 83, 84, 90.
 Noah, 80.
 non-Aila, 148.
 non-Aryan, 69, 71, 74, 85, 89-94,
 96, 141, 146, 148-52.
 non-Brahmin, 99.
 non-Dravidian, 4, 9.
 Nordic, 9, 38.

 Oldenberg, 106, 127.
 Oligocene, 131.
 Olympus, 137.
 Oppert, 2.
 Oraons, 84.
 { Oriasa, 34, 69, 70, 117, 142.
 { Oriya, 28.
 Oudh, 28, 31, 32, 35, 67, 114,
 120-4, 141, 143. See also
 Ayodhya.
 Oxus, 21.

 Padmapravritakam, 40.
 Padma Purana, 84.
 Pajavana, 145. See also Sudas.
 Pakthas, 104, 107.
 Palestine, 61, 63.
 Pali-Buddhist, 31.
 Pallava, 99, 100.
 Panchajana, 143.
 Panchala, 31, 52, 69, 72, 89, 103,
 108, 112, 114, 118, 143, 145,
 148. See also Kuru-Panchala.
 Panchama, 84.
 Panchavimsa Brahmana, 113.
 Pandavas, 29, 30, 31, 109, 111,
 124, 144. See also Kuru-
 Pandavas.
 Pandya, 41, 71-3, 95.
 Pani, 105, 106, 132.
 Panik, 105.
 Panini, 39-43, 46, 48, 54, 71, 72.
 Panipat, 121.
 Para Ainara, 81, 114.
 Parasurama, 93, 121, 122.
 Pargiter, F. E., 50, 52, 58, 59,
 103, 121, 140-4, 146-8, 150-2.
 Paribhashas, 41.
 Parikshit, 50, 51, 110, 111, 124,
 127.
 Parjanya, 6.
 Parsees, 37.
 Parvanath, 59.
 Parthia, 39.
 Parushni or Ravi, 66, 103, 107.
 Patanjali, 39, 40, 41.
 Paula, 144.
 Pauranic, 31, 34, 50, 84, 103,
 104, 110, 113-116, 118, 129,
 135, 140, 143, 144, 146, 148.
 Paurava, 58, 115, 119, 123, 147,
 147.
 Penka, 10, 20.
 Perikunus, 6.
 { Persia, 1, 5, 6, 13, 17, 21-3, 25,
 36, 40, 56, 138, 140.
 { Persian, 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 13, 43, 44,
 57, 132.
 Persian Gulf, 37, 63, 106.
 Perunu, 6.
 Peschel, 9.
 Phalguni, 53.
 { Phallic, 152.
 { Phallus-worshipper, 79.
 Phonician, 3, 7, 106.
 Pietet, 20.
 Pijavana, 106, 143, 152.
 Piscium, 53.
 Plishacha, 27, 38.
 Posche, 10.
 Pott, 20.
 Pracheta, 118.
 Pradyota, 59, 125, 126.
 Prakrit, 99.

- Prasenjiti, 128, 145.
 Prasniputra, 81.
 Pratardana, 122, 143.
 Pratipa, 52, 109, 111.
 Pratisthana, 140.
 Prativindhya, 144.
 Pravahana Jaivali, 112.
 Pre-Aryan, 65, 151.
 Pre-Dravidian, 36, 81-3.
 Pre-Vedic, 64, 80, 145, 148.
 Projapati, 136.
 Prata, 52.
 Prussia, 124.
 Pulindas, 68, 69.
 Pundra, 34, 68, 69, 73, 91, 92, 117.
 Punic, 106.
 Punika, 126.
 Punjab, 16, 17, 25-8, 30, 31, 33, 6, 57, 65-7, 69, 70, 71, 77, 80, 81, 85-7, 89, 90, 103, 117, 120, 130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 145, 147.
 Punjabee, 91.
 Punjabese, 27, 87.
 Purana, 50, 58-60, 69, 81, 84, 93, 94, 104, 109, 111, 115-19, 124, 141, 143, 145, 148, 151. See also Pauranic.
 Puru, 102, 103, 106-8, 110, 113, 116, 118, 144, 147. See also Paurava.
 Purukutsa, 60, 81, 107, 113, 144.
 Pururava, 115, 120, 140, 142, 145, 147, 152.
 Radha-Krishna, 152.
 Raghu, 123, 143.
 Rahula, 145.
 Rakhas or Rakshasas, 16, 30, 71, 77, 96, 132, 133, 151.
 Rajasuya, 112.
 Rajputana, 28, 35, 66, 119, 130, 134, 135, 137.
 Rama, 52, 96, 143.
 Ramayana, 71, 117, 123, 124, 151.
 Rapson, 30, 38.
 Rathaesthas, 38.
 Rattikas or Rattas, 38.
 Ravana, 96, 127.
 Ravi, 66, 103. See also Parvini.
 Ray Choudhury, Prof. H. C., 50, 51.
 Rhode, 20.
 Rhys, J., 20.
 Rhys Davids, 72.
 Rigveda, 18, 25, 30, 31, 33, 45, 51, 53-5, 57, 64, 66, 73-7, 79, 80, 83, 87-9, 102, 103, 105-9, 113, 116, 117, 129, 132-8, 140-51.
 Rigvedic, 46, 15, 16, 25, 27, 34, 35, 54, 55, 57, 64, 67, 79, 81, 86-88, 102, 104, 105, 109, 129, 131, 132, 135, 142-4, 148.
 Ristisena, 109.
 Risley, Sir Herbert, 27, 28, 34, 36, 37, 82, 87, 97, 147.
 Rohilkhand, 103.
 { Roman, 1, 2, 12, 63.
 { Rome, 1, 5, 12, 62.
 Rudhikra, 105.
 Russia, 20.
 Rutot, 131.
 Sabara, 68, 69.
 Sahdaratravali, 18.
 Sadanira, 68.
 Sagara, 122, 123, 143.
 Sahadeva, 144.
 Saka, 39, 40.
 Sakabhoj, 49.
 Sakadisa Bhaditayana, 40.
 Sakaparthivadnam, 39.
 Sakapriya, 40.
 Sakya, 34, 59, 128, 145.
 Sambhara, 105, 106.
 Samhita, 53, 54, 56, 109, 110, 112, 119.
 Samvatana, 103, 108.
 Sandilya, 51.
 Sanjiviputra, 81.
 Sankhayana Srauta Sutra, 114.
 Sankhya, 47, 48.
 Sanskut, 1, 2, 7, 13, 16, 20, 21, 39, 43, 44, 45, 78, 80, 81, 98, 99, 105, 121, 132, 145.

- Santanu, 109.
 Sapta-Sindhava, 130, 134, 136, 138. See also Hapta-Hendu.
 Saranyu, 6.
 Saraswati, 16, 27, 66, 67, 68, 81, 88, 102, 104, 116, 123, 134, 135, 137, 138, 142.
 Sardis, 43.
 Sarva, 6.
 Saryata, 121, 151, 152.
 Sasabindu, 144.
 Sastras, 129.
 Satamika Satrajita, 115.
 Satapatha Brahmana, 50, 51, 67, 80, 110-15, 118, 140, 144.
 Satrugna, 119.
 Satudru, 66, 106. See also Sutlej.
 Satvatas, 119, 143.
 Satyakama Jabala, 81.
 Satyavati, 52.
 Satyavrata Manu, 80.
 Saudasa, 145, 152.
 Saunagas, 39.
 Sauvira, 34, 70, 71, 117.
 Sayana, 73, 136.
 Sayce, 20, 21, 65.
 Scandinavia, 20.
 Schlegel, 14, 20.
 Schleicher, 20.
 Schleswig, 11.
 Scythian, 36.
 Scytho-Dravidian, 36, 37.
 Seligman, 38.
 { Semites, 9, 61, 63, 80.
 { Semitic, 3, 37-43, 62.
 Senart, 12.
 Sergi, 20.
 Shepherds, 62. See also Hyksos.
 Shu-king, 56.
 Siddhartha, 145. See also Buddha and Gautama.
 Sigrus, 105, 107.
 Simyu, 88, 105.
 { Sind, 33, 34, 65, 66, 70, 130, 135, 138, 142.
 { Sindhi, 28.
 { Sindhu, 66, 70, 71, 73, 123.
 Sinehu, 61.
 Sirhind, 27, 29, 86.
 Siamdevall, 79.
 Siamnagas, 32.
 Siva, 8, 64, 152.
 Sivas, 107.
 Sivas, 34.
 Skylax, 42.
 { Slav, 1.
 { Slavonic, 2, 6.
 Smith, Dr. V. A., 34, 42.
 Sauriti, 44.
 Soastos, 25. See also Suvastu.
 Sol, 6.
 Soma, 6, 138, 139.
 Soma Satrasaha, 112.
 Sramanas, 42.
 Scribinda, 105.
 Srinjaya, 103, 112, 144.
 Srutasena, 51, 111.
 Sruti, 44.
 Stein, Sir Aurel, 24.
 Strabo, 23.
 Subandu, 61.
 Sudas, 81, 88, 106-8, 143-5, 148, 150-2.
 Suddhodana, 145.
 Sudra, 84, 90, 92-4, 99.
 Sudraka, 40.
 Suhna, 34, 117.
 Suka, 52.
 Sumatra, 83.
 Sumerian, 65, 80.
 Surasena, 72, 104, 113, 114, 119, 123, 126.
 Surastra, 70, 71, 123.
 Surjya or Suria, 6, 60, 64.
 Sutarna, 61.
 Sutas, 146.
 Sutlej, 66, 135. See also Satudru.
 Sutra, 13, 40, 44, 46-9, 114, 127.
 Suvastu, 25, 66, 142. See also Swat.
 Suwardata, 61.
 Svapnavasavadatta, 125.
 Sveta, 144.
 Swat, 25, 66, 142. See also Suvastu.
 Syria, 61, 62, 63.

- Taittiriya Brahmāna, 18.
 Taittiriya Samhita, 108.
 Takshasila or Taxila, 124.
 Talajangha, 121.
 / Tamil, 73, 96, 98, 99, 121.
 / Tamilian, 97-9.
 Tamirmuni, 97.
 Tantric, 93.
 Tartar, 22.
 Taylor, 3.
 Telegu, 69, 97, 99.
 Tell-el-Amarna, 61.
 Tertiary, 54, 130, 137.
 / Teuton, 7, 10, 144.
 / Teutonic, 2, 6, 9.
 Thibet, 82.
 Thor, 7.
 Thunderer, 74.
 Thurston, 82.
 Thutmose, 63.
 Tilak, 18, 19, 20, 131, 137.
 Tirhankara, 58.
 Tiukahu, 34, 117.
 Tin, 7.
 Tealia, 83.
 Tocharian, 23.
 Traivishna, 113.
 Trasadasyu, 60, 107-9, 113, 144.
 Trēta Age, 320.
 Trigartias, 104.
 Trikahi, 108.
 Tripolje, 22.
 Trisanku, 152.
 Trita, 6.
 Trisū, 106.
 Tryaruna, 60, 113.
 Tukultinimiv, 60.
 Tundikera, 121.
 Tura Kavashoya, 51, 81.
 Turanian, 10, 133.
 Turkestan, 24.
 Turvaaha, 33, 103, 104, 106, 107,
 116, 118, 143, 147.
 Udayana, 125, 126.
 Uddalaka, 51, 126.
 Ugrasena, 51, 111.
 Ujjalvy, 10.
 Un-Vedic, 93.
 Upamasravas, 108.
 Upanishad, 32, 44, 45, 47-51,
 57, 78, 115, 117, 127.
 Uranus, 6.
 Usanas-Sukra, 151.
 Ushas, 6, 19, 64, 67.
 Usinara, 31, 34, 69, 104, 117.
 Utarakutu, 18.
 Vadhyasava, 144.
 Vagadha, 69.
 Vaichitravitya, 81, 115. See also
 Dhritarastra.
 Vaidya, C. V., 29.
 Vaisali, 122, 127.
 Vaissampayana, 52.
 Vaivānara, 110.
 Vaisya, 91.
 Vaivasvata, 147.
 / Vajji, 72, 128.
 / Vajjian, 127.
 Vala, 105, 106.
 Vamsa, 72, 89.
 Vamsa Brahmāna, 40.
 Vanga, 34, 69, 71-3, 91, 92, 117.
 Varchin, 105.
 Varttikas, 39-41.
 Varuna, 6, 8, 150, 151.
 Vasas, 31, 69.
 Vasistha, 71, 107, 108, 123, 148,
 150-2.
 Vasu, 115, 119.
 Vasudeva, 58.
 / Vatsa, 122, 126, 128.
 / Vataaraj, 125.
 / Vayu, 6.
 / Vayu Purana, 126, 148.
 Veda, 5, 6, 9, 13-16, 45, 50,
 112, 129, 139. See also Rig-
 veda, Yajurveda and Atharva-
 veda.
 Vedic, 6, 14, 15, 17, 19, 28,
 31, 32, 35, 37, 39, 40, 44,
 45, 50, 54-7, 59, 60, 64, 66,
 68, 73, 77, 78, 87, 91, 94,
 103, 106, 112-14, 129-31,
 133, 136, 140-5, 150, 152.

- Vedangas, 44.
 Veddas, 83.
 Vena, 152.
 Vendidad, 19.
 Vibhisana, 96.
 Vidarbha, 69, 79, 71, 95, 119,
 122, 123. See also Berar.
 Videgha Mathava, 113.
 (Videha, 37, 35, 67-9, 89, 113,
 114, 122, 126, 127, 143.
 (Videhan, 114.
 Vijayanagar, 58.
 Vikramaditya, 145.
 Vindhya, 27, 66, 67, 69, 96, 104,
 134, 142, 143.
 Vipasha, 66, 106. See also Beas.
 Vishanins, 107.
 (Vishnu, 8, 64.
 (Vishnu Purana, 51, 109.
 Viswamitra, 68, 106-8, 150, 152.
 Vitasta, 66. See also Jhelum.
 Vitihotra, 121.
 Vitranan, 6.
 Vratyas, 68.
 Vredenburg, 23, 138.
 Vrishni, 119, 126.
 Vyasa, 52.
 Wales, 92.
 Warren, 20.
 Weber, 109.
 Whilney, 57.
 Winternitz, 49, 57, 132.
 Woden, 7.
 Yadava, 73, 119, 123.
 Yadu, 33, 35, 97, 103, 104, 106,
 107, 113, 116, 118, 119, 142,
 4, 147.
 Yajati, 116, 120, 147.
 (Yajnavalkya, 51, 52, 127.
 (Yajnavalkyakanda, 51.
 Yajurveda, 112.
 Yakshu, 105, 107.
 Yama, 6.
 Yaska, 46, 47, 54, 73, 143.
 Yaudheyas, 34, 117.
 Yavanani, 42.
 Yudhisthira, 29.
 Yuvanasha, 120.
 Zaborowski, 20.
 Zarathustra or Zoroaster, 55.
 Zend, 5, 16, 20, 21. See also
 Avesta.
 Zeus, 6, 137.



Dr. L. D. Barnett, British Museum, England—

"It seems to me a **thoughtful and sensible survey** of the facts, and on several important points I am pleased to find that your views agree with mine." (5. 10. 1925).

Prof. A. B. Keith, Edinburgh University, Scotland—"It is decidedly advantageous to have a statement of the issues regarding the Aryan invasion **set forth clearly and effectively**, and I am glad to note that you have exercised a **sober and independent judgment** on the various issues. While the theories of Dr. Das and Mr. Pargiter are doubtless unacceptable, it is interesting to have their defects exposed in your Appendices, because statements left uncontradicted are apt to mislead those who are not expert at the outset of their studies and to lead them into false paths of investigation." (2. 10. 1925).

Prof. J. Jolly, Warzburg University, Germany—"Your **valuable work** on the Aryanisation of India has been duly received and it seems to be **very useful**, as it contains a **critical examination** of all the various theories concerning the immigration of the Aryans into India. The nature of Aryan colonisation and of the Dravidian element of Indian culture has been **carefully analysed**. The political history of the country has been traced back to the Vedas. The **copious Index** shows what a **large field has been covered by your researches** as contained in this volume." (6. 10. 1925).

Prof. M. Winternitz, Prague University, Czechoslovakia—

"I am greatly obliged to you for your kindness in sending me your **interesting book** on the Aryanisation of India. I agree with you on most points, especially in your criticisms of Dr. Das's Rigvedic India and of Mr. Pargiter's theories in the Appendix. Of course, there is still much in these questions that must remain doubtful." (20. 10. 1925)

Prof. M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, U.S.A.—
—"Fine book."



CATALOGUED.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY,
NEW DELHI ✓

Catalogue No.
934.012/Dut-16496.

Author— Dutt, Tripendra Kumar.

Title— Aryanisation of India.

| Borrower No. | Date of Issue | Date of Return |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
|--------------|---------------|----------------|

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.