

उद्यश्रवा व्यासशिष्यः कर्ममध्ये महर्षये।
महाभारतमाख्यानं हरिवंशकथान्वितं॥
वेदव्यासैकविज्ञेयं महागुणगणान्वितं।
हरिप्रियं श्रुतिसुखं कर्ममध्ये महर्द्धिमत॥
आसीद्गृहपतिर्यो वै नैमिषारण्यवासिनां।
शतानीकाय राज्ञे यो जनमेजयसूनवे॥
उपानयद्विष्णुधर्मान् साक्षात्कारकरान् हरेः।
स शौनको मुनिगतो श्रूयमाणो महायशः॥
द्वितीयं मंडलं दृष्ट्वा श्रुतभारतसंहितं।
संसाराश्रिमहापोतविष्णुधर्मप्रवर्त्तकः॥
एकविंशतिशाखस्य बह्वृचस्य महर्षिभिः।
कल्पितः कल्पितारोऽभूद्भवेद इव पारगः॥
शाकलस्य संहितैका वाष्कलस्य तथापरा।
ते संहिते समाश्रित्य ब्राह्मणान्येकविंशतिः॥
ऐतरेयकमाश्रित्य तदेवान्यैः प्रपूरयन्।
कल्पसूत्रं चकाराद्यं महर्षिर्गणपूजितः॥
शौनकस्य तु शिष्योऽभूद्भगवानाश्वलायनः।
स तस्माच्छ्रुतसर्वज्ञः सूत्रं कृत्वा न्यवेदयत्॥

¹ से क Ch., W.

² द्वि धर्मात् W. दृ धर्मान् Ch.

³ करान् Ch., W.

⁴ दृष्टा W.

⁵ ता W., Ch.

⁶ खास्य W., Ch.

⁷ नः W.

⁸ च Ch., W.

⁹ गुण Ch., W.

¹⁰ यन् Ch., W.

प्रबोधपरिशुद्धार्थं शौनकस्य प्रियं त्विति ।
 सहस्रखंडं स्वकृतं सूत्रं ब्राह्मणसंनिभं ॥
 शिष्याश्चलायनप्रीत्यै शौनकेन विपाटितं ।
 उक्तं तत्तत्कृतं सूत्रमस्य वेदस्य चास्त्विति ॥
 शौनकीया दश ग्रंथास्तदा ऋग्वेदगुप्तये ।
 आर्य्यनुक्रमणीत्याद्या क्वादसी देवती तथा ॥
 अनुवाकानुक्रमणी सूक्तानुक्रमणी तथा ।
 ऋक्पादयोर्विधाने च वार्हदैवतमेव च ॥
 प्रातिशाख्यं शौनकीयं स्मार्तं दशममुच्यते ।
 स सूत्रदशकं ज्ञात्वा तथा साकृतगोत्रजः ॥
 शौनकस्य प्रसादेन कर्मज्ञः समपद्यत ।
 कात्यायनमुनिर्मेने त्रयोदशकमत्र तु ॥
 शौनकीयं च दशकं तद्विषयस्य त्रिकं तथा ।
 द्वादशाध्यायकं सूत्रं चतुष्कगृह्यमेव च ॥
 चतुर्थारण्यकं चेति ह्याश्वलायनसूत्रकं ।
 सशिष्यशौनकाचार्यत्रयोदशकविष्णुनिः ॥
 वाजिनां सूत्रकृत्साम्नामुपग्रंथस्य कारकः ।
 स्युतेषु कर्ता श्लोकानां भाजमानां च कारकः ॥
 अथर्वणं निर्ममे यः सम्यग्वै ब्राह्मणकारिकाः ।
 महावार्त्तिकनौकारः पाणिनीयमहार्णवे ॥

¹ ने न W. Ch. ² तथा W. Ch.

³ साकृतगोत्रजः W., साकृतगोत्रज Ch.

⁴ चातुष्क W.

⁵ पार्षदस्य ?

यत्प्रणीतानि वाक्यानि भगवांस्तु पतंजलिः।

व्याख्यच्छांतनवीयेन महाभाष्येन^१ हर्षितः॥

योगाचार्यः स्वयं कर्ता योगशास्त्रनिदानयोः।

एवंगुणगौर्युक्तः कात्यायनमहामुनिः॥

तपोयोगान्निर्ममे यः सर्वानुक्रमणीमिमां।

सशिष्यशौनकाचार्यसर्वग्रन्थार्थवर्तनात्॥

प्राज्जर्बकृचसिंहास्तु सर्वानुक्रमणीमिमां। &c.

If we accept this statement of Shadguruśishya,—and it certainly seems to agree in the main with what we might have guessed from the character of the works, ascribed respectively to Śaunaka, Āśvalāyana and Kātyāyana,—we should have to admit at least five generations of teachers and pupils: first Śaunaka; after him Āśvalāyana, in whose favour Śaunaka is said to have destroyed one of his works; thirdly, Kātyāyana, who studied the works both of Śaunaka and Āśvalāyana; fourthly Patanjali, who wrote a commentary on one of Kātyāyana's works; and lastly Vyāsa, who commented on a work of Patanjali. It does not follow that Kātyāyana was a pupil of Āśvalāyana, or that Patanjali lived immediately after Kātyāyana, but the smallest interval which we can admit between every two of these names is that between teacher and pupil, an interval as large as that between father and son, or rather larger. The question now arises: Can the date of any one of these authors be fixed chronologically?

Before we attempt to answer this question, it will be necessary to establish the identity of Kātyāyana

^१ तदंजलिः Ch. W. ^२ छांतयनीयेन W., छांतपनीयेन Ch.

^३ भाष्येण or भाष्येन?

and Vararuchi. Kātyāyana was the author of the *Sarvānukramaṇī*, and the same work is quoted as the *Sarvānukramaṇī* of Vararuchi¹, the compiler of the doctrines of Śaunaka. In Professor Wilson's Catalogue of the Mackenzie Collection, a *Prātiśākhya* is ascribed to Vararuchi, and this can hardly be anything else but the *Mādhyandina-prātiśākhya* of Kātyāyana. Hemachandra in his Dictionary gives Vararuchi as a synonyme of Kātyāyana without any further comment, just as he gives Śālāturiya as a synonyme of Pāṇini.

Let us now consider the information which we receive about Kātyāyana Vararuchi from Brahmanic sources. Somadevabhaṭṭa of Kashmir collected the popular stories current in his time, and published them towards the beginning of the twelfth century under the title of *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*², the Ocean of the Rivers of Stories. Here we read that Kātyāyana

¹ MS. E. I. H. 576. contains a commentary on the *Rig-veda*, where a passage from the *Sarvānukramaṇī* is quoted as अत्र शौनकादिमतसंघहीतुर्वररुचेरनुक्रमणिका॥ This commentary of Ātmānanda seems anterior to Sāyaṇa. In the introduction different works and commentaries, connected with the Veda are quoted, but Mādharma and Sāyaṇa are never mentioned. We find the *Skāndabhāṣya*, and commentators such as Udgītha-bhāṣkara, mentioned (स्कांदभाष्यादिषु भाष्यकारैरुद्गीथभास्करादिभिः) by Ātmānanda, and the same works were known also to Devarājajvan. Devarājajvan, however, quotes not only *Skandasvāmin* and Bhaṭṭa-bhāṣkara-miśra, but also Mādharma. He therefore was later than Mādharma. *Skandasvāmin*, and Bhāṣkara, on the contrary, were anterior to Mādharma, being quoted in his commentary. Ātmānanda, though not quoted by Mādharma, seems anterior to Mādharma, and the authorities which he quotes are such as Śaunaka, Vedamitra (Śākalya), the *Bṛihaddevatā*, *Vishṇu-dharmottara*, and *Yāska*.

² *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, edited by Dr. Hermann Brockhaus. Leipzig, 1839.



Vararuchi, being cursed by the wife of Śiva, was born at Kauśambī, the capital of Vatsa. He was a boy of great talent and extraordinary powers of memory. He was able to repeat to his mother an entire play, after hearing it once at the theatre; and before he was even initiated he was able to repeat the *Prātiśākhya* which he had heard from Vyāli. He was afterwards the pupil of Varsha, became proficient in all sacred knowledge, and actually defeated Pāṇini in a grammatical controversy. By the interference of Śiva, however, the final victory fell to Pāṇini. Kātyāyana had to appease the anger of Śiva, became himself a student of Pāṇini's Grammar, and completed and corrected it. He afterwards is said to have become minister of King Nanda and his mysterious successor Yogananda at Pāṭaliputra.

✓ We know that Kātyāyana completed and corrected Pāṇini's Grammar, such as we now possess it.¹ His Vārttikas are supplementary rules, which show a more extensive and accurate knowledge of Sanskrit than even the work of Pāṇini. The story of the contest between them was most likely intended as a mythical way of explaining this fact. Again we know that Kātyāyana was himself the author of one of the *Prātiśākhya*s, and Vyāli is quoted by the authors of the *Prātiśākhya*s as an earlier authority on the same subject.² So far the story of Somadeva agrees with the account of Shadguruśishya and with the facts as

¹ The same question with regard to the probable age of Pāṇini, has been discussed by Prof. Böhtlingk in his edition of Pāṇini. Objections to Prof. Böhtlingk's arguments have been raised by Prof. Weber in his *Indische Studien*. See also *Rig-veda*, Leipzig, 1857, Introduction.

² Cf. *Rig-veda*, Leipzig, 1857, p. lxvii.

we still find them in the works of Kâtyâyana. It would be wrong to expect in a work like that of Somadeva historical and chronological facts in the strict sense of the word; yet the mention of King Nanda, who is an historical personage, in connection with our grammarian, may, if properly interpreted, help to fix approximately the date of Kâtyâyana and his predecessors, Śaunaka and Āśvalâyana. If Somadeva followed the same chronological system as his contemporary and countryman, Kalhaṇa Paṇḍita, the author of the Rājataranginī or History of Kashmir, he would, in calling Pāṇini and Kâtyâyana, the contemporaries of Nanda and Chandragupta, have placed them long before the times which we are wont to call historical.¹ But the name of Chandragupta fortunately enables us to check the extravagant systems of Indian chronology. Chandragupta, of Pāṭaliputra, the successor of the Nandas, is Sandrocottus, of Palibothra, to whom Megasthenes was sent as ambassador from Seleucus Nicator; and, if our classical chronology is right, he must have been king at the turning point of the fourth and third centuries B.C. We shall have to examine hereafter the different accounts which the Buddhists and Brahmans give of Chandragupta and his relation to the preceding dynasty of the Nandas. Suffice it for the present that if Chandragupta was king in 315, Kâtyâyana may be placed, according to our interpretation of Somadeva's story, in the second half of the fourth century B.C. We may disregard the story of Somadeva, which actually makes Kâtyâyana himself minister of Nanda, and thus would make him an old man at the time of Chandragupta's accession to the throne. This is, according to its own

¹ Lassen, Indische Alterthumskunde, ii. 18.



showing, a mere episode in a ghost story¹, and had to be inserted in order to connect Kâtyâyana's story with other fables of the Kathâ-sarit-sâgara. But there still remains this one fact, however slender it may appear, that as late as the twelfth century A.D., the popular tradition of the Brahmans connected the famous grammarians Kâtyâyana and Pânini with that period of their history which immediately preceded the rise of Chandragupta and his Śûdra dynasty; and this, from an European point of view, we must place in the second half of the fourth century B.C.

The question now arises, can this conjectural date, assigned to Kâtyâyana, be strengthened by additional evidence? Professor Böhrtlingk thought that this was possible; and he endeavoured to show that the great Commentary of Patanjali, which embraces both the Vârttikâs of Kâtyâyana and the Sûtras of Pânini, was known in the middle of the second century B.C. It is said in the history of Kashmir, that Abhimanyu, the king of Kashmir, sent for Brahmans to teach the Mahâbhâshya in his kingdom. Abhimanyu, it is true, did not reign, as Professor Böhrtlingk supposed, in the second century B.C., but, as has been proved from coins by Professor Lassen, in the first century A.D. But even thus this argument is important. In the history of Indian literature dates are mostly so precarious that a confirmation even within a century or two is not to be despised. The fact that Patanjali's immense commentary on Pânini and Kâtyâyana had become so famous as to be imported by royal authority into Kashmir in the first half of the first century

¹ According to the southern Buddhists it was Chandragupta, and not Nanda, whose corpse was reanimated. As. Res. xx. p. 167.

A.D., shows at least that we cannot be very far wrong in placing the composition of the original grammar and of the supplementary rules of Kātyāyana on the threshold of the third century B.C. At what time the Mahābhāṣya was first composed it is impossible to say. Patanjali, the author of the Great Commentary, is sometimes identified with Pingala; and on this view, as Pingala is called the younger brother, or at least the descendant of Pāṇini¹, it might be supposed that the original composition of the Mahābhāṣya belonged to the third century. But the identity of Pingala and Patanjali is far from probable, and it would be rash to use it as a foundation for other calculations.

It will readily be seen how entirely hypothetical all these arguments are. If they possess any force it is this, that in spite of the conflicting statements of Brahmanical, Buddhist, and European scholars, nothing has been brought forward as yet that would render the date here assigned to Kātyāyana impossible. Nay more;—if we place Kātyāyana in the second half of the fourth century, Āśvalāyana, the predecessor of Kātyāyana, about 350, and Śaunaka, the teacher of Āśvalāyana, about 400; and if then, considering the writers of Sūtras anterior to Śaunaka and posterior to Kātyāyana, we extend the limits of the Sautra period of literature from 600 to 200, we are still able to say, that there is no fact in history or literature that would interfere with such an arrangement. As an experiment, therefore, though as no more than an experiment, we propose to fix the years 600 and 200 B.C. as the limits of that age

¹ Shadguruśishya: तथा च सूत्र्यते हि भगवता पिंगलेन पाणिन्यनुजेन॥



during which the Brahmanic literature was carried on in the strange style of Sūtras.

In order to try the strength of our supposition we shall ourselves attempt the first attack upon it.

There is a work called the Uṇādi-sūtras, which, as it is quoted under this name by Pāṇini, must have existed previous to his time. The author is not known. Among the words the formation of which is taught in the Uṇādi-sūtras,¹ we find (iii. 140) *ḍinārah*, a golden ornament; (iii. 2) *Jinah*, synonymous with Arhat, a Buddhist saint; (iv. 184) *tirī-tam*, a golden diadem; (iii. 25) *stūpah*, a pile of earth.

The first of these words, *ḍināra*, is derived by the author of the Uṇādi-sūtras from a Sanskrit root, *ḍin*. By other grammarians it is derived from *ḍina*, poor, and *ṛi*, to go, what goes or is given to the poor. It is used sometimes in the sense of ornaments and seals of gold. These derivations, however, are clearly fanciful, and the Sanskrit *ḍināra* is in reality the Latin *denarius*.² Now, if Pāṇini lived in the middle of the fourth century B.C., and if the Uṇādi-sūtras were anterior to Pāṇini, how could this Roman word have found its way into the Uṇādi-sūtras? The word *de-*

¹ A new and more correct edition of the Uṇādi-sūtras has lately been published by Dr. Aufrecht, Bonn, 1859.

² J. Prinsep says: "The Roman denarius, from which *Dinār* was derived, was itself of silver, while the Persian *Dirhem* (a silver coin) represents the Drachma, or dram weight, of the Greeks. The weight allowed to the Dinar of 32 *ratīs*, or 64 grains, agrees so closely with the Roman and Greek unit of 60 grains, that its identity cannot be doubted, especially when we have before us the actual gold coins of Chandragupta (?) (didrachmas), weighing from 120 to 130 grains, and indubitably copied from Greek originals, in device as well as weight."

narius is not of so late a date in India as is generally supposed. Yet the earliest document where it occurs is the Sanchi inscription No. I.¹ Burnouf remarked that he never found the word *dīnāra* used in what he considered the ancient Buddhist Sūtras. It occurs in the Avadāna-śataka, and in the Divyāvadāna. It would seem to follow, therefore, either that the Uṇādi-sūtras and Pāṇini must be placed later than Chandragupta, or that the Sūtra in which this word is explained is spurious. It would not be right to adopt the latter supposition without showing some cause for it. It is well known that in a literature which is chiefly preserved by oral tradition, corrections and additions are more easily admitted than in works existing in MS. The ancient literature of India was continually learnt by heart; and even at the present day, when MSS. have become so common, some of its more sacred portions must still be acquired by the pupil from the mouth of a teacher, and not from MSS. If new words, therefore, had been added to the language of India after the first composition of the Uṇādi-sūtras, there would be nothing surprising in a Sūtra being added to explain such words. Happily, however, we are not left in this instance to mere hypothesis. Ujvaladatta, the author of a commentary on the Uṇādi-sūtras, forms a favourable exception to most Sanskrit commentators, in so far as he gives us in his Commentary some critical remarks on the readings of MSS. which he consulted. He states in his introduction that he had consulted old MSS. and commentaries, and he evidently feels conscious of the merit of his work, when

¹ Journal A. S. B., vol. vi. p. 455. Notes on the facsimiles of the inscriptions from Sanchi near Bhilsa, by James Prinsep.

he says, "If anybody, after having studied this commentary of mine, suppresses my name in order to put forth his own power, his virtuous deeds will perish."¹ Now in his remarks on our Sūtra, Ujvaladatta says, "Dināra means a gold ornament, but this Sūtra is not to be found in the Sūtivṛitti and Devavṛitti."² If, therefore, the presence of this word in the Unādi-sūtras would have overthrown our calculations as to the age of Pāṇini and his predecessor who wrote the Sūtras, the absence of it except in one Sūtra, which is proved to be of later date, must serve to confirm our opinion. Cosmas Indicopleustes remarked that the Roman denarius was received all over the world; and how the denarius came to mean in India a gold ornament we may learn from a passage in the "Life of Mahāvīra."³ There it is said that a lady had around her neck a string of grains and golden dinars, and Stevenson adds that the custom of stringing coins together, and adorning with them children especially, is still very common in India.

That Ujvaladatta may be depended upon when he makes such statements with regard to MSS. or commentaries, collated by himself, can be proved by another instance. In the Unādi-Sūtras IV. 184, we read: "kṛitrikṛipibhyaḥ kṛitan." Out of the three words of which the etymology is given in this Sūtra, *kṛipitam*, water, and *kiritam*, a crest, are known as ancient words. The former occurs in the Gaṇa

¹ योऽमुं वृत्तिं समालोच्य स्वपौरुषसमीहया।

मन्त्रामाच्छादनं कुर्यात्सुव्रतं तस्य नश्यति॥

² सूत्रमिदं सूतीवृत्तौ (सतीवृत्तौ?) देववृत्तौ च न दृश्यते॥

³ Kalpa-sūtra, translated by Stevenson, p. 45.

Kripanādi (Pān. VIII. 2. 18. 1.); the other in the Gaṇa arddharchādi. The third word, however, *tiriṭa*, a tiara, has never been met with in works previous to Pāṇini. Now, with regard to this word, Ujjvaladatta observes that it is left out in the Nyāsa.¹ The authority of this work, a commentary by Jinendra on the Kāśikāvṛitti, would, by itself, be hardly of sufficient weight; but on referring to the MS. of Mahābhāṣya at the Bodleian Library, I find that there also the Sūtra is quoted exactly as Ujjvaladatta said, i. e. without the root from which *tiriṭa* is derived. Having thus found Ujjvaladatta trustworthy and accurate in his critical remarks, we feel inclined to accept his word, even where we cannot control him, or where the presence of certain words in the Sūtras might be explained without having recourse to later interpolations. Thus *stūpaḥ*, which occurs III. 25, might be explained as simply meaning a heap of earth. Nay, it is a word which, in its more general sense, is found in the Veda. Yet the most common meaning of *stūpa* is a Buddhist monument, and as we are told by Ujjvala, that this word does not occur in the Sativṛitti, and that in the Sarvasva it is derived in a different manner, we can have little doubt that it was not added till after the general

¹ हपो रो लः (पा० ङ. २. १८.) इत्यत्र न्यासे वृद्धिभिर्भां
चेति सूत्रं दृश्यते। अतस्तरतिरत्र नास्तीति लक्ष्यते॥

Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, ii. 40, mentions this work in his list of Sanskrit grammars: "Nyāsa or Kāśikā vṛitti panjikā by Jinendra: another exposition of the Kāśikā vṛitti, with explanatory notes by Rakshita." He adds, however, with his usual caution: "I state this with some distrust, not having yet seen the book. The Nyāsa is universally cited; and the Bodhinyāsa is frequently so. Vopadeva's Kāvya-kāmadhenu quotes the Nyāsa of Jinendra and that of Jinendrabuddhi."



spreading of Buddhism and the erection of Topes in India; a negative argument which gives additional strength to the supposition that the original Uṇādi-sūtras were composed before that period.¹

To add one more instance. In all the editions of the Uṇādi-sūtras, Jina occurs as the name of the founder of a Bauddha sect. As many scholars have assigned to Jina and the Jains a very modern date, the presence of this name might seem to throw considerable doubt on the antiquity ascribed to the Uṇādi-sūtras. In a passage of Sāyaṇa, however (Rv. i. 61. 4.), where he has occasion to quote the Sūtra containing, among other words, the etymology of Jina, all the MSS. omit the root *jī*, from which Jina is said to be derived. It is equally omitted in Nṛsinha's Svaramanjari.

The test which has thus been applied to our chronological arrangement of the Sūtra literature in general, in the case of the Uṇādi-sūtras, so far from invalidating, has rather strengthened our argument for placing the whole literature of the Sūtras, at least of those which are connected with the Vedas, between the years 600 and 200 B.C.

PARÍŚIṢṬAS.

There is one class of works which must be mentioned before we leave the Sūtra period, the so-called *Parīśiṣṭas*. They are evidently later than the Sūtras, and their very name, Paralipomena, marks their secondary importance. They have, however, a character of their own, and they represent a distinct period of Hindu literature, which, though it is of

¹ The word *stūpa* does not occur in Pāṇini or the Gaṇapāṭha. Sāyaṇa to Rv. i. 24. 7. does not quote the Uṇādi-sūtra, but derives *stūpa* from a root *styai*, affix *pa*.

less interest to the student, and though it shows clear traces of intellectual and literary degeneracy, is not on that account to be overlooked by the historian. Some of the more substantial *Parīśiṣṭas* profess to be composed by authors whose names belong to the *Sūtra* period. Thus *Śaunaka* is called the author of the *Charaṇavyūha* by the commentator of *Pāraskara's* *Gṛihya-sūtras*, *Rāma-kṛishṇa* ¹ (MS. E.I.H. 440. 577. 912.) ; a writer no doubt quite untrustworthy where he gives his own opinions, but yet of some importance where he quotes the opinions of others. *Kātyāyana* is quoted as the author of the *Chhandoga-parīśiṣṭa*.² The same *Kuśika*, who is known as the author of the *Sūtras* for the *Ātharvaṇa*, is mentioned as the author of the *Ātharvaṇa-parīśiṣṭas* also. Other *Parīśiṣṭas*, though not ascribed to *Kātyāyana*, are said to be composed in accordance with his opinions.³ Again, while the *Gṛihya-sūtras* of the *Chhandogas* are acknowledged as the work of *Gobhila*, a *Parīśiṣṭa* on the same subject is ascribed to the son of *Gobhila*.⁴ The names of *Śaunaka* and *Kātyāyana* are frequently invoked at the beginning or end of these works, and though some of them ap-

¹ तन्त्रार्णयस्वरणयूहे शौनकेन दर्शितः॥

² कन्दोगपरिशिष्टं कात्यायनमुनिकृतं सामवेदिककर्मबोधकं गोभिलसूत्राणां परिशेषशास्त्रमिति स्रुतिः॥

³ MS. Bodl. W. 510. अष्टादश परिशिष्टानि तदादौ यूपलक्षणं। चातुर्थ्यं (चातुर्वर्ण्यं) प्रवक्ष्यामि वृत्ताणां पञ्चभिः सह॥ निंदाप्रशंसे वक्ष्यामः कात्यायनमतात्तथा॥

⁴ MS. Bodl. W. 504. वृहत्संहं नाम परिशिष्टं गोभिलपुत्रकृतं॥



pear to us simply useless and insipid, it is not to be denied that others contain information which we should look for in vain in the Sûtras. Their style is less concise than that of the Sûtras. The simple Anushtubh Śloka preponderates, and the metre is more regular than that of the genuine Anushtubh compositions of Śaunaka. Their style resembles that of the Bârhaddaivata and Rig-vidhâna, works originally composed by Śaunaka, but handed down to us, as it would seem, in a more modern form. But on the other side the Paríśishtas have not yet fallen into that monotonous uniformity which we find in works like the Mânava-dharma-śâstra, the Paddhatis, or the later Purâṇas; and passages from them are literally quoted in the Purâṇas. The Paríśishtas, therefore, may be considered the very last outskirts of Vedic literature, but they are Vedic in their character, and it would be difficult to account for their origin at any time except the expiring moments of the Vedic age. /

The following argument may serve to confirm the favourable view which I take of some of the Paríśishtas. Besides the MSS. of the Charaṇavyûha, there is a printed edition of it in Râja Râdhakânta Deva's Śabdakalpadruma. This printed text is evidently taken from more modern MSS. It quotes seventeen instead of fifteen Śâkhâs of the Vâjasaneyins; whereas the original number of fifteen is confirmed by our MSS. of the Charaṇavyûha, by the Pratijnâ-paríśishta, and even by so late a work as the Vishṇu-purâṇa (p. 281.). We may therefore suppose that at the time when the Paríśishta, called the Charaṇavyûha, was originally composed, these two additional Śâkhâs did not yet exist. Now one of them is the Śâkhâ of the Kâtyâyaniyas, a Śâkhâ, like many of those men-

tioned in the Purāṇas, founded on Sūtras, not on Brāhmaṇas. The fact, therefore, of this modern Śākhā not being mentioned in the original Charaṇavyūha serves as an indication that at the time of the original composition of that Paríśishta, sufficient time had not yet elapsed to give to Kātyāyana the celebrity of being the founder of a new Śākhā.

On the other hand it should be stated that Pāṇini does not seem to have known literary works called Paríśishtas.¹

The number of Paríśishtas is frequently stated at eighteen. This may have been their number at some time, or for one particular Veda, but it is now considerably exceeded. The Charaṇavyūha, itself a Paríśishta, gives the same number; but it seems to speak of the Paríśishtas of the Yajur-veda only. There is a collection of Paríśishtas for each Veda. Works, such as the Bahvricha-paríśishta, Sāṅkhāyana-paríśishta, Āśvalāyana-grihya-paríśishta, must be ascribed to the Rig-veda. A MS. (Bodl. 466.) contains a collection of Paríśishtas which belong to the Sāma-veda. At the end of the first treatise it is said: "iti Sāmagānām chhandah samāptam," "here end the metres of the Sāma-singers."² Other treatises begin with the invocation, "Namaḥ Sāmavedāya." The second is called Kratusangraha, on sacrifices; the third, Viniyoga-sangraha, on the employment of hymns; the fourth, Somotpattiḥ, on the origin of Soma. The fifth and sixth treatises contain the index to the Archika of the Sāma-veda after the Naigeya-śākhā. As no pointed allusions to other Vedas occur

¹ Paríśishta occurs only as a pratyudāharāṇa in Pān. iv. 1. 48, but it is used there as a feminine, and in quite a different sense.

² It is also called chhandasām vichayah, and contains quotations from the Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa, Pingala, the Nidāna, and Uktha-śāstra.



In these tracts, there can be little doubt that the whole collection of these Paríśishtas may be classed as Sâma-veda literature. The Chhandoga-paríśishta, however, which is commonly ascribed to Kâtyâyana, is not found in this MS. The Paríśishtas of the Yajur-veda are enumerated in the Charaṇavyûha, and will have to be examined presently. Those of the Âtharvaṇa are estimated by Professor Weber at seventy-four¹, and are said to be written in the form of dialogues, in a style similar to that of the Purâṇas, and sometimes, we are told, agreeing literally with chapters of the astrological Sanhitâs.

According to the Charaṇavyûha² the following are the eighteen Paríśishtas of the Yajur-veda:

1. The Yûpalakṣaṇam; according to Vyâsa's Charaṇavyûha, the Upajyotisham.
2. The Chhâgalakṣaṇam; Mâṅgalalakṣaṇam, (Vyâsa).
3. The Pratijnâ; Pratijnânuvâkyam? (Vyâsa).
4. The Anuvâkasankhyâ; Parisankhyâ (Vyâsa).
5. The Charaṇavyûhaḥ; Charaṇavyûhaḥ (Vyâsa).
6. The Śrâddhakalpāḥ; Śrâddhakalpāḥ (Vyâsa).
7. The Śulvikâni or Śulvâni.
8. The Pârshadam.

¹ According to a passage in the Charaṇavyûha, belonging to the Âtharvaṇa, the number of the Kauśikoktâni Paríśishtâni would amount to 70.

² Besides the MS. of the E. I. H., and collations of some of the MSS. at Berlin, I have used the printed edition of the Charaṇavyûha in Râdhakânta's Sanskrit Encyclopædia. The MSS. differ so much that it would be hazardous to correct the one by the other. They probably represent different versions of the same text. The name of the author varies likewise. Sometimes he is called Śaunaka, sometimes Kâtyâyana, and in Râdhakânta's edition, Vyâsa. The last is, perhaps, meant for the same whom we found mentioned before as the author of a Commentary on Patanjali's Yoga. The text has since been published by Prof. Weber.

9. The Rīgyajūnshī.
10. The Ishtakāpūṇam.
11. The Pravarādhyāyaḥ; Pravarādhāyaḥ (Vyāsa, No. 7.)
12. The Uktha-sāstram; Sāstram (Vyāsa, No. 8).
13. The Kratusankhyā; Kratu (Vyāsa, No. 9).
14. The Nigamāḥ; Āgamāḥ (Vyāsa, No. 10).
15. The Yajnapāśve or pāśvam; Yajnam (Vyāsa, No. 11); Pāśvān (Vyāsa, No. 12).
16. The Hautrakam; Hautrakam (Vyāsa, No. 13).
17. The Prasavotthānam; Paśavaḥ (Vyāsa, No. 14); Ukthāni, (Vyāsa, No. 15).
18. The Kūrmalakṣaṇam; Kūrmalakṣaṇam, (Vyāsa, No. 16).

A similar order has evidently been followed in a collection of the Parīsishtas, forming part of Professor Wilson's valuable collection of MSS., now deposited in the Bodleian Library. The MS., however, is incomplete, and seems to have been copied by a person ignorant of Sanskrit from another MS., the leaves of which had been in confusion. Most of the MSS. of these Parīsishtas are carelessly copied, whereas the MSS. of the Sūtras are generally in excellent condition. The MSS. which Rāja Rādhakāntadeva used seem to have been in an equally bad state, if we may judge from the various readings which he occasionally mentions.¹ But although the Bodleian MS. leaves much to desire, it serves at least to support the authenticity of the titles given in the MS. of the Charaṇavyūha against the blunders of the printed text. We find there:

¹ For instance पारव्यानुहोत्रकमपि पाठः। instead of पारव्यानुहोत्रकं॥



1. The Yûpalakshaṇam,¹ a short treatise on the manner of preparing the sacrificial post.

2. The Chhâgalakshaṇam,² on animals fit for sacrifice.

3. The Pratijnâ,³ begins with giving some definition of sacrificial terms, but breaks off with the fourth leaf, whereas the Pravarâdhyâya (No. 11) had already been commenced on the third, and is afterwards carried on on the fifth leaf. Thus we lose from the fourth to the eleventh Parîśishta, which formed part of the original MS. if we may judge from the fact that the Pravarâdhyâya is here also called the eleventh Parîśishta.

4. The Anuvâkasankhyâ exists in MS. E. I. H. 965.

5. The Charaṇavyûhaḥ is found in numerous copies.

6. The Śrâddhakalpaḥ exists in MS. E. I. H. 1201, and MS. Chambers 66. It is there ascribed to Kâtyâyana. There is also among the Chambers MSS. at Berlin (292—294) a Śrâddha-kalpa-bhâshya ascribed to Gobhila.

7. The Śulvikâni are found in MS. Chambers 66, and a Śulvadîpikâ, MS. E. I. H. 1678.

8. The Pârshadam. This must not be mistaken for a Prâtisâkhyâ, nor would it be right to call the Prâtisâkhyas Parîśishtas. The Pârshada is a much smaller work, as may be seen from a MS. in the Royal Library at Berlin, Chambers 378.

9. The Rigyajûnshi is the only Parîśishta that cannot be verified in MS.; there is no reason for supposing that it was an Anukramaṇi either of the Yajur-veda or Rig-veda.

10. The Ishtakâpûraṇam has been preserved in

¹ MS. Chambers, 66.

² MS. Chambers, 66.

³ Called Prâtishta-lakshaṇam in MS. Chambers, 66.

MS. Chambers 389 with a commentary by Karka, and in MS. Chambers 392, with a commentary by Yājñikadeva.

11. The Pravarādhyāyaḥ is found again in our own MS., and is followed by a small tract, the Gotranir-
ṇayaḥ. The seven principal Pravaraś are those of
the Bhrigus, Angiras, Viśvāmitras, Vasishṭhas, Kaśya-
pas, Atris, and Agastis. The eight founders of Gotras
or families are Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Viśvāmitra,
Atri, Gautama, Vasishṭha, Kaśyapa and Agastya.¹
The whole treatise, of which more hereafter, is
ascribed to Kātyāyana.²

12. The Ukthakāśtram is found in our MS. So is

13. The Kratusankhyā, which gives an enumeration
of the principal sacrifices.

14. The Nigama-pariśiśṭa is the last in our MS.
It contains a number of Vedic words with their ex-
planations, and forms a useful appendix to Yāska's
Nirukta. It alludes not only to the four castes, but
the names of the mixed castes also, according to the
Anuloma and Pratiloma order, are mentioned.

The four last Pariśiśṭas are wanting in our MS.

The fifteenth, however, the Yajnapârśvam is found
in MS. E. I. H. 1729, Chambers, 358; the sixteenth,
the Hautrakam, exists with a commentary in MS.
Chambers 669. The two last Pariśiśṭas have not
yet been met with in MS., but we may probably

१ जमदग्निर्भरद्वाजो विश्वामित्रोऽत्रिगौतमौ।

वसिष्ठकश्यपागस्त्या मुनयो गोत्रकारिणः॥

एतेषां चान्यपत्यानि तानि गोत्राणि मन्यते॥

२ कात्यायनविरचितो विप्राणां हितकाम्यया।

अध्यायः प्रवराख्योऽयं पुरा ब्रह्मविनिर्मितः॥



form some idea of the last, the Kûrmalakṣaṇam, from some chapters of Varāhamihira's Bṛihatsaṇhitâ, where we find both a Kûrmavibhāgaḥ and a Kûrmalakṣaṇam, the last being there followed by a chapter, called by the same name as the second Paṛiśiṣṭa, Chhâgalakṣaṇam.

Although there is little of real importance to be learned from these Paṛiśiṣṭas, the fact of their existence is important in the history of the progress and decay of the Hindu mind. As in the first or Chhandas period, we see the Aryan settlers of India giving free utterance to their thoughts and feelings, and thus creating unconsciously a whole world of religious, moral, and political ideas; as we find them again during the second or Mantra period, carefully collecting their harvest; and during the third or Brâhmaṇa period busily occupied in systematising and interpreting the strains of their forefathers, which had already become unintelligible and sacred; as in the fourth or Sûtra period we see their whole energy employed in simplifying the complicated system of the theology and the ceremonial of the Brâhmaṇas; so we shall have to recognise in these Paṛiśiṣṭas a new phase of the Indian mind, marked by a distinct character, which must admit of historical explanation. The object of the Paṛiśiṣṭas is to supply information on theological or ceremonial points which had been passed over in the Sûtras, most likely because they were not deemed of sufficient importance, or because they were supposed to be well known to those more immediately concerned. But what most distinguishes the Paṛiśiṣṭas from the Sûtras is this, that they treat everything in a popular and superficial manner; as if the time was gone, when students would spend ten or twenty years of their lives



in fathoming the mysteries and mastering the intricacies of the Brâhmaṇa literature. A party driven to such publications as the *Parīśiṣṭas*, is a party fighting a losing battle. We see no longer that self-complacent spirit which pervades the Brâhmaṇas. The authors of the Brâhmaṇas felt that whatever they said must be believed, whatever they ordained must be obeyed. They are frightened by no absurdity, and the word "impossible" seems to have been banished from their dictionary. In the *Sûtras* we see that a change has taken place. Their authors seem to feel that the public which they address will no longer listen to endless theological swaggering. There may have been deep wisdom in the Brâhmaṇas, and their authors may have sincerely believed in all they said; but they evidently calculated on a submissiveness on the part of their pupils or readers, which only exists in countries domineered over by priests or professors. The authors of the *Sûtras* have learned that people will not listen to wisdom unless it is clothed in a garb of clear argument and communicated in intelligible language. Their works contain all that is essential in the Brâhmaṇas, but they give it in a practical, concise and definite form. These works were written at a time when the Brahmins were fighting their first battles against the popular doctrines of Buddha. They were not yet afraid. Their language is firm, though it is no longer inflated. "Buddhism," as Burnouf says,¹ "soon grew into a system of easy devotion, and found numerous recruits among those who were frightened by the difficulties of Brahmanical science. At the same time that

¹ Burnouf, *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme*. Roth, *Abhandlungen*, p. 22.



Buddhism attracted the ignorant among the Brahmans, it received with open arms the poor and the miserable of all classes." It was to remove, or at least to simplify, the difficulties of their teaching, that men like Śaunaka and Kātyāyana adopted the novel style of the Sūtras. Such changes in the sacred literature of a people are not made without an object, and the object of the Sūtras, as distinct from that of the Brāhmaṇas, could be no other than to offer practical manuals to those who were discouraged by too elaborate treatises, and who had found a shorter way to salvation opened to them by the heretical preaching of Buddha. After the Sūtras there is no literature of a purely Vedic character except the Pāṇisṣṭas. They still presuppose the laws of the Sūtras and the faith of the Brāhmaṇas. There is as yet no trace of any definite supremacy being accorded to Śiva or Viṣṇu or Brahman. New gods, however, are mentioned; vulgar or popular ceremonies are alluded to. The castes have become more marked and multiplied. The whole intellectual atmosphere is still Vedic, and the Vedic ceremonial, the Vedic theology, the Vedic language seem still to absorb the thoughts of the authors of the Pāṇisṣṭas. Any small matter that had been overlooked by the authors of the Sūtras is noted down as a matter of grave importance. Subjects on which general instructions were formerly considered sufficient, are now treated in special treatises, intended for men who would no longer take the trouble of reading the whole system of the Brahmanic ceremonial. The technical and severe language of the Sūtras was exchanged for a free and easy style, whether in prose or metre; and however near in time the Brahmans may place the authors of



the Sûtras and some of the *Parîśiṣṭas*, certain it is that no man who had mastered the Sûtra style would ever have condescended to employ the slovenly diction of the *Parîśiṣṭas*. The change in the position and the characters of the Brahmins, such as we find them in the Sûtras, and such as we find them again in the *Parîśiṣṭas*, has been rapid and decisive. The men who could write such works were aware of their own weakness, and had probably suffered many defeats. The world around them was moving in a new direction, and the old Vedic age died away in impotent twaddle.

Considerations like these, in addition to what we found before in inquiring into the age of Kâtyâyana, tend to fix the Sûtra period, as a phase in the literary history of India, as about contemporaneous with the first rise of Buddhism; and they would lead us to recognise in the *Parîśiṣṭas* the exponents of a later age, that had witnessed the triumphs of Buddhism and the temporary decay of Brahmanic learning and power. The real political triumph of Buddhism dates from Aśoka and his council, about the middle of the third century B.C., and while most of the Vedic Sûtras belong to this and the preceding centuries, none of the *Parîśiṣṭas* were probably written before that time.

Before the Council of Pāṭaliputra the Buddhists place, indeed, 300 years of Buddhist history, but that history was clearly supplied from their own heads and not from authentic documents. Buddhism, up to the time of Aśoka, was but one out of many sects established in India. There had been as yet no schism, but only controversy, such as we find in the Brāhmaṇas themselves between different schools and parties. There were as yet no Brahmins as opposed to



Buddhists, in the later sense of the word. No separation had as yet taken place, and the greatest reformers at the time of Buddha were reforming Brahmans. This is acknowledged in the Buddhist writings, though they probably were not written down before Aśoka's Council. But even then Buddha is represented as the pupil of the Brahmans, and no slur is cast on the gods and the songs of the Veda. Buddha, according to his own canonical biographer, learned the Rig-veda and was a proficient in all the branches of Brahmanic lore. His pupils were many of them Brahmans, and no hostile feeling against the Brahmans finds utterance in the Buddhist Canon. This forms a striking contrast with the sacred literature of the Jains. The Jains, who are supposed to have made their peace with the Brahmans, yet in their sacred works, written towards the beginning of the fifth century A.D., treat their opponents with marked disrespect. Their great hero Mahāvīra, though at first conceived by a Brahman woman, is removed from her womb and transferred to the womb of a Kshatriya woman, for "surely," as Sakko (Indra) says¹, "such a thing as this has never happened in past, happens not in present, nor will happen in future time, that an Arhat, a Chakravarti, a Baladeva, or a Vasudeva should be born in a low caste family, a servile family, a degraded family, a poor family, a mean family, a beggar's family, or a Brahman's family; but, on the contrary, in all time, past, present, and to come, an Arhat, a Chakravarti, a Vasudeva, receives birth in a noble family, an honourable family, a royal family, a Kshatriya family, as in the family of Ikshvāku, or the Harivaṁśa, or some such family of pure descent."

¹ Kalpa-sutra, p. 35.



Now this is mere party insolence, intelligible in the fifth century A. D., when the Brahmans, as a party, were re-establishing their hierarchical sway. Nothing of the kind is to be found in the canonical books of the Buddhists. Buddha had his opponents, and among them chiefly the Tirthakas; but so had all eminent sages of whom we read in the Brāhmaṇas. But Buddha had also his friends and followers, and they likewise were Brahmans and Rishis; some of them accepted his doctrines, not excluding the abolition of caste. Buddhism, in its original form, was only a modification of Brahmanism. It grew up slowly and imperceptibly, and its very founder could hardly have been aware of the final results of his doctrines. Before the time that Buddhism became a political power, it had no history, no chronology, it hardly had a name. We hear nothing of Bauddhas in the Brāhmaṇas, though we meet there with doctrines decidedly Buddhistic. The historical existence of Buddhism begins with Aśoka, and the only way to fix the real date of Aśoka is by connecting him with Chandragupta, his second predecessor, the Sandrocottus of the Greeks. To try to fix it according to the early Buddhist chronology would be as hopeless as fixing the date of Alexander according to the chronology of the Purāṇas.

It is possible to discover in the decaying literature of Vedic Brahmanism the contemporaneous rise of a new religion, of Buddhism. Every attempt to go beyond, and to bring the chronology of the Buddhists and Brahmans into harmony has proved a failure. The reason, I believe, is obvious. The Brahmans had a kind of vague chronology in the different capitals of their country. They remembered the names of their kings, and they endeavoured to remember the years



of their reigns. But to note the year in which an individual, such as Gautama Śākyaśinha, was born, however famous he may have been in his own neighbourhood or even in more distant Parishads, would have entered as little into their thoughts as the Romans, or even the Jews, thought of preserving the date of the birth of Jesus before he had become the founder of a religion. Buddha's immediate followers may have recollected and handed down, by oral communication, the age at which Buddha died; the age of his disciples too may have been recollected, together with the names of some local Rājās who patronised Buddha and his friends; but never, until the adoption of Buddhism as the state religion by Aśoka, could there have been any object in connecting the lives of Buddha and his disciples with the chronology of the Solar or Lunar Dynasties of India. When, at the time of Aśoka, it became necessary to give an account of the previous history of Buddhism, the chronology then adopted for the early centuries of that faith was necessarily of a purely theoretical kind. We possess more than one system of Buddhist chronology, but none of them can be considered authentic with regard to the times previous to Aśoka, the second successor of Chandragupta. There is the system of the Southern Buddhists, framed in Ceylon; there are the various systems of the Northern Buddhists, prevalent in Nepal, Tibet, and China; and the system of the Purāṇas, if system it can be called, in which Śākya is made the father of his father, and grandfather of his son. To try to find out which of these chronological systems is the most plausible seems useless, and it can only make confusion worse confounded if we attempt a combination of the

three. It has been usual to prefer the chronology of Ceylon, which places Buddha's death in 543 B.C. But the principal argument in favour of this date is extremely weak. It is said that the fact of the Ceylonese era being used as an era for practical purposes speaks in favour of its correctness. This may be true with regard to the times after the reign of Asoka. In historical times any era, however fabulous its beginning, will be practically useful; but no conclusion can be drawn from this, its later use, as to the correctness of its beginning. As a conventional era, that of Ceylon may be retained, but until new evidence can be brought forward to substantiate the authenticity of the early history of Buddhism as told by the Ceylonese priests, it would be rash to use the dates of the Southern Buddhists as a corrective standard for those of the Northern Buddhists or of the Brahmans. Each of these chronological systems must be left to itself. They start from different premises, and necessarily arrive at different results. The Northern Buddhists founded their chronology on a reported prophecy of Buddha, that "a thousand years after his death his doctrines would reach the Northern countries."¹ Buddhism was definitely introduced into China in the year 61 A.D.; hence the Chinese fix the date of Buddha's death about one thousand years anterior to the Christian era. The variations of the date, according to different Chinese authorities, are not considerable, and may easily be explained by the uncertainty of the time at which Buddhism found its way successively into the various countries north of India, and at last into China.

¹ Lassen, *Indian Antiquities*, ii., p. 58. Schiefner, *Mélanges Asiatiques*, i. 436.



Besides 950 or 949 B.C.¹, which are the usual dates assigned to Buddha's death by Chinese authorities, we may mention the years 1130, 1045, 767, for each of which the same claim has been set up. The year 1130 rests on the authority of Tchao-chi, as quoted by Matouanlin in the annals of the Soui.² Fahian, also, seems to have known this date; for, according to his editor, he placed the death of Buddha towards the beginning of the dynasty Tcheu, and this, according to Chinese chronology, took place in 1122.³ In another place, however, Fahian, speaking of the spreading of Buddhism towards the north, places this event 300 years after Buddha's Nirvâna, or in the reign of the Emperor Phing-Wang. As this emperor reigned 770—720, Fahian would seem to have dated the Nirvâna somewhere between 1070 and 1020. The date 767 rests on the authority of Matouanlin.⁴ From Tibetan books no less than fourteen dates have been collected⁵; and the Chinese pilgrims who visited India found it impossible to fix on any one date as established on solid evidence. The list of the thirty-three Buddhist patriarchs, first published by Rémusat (*Mélanges Asiatiques*, i. p. 113), gives the date of their deaths from Chakia-mouni, who died 950 B.C., to Soui-neng, who died 713 A.D., and bears, like everything Chinese, the character of the most exact chronological accuracy. The first link,

¹ Lassen, ii. 52. Foucaux, *Rgya Tcher Rol Pa*, p. xi.

² Foucaux, l. c. note communicated by Stan. Julien.

³ Neumann, *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, ii. 117; Lassen, ii. 54.

⁴ Foucaux, l. c. According to Klaproth Matouanlin places Buddha 688 to 609.

⁵ Csoma, *Tibetan Grammar*, p. 199—201. They are: 2422, 2148, 2139, 2135, 1310, 1060, 884, 882, 880, 837, 752, 653, 576, 546.

however, in this long chain of patriarchs is of doubtful character, and the lifetime of Buddha, from 1029 to 950, rests on his own prophecy, that a Millennium would elapse from his death to the conversion of China. If, therefore, Buddha was a true prophet he must have lived about 1000 B.C., and this date once established, everything else had to give way before it. Thus Nâgârjuna, called by the Chinese Nâga Koshuna, or Loung-chou, is placed in their own traditional chronology, which they borrowed from the Buddhists in Northern India, 400 years after the Nirvâna.¹ The Tibetans assign the same date to him.² In the list of the patriarchs, however, he occupies the fourteenth place, and dies 738 years after Buddha. The twelfth patriarch, Maning (Deva Bodhisatva), is traditionally placed by the Chinese 300 years after Buddha. In the list of the patriarchs he dies 618 years after the Nirvâna.

But if in this manner the starting point of the Northern Buddhist chronology turns out to be merely hypothetical, based as it is on a prophecy of Buddha, it will be difficult to avoid the same conclusion with regard to the date assigned to Buddha's death by the Buddhists of Ceylon and of Burmah and other countries which received their canonical books from Ceylon. The Ceylonese possess a trustworthy and intelligible chronology beginning with the year 161 B.C.³ Before that time their chronology is traditional, and full of absurdities. According to Professor Lassen, we ought to suppose that the Ceylonese, by some

¹ Lassen ii. 58. Burnouf, Introduction, i. p. 350. n. 51.

² As they place Vasumitra more than 400 after Buddha, the date for Nâgârjuna ought to be about 450.

³ Turnour, Examination of the Pali Buddhistical Annals, Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vi. p. 721.



means or other, were in possession of the right date of Buddha's death; and as there was a prophecy of Buddha that Vijaya should land in Ceylon on the same day on which Buddha entered the Nirvāṇa,¹ we are further asked to believe that the Ceylonese historians placed the founder of the Vijayan dynasty of Ceylon in the year 543, in accordance with their sacred chronology. We are not told, however, through what channel the Ceylonese could have received their information as to the exact date of Buddha's death, and although Professor Lassen's hypothesis would be extremely convenient, and has been acquiesced in by most Sanskrit scholars, it would not be honest were we to conceal from ourselves or from others that the first and most important link in the Ceylonese, as well as in the Chinese chronology, is extremely weak. All we know for certain is, that the Ceylonese had an historical chro-

¹ Mahāvanso, p. 46. The Mahāvanśa was written in Pāli by Mahānāma. He was a priest and uncle of king Dasenkelleya or Dhātusena, who reigned from A.D. 459 to 477. Mahānāma made use of earlier histories, and mentions among them the Dipavansā. This work, also called Mahāvanśa, and written in Pāli, is supposed to be still in existence, and carries the history to the reign of Mahāsena, who died A. D. 302. Mahānāma, though he lived more than a hundred years after Mahāsena's death, does not seem to have carried the history much further. His work ends with the account of Mahāsena's reign. It terminates with the 48th verse of the 37th chapter of what is now known as the Mahāvanśa, and it is only from conjecture that Turnour, the editor and translator of the first 38 chapters of the Mahāvanśa, ascribes the end of the 37th, and the whole of the 38th chapter, to the pen of Mahānāma. Mahānāma's work was afterwards continued by different writers. It now consists of 100 chapters, and carries the history of Ceylon to the middle of the 18th century. He is likewise the author of a commentary on his own work, which commentary ends at the 48th verse of the 37th chapter.



nology after the year 161 B.C., that is to say, long before the Brahmans or Buddhists of the North can show anything but tradition. If, then, the exact Ceylonese chronology begins with 161 B.C., it is but reasonable to suppose that there existed in Ceylon a traditional native chronology extending beyond that date; and that, at all events, the first conquest of Ceylon, the establishment of the first dynasty, had some date, whether true or false, assigned to it in the annals of the country. *Vijaya*, the founder of the first dynasty, means *Conquest*, and such a person most likely never existed. But his name and fame belong to Ceylon; and even the latest traditions have never connected him with the Buddhist dynasties of India. He is called in the *Mahâvanśa*, the son of *Sinhabâhu*, the sovereign of *Lâla* (supposed to be a subdivision of *Magadha*, near the *Gandakî* river), and he is connected by a miraculous genealogy with the kings of *Banga* (Bengal) and *Kalinga* (Northern *Circars*), but not with the Buddhist dynasties of *Magadha*. The only trace of Buddhism that can be discovered in the legends of *Vijaya* consists in the fact that his head, and the heads of his seven hundred companions, were shaved when they were sent adrift in a ship that was ultimately to bring them to Ceylon. But the author of the *Mahâvanśa* takes care to say that this shaving of their heads was part of the punishment inflicted on *Vijaya* by his father, who, when asked by the people to execute his own son for numberless acts of fraud and violence, preferred to send him and his companions adrift on the ocean, after their heads had been shaved. Supposing then that before *Dushtagâmani*, *i. e.* before 161 B.C., the Ceylonese possessed a number of royal names, and that by as-



signing to each of them a more or less fabulous reign, they had arrived at the year 543 as the probable date of the Conquest, we can well understand how, under the influence of the later Buddhists, exactly the same thing took place in Ceylon which took place in China. Various temples in Ceylon had their legends, by which their first foundation was ascribed to Buddha himself. Hence the Mahâvanśa begins with relating three miraculous visits which Buddha, during his lifetime, paid to Ceylon. At that time, however, it is said that Ceylon was still inhabited by Yakshas. If thus the very earliest history of the island had been brought in connection with Buddha, it is but natural that some sanction of a similar kind should have been thought necessary with regard to the Conquest. A prophecy was, therefore, invented. "The ruler of the world, Buddha," so says the Mahâvanśa, "having conferred blessings on the whole world, and attained the exalted, unchangeable Nirvâṇa, seated on the throne on which Nirvâṇa is achieved, in the midst of a great assembly of devatâs, the great divine sage addressed this celebrated injunction to Śakra, who stood near him: 'One Vijaya, the son of Sinhabâhu, king of the land of Lâla, together with seven hundred officers of state, has landed on Lankâ. Lord of Devas! my religion will be established in Lankâ. On that account thoroughly protect, together with his retinue, him and Lankâ.' The devoted King of Devas having heard these injunctions of the successor (of former Buddhas), assigned the protection of Lankâ to the Deva Utpalavarna (Vishṇu). He, in conformity to the command of Śakra, instantly repaired to Lankâ, and in the character of a parivrâjaka (devotee) took his station at the foot of a tree.



“With Vijaya at their head the whole party approaching him, inquired, ‘Pray, devotee, what land is this?’ he replied, ‘The land Lankâ.’ Having thus spoken, he blessed them by sprinkling water on them out of his jug, and having tied (charmed) threads on their arms, departed through the air.”

At the end of the preceding chapter, the date of the event is still more accurately fixed. “This prince named Vijaya,” we read there, “who had then attained the wisdom of experience, landed in the division Tâmrarnî of this land Lankâ, on the day that the successor of former Buddhas reclined in the arbour of the two delightful sal-trees, to attain Nirvâṇa.” In this manner the conquest of Ceylon was invested with a religious character, and at the same time a connection was established between the traditional chronology of Ceylon and the sacred history of Buddha. If Buddha was a true prophet, the Ceylonese argue quite rightly that he must have died in the year of the Conquest, or 543 B. C.

This synchronism once established, it became necessary to accommodate to it, as well as possible, the rest of the legendary history of the Buddhists. It contained but few historical elements previous to Aśoka’s Council, but that council had again to be connected with the history of Ceylon. Aśoka was the cotemporary of Devânâmpriya Tishya, King of Ceylon. This king adopted Buddhism, and made it, like Aśoka, the state religion of the island. Now, according to the traditional chronology of Ceylon, Devânâmpriya Tishya came to the throne 236 years after the landing of Vijaya¹, and he reigned forty years (307—267 B.C.) He was intimately connected with Aśoka, as we shall

¹ Mahavanso, Pref. p. lii.



see, and it was necessary that the same interval which in the historical traditions of Ceylon separated Devânâmpriya Tishya from Vijaya should separate Aśoka from Buddha. This was achieved in the following manner: One Aśoka is supposed to have come to the throne ninety years after Buddha, and a council (the second, as it is called) is supposed to have taken place in the tenth year of his reign, or just one hundred years after Buddha. At that second council a prophecy was uttered that in 118 years a calamity would befall the Buddhist religion. This refers to the reign of the so-called second Aśoka, who was at first a great enemy to religion. Now the first Aśoka is represented to have reigned 18 years after the Council (100 anno Buddhæ), and if we cast up these 118 years, the 22 years of Aśoka's sons, the 22 years of the Nine, the 24 years¹ of Chandragupta, the 28 years of Bindusara, and the 4 years which elapsed before Aśoka's inauguration², we find that Aśoka's inauguration would fall just 118 years after the second Council, 218 years after Buddha, or 325 B.C. The Council of this real Aśoka was held in the 17th year of his reign, or 235 after Buddha. Mahendra, the son of Aśoka, proceeded to Ceylon in the next year, or 236 years after Buddha; and in this manner the arrival of Mahendra in Ceylon, and the inauguration of Devânâmpriya Tishya as King of Ceylon, are brought together in the same year. It is true that in order to achieve this, it has become necessary to add a first Aśoka³,

¹ Not thirty-four years as printed in the *Mahāvanso*. See Lassen, ii. 62. n.

² *As. Res.*, xx. p. 167.

³ This first Aśoka is called Kâlâśoka, a name which it would be too bold to explain as the chronological Aśoka.



of whom the Northern Buddhists know nothing; it has become necessary to admit another Moggaliputto, and another Council, all equally unknown except in the traditional chronology of Ceylon. The Northern Buddhists know but one Aśoka, the grandson of Chandragupta; they know but one Council, besides the Assembly following immediately on the death of Buddha, viz. the Council of Pāṭaliputra under Dharmāśoka, and this they place 110 years after Buddha's Nirvāṇa.¹ Pindola, a contemporary of of Buddha, was seen as an old man by Aśoka. But who was to contradict the Ceylonese historians? They possessed, what the Buddhists of Magadha did not possess, a history of their island and their sovereigns. They valued historical chronology for its own sake, forming an exception in this respect to all other nations of India. They were a colony, and like most colonies, they valued the traditions of the past. The Buddhists of Magadha, as far as we are able to judge, preserved but a few historical recollections, frequently in the form of prophecies, which they afterwards forced into the loose frame of the Brahmanic chronology. The Buddhists of Ceylon did not borrow the outlines of their history either from the Brahmanas or from the Buddhists of Magadha; and this is a point which has never been sufficiently considered. Their outlines of history were not constructed originally in order to hold the Buddhist traditions of the North. They may have been slightly modified, so as to avoid glaring inconsisten-

¹ In some instances that date is changed to 200 A.B., by means of a reaction exercised by the literature of Ceylon on the chronology of the Continental Buddhists. Burnouf, Introduction, p. 436. 578.



ties between the profane history of Ceylon and the sacred history of Buddhism. But there is evidence to show that, on the other hand, the historical legends of Magadha had to yield much more considerably,—the framers of the final chronology finding it impossible to ignore the annals of their island and the reigns of their ancient half-fabulous kings. The chronology of the Mahâvanśa is a compromise between the chronology of Ceylon and that of Magadha, but the latter was the more pliant of the two. There is nothing to prove that the *terminus à quo* of the chronology of Ceylon,—the date of Vijaya's landing—was borrowed from the North. There were Buddhist traditions connecting Vijaya's landing with the death of Buddha, but the date 543 B. C. is never found in the sacred chrōnology of Buddhism, before it was borrowed from the profane chronology of Ceylon. There were similar, and, as it would seem, better founded traditions, connecting Devânâmpriya Tishya with the great Aśoka; but the date of Devânâmpriya Tishya was not determined by the date of the great Aśoka, nor was the date of Aśoka's Council, as 110 after Buddha, accepted in Ceylon. On the contrary, the interval between Vijaya and Devânâmpriya Tishya was allowed to remain as it stood in the Ceylonese annals, and the Buddhist traditions were stretched in order to suit that interval. An intermediate Aśoka and an intermediate Council were admitted, which were unknown to the Northern Buddhists. The prophecy that Nâgârjuna should live 400 years after Buddha¹, had been altered by the Chinese so as to suit their chronology. They placed him 800 years after

¹ As. Res. xx. 513.



Buddha. In like manner the Ceylonese Buddhists, having fixed Buddha's death at 543 B.C., changed the traditional date of Nāgārjuna from 400 to 500 after Buddha.¹ All this is constructive chronology, and whether we follow the Chinese or Ceylonese date of Buddha, we must always remember that in both the *terminus à quo* is purely hypothetical. This does not interfere with the correctness of minor details, such as the number of years assigned to each king, and in particular the chronological distance between certain events. These may have formed part of popular tradition, long before any system of chronology was established. A very old man, Piṇḍola, was represented in a popular legend to have been a contemporary both of Buddha and of Dharmāśoka. Hence the interval between the founder and the royal patron of Buddhism would naturally be fixed at about 100 years. This is a tradition which may be used for historical purposes. Again, when we see that a date like that of Nāgārjuna fixed in the North of India at 400 after Buddha, is altered to 800 and 500, so as to suit the requirements of two different systems of chronology, we may feel inclined to look upon the unsystematic date as the most plausible. But in order to make use of such indications we must first of all establish a $\pi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}$, and this can only be found in Chandragupta. Everything in Indian chronology depends on the date of Chandragupta. Chandragupta was the grandfather of Aśoka, and the contemporary of Seleucus Nicator. Now, according to Chinese chronology, Aśoka would have lived, to waive minor

¹ Turnour, Examination of some points of Buddhist Chronology, Journal of the As. S. B., v. 530. Lassen, ii. 58.



differences, 850 or 750 B.C., according to Ceylonese chronology, 315 B.C. Either of these dates is impossible, because it does not agree with the chronology of Greece, and hence both the Chinese and Ceylonese dates of Buddha's death must be given up as equally valueless for historical calculations.

There is but one means through which the history of India can be connected with that of Greece, and its chronology be reduced to its proper limits. Although we look in vain in the literature of the Brahmans or Buddhists for any allusion to Alexander's conquest, and although it is impossible to identify any of the historical events, related by Alexander's companions, with the historical traditions of India, one name has fortunately been preserved by classical writers who describe the events immediately following Alexander's conquest, to form a connecting link between the history of the East and the West. This is the name of Sandracottus or Sandrocyptus, the Sanskrit Chandragupta.

We learn from classical writers, Justin, Arrian, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Quintus Curtius and Plutarch, that in Alexander's time there was on the Ganges a powerful king of the name of Xandrames, and that soon after Alexander's invasion, a new empire was founded there by Sandracottus or Sandrocyptus. Justin says: "Sandracottus gave liberty to India after Alexander's retreat, but soon converted the name of liberty into servitude after his success, subjecting those whom he had rescued from foreign dominion to his own authority. This prince was of humble origin, but was called to royalty by the power of the gods; for, having offended Alexander by his impertinent lan-

guage,¹ he was ordered to be put to death, and escaped only by flight. Fatigued with his journey he lay down to rest, when a lion of large size came and licked off the sweat that poured from him with his tongue, and retired without doing him any harm. The prodigy inspired him with ambitious hopes, and collecting bands of robbers he roused the Indians to rebellion. When he prepared for war against the captains of Alexander, a wild elephant of enormous size approached him, and received him on his back as if he had been tamed. He was a distinguished general and a brave soldier. Having thus acquired power, Sandracottus reigned over India at the time when Seleucus was laying the foundation of his greatness, and Seleucus entered into a treaty with him, and settling affairs on the side of India directed his march against Antigonus."²

Besides this we may gather from classical writers the following statements, bearing on Xandrames and Sandrocyptus: "When Alexander made inquiries about the interior of India, he was told that beyond the Indus there was a vast desert of 12 (or 11, according to Curtius,) days' journey, and that at the farthest borders thereof ran the Ganges. Beyond that river, he was told, the Prasii (Prâchyas) dwelt, and the Gan-garidæ. Their king was named Xandrames, who could bring into the field 20,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 2,000 chariots, and 4,000 (or 3,000, Curtius,) elephants. Alexander who did not at first believe this, inquired from king Porus whether this account of the power

¹ Plutarch, Vita Alex. c. 62, says that Sandracottus saw Alexander when he was a *μειράκιον*.

² Justini Hist. Philipp. Lib. xv. cap. iv.



of Xandrames was true; and he was told by Porus that it was true, but that the king was but of mean and obscure extraction, accounted to be a barber's son; that the queen, however, had fallen in love with the barber, had murdered her husband, and that the kingdom had thus devolved upon Xandrames."¹ Quintus Curtius says², "that the father of Xandrames had murdered the king, and under pretence of acting as guardian to his sons, got them into his power and put them to death; that after their extermination he begot the son who was then king, and who, more worthy of his father's condition than his own, was odious and contemptible to his subjects." Strabo adds³, "that the capital of the Prasii was called Palibothra, situated at the confluence of the Ganges and another river," which Arrian⁴ specifies as the Eranoboas. Their king, besides his birth-name, had to take the name of the city, and was called the Palibothrian. This was the case with Sandracottus to whom Megasthenes was sent frequently. It was the same king with whom Seleucus Nicator contracted an alliance, ceding to him the country beyond the Indus, and receiving in its stead 500 elephants.⁵ Megasthenes visited his court several times⁶; and the same king, as Plutarch says⁷,

¹ Diodorus Siculus, xvii. 93. The statement in Photii Biblioth. p. 1579, that Porus was the son of a barber, repeated by Libanius, tom. ii. 632., is evidently a mistake. Plutarch, *Vita Alexandri*, c. 62, speaks of 80,000 horse, 8,000 chariots, and 6,000 elephants.

² Quintus Curtius, ix. 2.

³ Strabo, xv. 1. 36.

⁴ Arrian, *Indica*, x. 5.

⁵ Strabo, xv. 2. 9.

⁶ Arrian, *Exped.* v. 6, *Indica*, v. 3.

⁷ Plutarch, *Vita Alexandri*, c. 62.

"traversed India with an army of 600,000 men, and conquered the whole."

These accounts of the classical writers contain a number of distinct statements which could leave very little doubt as to the king to whom they referred. Indian historians, it is true, are generally so vague and so much given to exaggeration, that their kings are all very much alike, either all black or all bright. But nevertheless, if there ever was such a king as the king of the Prasii, an usurper, residing at Pāṭaliputra, called Sandrocyptus or Sandracottus, it is hardly possible that he should not be recognized in the historical traditions of India. There is in the lists of the kings of India the name of Chandragupta, and the resemblance of this name with the name of Sandracottus or Sandrocyptus was first, I believe, pointed out by Sir William Jones.¹ Wilford, Professor Wilson, and Professor Lassen have afterwards added further evidence in confirmation of Sir W. Jones's conjecture; and although other scholars, and particularly M. Troyer, in his edition of the *Rājataranginī*, have raised objections, we shall see that the evidence in favour of the identity of Chandragupta and Sandrocyptus is such as to admit of no reasonable doubt. It is objected that the Greeks called the king of the powerful empire beyond the Indus, *Xandrames*, or *Aggramen*. Now the last name is evidently a mere misspelling for *Xandrames*, and this *Xandrames* is not the same as *Sandracottus*. *Xandrames*, if we understand the Greek accounts rightly, is the predecessor of Chandragupta or rather the last king of the empire conquered by *Sandracottus*. If, however, it should be

¹ Asiatic Researches, vol. iv. p. 11.



maintained, that these two names were intended for one and the same king, the explanation would still be very easy. For Chandragupta (the protected of the moon), is also called Chandra¹, the Moon; and Chandramas, in Sanskrit, is a synonyme of Chandra. Xandrames, however, was no doubt intended as different from Chandragupta. Xandrames must have been king of the Prasii before Sandracottus, and during the time of Alexander's wars. If this Xandrames is the same as the last Nanda, the agreement between the Greek account of his mean extraction, and the Hindu account of Nanda being a Śûdra, would be very striking. It is not, however, quite clear whether the same person is meant in the Greek and Hindu accounts. At the time of Alexander's invasion Sandracottus was very young, and being obliged to fly before Alexander, whom he had offended, it is said that he collected bands of robbers, and with their help succeeded in establishing the freedom of India. Plutarch says distinctly that Sandracottus reigned soon after, that is soon after Xandrames, and we know from Justin, that it was Sandracottus, and not Xandrames, who waged wars with the captains of Alexander. Another objection against the identification of Chandragupta and Sandracottus was the site of their respective capitals. The capital of Chandragupta, Pâtaliputra, was no doubt the same as the Palibothra of Sandracottus, the modern Patna. But exception was taken on the ground that Patna is not situated near the confluence of the Ganges and the Sone or Erannoboas, where the ancient Palibothra stood. This, however, has been explained by a change

¹ See Wilson's notes on the *Mudrâ Râkshasa*, p. 132.



in the bed of the river Sone, which is established on the best geographical evidence.

There are several other points on which the histories of Chandragupta and Sandracottus agree. Sandracottus founded a new empire at Palibothra. Chandragupta was the founder of a new dynasty, the Mauryas¹ at Pāṭaliputra. Sandracottus gained the throne by collecting bands of robbers. Chandragupta did the same. Sandracottus was called to royalty by the power of the gods and by prodigies. So was Chandragupta, although the prodigy related by Justin is not exactly the same as the prodigies related by Hindu authors. So far, therefore, there is nothing in the Greek accounts that is not confirmed by Hindu tradition. That there should be a great deal more in Hindu tradition than was known to the Greeks is but natural, particularly as many of the Hindu stories were evidently invented at a later time and with a certain object. As the grandson of Chandragupta was the great patron of the Buddhists, attempts were naturally made by Buddhist writers to prove that Chandragupta belonged to the same race as Buddha; while on the other hand the Brahmanic writers would be no less fertile in inventing fables that would throw discredit on the ancestor of the Buddhist sovereigns of India. Some extracts from the writings of these hostile parties will best show

¹ The name of Maurya seems to have been known to the Greeks. See Cunningham, *Journal of the As. Soc. of Bengal*, xxiii. p. 680.

The wooden houses in which the tribe of the Morieis are said to have lived, may refer to the story of the Mauryas living in a forest. See Mahāvanso, p. xxxix.

The statement of Wilford, that Maurya meant in Sanskrit the offspring of a barber and a Śūdra-woman, has never been proved.



how this was achieved. In the Mahāvanso¹ we read : “Kālāsoko had ten sons : these brothers (conjointly) ruled the empire righteously for twenty-two years. Subsequently there were nine brothers : they also according to their seniority reigned for twenty-two years. Thereafter the Brahman Chānakko, in gratification of an implacable hatred borne towards the ninth surviving brother, called Dhana-nando, having put him to death, installed in the sovereignty over the whole of Jambudīpo, a descendant of the dynasty of Moriyān sovereigns, endowed with illustrious and beneficent attributes, and surnamed Chandagutto. He reigned 24 (not 34) years.”

The commentary on this passage adds the following details² : “Subsequent to Kālāsoko, who patronised those who held the second convocation, the royal line is stated to have consisted of twelve monarchs to the reign of Dhammāsoko, when they (the priests) held the third convocation. Kālāsoko’s own sons were ten brothers. Their names are specified in the Atthakathā. The appellation of ‘the nine Nandos’ originates in nine of them bearing that patronymic title.

“The Atthakathā of the Uttaravihāro priests sets forth that the eldest of these was of an extraction (maternally) not allied (inferior) to the royal family ; and that he dwelt in one of the provinces³ ; it gives

¹ Mahāvanso, p. 21. The Pāli orthography has been preserved in the following extracts.

² Mahāv., p. 38.

³ It would seem that the eldest son of Aśoka did not participate in the general government of the country, but received a provincial vice-royalty. But in the Burmese histories it is stated distinctly that the eldest son, named Bhadrāsena, reigned with nine of his brothers during a period of twenty-two years.

also the history of the other nine. I also will give their history succinctly, but without prejudice to its perspicuity.

"In aforetime, during the conjoint administration of the (nine) sons of Kālāsoko, a certain provincial person appeared in the character of a marauder, and raising a considerable force, was laying the country waste by pillage. His people, who committed these depredations on towns, whenever a town might be sacked, seized and compelled its own inhabitants to carry the spoil to a wilderness, and there securing the plunder, drove them away. On a certain day, the banditti who were leading this predatory life having employed a daring, powerful, and enterprising individual to commit a robbery, were retreating to the wilderness, making him carry the plunder. He who was thus associated with them, inquired: 'By what means do you find your livelihood?' 'Thou slave' (they replied) 'we are not men who submit to the toils of tillage, or cattle tending. By a proceeding precisely like the present one, pillaging towns and villages, and laying up stores of riches and grain, and providing ourselves with fish and flesh, toddy and other beverage, we pass our lives jovially in feasting and drinking.' On being told this, he thought: 'This mode of life of these thieves is surely excellent; shall I, also, joining them, lead a similar life?' and then said, 'I also will join you, I will become a confederate of yours. Admitting me among you, take me (in your marauding excursions).' They replying 'sādhu,' received him among them.

"On a subsequent occasion, they attacked a town which was defended by well armed and vigilant inhabitants. As soon as they entered the town the people



rose upon and surrounded them, and seizing their leader, and hewing him with a sword, put him to death. The robbers dispersing in all directions repaired to, and reassembled in the wilderness. Discovering that he (their leader) had been slain; and saying, 'In his death the extinction of our prosperity is evident; having been deprived of him, under whose control can the sacking of villages be carried on? even to remain here is imprudent; thus our disunion and destruction are inevitable:' they resigned themselves to desponding grief. The individual above mentioned, approaching them, asked: 'What are ye weeping for?' On being answered by them, 'We are lamenting the want of a valiant leader, to direct us in the hour of attack and retreat in our village sacks.' 'In that case, my friends,' (said he) 'ye need not make yourselves unhappy; if there be no other person able to undertake that post, I can myself perform it for you: from henceforth give not a thought about the matter.' This and more he said to them. They, relieved from their perplexity by this speech, joyfully replied, 'sâdhu,' and conferred on him the post of chief.

"From that period proclaiming himself to be Nando, and adopting the course followed formerly (by his predecessor), he wandered about, pillaging the country. Having induced his brothers also to co-operate with him, by them also he was supported in his marauding excursions. Subsequently assembling his gang, he thus addressed them: 'My men! this is not a career in which valiant men should be engaged; it is not worthy of such as we are; this course is only befitting base wretches. What advantage is there in persevering in this career, let us aim at supreme sovereignty?'

They assented. On having received their acquiescence, attended by his troops and equipped for war, he attacked a provincial town, calling upon (its inhabitants) either to acknowledge him as sovereign, or to give him battle. They on receiving this demand all assembled, and having duly weighed the message, by sending an appropriate answer, formed a treaty of alliance with them. By this means reducing under his authority the people of Jambudīpo in great numbers, he finally attacked Pātiliputta¹ (the capital of the Indian empire), and usurping the sovereignty, died there a short time afterwards, while governing the empire.

“His brothers next succeeded to the empire in the order of their seniority. They altogether reigned twenty-two years. It was on this account that (in the Mahāvanso) it is stated that there were nine Nandos.

“Their ninth youngest brother was called Dhana-nando, from his being addicted to hoarding treasure. As soon as he was inaugurated, actuated by miserly desires the most inveterate, he resolved within himself, ‘It is proper that I should devote myself to hoarding treasure;’ and collecting riches to the amount of eighty kotis, and superintending the transport thereof himself, and repairing to the banks of the Ganges, by means of a barrier constructed of branches and leaves interrupting the course of the main stream, and forming a canal, he diverted its waters into a different channel; and in a rock in the bed of the

¹ Pātaliputra was then governed by the youngest son of Aśoka, called Pinjamakh, and the robber-king, who first called himself Nanda, is said to have reigned a short time under the title of Ugrasena. As. Res. xx. p. 170.



river having caused a great excavation to be made, he buried the treasure there. Over this cave he laid a layer of stones, and to prevent the admission of water, poured molten lead on it. Over that again he laid another layer of stones, and passing a stream of molten lead (over it), which made it like a solid rock, he restored the river to its former course. Levying taxes even on skins, gums, trees, and stones, among other articles, he amassed further treasures, which he disposed of similarly. It is stated that he did so repeatedly. On this account we call this ninth brother of theirs, as he personally devoted himself to the hoarding of treasure, 'Dhana-nando.'

"The appellation of 'Moriyan sovereigns' is derived from the auspicious circumstances under which their capital, which obtained the name of Moriya, was called into existence.

"While Buddha yet lived, driven by the misfortunes produced by the war of (prince) Vidhudhabo, certain members of the Sākya line retreating to Himavanto, discovered a delightful and beautiful location, well watered, and situated in the midst of a forest of lofty bo and other trees. Influenced by the desire of settling there, they founded a town at a place where several great roads met, surrounded by durable ramparts, having gates of defence therein, and embellished with delightful edifices and pleasure gardens. Moreover that (city), having a row of buildings covered with tiles, which were arranged in the pattern of the plumage of a peacock's neck, and as it resounded with the notes of flocks of 'konchos' and 'mayuros' (pea-fowls), was so called. From this circumstance these Sākya lords of this town, and their children and descendants, were renowned throughout



Jambudîpo by the title of 'Moriya.' From this time that dynasty has been called the Morian dynasty."

After a few isolated remarks, the Tikâ thus proceeds in its account of Chânakko and Chandagutto:

"It is proper that in this place a sketch of these two characters should be given. Of these, if I am asked in the first place, 'Where did this Chânakko dwell? Whose son was he?' I answer, 'he lived at the city of Takkasilâ. He was the son of a certain Brahman at that place, and a man who had achieved the knowledge of the three Vedas; could rehearse the mantos; skilful in stratagems; and dexterous in intrigue as well as policy. At the period of his father's death he was already well known as the dutiful maintainer of his mother, and as a highly gifted individual worthy of swaying the chhatta.

"On a certain occasion, approaching his mother, who was weeping, he inquired, 'My dear mother, why dost thou weep?' On being answered by her, 'My child, thou art gifted to sway a chhatta. Do not, my boy, endeavour by raising the chhatta, to become a sovereign. Princes everywhere are unstable in their attachments. Thou also, my child, wilt forget the affection thou owest me. In that case, I should be reduced to the deepest distress. I weep under these apprehensions.' He exclaimed: 'My mother, what is that gift that I possess? On what part of my person is it indicated?' and on her replying, 'My dear, on thy teeth,' smashing his own teeth, and becoming 'Kandhadatto' (a tooth-broken man) he devoted himself to the protection of his mother. Thus it was that he became celebrated as the filial protector of his mother. He was not only a tooth-broken man, but he was disfigured by a



disgusting complexion, and by deformity of legs and other members prejudicial to manly comeliness.

“ In his quest of disputation, repairing to Pupphapura, the capital of the monarch Dhana-nando, (who, abandoning his passion for hoarding, becoming imbued with the desire of giving alms, relinquishing also his miserly habits, and delighting in hearing the fruits that resulted from benevolence, had built a hall of alms-offering in the midst of his palace, and was making an offering to the chief of the Brahmans worth a hundred kotis, and to the most junior Brahman an offering worth a lac,) this Brahman (Chânakko) entered the said apartment, and taking possession of the seat of the chief Brahman, sat himself down in that alms hall.

“ At that instant Dhana-nando himself—decked in regal attire, and attended by many thousands of ‘siwakâ’ (state palanquins), glittering with their various ornaments, and escorted by a suite of a hundred royal personages, with their martial array of the four hosts, of cavalry, elephants, chariots, and infantry, and accompanied by dancing-girls, lovely as the attendants on the devos, himself a personification of majesty, and bearing the white parasol of dominion, having a golden staff and golden tassels, with this superb retinue repairing thither, and entering the hall of alms-offering, beheld the Brahman Chânakko seated. On seeing him, this thought occurred to him (Nando): ‘Surely it cannot be proper that he should assume the seat of the chief Brahman.’ Becoming displeased with him, he thus evinced his displeasure. He inquired: ‘Who art thou, that thou hast taken the seat of the chief Brahman?’ and being answered (simply), ‘It is I;’



‘Cast from hence this cripple Brahman; allow him not to be seated,’ exclaimed Nando; and although the courtiers again and again implored of him, saying, ‘Dévo! let it not be so done by a person prepared to make offerings as thou art, extend thy forgiveness to this Brahman;’ he insisted upon his ejection. On the courtiers approaching Chânakko, and saying, ‘Achâriyo! we come, by the command of the rāja, to remove thee from hence; but incapable of uttering the words, “Achâriyo, depart hence,” we now stand before thee abashed.’ Enraged against him (Nando), rising from his seat to depart, he snapt asunder his Brahmanical cord, and dashed down his jug on the threshold, and thus invoking malediction: ‘Kings are impious: may this whole earth, bounded by the four oceans, withhold its gifts from Nando,’ he departed. On his sallying out, the officers reported this proceeding to the rāja. The king, furious with indignation, roared, ‘Catch, catch, the slave.’ The fugitive, stripping himself naked, and assuming the character of an aji-vako, and running into the centre of the palace, concealed himself in an unfrequented place, at the San-khârathânan. The pursuers, not having discovered him, returned and reported that he was not to be found.

“In the night he repaired to a more frequented part of the palace, and meeting some of the suite of the royal prince Pabbato, admitted them into his confidence. By their assistance he had an interview with the prince. Gaining him over by holding out hopes of securing the sovereignty for him, and attaching him by that expedient, he began to search the means of getting out of the palace. Discovering



that in a certain place there was a ladder leading to a secret passage, he consulted with the prince, and sent a message to his (the prince's) mother for the key of the passage. Opening the door with the utmost secrecy, he escaped with the prince, and they fled to the wilderness of Vinjjhâ (Vindhya).

“While dwelling there, with the view of raising resources, he converted (by recoinage) each kahâ-pana into eight, and amassed eighty kotis of kahâ-panas. Having buried this treasure, he commenced to search for a second individual entitled (by birth) to be raised to sovereign power, and met with the aforesaid prince of the Moriyân dynasty called Chandagutto.

“His mother, the queen consort of the monarch of Moriya-nagara, the city before mentioned, was pregnant at the time that a certain powerful provincial râja conquered that kingdom, and put the Moriyân king to death. In her anxiety to preserve the child in her womb, she departed for the capital of Puppha-pura under the protection of her elder brothers, and under disguise she dwelt there. At the completion of the ordinary term of pregnancy she gave birth to a son, and relinquishing him to the protection of the devos, she placed him in a vase, and deposited him at the door of a cattle pen. A bull named Chando stationed himself by him, to protect him; in the same manner that Prince Ghoso, by the interposition of the devatâ, was watched over by a bull. In the same manner, also, that the herdsman in the instance of that Prince Ghoso repaired to the spot where that bull planted himself, a herdsman, on observing this prince, moved by affection, like that borne to his own child, took charge of and tenderly reared him; and

in giving him a name, in reference to his having been watched by the bull Chando, he called him 'Chandagutto,' and brought him up. When he had attained an age to be able to tend cattle, a certain wild huntsman, a friend of the herdsman, becoming acquainted with the boy, and attached to him, took him from (the herdsman) to his own dwelling, and established him there. He continued to dwell in that village.

"Subsequently, on a certain occasion, while tending cattle with other children in the village, he joined them in a game called 'the game of royalty.' He himself was named Râja; to others he gave the offices of sub-king, &c. Some being appointed judges, were placed in a judgment hall; some he made officers of the king's household; and others, outlaws or robbers. Having thus constituted a court of justice, he sat in judgment. On culprits being brought up, when they had been regularly impeached and tried, on their guilt being clearly proved to his satisfaction, according to the sentence awarded by his judicial ministers, he ordered the officers of the court to chop off their hands and feet. On their replying, 'Devo! we have no axes;' he answered: 'It is the order of Chandagutto that ye should chop off their hands and feet, making axes with the horns of goats for blades, and sticks for handles.' They acted accordingly; and on striking with the axe, the hands and feet were lopped off. On the same person commanding, 'Let them be reunited,' the hands and feet were restored to their former condition.

"Chânakko happening to come to that spot, was amazed at the proceeding he beheld. Accompanying (the boy) to the village, and presenting the huntsman with a thousand kahâpanas, he applied for him; saying, 'I will teach your son every accomplishment;



consign him to me.' Accordingly, conducting him to his own dwelling, he encircled his neck with a single fold of a woollen cord, twisted with gold thread, worth a lac.

"The discovery of this person is thus stated (in the former works): 'He discovered this prince descended from the Morian line.'

"He (Chânakko) invested Prince Pabbato, also, with a similar woollen cord. While these youths were living with him, each had a dream, which they separately imparted to him. As soon as he heard each (dream), he knew that of these Prince Pabbato would not attain royalty; and that Chandagutto would, without loss of time, become paramount monarch in Jambudîpo. Although he made this discovery, he disclosed nothing to them.

"On a certain occasion having partaken of some milk-rice prepared in butter, which had been received as an offering at a brahmanical disputation, they retired from the main road, and lying down in a shady place, protected by the deep foliage of trees, fell asleep. Among them the Achâriyo awakening first, rose, and for the purpose of putting prince Pabbato's qualifications to the test, he gave him a sword, and telling him: 'Bring me the woollen thread on Chandagutto's neck, without either cutting or untying it,' sent him off. He started on the mission, and failing to accomplish it, he returned. On a subsequent day, he sent Chandagutto on a similar mission. He repairing to the spot where Pabbato was sleeping, and considering how it was to be effected, decided: 'There is no other way of doing it; it can only be got possession of, by cutting his head off.' Accordingly chopping his head off, and bringing away the woollen thread, he

presented himself to the Brahman, who received him in profound silence. Pleased with him, however, on account of this (exploit), he rendered him in the course of six or seven years highly accomplished, and profoundly learned.

“Thereafter, on his attaining manhood, he decided : ‘From henceforth this individual is capable of forming and controlling an army;’ so he repaired to the spot where his treasure was buried, and took possession of it, and employed it, enlisting forces from all quarters, and distributing money among them; and having thus formed a powerful army, he entrusted it to him. From that time throwing off all disguise, and invading the inhabited parts of the country, he commenced his campaign by attacking towns and villages. In the course of their (Chânakko and Chandagutto’s) warfare, the population rose to a man, and surrounding them, and hewing their army with their weapons, vanquished them. Dispersing, they re-united in the wilderness; and consulting together, they thus decided : ‘As yet no advantage has resulted from war; relinquishing military operations, let us acquire a knowledge of the sentiments of the people.’ Thenceforth, in disguise, they travelled about the country. While thus roaming about, after sunset retiring to some town or other, they were in the habit of attending to the conversation of the inhabitants of those places.

“In one of these villages, a woman having baked some ‘appalapûva’ (pancakes) was giving them to her child, who leaving the edges would only eat the centre. On his asking for another cake, she remarked : ‘This boy’s conduct is like Chandagutto’s in his attempt to take possession of the kingdom.’ On his inquiring : ‘Mother, why, what am I doing; and



what has Chandagutto done?' 'Thou, my boy,' said she, 'throwing away the outside of the cake, eatest the middle only. Chandagutto also in his ambition to be a monarch, without subduing the frontiers, before he attacked the towns, invaded the heart of the country, and laid towns waste. On that account, both the inhabitants of the town and others, rising, closed in upon him, from the frontiers to the centre, and destroyed his army. *That was his folly.*'

"They, on hearing this story of hers, taking due notice thereof, from that time again raised an army. On resuming their attack on the provinces and towns, commencing from the frontiers, reducing towns, and stationing troops in the intervals, they proceeded in their invasion. After a respite, adopting the same system, and marshalling a great army, and in regular course reducing each kingdom and province, then assailing Pâtiliputta and putting Dhana-nando to death, they seized that sovereignty.

"Although this had been brought about, Chânakko did not at once raise Chandagutto to the throne; but for the purpose of discovering Dhana-nando's hidden treasure, sent for a certain fisherman (of the river); and after deluding him with the promise of raising the chhatta for him, and securing the hidden treasure, within a month from that date, put him also to death¹, and inaugurated Chandagutto monarch.

"Hence the expression (in the Mahâvanso) 'a descendant of the dynasty of Moriyān sovereigns;' as well as the expression 'installed in the sovereignty.' All the particulars connected with Chandagutto, both before his installation and after, are recorded in the

¹ This is probably the Kaivarta-nanda of the Rājaraṭnākara.



Atthakathâ of the Uttaravihâro priests. Let that (work) be referred to, by those who are desirous of more detailed information. We compile this work in an abridged form, without prejudice however to its perspicuity.

“His (Chandagutto’s) son was Bindusâro. After his father had assumed the administration, (the said father) sent for a former acquaintance of his, a Jati-lian, named Maniyatappo, and conferred a commission on him. ‘My friend, (said he) do thou restore order into the country; suppressing the lawless proceedings that prevail.’ He replying ‘sâdhu,’ and accepting the commission, by his judicious measures, reduced the country to order.

“Chânakko, determined that to Chandagutto—a monarch, who by the instrumentality of him (the aforesaid Maniyatappo) had conferred the blessings of peace on the country, by extirpating marauders who were like unto thorns (in a cultivated land)—no calamity should befall from poison, decided on inuring his body to the effects of poison. Without imparting the secret to any one, commencing with the smallest particle possible, and gradually increasing the dose, by mixing poison in his food and beverage, he (at last) fed him on poison, at the same time taking steps to prevent any other person participating in his poisoned repasts.

“At a subsequent period his queen consort was pronounced to be pregnant. Who was she? Whose daughter was she? ‘She was the daughter of the eldest of the maternal uncles who accompanied the rāja’s mother to Pupphapura.’¹ Chandagutto wedding this daughter of his maternal uncle, raised her to the dignity of queen consort.

¹ See page 289.



"About this time, Chânakko, on a certain day having prepared the monarch's repast sent it to him, himself accidentally remaining behind for a moment. On recollecting himself, in an agony of distress, he exclaimed, 'I must hasten thither, short as the interval is, before he begins his meal;' and precipitately rushed into the king's apartment, at the instant that the queen who was within seven days of her confinement, was in the act, in the râja's presence, of placing the first handful of the repast in her mouth. On beholding this, and finding that there was not even time to ejaculate 'Don't swallow it,' with his sword he struck her head off; and then ripping open her womb, extricated the child with its caul, and placed it in the stomach of a goat. In this manner, by placing it for seven days in the stomach of seven different goats, having completed the full term of gestation, he delivered the infant over to the female slaves. He caused him to be reared by them, and when a name was conferred on him—in reference to a spot, (Bindu) which the blood of the goats had left—he was called Bindusâro."

This Bindusâra succeeded his father as king, and, after a reign of 28 years, he was succeeded by the great Âsoka. In this manner the Buddhists prove that through the Mauryas, Âsoka belonged to the same family as Buddha, to the royal family of the Śâkyas.

The Brahmans, on the contrary, endeavour to show that Chandragupta belonged to the same contemptible race as the Nandas. Thus we read in the Vishṇu-purâṇa¹:—

"The last of the Brihadratha dynasty, Ripunjaya, will have a minister named Śunika (Śunaka, Bh. P.),

¹ Vishṇu-purâṇa, translated by H. H. Wilson, p. 466.

who having killed his sovereign, will place his son Pradyota upon the throne (for 23 years, Vāyu and Matsya P.). His son will be Pālaka (24 years, V.; Tilaka or Bālaka, 28 years, M.P.). His son will be Viśākhayūpa (50 years V.; 53 M.P.). His son will be Janaka (Ajaka, 21 years V.; Sūryaka, 21 years M.; Rajaka, Bh. P.). And his son will be Nandivardhana (20 years V. and M.P.). These five kings of the house of Pradyota will reign over the earth for 138 years (the same number in V. and Bh. P.).

“The next prince will be Śīsunāga¹; his son will be Kākavarṇa (36 years V. and M.); his son will be Kshemadharman (Kshemakarman, 20 years V., Kshemadharman, 36 years M.); his son will be Kshatraujas (40 years V.; Kshemajit or Kshemarchis, 36 years M.; Kshetrajna, Bh. P.); his son will be Vidmisāra (Vimbisāra, 28 years V.; Vindusena or Vindhyasena, 28 years M.; Vidhisāra, Bh.); his son will be Ajātaśatru²; his son will be Dharbaka (Harshaka, 25 years V.; Vanśaka, 24 years M.); his son will be Udayāśva (33 years V.; Udibhi or Udāsin, 33 years M.)³; his son also will be Nandivardhana; and his son will be Mahānanda (42 and 43 years V.; 40 and 43 years M.). These ten Śāisunāgas will be kings of the earth for 362 years.

“The son of Mahānanda will be born of a woman of the Śūdra-class; his name will be Nanda, called Mahāpadma, for he will be exceedingly avaricious. Like another Paraśu-rāma, he will be the annihilator

¹ Śīsunāka, who, according to the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇa, relinquished Benares to his son, and established himself at Girivraja or Rājagṛiha in Behar, reigned 40 years, V. and M. P.

² 25 years V.; 27 years M.: the latter inserts a Kaṇvāyana, 9 years, and Bhūmimitra or Bhūmiputra, 14 years, before him.

³ According to the Vāyu, Udaya or Udayāśva founded Pāṭali-putra, on the southern angle of the Ganges.



of the Kshatriya race, for after him the kings of the earth will be Śûdras. He will bring the whole earth under one umbrella, he will have eight sons, Sumâlya, and others, who will reign after Mahâpadma; and he and his sons will govern for a hundred years. The Brahman Kauṭilya will root out the nine Nandas.

“Upon the cessation of the race of Nanda, the Mauryas will possess the earth. Kauṭilya will place Chandragupta¹ on the throne; his son will be Vindusâra²; his son will be Âsokavardhana; his son will be Suyâsas; his son will be Daśaratha; his son will be Sangata; his son will be Śâlisûka; his son will be Somaśarman; his son will be Śâśadharman, and his successor will be Vṛihadratha. These are the ten Mauryas who will reign over the earth for 137 years.”

The title of Maurya, which by the Buddhists was used as a proof of Âsoka's royal descent, is explained by the Brahmans³ as a metronymic, Murâ being given as the name of one of Nanda's wives.

If now, we survey the information here brought together from Buddhist, Brahmanic, and Greek sources, we shall feel bound to confess that all we really know is this:—

¹ The length of this monarch's reign is given uniformly by the Purâṇas and the Buddhist histories, as 24 years. The number is given by the Vâyû-Purâṇa, the Dîpavanśa, the Mahâvanśa (where 34 is a mistake for 24), and in Buddhaghosha's Arthakatha. Cf. Mahâv. p. lii.

² The Vâyû-Purâṇa calls him Bhadrasâra, and assign 25 years to his reign.

³ Vishṇu-purâṇa, p. 468. n. 21. This rests only on the authority of the commentator on the Vishṇu-purâṇa; but Chandragupta's relationship with Nanda is confirmed by the Muḍrâ-râkshasa.



Chandragupta is the same person as Sandrocypsus, or Sandracottus. This Sandracottus, according to Justin (xv. 4.), had seized the throne of India after the prefects of Alexander had been murdered (317 B. C.). Seleucus found him as sovereign of India when, after the taking of Babylon and the conquest of the Bactrians, he passed on into India. Seleucus, however, did not conquer Sandracottus, but after concluding a league with him, marched on to make war against Antigonus. This must have taken place before 312, for in that year, the beginning of the Seleucidan era, Seleucus had returned to Babylon.

We may suppose that Chandragupta became king about 315, and as both the Buddhist and Brahmanic writers allow him a reign of 24 years, the reign of Bindusâra would begin 291 B. C. This Bindusâra again had according to both Brahmanic and Buddhist authors, a long reign of either twenty-five or twenty-eight years. Taking the latter statement as the better authenticated, we find that the probable beginning of Âśoka's reign took place 263 B. C.; his inauguration 259 B. C.; his Council either 246 or 242 B. C. At the time of Âśoka's inauguration, 218 years had elapsed since the conventional date of the death of Buddha. Hence if we translate the language of Buddhist chronology into that of Greek chronology, Buddha was really supposed to have died 477 B. C., and not 543 B. C. Again, at the time of Chandragupta's accession, 162 years were believed to have elapsed since the conventional date of Buddha's death. Hence Buddha was supposed to have died $315 + 162 = 477$ B. C. Or, to adopt a different line of argument, Kanishka, according to the evidence of coins,¹ must have reigned before and after the Christian

¹ Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, ii. 413.



era. In the Stûpa of Manikyâla, which was built by Kanishka¹, Roman coins have been found of as late a date as 33 B.C. How long before that date this Turushka or Indoscythian king may have assumed the sovereignty of India it is difficult to determine. But under him the Northern Buddhists place a new Council which was presided over by Vasumitra², and the date of which is fixed at *more than* 400 after Buddha's Nirvâna.³ If we add 400 and 33, and take into account that the Council took place *more than* 400 years after Buddha, and that Kanishka must have reigned some years before he built his Stûpa, we find again that 477 B. C. far more likely than 543, as the conventional date of Buddha's death. All the dates, however, before Chandragupta are to be considered only as hypothetical. The second council under Kâlâśoka is extremely problematical, and the date of Buddha's death, as 218 before Aśoka, is worth no more than the date of Vijaya's landing in Ceylon, fixed 218 before Devânâmpriya Tishya. Professor Lassen, in order to give an historical value to the date of 543 assigned to the death of Buddha, adds 66 years to the 22 years of the reign of the Nandas, and he quotes in support of this the authority of the Purâṇas which ascribe 88 years to the first Nanda. The Purâṇas, however, if taken in their true meaning, are entirely at variance with the Buddhist chronology before Chandragupta, and it is not allowable to use them as a corrective. As to

¹ A. Cunningham in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, xviii. p. 20.

² Asiatic Researches, xx. 297.

³ Nâgârjuna, who must be somewhat later than Vasumitra, is roughly placed 400 years after Buddha by the Northern, 500 after Buddha by the Southern Buddhists.



the chronology of the Ceylonese Buddhists, so far from becoming more perfect by the addition of those sixty-six years, it would really lose all consistency. The most useful portions of that chronology are the prophecies of Buddha and others, as to the number of years intervening between certain events. All these dates would have to be surrendered if we adopted Professor Lassen's correction. The great Council would not fall 218 years after Buddha's death, Chandragupta would not come to the throne 162 years after the Nirvâṇa: Buddha, in fact, as well as his apostles, would be convicted as false prophets by their very disciples.

Whatever changes may have to be introduced into the earlier chronology of India, nothing will ever shake the date of Chandragupta, the illegitimate successor of the Nandas, the ally of Seleucus, the grandfather of Aśoka. That date is the sheet-anchor of Indian chronology, and it is sufficient for the solution of the problem which occupies us at present. It enables us to place Kâtyâyana before Chandragupta, the successor of the Nandas, or, at all events, the founder of a new dynasty, subsequent to the collapse of Alexander's empire. It enables us to fix chronologically an important period in the literature of India, the Sûtra period, and to extend its limits to at least three generations after Kâtyâyana, to about 200 B. C. In doing so, I am far from maintaining that the evidence which connects the names of Kâtyâyana and Nanda is unexceptionable. Nowhere except in Indian history should we feel justified in ascribing any weight to the vague traditions contained in popular stories which were written down more than a thousand years after the event. The most that can be said in favour of these traditions is, first,



that there was no object in inventing them; secondly, that they are not in contradiction with anything we know of the early history of India from other sources; and thirdly, that the date which from their suggestions we assign to the literary works of Kātyāyana and his predecessors and successors, harmonises with the conclusions derived from the literature of the Brahmans, as to the probable growth and decay of the Hindu mind previous to the beginning of our era.

Although these chronological discussions have occupied so much of our space, it is necessary to add a few words of explanation. It might seem as if, in bringing together all the evidence available for our purpose, certain authorities had been overlooked which might have confirmed our conclusions. Professor Böhtlingk, whose researches with regard to the age of Pāṇini deserve the highest credit, has endeavoured to fortify his conclusions by some additional evidence, derived from the works of Chinese travellers; and other writers on the same subject have followed his example, though they have given a different interpretation to the statements of those travellers, and have arrived at different results as to the probable date of Pāṇini. The evidence of these Buddhist pilgrims, however, yields no real results, either for or against the date assigned to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, and it is for this reason that it has been entirely discarded in the preceding pages. Professor Böhtlingk relied on the testimony of Hiouen-thsang, a Buddhist pilgrim who travelled through India in the years 629—645 after Christ, and whose travels have lately been translated by M. Stanislas Julien. There we read¹:

¹ *Mémoires sur les Contrées occidentales par Hiouen-thsang*, liv. iv. p. 200.



“Après avoir fait environ cinq cent li, au sud-est de la capitale (de Chînapati), il arriva au couvent appelé Ta-mo-sou-fa-na-seng-kia-lan (Tâmasavana-sanghârâma), ou le couvent de la Forêt Sombre. On y comptait environ trois cent religieux qui suivaient les principes de l'école des Sarvâstivâdas. Ils avaient un extérieur grave et imposant, et se distinguaient par la pureté de leur vertu et l'élévation de leur caractère. Ils approfondissaient surtout l'étude du petit Véhicule. Les mille Buddhas du Kalpa des Sages (Bhadrakalpa) doivent, dans ce lieu, rassembler la multitude des Devas et leur expliquer la sublime loi. Dans la trois centième année après le Nirvâna de Śākya Tathâgata, il y eut un maître des Śâstras, nommé *Kâtyâyana*, qui composa, dans ce couvent, le Fa-tchi-lun (Abhidharma-jñâna-prasthâna).”

At first sight this might seem a very definite statement as to the age of *Kâtyâyana*, placing him, if we accept the conventional date of Buddha's death, about 243 B. C. But how can we prove that Hiouen-thsang was speaking of *Kâtyâyana* Vararuchi? It might be said that the *Kâtyâyana*, so simply mentioned by Hiouen-thsang, must be a person of note. Hiouen-thsang does not mention ancient authors except men of note, and the *Kâtyâyana* whose dates he gives in this place, cannot be a chance person of that name, but must be some well-known author.¹ It could hardly be meant for Mahâkâtyâyana, because he was the pupil of Buddha, and could not be placed 300 years after his Nirvâna. Besides Mahâkâtyâyana, there is certainly no person of the same name of greater

¹ Foucaux, *Lalitavistara*, pp. 3. 415. 417.



literary fame than Kâtyâyana Vararuchi. But the Kâtyâyana of whom Hiouen-thsang speaks was a Buddhist, and the author of a work on metaphysics, which Hiouen-thsang himself translated from Sanskrit into Chinese. Making all possible allowance for the tendency of later Buddhist writers to refer the authorship of certain works to names famous in ancient Brahmanic history, we can hardly build much on the supposition that the author meant by the Chinese traveller was the old Kâtyâyana Vararuchi, the contemporary of Pāṇini. But, even if all these objections could be removed, what use could we make of Hiouen-thsang's chronology, who follows the system of the Northern, and not of the Ceylonese, Buddhists, who makes Aśoka to reign 100 years after Buddha, Kanishka 400, the king of Himatala 600, and so on? We should first have to determine what, according to Hiouen-thsang, was the real date of Buddha's Nirvāṇa, and what was the era used at his time in the monasteries of Northern India; whether he altered the dates, assigned by the Buddhists of India to the various events of their traditional history, according to the standard of the Chinese Buddhist chronology, or whether he simply repeated the dates, such as they were communicated to him in the different places which he visited. All these questions would have to be answered, and if they could be answered, we should in the end only arrive at the date of a Kâtyâyana, but not of the Kâtyâyana with whom we are concerned.

There is another passage in Hiouen-thsang which has been frequently discussed, and according to which it would seem that we should have to place Pāṇini much later, and that Kâtyâyana, the critic of

Pāṇini, could not have lived before the first century after Christ.

M. Reinaud, in his excellent work, "*Mémoire Géographique, Historique et Scientifique sur l'Inde, antérieurement au milieu du XI^e. siècle, d'après les écrivains arabes, persans et chinois (Paris, 1849),*" was the first to call attention to this passage. He says (p. 88.): "Ainsi que pour plusieurs autres personnages notables du bouddhisme, Hiouen-thsang attribue à Pāṇini deux existences, la première à une époque où la vie de l'homme était plus longue qu'à présent, et la seconde vers l'an 500 après la mort de Bouddha, c'est-à-dire au temps du second Vikramāditya, un siècle environ après le règne de Kanika. Dans sa première existence, Pāṇini professait le brahmanisme; mais dans la seconde il se convertit avec son père au bouddhisme." M. Reinaud pointed out with great sagacity the various consequences which would follow from such a statement, and he remarked besides that the fact of the Yavanānī (lipi), the writing of the Ionians or the Greeks, being mentioned in Pāṇini, would likewise tend to place that grammarian rather later than was commonly supposed.

The same legend, thus partially translated from Hiouen-thsang, was made by Professor Weber the key-stone of a new system of Indian chronology. Admitting the double existence of Pāṇini, he says that his second existence falls 500 years after Buddha, or 100 after Kanishka, whom Hiouen-thsang places 400 after Buddha. The date assigned by Hiouen-thsang to Kanishka is rejected by Professor Weber. He takes, however, the real date of Kanishka, as established on numismatic evidence, about 40 A. D.; he then adds to it the hundred years, which, ac-



According to the constructive chronology of the Northern Buddhists, elapsed between Kanishka and Pāṇini, and thus deduces 140 A.D. as a new date for Pāṇini.

Without entering into the merits of these calculations, we are enabled by the publication of the complete translation of Hiouen-thsang to show that, in reality, the Chinese pilgrim never placed Pāṇini so late as 500 after Buddha. On the contrary, he represents the reputation of that old grammarian as firmly established at that time, and his grammar as the grammar then taught to all children. I subjoin the extracts from Hiouen-thsang : —

“Après avoir fait environ vingt li au nord-ouest de la ville de *Ou-to-kia-han-t'cha* (Uḍakhāṇḍa ?), il arriva à la ville de *P'o-lo-tou-lo* (Śālātura) qui donna le jour au *Rishi Po-ni-ni* (Pāṇini), auteur du *Traité Ching-ming-lun* (Vyākaraṇam).

“Dans la haute antiquité, les mots de la langue étaient extrêmement nombreux ; mais quand le monde eut été détruit, l'univers se trouva vide et désert. Des dieux d'une longévité extraordinaire descendirent sur la terre pour servir de guides aux peuples. Telle fut l'origine des lettres et des livres. A partir de cette époque, leur source s'agrandit et dépassa les bornes. Le dieu *Fan* (Brahman) et le roi du ciel (Indra) établirent des règles et se conformèrent au temps. Des *Rishis* hérétiques composèrent chacun des mots. Les hommes les prirent pour modèles, continuèrent leur œuvre, et travaillèrent à l'envi pour en conserver la tradition ; mais les étudiants faisaient de vains efforts, et il leur était difficile d'en approfondir le sens.

“A l'époque où la vie des hommes était réduite à cent ans, on vit paraître le *Rishi Po-ni-ni* (Pāṇini),



qui était instruit dès sa naissance et possédait un vaste savoir. Affligé de l'ignorance du siècle, il voulut retrancher les notions vagues et fausses, débarrasser la langue des mots superflus et en fixer les lois. Comme il voyageait pour faire des recherches et s'instruire, il rencontra le dieu *Tseu-thsai* (Īśvara Deva), et lui exposa le plan de l'ouvrage qu'il méditait.

“ ‘A merveille!’ lui dit le dieu *Tseu-Thsai* (Īśvara Deva); ‘vous pouvez compter sur mon secours.’

“Après avoir reçu ses instructions, le *Rishi* se retira. Il se livra alors à des recherches profondes, et déploya toute la vigueur de son esprit. Il recueillit une multitude d'expressions, et composa un *livre de mots*¹ qui renfermait mille *śloka*s; chaque *śloka* était de trente-deux syllabes. Il sonda, jusqu'à leurs dernières limites, les connaissances anciennes et nouvelles, et ayant rassemblé, dans cet ouvrage, les lettres et les mots, il le mit sous une enveloppe cachetée et le présenta au roi, qui en conçut autant d'estime que d'admiration. Il rendit un décret qui ordonnait à tous ses sujets de l'étudier et de l'enseigner aux autres. Il ajouta que quiconque pourrait le réciter, d'un bout à l'autre, recevrait, pour récompense, mille pièces d'or. De là vient que, grâce aux leçons successives des maîtres, cet ouvrage est encore aujourd'hui en grand honneur. C'est pourquoi les Brâhmanes de cette ville ont une science solide et des talents élevés, et se distinguent à la fois par l'étendue

¹ “Livre de mots” is intended as the title of Pāṇini's grammar, which was “*Śabdānuśāsanam*.” This title is left out in the Calcutta edition, and likewise in Professor Böhlingk's edition of Pāṇini. See *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vii. 162.



de leurs connaissances et la richesse de leur mémoire.

“ Dans la ville de *P'o-lo-tou-lo* (lisez *So-lo-tou-lo* — *Śālatura*), il y a un *Stûpa*. Ce fut en cet endroit qu'un *Lo-han* (un *Arhat*) convertit un disciple de *Po-ni-ni* (*Pânini*). Cinq cents ans après que *Jou-lai* (le *Tathâgata*) eut quitté le monde, il y eut un grand *O-lo-han* (*Arhat*) qui, venant du royaume de *Kia-chi-mi-lo* (*Cachemire*), voyageait pour convertir les hommes. Quand il fut arrivé dans ce pays, il vit un *Fan-tchi* (un *Brahmachârin*) occupé à fouetter un petit garçon qu'il instruisait. ‘ Pourquoi maltraitez-vous cet enfant ? ’ dit l'*Arhat* au *Fan-tchi* (*Brahmachârin*).

“ ‘ Je lui fais étudier, ’ répondit-il, ‘ le *Traité de la Science des Sons* (*Ching-ming* — *Vyākaraṇam*), mais il ne fait aucun progrès. ’

“ L'*Arhat* se dérida et laissa échapper un sourire. Le vieux *Fan-tchi* (*Brahmachârin*) lui dit : ‘ Les *Cha-men* (*Śramaṇas*) ont un cœur affectueux et compatissant, et s'apitoient sur les créatures qui souffrent. L'homme plein d'humanité vient de sourire tout à l'heure ; je désirerais en connaître la cause. ’

“ ‘ Il n'est pas difficile de vous l'apprendre, ’ répondit l'*Arhat*, ‘ mais je crains de faire naître en vous un doute d'incrédulité. Vous avez, sans doute, entendu dire qu'un *Rishi*, nommé *Po-ni-ni* (*Pânini*) a composé le *Traité Ching-ming-lun* (*Vyākaraṇam*), et qu'il l'a laissé, après lui, pour l'instruction du monde. ’ Le *Po-lo-men* (le *Brâhmane*) lui dit : ‘ Les enfants de cette ville, qui sont tous ses disciples, révèrent sa vertu, et la statue, élevée en son honneur, subsiste encore aujourd'hui. ’

“ ‘ Eh bien ! ’ repartit l'*Arhat*, ‘ cet enfant, à qui

vous avez donné le jour, est précisément ce *Rishi*. (Dans sa vie antérieure,) il employait sa forte mémoire à étudier les livres profanes; il ne parlait que des traités hérétiques et ne cherchait point la vérité. Son esprit et sa science dépérissent, et il parcourut, sans s'arrêter, le cercle de la vie et de la mort. Grâce à un reste de vertu, il a obtenu de devenir votre fils bien-aimé. Mais les livres profanes et l'éloquence du siècle ne donnent que des peines inutiles. Pourrait-on les comparer aux saintes instructions de *Jou-lai* (du Tathâgata), qui, par une influence secrète procurent l'intelligence et le bonheur?

“ Jadis, sur les bords de la mer du midi, il y avait un arbre desséché dont le tronc creux donnait asile à cinq cents chauves-souris. Des marchands s'arrêtèrent un jour au pied de cet arbre. Comme il régnait alors un vent glacial, ces hommes, qui étaient tourmentés par la faim et le froid, amassèrent du bois et des broussailles et allumèrent du feu au pied de l'arbre. La flamme s'accrut par degrés et embrasa bientôt l'arbre desséché.

“ Dans ce moment, il y eut un des marchands qui, après le milieu de la nuit, se mit à lire, à haute voix, le Recueil de l'*O-pi-ta-mo* (de l'Abhidharma). Les chauves-souris, quoique tourmentées par l'ardeur du feu, écoutèrent avec amour les accents de la loi, supportèrent la douleur sans sortir de leur retraite, et y terminèrent leur vie. En conséquence de cette conduite vertueuse, elles obtinrent de renaître dans la classe des hommes. Elles quittèrent la famille, se livrèrent à l'étude, et, grâce aux accents de la loi, qu'elles avaient jadis entendus, elles acquirent une rare intelligence, obtinrent toutes ensemble la dignité d'*Arhat*, et cultivèrent, de siècle en siècle, le champ



du bonheur. Dans ces derniers temps, le roi *Kia-ni-se-kia* (Kanishka) et l'honorable *Hie* (Ārya Pārśvika) convoquèrent cinq cents sages dans le royaume de *Kia-chi-mi-lo* (Cachemire), et composèrent le *Pi-po-cha-lun* (le Vibhāshā-sāstra). Tous ces sages étaient les cinq cents chauves-souris qui habitaient jadis le creux de l'arbre desséché. Quoique j'aie un esprit borné, j'étais moi-même l'une d'elles. Mais les hommes diffèrent entre eux par la supériorité ou la médiocrité de leur esprit; les uns prennent leur essor, tandis que les autres rampent dans l'obscurité. Maintenant, ô homme plein d'humanité, il faut que vous permettiez à votre fils bien-aimé de quitter la famille. En quittant la famille (en embrassant la vie religieuse), on acquiert des mérites ineffables.'

"Lorsque l'*Arhat* eut achevé ces paroles, il donna une preuve de sa puissance divine en disparaissant à l'instant même.

"Le Brâhmane se sentit pénétré de foi et de respect, et après avoir fait éclater son admiration, il alla raconter cet événement dans tout le voisinage. Il permit aussitôt à son fils d'embrasser la vie religieuse et de se livrer à l'étude. Lui-même se convertit immédiatement, et montra la plus grande estime pour les *trois Précieux*. Les hommes de son village suivirent son exemple, et, aujourd'hui encore, les habitants s'affermirent de jour en jour dans la foi.

"En partant au nord de la ville de *Ou-to-kia-han-t'cha* (Udakhāṇḍa?), il franchit des montagnes, traversa des vallées, et, après avoir fait environ six cents li, il arriva au royaume de *Ou-tchang-na*¹ (Udyāna).²

¹ Inde du nord.

² Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales, traduits du Sanscrit

Whatever the historical value of this legend may be, it is quite clear that it lends no support of any kind to the opinion of those who would place the grammarian Pāṇini 500 years after Buddha, or 100 years after Kanishka.

It is possible that the inquiries into the ancient literature of Buddhism, particularly in China, may bring to light some new dates, and help us in unravelling the chronological traditions of the Brahmins of India. The services already rendered to Sanskrit archæology by the publications of M. Stanislas Julien are of the highest value, and they hold out the promise of a still larger harvest; but for the present we must be satisfied with what we possess, and we must guard most carefully against rash conclusions, derived from evidence that would break down under the slightest pressure. Even without the support which it was attempted to derive from Hiouen-thsang, Kātyāyana's date is as safe as any date is likely to be in ancient Oriental chronology; and the connection between Kātyāyana and his predecessors and successors, supported as it is not only by tradition but by the character of their works which we still possess, supplies the strongest confirmation of our chronological calculations. As to other works of the Sūtra period, there are no doubt many, the date of which cannot be fixed by any external evidence. Tradition is completely silent as to the age of many of their authors. With regard to them

en Chinois, en l'an 648, par Hiouen-thsang, et du Chinois en Français par M. Stanislas Julien, Membre de l'Institut; tome i. p. 125; Voyages des Pèlerins Bouddhistes, vol. ii. See also the author's edition of the Rig-veda and Prātisākhya, Introduction, p. 12.



we must trust, at least for the present, to the similarity of their style and character with the writings of those authors whose age has been fixed. It is possible that the works of earlier authors quoted by Yāska and Pāṇini and others might still come to light, if any systematic search for ancient MSS. was made in different parts of India. Many works are quoted by Sāyana, Devarāja, Ujvaladatta, and other modern writers, which are not to be found in any European Library. Some of them may still be recovered.¹ We must not, however, expect too much. Vast as the ancient literature of India has been, we must bear in mind that part of it existed in oral tradition only, and was never consigned to writing. In India, where before the time of Pāṇini we have no evidence of any written literature, it by no means follows that, because an early Rishi is quoted in support of a theory, whether philosophical or grammatical, there ever existed a work written by him with pen and ink. His doctrines were handed down from generation to generation; but, once erased from the tablets of memory, they could never be recovered.

In the Sūtras which we still possess, it is most important to observe the gradual change of style. Śaunaka's style, when compared with that of his successors, is natural, both in prose and verse. His prose more particularly runs sometimes so easily and is so free from the artificial contrivances of the later Sūtras, that it seems a mistake to apply to it the

¹ According to the opinion of M. Fitz-Edward Hall, a scholar of the most extensive acquaintance with Sanskrit literature, the number of distinct Sanskrit works in existence is, probably, not less than ten thousand. (Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1858, p. 305.)



name of Sûtra. It is not unlikely that this title was assigned to his works at a time when its meaning had not yet been restricted either to the long "yarns" of the Buddhists or to the compendious paragraphs of the Brahmans, and we may well believe the statement that Śaunaka's works on the ceremonial resembled more the Brâhmanas than the later Sûtras. Āśvalāyana's style is still intelligible, and less cramped by far than the style of the Nirukta, a work commonly ascribed to Yâska, the collector of the Nighaṇṭus. Pāṇini is more artificial. He is no longer writing and composing, but he squeezes and distils his thoughts, and puts them before us in a form which hardly deserves the name of style. Kātyāyana is still more algebraic; but it is in Pingala that the absurdity of the Sûtras becomes complete. If any writers succeeded him, they could hardly have excelled him in enigmatic obscurity, and we may well believe that he was one of the last writers of Sûtras. The authors of the Paṇīśiṣṭas, unwilling to wear the strait-jacket of the Sûtrakâras, and unable to invent a more appropriate dress, adopted the slovenly metre of epic poetry, well adapted for legendary narration, but unfit for scientific discussion.



CHAPTER II.

THE BRÂHMAṆA PERIOD.

HAVING assigned to the Sûtra literature of India the wide limits of a period extending from 600 to 200 B.C., we have now to examine another and confessedly more ancient class of Vedic writings, differing in style both from the Sûtras, which are posterior, and from the Mantras, which are anterior to them. These are called by the comprehensive name of Brâhmanas. But as between the Sûtras and the later Sanskrit literature we discovered a connecting link in the writings known under the name of Pariśishtas, so we meet on the frontier between the Brâhmana and the Sûtra literature, with a class of works, intermediate between the Brâhmanas and Sûtras, which claim to be considered first. These are the Âranyakas, or "The Treatises of the Forest."

THE ÂRANYAKAS.

The Âranyakas are so called, as Sâyaṇa informs us, because they had to be read in the forest.¹ It

¹ Sâyaṇa on the Taittirîyâranyaka. अरण्यस्थानादितदारण्यकमितीर्यते। अरण्ये तदधीयीतेत्येवं वाक्यं प्रवक्ष्यते॥

And again, एतदारण्यकं सर्वं नाव्रती ओतुमर्हति॥ Parts of the Taittirîyâranyaka are exempted from the restriction that they

might almost seem as if they were intended for the *Vanaprasthas* only, people who, after having performed all the duties of a student and a householder, retire from the world to the forest to end their days in the contemplation of the deity. Thus it is said in the *Ârunikopaniṣad*, that the *Sannyâsin*, the man who no longer recites the Mantras and no longer performs sacrifices, is bound to read, out of all the Vedas, only the *Âranyaka* or the *Upaniṣad*. In several instances the *Âranyakas* form part of the *Brâhmanas*, and they are thus made to share the authority of *Śruti* or revelation. We have seen, however, that part of an *Âranyaka* was ascribed to a human author, to *Âśvalâyana*. Another part is quoted by *Sâyana*, in his Commentary on the *Rig-veda*¹, as being a *Sûtra* work of *Śaunaka's*. / Colebrooke found, in one transcript of this *Âranyaka*, that it was ascribed to *Âśvalâyana*; but he remarks, "probably by an error of the transcriber." This is not the case; and it is a good proof of a certain critical conscience even amongst the orthodox dog-

should be read in the forest only: नारण्याधीतिनियमः सावि-
त्रादिचतुष्टये।; and hence they are ranged with the *Brâhmanas*,
अतस्तद्वाङ्मण्यं ये श्रुतं व्याख्यातमप्यदः॥

¹ P. 112. पंचमारण्यक औष्णिहृत्वाशीतिरिति खंडे शौ-
नकेन सूचितं सुरुपक्षन्मृतय इति त्रीण्यं मानसि रयि-
मिति द्वे इति। These words occur in the *Aitareyâranyaka*, v. 2.

11. सुरुपक्षन्मृतय इति त्रीण्यं मानसि रयिमिति सूक्ते।
Other passages quoted by *Sâyana* from this *Âranyaka* can always
be identified in the *Aitareyâranyaka*. Cf. Colebrooke, *Misc.*
Essays, i. 46.



realists of the Hindus, that they acknowledged a certain difference between the Brâhmanas and Âranyakas, although it was of great importance to them, particularly in their orthodox philosophy, to be able to appeal to passages from the Âranyakas as invested with a sacred authority. The most important Upanishads, which are full of philosophy and theosophy, form part of the Âranyakas, and particularly in later times the Âranyaka was considered the quintessence of the Vedas.¹ Nevertheless it is acknowledged by Indian authors² that a mistake may be made, and the work of a human author may be erroneously received as a part of the sacred book by those who are unacquainted with its true origin. An instance, they say, occurs among those who use the Bahvrîch, a śâkhâ of the Rig-veda, by whom a ritual of Âśvalâyana has been admitted, under the title of the fifth Âranyaka, as a part of the Rig-veda. / That the Âranyakas presuppose the existence of the Brâhmanas may be clearly seen from the Brihadâranyaka, of which we possess now a complete edition by Dr. Rœer, of Calcutta, together with two

¹ Mahâbhârata i. 258.: "This body of the Mahâbhârata (the index) is truth and immortality; it is like new butter from curds, like the Brahman among men, like the Âranyaka from the Vedas, like nectar from medicinal plants, like the sea, the best among lakes, like the cow, the highest among animals." Thus the Upanishad is called the essence of the Veda; Śatap-brâhm. x. 3. 5. 12.

तस्य वा एतस्य यजुषो रस एवोपनिषत् ।

² This is taken from Colebrooke's extracts from the Pûrva-mîmânsâ; a system of philosophy of which it would be most desirable to have a complete edition. (Miscellaneous Essays, i. 307.) Dr. Goldstûcker, of Königsberg, has collected large materials for such a work; and I trust he will shortly find an opportunity of publishing the important results of his studies.

Sanskrit commentaries. If we take for instance the story of Janaka, who promised a large prize to the wisest Brahman at his sacrifice, and compare this story, as it is given in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa (xi. 4. 6.) with the third Adhyāya of the Bṛihadāraṇyaka where the same subject occurs, we find in the Āraṇyaka all the details given almost in the same words as in the Brāhmaṇa, but enlarged with so many additions, particularly with respect to the philosophical disputations which take place between Yājñavalkya and the other Brahmans, that we cannot hesitate for a moment to consider the Āraṇyaka as an enlargement upon the Brāhmaṇa.

The chief interest which the Āraṇyakas possess at the present moment consists in their philosophy. The philosophical chapters well known under the name of Upanishads are almost the only portion of Vedic literature which is extensively read to this day. They contain, or are supposed to contain, the highest authority on which the various systems of philosophy in India rest. Not only the Vedānta philosopher, who, by his very name, professes his faith in the ends and objects of the Veda,¹ but the Sāṅkhya, the Vaiśeṣika, the Nyāya, and Yoga philosophers, all pretend to find in the Upanishads some warranty for their tenets, however antagonistic in their bearing. The same applies to the numerous sects that have existed and still exist in India. Their founders, if they have

¹ Vedānta is used, but not yet in its technical sense, Taittiriya-āraṇyaka, x. 12.; a verse frequently repeated elsewhere.

वेदांतविज्ञानमुनिश्चितार्थाः संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धमत्त्वाः।
ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परांतकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे॥



any pretensions to orthodoxy, invariably appeal to some passage in the Upanishads in order to substantiate their own reasonings. Now it is true that in the Upanishads themselves there is so much freedom and breadth of thought that it is not difficult to find in them some authority for almost any shade of philosophical opinion. The old Upanishads did not pretend to give more than "guesses at truth," and when, in course of time, they became invested with an inspired character, they allowed great latitude to those who professed to believe in them as revelation. Yet this was not sufficient for the rank growth of philosophical doctrines during the latter ages of Indian history; and when none of the ancient Upanishads could be found to suit the purpose, the founders of new sects had no scruple and no difficulty in composing new Upanishads of their own. This accounts for the large and ever growing number of these treatises. Every new collection of MSS., every new list of Upanishads given by native writers, adds to the number of those which were known before; and the most modern compilations seem now to enjoy the same authority as the really genuine treatises.

The original Upanishads had their place in the *Āraṇyakas* and *Brāhmaṇas*. There is only one instance of a *Sanhitā* containing Upanishads — the *Vājasaneyi-sanhitā*, which comprises the *Īśa-upanishad*, forming the 40th book, and the *Śivasankalpa*, forming part of the 34th book. This, however, so far from proving the greater antiquity of that Upanishad, only serves to confirm the modern date of the whole collection known under the name of *Vājasa-*



neyi-sanhitâ.¹ But though the proper place of the genuine Upanishads was in the Brâhmanas, and here chiefly in those secondary portions commonly called Âranyakas, yet in later times, the Upanishads obtained a more independent position, and though they still professed to belong more particularly to one or the other of the four Vedas, that relationship became very lax and changeable.

The true etymological meaning of the word Upanishad had been forgotten in India. It is generally explained by *rahasya*, or *guhya âdesâh*, mystery; and an artificial etymology is given, according to which Upanishad would mean "destruction of passion or ignorance, by means of divine revelation."² The original signification of the word, however, must have been that of sitting down near somebody in order to listen, or in order to meditate and worship. Thus we find *upa + sad* used in the sense of sitting and worshipping :

Rv. ix. 11. 6.—Nâmasâ it úpa sîdata, "Approach him with praise."

Rv. x. 73. 11.—Vâyah suparnâh úpa sedur I'ndram priyâmedhâh rîshayah nâ'dhamânâh, "The poets with good thoughts have approached Indra begging, like birds with beautiful wings."

The root *âs*, which has the same meaning as *sad*, to sit, if joined with the preposition *upa*, expresses the same idea as *upa sad*, i. e. to approach respectfully, to worship (Rv. x. 153. 1). It is frequently used to express the position which the pupil occupies

¹ Mahidhara maintains that some parts of the Upanishad were aimed at the Buddhists, who denied the existence of an intelligent Self, called life a water bubble, and knowledge intoxication.

² Colebrooke, Essays, i. 92.



when listening to his teacher,¹ and it clearly expresses a position of inferiority in such passages as, Śat-brāhmaṇa, i. 3. 4. 15: "tasmād uparyāsinam kshatriyam adhastād imāḥ prajā upāsate," "therefore those people below (the Viś or Vaiśyas) sit under, or pay respect to the Kshatriya who sits above." Still more decisive is another passage in the same work (ix. 4. 3. 3), where *upanishādin* is used in the sense of subject: "kshatrāya tad viśam adhastād upanishādinim karoti," "he thus makes the Viś below subject to the Kshatriya." There can be little doubt therefore that Upanishad meant originally the act of sitting down near a teacher,² of submissively listening to him; and it is easy to trace the steps by which it came to mean implicit faith,³ and, at last, truth or divine revelation.

The songs of the Veda contained but little of philosophy or theosophy, and what the Brahmans call the higher knowledge is not to be sought for in the hymns of the Rishis. "What,"⁴ says the author of the Śvetāśvatara-upanishad, "what shall a man do with the hymns, who does not know that eternal word of the hymns in the highest heaven, that in which all the gods are absorbed? Those who know it, they are blessed." The same sentiment is fre-

¹ Pân. iii. 4. 72. comment.: Upāsito gurum bhavān; and upāsito gurur bhavatā.

² In this sense Upanishad is frequently used in the plural, and signifies sessions.

³ Chhândogya-upanishad, i. 1. 9. यदेव विद्यया करोति अद्वयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं। "What a man performs with knowledge, trust, and faith, that is effectual."

⁴ Śvetāśvatara-upanishad, ed. Röer, Bibliotheca Indica, vii. 339.

quently expressed, but nowhere with greater force than in a passage of the Katha-upanishad¹, a passage most remarkable in many respects. "That divine Self," the poet says, "is not to be grasped by tradition², nor by understanding, nor by all revelation; by him whom He himself chooses, by him alone is He to be grasped; that Self chooses his body as his own."/ Rammohun Roy when he visited the British Museum and found the late Dr. Rosen engaged in preparing an edition of the hymns of the Veda, expressed his surprise at so useless an undertaking. But the same philosopher looked upon the Upanishads as worthy to become the foundation of a new religion, and he published several of them himself with notes and translations. "The adoration of the invisible Supreme Being," he writes, "is exclusively prescribed by the Upanishads or the *principal* parts of the Veda, and also by the Vedant," and if other portions of the Veda seem to be in contradiction with the pure doctrine of the Upanishads, he hints that the whole work must not only be stripped of its authority, but looked upon as altogether unintelligible.³

/ The early Hindus did not find any difficulty in reconciling the most different and sometimes contradictory opinions in their search after truth; and a most extraordinary medley of oracular sayings might be collected from the Upanishads, even from those which are genuine and comparatively ancient, all tending to elucidate the darkest points of philosophy and religion, the creation of the world, the nature of

¹ IL. 23. It is also found in the Muṇḍaka.

² Pravachana, tradition, the Brāhmaṇas; see p. 109. Commentary: "ekavedasvikaraṇena," "by learning one Veda."

³ Translation of the Kena-upanishad by Rammohun Roy, Calcutta, 1816, p. 6.



God, the relation of man to God, and similar subjects.

That one statement should be contradicted by another seems never to have been felt as any serious difficulty. Thus we read in the first verse of the Śvetâśvatara-upanishad: "Is Brahman the cause? Whence are we born? By what do we live? Where do we go? At whose command do we walk after the Law, in happiness and misery? Is Time the cause, or Nature, or Law, or Chance, or the Elements? Is Man to be taken as the source of all? Nor is it their union, because there must be an independent Self, and even that independent Self has no power over that which causes happiness and pain."¹ The answers returned to such questions are naturally vague and various. Thus Mâdhava in his Commentary on Parâśara, quotes first from the Bahvṛicha-upanishad. "In the beginning this (world) was Self alone, there was nothing else winking. He thought, Let me create the worlds, and he created these worlds." From this it would follow that the absolute Self was supposed to have created everything out of nothing. But immediately afterwards Mâdhava quotes from another Upanishad, the Śvetâśvatara (IV. 10.), where Mâyâ or delusion is called the principle, and the Great Lord himself, the deluded.² This is evidently an

- १ किं कारणं ब्रह्म कुतः स्र जाता जीवाम केन क्व च संप्रतिष्ठिताः ।
अधिष्ठिताः केन सुखेतेरेषु वर्तामहे ब्रह्मविदो व्यवस्थां ॥
कालः स्वभावो नियतिर्यदृच्छा भूतानि योनिः पुरुष इति चिंत्या ।
संयोग एषां न त्वात्मभावादात्माप्यनीशः सुखदुःखहेतोः ॥
- २ मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरं ।
तस्यावयवभूतैस्तु व्याप्तं सर्वमिदं जगत् ॥