1

STUDIES IN THE BUDDHIST JĀTAKAS

STUDIES IN THE
BUDDHIST JĀTAKAS

(TRADITION AND POLITY)

By

Dr. Benoychandra Sen

M. A., LL. B., Ph. D. (Lond.)

SARASWAT LIBRARY

CALCUTTA

FIRST EDITION 1974

SARASWAT LIBRARY
206 Bidhan Sarani
Calcutta 700 006

Printed in India
by B. Bhattacharjee at Saraswat Press, 206 Bidhan Sarani
Calcutta 700 006 and published by P. Bhattacharyya for
Saraswat Library, 206 Bidhan Sarani, Calcutta 700 006.

To my daughter Khuku

CONTENTS

Preface i

Abbreviations ix

Chapter

I Pre-Buddhist Age and its End 1

II Historical Tradition and the Age of the Buddha 28

III Geography of the Jātakas—External relations 54

IV Kingship 74

V Princely career and court-life 98

VI People and Government 137

VII Tales of ancient kings 187

Addenda 231

Notes 237

Index 249

Select List of Jātakas 264

Additions and Corrections 269

PREFACE

This dissertation on the Jātakas was completed in 1926. It won an award from the University of Calcutta and appeared substantially in its present form as an article in volume XX of its Journal of the Department of Letters in 1930. Shortly after its publication I received a letter from a distinguished European scholar, containing a few simple queries, which could have been easily anticipated in a preface, but there was no room for it in the article, as then published. I have now an opportunity in the present context to make amends for this omission in a brief retrospect and also to state some of the grounds for the use made of legendary materials in the survey attempted in the following chapters.

To begin with, I remember how it was a mere chance that initiated my contact with the Jātakas. A sympathetic friend had placed within my easy reach the six volumes of the English Translation of the Jātakas edited by Cowell. I was then a recent recruit to the teaching profession with a heavy work-load on my shoulders. During a vacation in 1924 I took out one of these volumes and started reading a few stories from it at random by way of relaxation. This casual reading aroused an interest which soon led me to a study, mainly, of the original texts in the Collection edited in six volumes by Fausböll. As I proceeded, I came to share the view supported by previous researches that the collection is a storehouse of information about life and society in ancient India with special reference to the organisation of castes, rituals, festivals, customs and usages of different

communities or groups of people, economy, etc. It was found that there was yet some scope for further research on Jātaka traditions in relation to problems of political history and cognate institutions, previously treated more or less in an isolated manner. It was expected that a more detailed and systematic inquiry might bring to light facts not yet adequately known or stressed in the fields indicated above. Moreover, the controversy that had long been raging over the character and authenticity of Purāṇic genealogies emphasised the need for an analytical review of the old traditions preserved in the Birth-stories, to judge their comparative merits.

It is said on the authority of Buddhist literature that Jātaka stories, referred to as '*stories of the past*', were told by the Master in the course of his conversations and discourses on different occasions. This, in theory, claims for the sources of the stock of legends thus used, a pre-Buddhist character, devoid of features that presumably later converted them into Birth-stories, as understood in the Buddhist sense. Apart from the implications of the information derived from Buddhist sources as mentioned above, ancient tradition may quite possibly be found recorded in literature of a later date. In the case of the Jātakas, it is to be noted that with all their elements of antiquity, which may be traced in at least some of these compositions, they received a final shape at a considerably later period. It may be stated here that problems of the literary history of the Jātakas have only a marginal interest in the present work, which is concerned with the exclusive topics selected for discussion, as already noted. Though unconfirmed tradition in many fields is, to a large extent, unsuitable for purposes of critical history, it has been shown that in spite of evident shortcomings as a historical source, accounts, for example, those preserved in the "introductory episodes" compiled in

Fausböll's Collection, are of much use to scholars in glimpsing the political conditions of the Age of the Buddha and his royal contemporaries, its systems of government, specially the constitutions of the Śākya and Licchavi republics, its geographical background, etc. But unlike this, a considerable area of the traditions recorded in the *Birth-stories*, viz. those concerning kings and princes of an indefinite past seems to preserve weak, inconspicuous or mostly unreal links with history which in many parts is still to be written with a reasonable assurance of accuracy. Purāṇic genealogies being themselves unconfirmed and uncorroborated are not quite helpful in the matter. Although the tradition contained in the Jātakas can hardly be expected to make any authentic contribution to history in a real sense it may be of some indirect use even if it shows any broad trends of political development as apart from indisputable facts of history which it fails to offer. Thus from accounts of '*past*' glories of some kingdoms, read with those alluding to their decline, a sequence may be observed in the change of their political fortunes, though it must be admitted that the value of factual support for this and similar deductions, to be derived from these legendary sources, may be inconsequential for a critical reconstruction. Then, again, such references, implied or explicit, to shiftings of centres of political power, and those that give indications, however insufficient, of a transition to the relatively settled order that emerged in the 6th-5th century B. C., which the stories may contain, should not escape attention as these may have some use in suggesting a working basis for the appreciation of a history that had passed into legend. Thus it may be worthwhile to note that some characters are found portrayed in the stories with striking vividness. It is not impossible to surmise that these may have some elements of history behind

them, naturally opening a field for speculation, not entirely useless as instances showing how the popular memory had been deeply stirred and impressed. In view of the material which had accumulated out of the efforts of previous writers to rationalise various streams of traditions, it becomes necessary, as the author felt, to ente into current discussions regarding questions of identification of legendary personalities and chronology, though yielding uncertain results, to offer his own suggestions about these matters not so much on an assumption of the accuracy of the procedure thus adopted as for straightening out points of a controversial character in hypothetical situations. For a study of the development of royal myths and ballads it is also of importance to examine the available links between Jātaka monarchies and genealogies on the one hand and those of the Vedic, Purāṇic and epic literatures on the other.

In two other fields, viz. geography and government, the Birth-stories furnish information of intrinsic value. It is to be noted, for example, that the geographical horizon indicated in some instances specially in regard to the south, is wider than revealed in the early Buddhist list of the sixteen Mahājanapadas. Though the question of date may not be solved in detail, it is evident that the geographial material provided, has a real basis as most of the Indian territories, towns, cities, rivers, mountains, etc. mentioned in the allied stories have been successfully identified. The picture of administrative and other organisations, as drawn in this work, is necessarily a product of an integration of materials, scattered in different stories and connected with different regions. It seems that a pattern ultimately developed and spread over a wide geographical area, with common features in the spheres indicated in them. The importance of the data

collected in this field is not materially diminished in spite of occasional absurdities and exaggerations.

My thesis on the Jātakas attracted some attention in scholarly circles in India and abroad. In this connection I should, first of all, refer to my brief discussions with the French savant of revered memory, Professor Sylvain Levi, whom I was privileged to meet at the Calcutta residence of my father, the late Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sen in 1928-29, and again at Paris in 1930. His remarks on my labours encouraged me to take an expeditious step for the publication of my work, which as already mentioned, first appeared in print in 1930. While this was in progress I was offered an honorary part-time lecturership in the department of Pali then headed by the late Dr. B. M. Barua. My association with this department, which I remember with pride and satisfaction, continued until my retirement from Calcutta University service several years ago. My work came to the notice of the late Professor Winternitz who reviewed it at considerable length in a journal in 1932 with comments which I carefully noted.

For many years there had been a demand for the publication of my work in book form, which it was not possible on my part to fulfil for various personal reasons. Sometime around 1966 the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, then under the principalship of Dr. Gaurinath Sastri, decided with the advice of its editorial Board to publish it as a monograph in its well-known Indological Series. This decision was announced in advance in several successive issues of the institution's Journal 'Our Heritage'. Later, when, on grounds of personal convenience, I proposed to publish it on my own, the University of Calcutta and Sanskrit College gave their consent, for which my sincere thanks are due to them.

This revised monograph does not represent any marked enlargement of the scope covered in the earlier version. As a matter of fact no new matter, textual or otherwise, has been introduced. Special care has been taken to revise the style and improve upon it in other ways on a selective principle. In this process portions of the text have been recast or rewritten, and clarifications added with similar other changes. All such operations, carried out to a proportionately appreciable extent, have not, however led to any basic change of previous viewpoints or interpretations. A different plan of chapterisation was worked out, which accounts for seven chapters replacing the previous four, with introductory notes revised and modified in several instances. The previous Appendix appears in this monograph as a new chapter with a short note added to it. References have been collected from the body of the book and transferred to the end, being arranged in a serial order. A list of the Jātakas, specially noticed in the book, has been added as a new feature with fuller references for the convenience of readers. A noticeable change is the splitting of Chapter I into two separate ones. It should be noted here that Chapter III which includes a geographical list, based both on the "introductory episodes" and the Birth-stories, does not specifically refer to the two different sources as such. This was considered unnecessary as the names of places and their rulers occurring in the former are already separately given in Chapter II, which should make the distinction evident in the comprehensive context in the following chapter. References to verses as a source are provided in connection with the stories where they occur in most cases where these may not be otherwise clear.

It is to be added that: (a) extracts from the stories or other portions of the Collected Texts, and the English Translation, used with grateful acknowledgments, and also

those included in the 'Notes', are from Fausböll (F) or Cowell (C), if not otherwise shown ; and (b) proper names and some words like Bodhisattva are spelt as they occur both in Pali and Sanskrit, from which they have been quoted.

I am thankful to my Publishers, the Saraswat Library for accommodation. It was Dr. S. K. Mitra's active interest that persuaded me to launch the present venture. I am grateful to him and other friends for their sincere cooperation. To Dr. (Miss) Puspa Niyogi I am indebted for her systematic help, specially in proof-reading, checking of the references and doing the index. My wife, Sm. Bela Devi, whose favourite subjects are history and literature, helped me with interesting suggestions.

A few mistakes including misprints are noticed in 'Additions and Corrections'.

May 22, 1974.

40, Dr. Sarat Banerjee Road,
Calcutta-29.

Benoychandra Sen

ABBREVIATIONS

Ait. Br.	....	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa—trans. into English by A. B. Keith, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 25, 1920.
AIHT.	...	F. E. Pargiter, Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, London, 1920.
BBS.	..	T. W. Rhys Davids, Buddhist Birth Stories, London, 1880.
BR.	....	Dinesh Chandra Sen, The Bengali Ramayanas, Calcutta, 1920.
Bud. Ind.	....	T. W. Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, London, 1903.
C.	....	The Jātaka (English Translation) Ed. E. B. Cowell, Vols. I—VII : Vol. 1 (Nos. 1-150), Trans.—Robert Chalmers ; Vol. II (151-300) Trans.—W. H. D. Rouse ; Vol. III (301-438), Trans.—H. T. Francis & R. A. Neil ; Vol. IV (439-510), Trans.—W. H. D. Rouse ; Vol. V (511-537), Trans.—H. T. Francis ; Vol. VI (538-547), Trans.—E. B. Cowell & W. H. D. Rouse ; Index Volume.
CHI.	....	Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Ed.—E. J. Rapson.
CII.	....	E. Hultzsch, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. I (Inscriptions of Aśoka).
CL.	....	D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, 1918.
CLAI.	....	R. C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1920.
CR.	....	Calcutta Review.

DB.	....	Rhys Davids, Dialogues of Buddha.
DKB.	....	F. E. Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age—London, 1913.
EI.	....	Epigraphia Indica.
ERE.	....	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Ed. J. Hastings.
EIP.	....	Shama Sastri, Evolution of Indian Polity.
F.	....	V. Fausböll, The Jātaka together with its commentary (Texts), London : Vol. I, Nos. 1-150, Vol. II, Nos. 151-300, Vol. III, Nos. 301-438, Vol. IV, Nos. 439-510, Vol. V, Nos. 511-537, Vol. VI, Nos. 537-547. Index Vol.—Dines Andersen.
HIL.	....	M. Winternitz, History of Indian Literature (English trans. by Mrs. S. Ketkar).—Vols. I and II, Calcutta 1927, 1933.
HP.	....	K. P. Jayaswal, Hindu Polity, Calcutta, 1924.
IA.	....	Indian Antiquary.
J.	....	Jātaka.
JA.	....	Journal Asiatique.
JASB.	....	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JBORS.	....	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
JPASB.	....	Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JRAS.	....	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London.
KA.	...	Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, Ed. R. Shamasastry, Mysore, 1919.

KAT.	...	Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya (English Translation by R. Shama Sastry, 1929).
LGAI.		R. K. Mookerji, Local Government in Ancient India, Oxford, 1919.
MASI.		Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.
Matsya-P.		Matsya Purāṇa.
MBH. or Mbh.		Mahābhārata.
PE.		Pillar Edict.
PHAI.		H. C. Raychaudhuri, Political History of Ancient India, 2nd Ed. Calcutta.
PRAG.	...	Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Gottingen.
PRG.	....	A Pali Reader with Notes and Glossary, Part II—Glossary by Dines Andersen.
RE.	....	Rock Edict.
RLGI.	....	Ritual-Literature in Grundriss der Indo-Iran.
SBE.	....	Sacred Books of the East, Oxford.
SGNIB.	....	Richard Fick, Die soziale Gliederung im nordöstlichen Indien zu Buddhas Zeit Kiel, 1897. English trans. by S. K. Maitra : "The Social Organisation in North-East India in Buddha's time", Calcutta, 1920.
Vāyu-P.	....	Vāyu Purāṇa.
Ved. Ind.	....	A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, Vedic Index, London, 1912.
Viṣṇu-P.	..	Viṣṇu, Purāṇa.
VP.	...	Vinaya Piṭaka.
Watters.	.	On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, Vols. I and II. Translated by Thomas Watters, London, 1904-05.
ZDMG.	..	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesselschaft, Leipzig.

Chapter I

Pre-Buddhist Age and its End

Historical tradition in the Jātakas ; constituents of the Jātaka texts ; antiquity. Vedic, epic and Purāṇic traditions compared. Lack of chronology in legendary history. Successive periods broadly indicated in Jātaka narrations ; the earliest layer and the Vedic literature. Age of Kāsi's greatness : Kāsi and Pañcāla ; Kāsi and Kosala. The Age of the Buddha ; Magadha and Aṅga. '100 Brahmadattas' ; Bhīmaratha of Vidarbha ; the Bhoja kings ; Daṇḍaki and Dāṇḍakya ; Apacara and Upacara ; Janakavaṁsa : Mahājanaka I and Mahājanaka II. Prasenajit, Udayana, Pradyota. Dasaratha Jātaka. The Yudhiṭṭhila race, Vidhura Paṇḍita ; the Kṛṣṇa legend and Mathura ; the story of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā ; the Pāṇḍavas and Vaka. Lomasakassapa and Ṛṣyaśṛṅga ; Dasaratha and Piliyakkha ; Vessantara and Rāma.

One of the essential problems, with which we ought to concern ourselves in a work on political history, is undoubtedly the problem of chronology. Even a casual reader of the Jātakas, *i. e.*, the Buddhist Birth-stories, knows that it is vain to look for any data that may be strictly construed as chronological in respect of the historical tradition embodied in them. A careful analysis can at best lead to the discovery of some broad clues

which may be useful in indicating that the tradition is related partly to pre-Buddhist India and partly to the Age of the Buddha, which is also indicated in the deliberate planning of the form of the text, consisting of prose portions, mixed in varying proportions with verses relating *a story of the past*, with a preamble and a conclusion, both outside its frame. The word 'past', however, is to be understood in a relative sense as denoting quite an unspecified stretch of time preceding the age of the Buddha, which is to be vaguely guessed with the help of traditions collected from the Vedic, Purāṇic and epic sources. Although the historical materials, gleaned from these branches of Indian literature, stand generally uncorroborated by any independent authentic source, it is still worthwhile to put together the scattered and stray information to show the nature of the legendary tradition formed to preserve the political history of the far-off ages. The most important reason why Indian literary materials are generally held in disfavour by critical scholars is that the dates of composition of most of the works which represent ancient tradition, are either unknown, or are subjects of keen speculation. In India tradition is quickly formed, but unfortunately it is rarely preserved in its original shape. It goes on receiving accretions from age to age, so that ultimately the gulf is widened between fact and its legendary representation, between the original story and the mass of accumu-

lated wisdom in which it gradually loses itself, some times beyond recognition. The Jātakas in their present form, as used in this book, belong to a sort of commentary, a product of literary manipulation, grown out of scholarly labours in the 5th century A. D. or even later, being based on a nucleus which is very much older. Winternitz, who is not sure of the high antiquity which is some times claimed for the Jātakas, still admits that, in spite of its later date, the commentary has made use of very old materials.[1] It is held that 'at any rate it can be proved that already in the 3rd or 2nd century B. C. some of the Jātaka stories were told just as we find them in our Jātaka commentary.' Even some of the longest stories were selected for illustration in bas-reliefs of the 3rd century B. C. Now, if these had attained to such a high degree of prominence in that period that they could be easily selected as popular themes for representation in art, it may be safely concluded that they had already been familiar to the people for a reasonable length of time. A further proof for the antiquity of the Jātaka tales is found in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* which records that "the Buddha taught both by sūtras, and stanzas, and by legends and Jātakas".[2] No definite opinion can be pronounced about the exact state of the Jātaka narratives in his time. It may be wrong to emphasise that the current Jātaka versions with all their details existed at the time when

the stories were illustrated on stone. The *atīta-vatthu* portions in the Jātakas supposedly testify to an attempt to preserve older traditions in a later commentary. Consequently Rhys Davids may be partially right in his alternative suggestion that the political and social conditions, depicted in the Jātakas, 'refer for the most part to the state of things that existed in North India...*before the Buddha's time*'.[3] The tradition belonging to earlier chronological strata is to some extent preserved in folklore style in these portions and may for that reason be regarded as pre-Buddhist, but even then it is doubtful if such material has been preserved in its original form. Richard Fick's luminous work on the social organisation in Buddha's time (6th-5th century B. C.), on the other hand, is based almost entirely on the evidence of the Jātaka stories. The stand-point permitting such an exclusive use of the Jātaka materials of diverse sorts as representing the age of the Buddha or pre-Buddhist times may be exceptionable if it seeks to treat refashioned tradition *en masse* as part of a definitive history for one period, vaguely indicated by some of its allusions. It is difficult to believe that even the *past* tradition has been preserved in its original form and that it was not reshaped and modified by the general outlook of the Buddha's age or any subsequent period when the commentary was produced. We must admit that in the absence of the original literary forms of the Jātaka stories which may have

been definitely assigned to the 6th century B. C. or earlier, our estimate of the present texts as a source of history for the pre-Buddha period should be moderate. There should be no mistake in differentiating folklore from history although it is undeniable that valuable data may be often discerned in the Jātaka stories.

The dynastic portions in the Purāṇas are believed by some scholars to have been constituted by *ślokas*, originally composed in Prakrit, or in Pali, 'either originally or perhaps more probably by conversion.'[4] This theory may usefully serve as the starting-point of a comprehensive enquiry into the entire body of ancient Indian tradition, which was originally current in popular literary forms, but which was added to, modified or transformed by successive schools of writers suiting the tastes and requirements of the different ages, and in conformity with divergent ideals, sectarian or national.

In this chapter we propose to confine our attention to the earliest political tradition embodied in the Jātakas, and point out its kinship to matters of an allied character to be found in the Purāṇas, the epics, etc.

Famous kings of the *past* :

Among the famous kings, referred to in the epics and Purāṇas, 'were Māndhātṛ, Hariścandra, Sagara, Bhagīratha, Daśaratha and Rāma of Ayodhyā ;

Śaśabindu and Arjuna Kārtavīrya among Yādavas ; Duṣyanta, Bharata, Ajamīḍha, Kuru and Śāntanu among Pauravas ; Jahnu and Gādhi of Kānyakubja ; Divodāsa and Pratardana of Kāśi ; Vasu Caidya of Cedi and Magadha ; Marutta, Āvīkṣita and Tṛṇabindu of the Vaiśāla kingdom ; and Uśīnara and Śivi of the Panjab Ānavas.'[5] And again, '"eulogistic ballads are found as those in praise of Arjuna Kārtavīrya, etc.," in the Purāṇas.[6] Some of these names are also to be found in the Jātakas. 'Ajjuna of the thousand arms' is mentioned in the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka (522), Saṁkicca Jātaka (530) and Bhūridatta Jātaka (543). References to Sagara, Dujīpa, Bhagīrasa, Uśīnara, Puthujjana, Śivi, Vessamitta and Yāmataggi are also available. Cecca 'who once could tread the air,' mentioned in the Samkicca Jātaka (530), and also alluded to in the Cetiya Jātaka (422), is none other than Vasu Caidya of Cedi, noted in Pargiter's list. Others, known to the Jātakas, are Aṭṭhaka (522, 541, 544), Dhataraṭṭha (544), Daṇḍaki, the Mejjha king (497, 530, 599), Kalābu, king of Kāśi (Khantivādi-J. 313 and Sarabhaṅga-J.—522), Mucalinda (541) or Mujalinda (543), Assaka (207, 541) and Sela (541). The kings included in this list are those who have been distinctly spoken of in several gāthās as belonging to bygone days and cited in those verses as illustrations from past history.

Chronological stages :

It is interesting to observe that amongst these ancient princes some sort of a chronological distinction may possibly be drawn between those alluded to in *gāthās* alone, and those who are mentioned not only in association with them in such verses but also treated in detail in separate stories. Those belonging to the former class, *e. g.*, Sagara, Dujīpa, Bhagīrasa, Puthujjana (Pṛthu-vainya ?), Vessamitta, Yāmataggi and Ajjuna seem to be the most ancient rulers, among those mentioned in the whole Jātaka literature, about some of whom ballads were current in the country as shown by Pargiter in the course of his research in the Purāṇic literature. By the time, however, these verses were composed, those mighty names had been reduced to mere memories to conjure with. To some subsequent periods of our history may be assigned the following kings, about whom a few details have been preserved, although they are of a scrappy character and certainly of questionable authenticity :—Daśaratha and Rāma of Banaras (evidently a mistake for Ayodhyā), the five Pāṇḍavas with Ajjuna as the eldest, Vāsudeva of Dvāravatī, the Yudhiṭṭhila kings of Indapatta, Uśīnara, Śivi, some of the Brahmadattas of Banaras, the Janakas of Videha, Dummukha of Pañcāla, Naggaji of Gandhāra, etc. References to these rulers, occur without any indication of

their time in the recorded tradition. Some of them, whether real or fictitious, are mentioned in groups as contemporaries of one another. The Kumbhakāra Jātaka (408) makes Dummukha of Pañchāla, Naggaji of Gandhāra, Karaṇḍu of Kaliṅga and Nimi of Videha, contemporaneous with one another, and this testimony H. C. Raychaudhuri is inclined to accept as correct.[7] It is impossible to decide the question of the authenticity of this evidence ; there may be some truth in the tradition which agrees with available non-Pali accounts in a striking manner. It should be noted that one Dummukha Pañcāla is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa as having been consecrated by Ṛṣi Vāmadeva.[8] The Sarabhaṅga Jātaka informs us that a king of, Kaliṅga (mentioned simply as king Kāliṅga) turned an ascetic. The Kumbhakāra Jātaka, where the synchronism occurs, tells us that king Karaṇḍu of Kaliṅga became an ascetic and lived with Naggaji and Dummukha in the same cave. It may be supposed that these two Kaliṅga kings were one and the same person. A more significant instance of synchronism is come across in the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka. Here we are told that Bhīmaratha, Kaliṅga and Aṭṭhaka were subordinate to king Daṇḍaki. Of these, it should be remembered, Aṭṭhaka is already regarded within the range of the Jātaka literature itself as an ancient king and referred to as an inspiring example of ideal kingship in some places. If these references in the two Jātakas

give any reliable guidance it will have to be concluded that Naggaji, Bhimaratha, Nimi, Aṭṭhaka and Karaṇḍu were contemporary princes ruling at a time when king Daṇḍaki was the most prominent figure in the politics of Southern India. There is, however, one difficulty in the way which is by no means insoluble. In the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka there is an incidental reference to the town of Lambacūlaka in the *vijita* or province of Caṇḍapajjota, in a manner which may suggest that he was a contemporary of the group of kings mentioned above. But in the Indriya Jātaka (423) the name of this prince is given as Pajaka. From the nature of these references it appears probable that these two versions of the same story were actually current at differents times one in the time of Caṇḍapajjota and the other in that of Pajaka, and were afterwards incorporated into the present edition, though they had no real or vital relation with the main incidents narrated in the general story. It may be proposed to identify Pajaka with Ajaka, who reigned for 21 years and whose son Nandivardhana was the last Pradyota.[9]

Towards the end of this ancient period which cannot, however, be definitely located, Kāśi was an important political power, of which there are certain indications in some of the Jātakas. Kāśi at this stage dreamt of conquering Gandhāra in the North-West, and in the South she claims to have brought the country of Assaka under her control. One Kāśi

monarch is ambitious enough to indulge in a thought of 'universal conquest'. He brings a thousand kings as prisoners to his city, where they are put to death in a most cruel manner (Dhonasākha-J 353). In another story we are told that Banaras was once known as the chiefest city in the whole of India (243). Manoja (532), a king of Kāśī, subdued 101 kings, including those of Aṅga and Magadha, Avantī and Assaka. The chief dynasty of Kāśi, known to the Jātakas, was called Brahmadatta ; and we also hear of the Brahmadattas of Aṅga, Assaka, and Pañcāla, etc.[10] One Jātaka (505) informs us that at one time Uttara-Pañcāla was included within the dominions of the Kurus.[11]

Macdonell and Keith state in the *Vedic Index* that in the Vedic literature the Kuru-Pañcālas are often expressly referred to as a united nation.[12] H.C. Raychaudhuri draws our attention to the 166th chapter of the Ādiparva of the Mahābhārata where it is mentioned 'that Uttara-Pañcāla was wrested from the Pañcālas by the Kurus and given away to their preceptor.'[13] We hear of one Arindama Sanasrata, a *mahārāja,* in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, who may be identified, for aught we know, with one Arindama, mentioned in the Sonaka-J. (529).

The next age indicated is prominently characterised by conflicts between neighbouring states in Northern India and in some parts of the peninsula also. One of the chief features of this period was

the uncertain and shifting nature of the political issues which could not be permanently settled by a kind of intermittent warfare. A temporary annexation of the enemy's kingdom could not be a guarantee for complete cessation of mutual hostilities, and so long as an effective cure was not found and applied, the political atmosphere continued to hold, in a state of suspended animation, the forces of a vital transformation, soon to burst upon the country and bring a mighty imperial organisation into existence.

We can here and there mark a spirit of propagandism, which deliberately seeks to protect the sanctity of specially favourite countries like Kāśi, where the Master turned the Wheel of the Law, even though the forces of history have already begun to operate in a reverse direction by proclaiming their political downfall.

Kāśi and Kosala :

When a Kāśi king is taken prisoner by Kosala, he invariably develops mystic meditations and the Kosalan king, out of fear and in a spirit of repentance, sets him free and restores his kingdom. Whatever may be the spiritual values of a system of meditation that gives consolation even in the most tragic moments of life and induces reverence in the enemy, the historian is to understand from these stories only that a new political order has

already begun to dawn upon the country. Thus the instability and indefiniteness which characterised the attempts of an earlier age was gradually disappearing from the disturbed political scene in a large part of Northern India.

Magadha and Aṅga :

Signs of a significant change in the political map are unmistakably visible when a king of Aṅga defeats a certain Magadhan monarch, who out of shame, jumps into the river Campā to commit suicide, but is finally set over the two kingdoms of Aṅga and Magadha by a Nāga king who receives a tribute in return for his services. It may not perhaps be imposisble to read into this legend an allusion to the rise of the first historical dynasty of Magadha where the influence of the Nāgas may be traced as a probable factor.[14]

A new set-up :

The attitude of Kosala also undergoes a radical change. The virtues which its king Mallika, cultivates are strikingly those of an aggressive monarch, determined to have his way (Rajovāda-J. 151). "Several successful invasions of Kāśi by the Kosalans under the kings Vaṅka, Dabbasena and Kaṁsa, are referred to a date before the Buddha's time. And the final conquest would seem to be ascribed to

Kaṁsa, as the epithet 'Conqueror of Benares' is a standing addition to his name."[15]

We are thus gradually drifted to a stage which is chronologically the last, as represented in greater detail in the Jātakas, where a settled order emerges out of the chaos and vagueness of the preceding age—such a picture, though of a doubtful value, of contemporary political history is furnished however, in the *paccupannavatthu* portion of the Jātaka literature, preserving for us the memories of an age, spiritually dominated by the Buddha and politically by Mahākosala and Pasenadi of Kosala, Bimbisāra and Ajātasattu of Magadha, Udaya of Kosāmbi and Caṇḍapajjota of Avanti. It must be pointed out, however, that this portion in the Jātaka literature is based on early traditions, though as some scholars have shown, they were compiled at a much later date. In this age Kāśi came to form an integral part of the kingdom of Kosala, and Bhaṭṭiya's son, Bimbisāra Seniya of Magadha annexed Aṅga by killing its last monarch Brahmadatta.[16]

Early history of Banaras :

Certain instances of Jātaka correspondence with the Purāṇas and the epics have already been noticed in connection with the chronological problem. Here we shall point out a few more cases without however, committing ourselves to an admission of

the historicity of the information supplied. Amongst the kings of Banaras, who are generally mentioned not under their individual names but under the dynastic name "Brahmadatta," D. R. Bhandarkar has identified Viśvakṣena and Udakṣena of the Purāṇas with Vissasena and Udayabhadda of the Jātakas respectively, and king Bhallaṭiya of Banaras, mentioned in the Bhallāṭiya Jātaka, with the Bhallāṭa of the Purāṇas. There is no cogent reason that may be offered in support of this view; the agreement in the names is not after all a very convincing argument. Viśvakṣena, Udakṣena and Bhallāṭa are names of three kings of South Pañcāla according to the Purāṇas.[17] But the Jātaka names are those of Kāśi kings. 'Brahmadatta,' the familiar title of Kāśi monarchs, mentioned in the Jātakas, is the name of the immediate predecessor of Viśvakṣena. That may go to support Dr. Bhandarkar's theory to some extent. It is interesting that a king called Cūlanī-Brahmadatta, noted in the Rāmāyaṇa,[18] is also mentioned in the Mahā Ummaga Jātaka (546).

100 Brahmadattas :

The Sabhāparva of the Mahābhārata[19] refers to the 'hundred Brahmadattas'-'*Śatañca Brahmadattānām*' and we have in the Jātakas numerous kings of that name. The name of Māndhātā occurs as that of a king of Cedi, but the Purāṇic tradition

assigns him to the royal dynasty of Ayodhyā making him a son of Yuvanāśva II and a remote descendent of Vikukṣi. Bhīmaratha, referred to in the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka,[19] is most probably a South Indian king. He was subordinate to king Daṇḍaki. We hear of a Bhoja Bhīmaratha in the 8th chapter of the Sabhāparva. A descendant of Vidarbha, named Bhīmaratha, is noted in the Vāyu Purāṇa. There is another Bhīmaratha, mentioned in the Vāyu Purāṇa.[20] He is a king of Banaras and is also known by the name of Divodāsa *(Divodāsa iti khyāto Vārāṇasyādhipaḥ)*. Bhoja Bhīmaratha of the Mahābhārata may be the same as Bhīmaratha mentioned in the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka. There seems to be much truth in the theory that, though they were principally associated with the country of Vidarbha, a line of Bhojas ruled separately in Daṇḍaka as well. "Kālidasa in his *Raghuvaṁsa*[21] calls the king of Vidarbha a Bhoja. But Vidarbha was not the only Bhoja State. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa refers to several Bhoja kings of the South. "A line of Bhojas must have ruled in Daṇḍaka." It was certainly in the country of Daṇḍaka that king Daṇḍaki ruled with his capital at Kumbhāvatī.[22]

Jātaka Daṇḍakī and Dāṇḍakya of Kauṭilya :

One may be tempted to identify him with the Bhoja king Daṇḍaki, who is spoken of as having

brought about the extinction of his family and kingdom "*Dāṇḍakyo nāma Bhojaḥ kāmāt Brāhmaṇa-kanyāmabhimanyamānas sabandhurāṣṭro vinanāśa*"[23] According to the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka the cause of the extermination was not a "lascivious attempt on a Brahmin girl" but an offence to a Brahmin ascetic.

The identity of Apacara or Upacara of Ceti, or simply Cecca, with Caidya Uparicara Vasu, may be easily accepted. According to the Purāṇas Vasu had five sons *viz.*, Bṛhadratha, Pratyagra, Kuśamba, Māvella and Matsya, to each of whom is given the credit of founding a new kingdom.[24] The Jātaka version is substantially the same. According to it Upacara of Ceti perished with his kingdom and his five sons founded five different kingdoms at the advice of a Brahmin who had turned an ascetic since his retirement from the post of royal chaplain.

Janakavaṁśa :

With regard to the Videhan line it may be pointed out that the Jātakas knew of more than one Janaka reigning at Mithilā. This is in striking agreement with the Purāṇic references to the *Janakavaṁśa* or the Janaka dynasty of Videha. Ancient tradition regards Kalāra Janaka or Kṛti as the last of the Janakas and this is corroborated by the Jātakas. Regarding the identification of Mahā-

janaka I with Janaka, father of Sītā of the Rāmāyaṇa, the philosopher-king of the Vedic literature, proposed by Dr. Raychaudhuri, we are afraid, the theory does not seem to be supported by strong reasons. The Jātakas do not give any information as regards Mahājanaka *the First* ; the only point mentioned about him is that he was the father of two sons, Ariṭṭhajanaka and Polajanaka. On the other hand, Mahājanaka *the Second* is a towering and well-marked personality, as having had a unique career in his early years, and in the later part of his life exhibiting a great spirit of renunciation. Though the Purāṇic and epic accounts do not supply any information of historical value regarding the early life of Janaka, yet by representing him as a philosopher of great repute, they show a good deal of kinship with the Jātaka tradition about the transformation of his character and outlook which occurred towards the end of his life. Moreover, when we consider the parallelism existing between a verse, to which Mahājanaka the Second is said to have given utterance, and another attributed to Janaka in the Mahābhārata, we feel strongly inclined to take Mahājanaka II as identical with Janaka—a view which seems to have been entertained by Rhys Davids. The Purāṇas mention a certain Ariṣṭanemi, who occupies the 73rd place in the list of the Videhan monarchs. He is the son of Ṛtujit. Raychaudhuri's attempt to identify Ariṣṭanemi with

Ariṭṭhajanaka does not appear to be plausible. Ariṣṭanemi's predecessor is Ṛtujit and successor Śrutāyus, but the Mahājanaka Jātaka mentions Ariṭṭhajanaka as having been preceded by his father Mahājanaka (who may be conveniently described as Mahājanaka I), and succeeded first by his brother Polajanaka and after his death by his son Mahājanaka II, who in our opinion is none other than the great Janaka mentioned in the epic literature. Neither the Purāṇas nor the Jātakas knew of Māthava Videgha, mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[25] It is, however, noteworthy that the Purāṇas explain the origin of 'Videha' and 'Mithilā'. In doing so they mention a king called Mithi. One Jātaka (541) indicates Makha as the earliest of the Videhan kings. This Makha may be identical with the Purāṇic Mithi. We fail to see how the name Māthava Videgha can be taken as equivalent to Makhadeva, but if the identity is to be accepted, we must have to thank Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri for making an interesting suggestion.[26]

References to Prasenajit[27], Udayana[28] and Pradyota[29] mentioned in the Purāṇic literature can be traced in some Jātakas, but they are more or less of a casual nature (*e. g.*, 'Udaya gave.....' ; 'Pasenadi's dreams' ; 'the town Lambacūlaka in the kingdom of Caṇḍapajjota', etc.).

There is a large body of tradition about various kings and princes, scattered in the whole literature

of the Jātakas, which in some cases bear evident resemblances to the epic and Purāṇic stories, but in other instances reveal, on a closer study, some striking points of difference. Stories which we find in their expanded, artificial and complex forms in the epics and the Purāṇas, are met with in the Jātaka literature, not as mere replicas, but with notable peculiarities in a much simpler garb, giving them a distinct stamp of originality and probably also indicating an independent source for them.

The question of the relationship between the Buddhist tradition on one hand, and the Purāṇic and epical history on the other, has been tackled by some eminent scholars, European and Indian. Such a discussion does not fall within the purview of the present thesis, and we humbly confess our inability to hazard here any opinion on a subject, which has puzzled so many historians of repute, without personally examining all the available materials, embodied in the entire literature, Buddhist, Jaina and Hindu, a task which is not being undertaken in the present context.

Here we shall content ourselves with an enumeration of the various parallelisms which may be noticed between some of the traditions preserved in the Jātakas and those contained in the Purāṇas and the epics, relating to ancient Indian princes, without commenting on claims to priority or the vexed question of origin or sources. We

believe, we should also refer in this connection to some of the leading theories on the subject of the inter-relation between the epics and their Jātaka versions in order to indicate the present stage of our research, so far as this topic is concerned.

The Dasaratha Jātaka and the Rāmāyaṇa :

The Dasaratha Jātaka (461) gives a version of the Rāmāyaṇa legend, but according to it Rāma *Paṇḍita's* mother was dead when his father took another wife whose son was Bharata Kumāra. Rāma had one uterine brother named Lakkhaṇa and a sister called Sītā. There is no reference to his contact with Rāvaṇa. As a matter of fact, according to the Dasaratha Jātaka, the exiled princes Rāma and Lakkhaṇa (Laksmaṇa) together with their *sister* Sītā had never gone to the South, but to the Himalayas where they lived in the forest. Dasaratha has been mentioned as a king of Banaras, which is probably due to the fact that the Jātakas, as a rule, as we have shown elsewhere, are inclined to show special favour to this country. A gāthā (Jayaddisa-J. 513), however indicates its knowledge of the *epic association of Rāma with the Daṇḍaka forest* and of his mother having been alive at the time of his departure from his capital.

The points which seem to have been overlooked by Weber are, firstly, that Lakkhaṇa and Sītā came back to Kāśi before the expiry of the full term,

Rāma remaining in the forest to complete the period appointed, and secondly, that there is another passage cited above where Rāma's exile in the Daṇḍaka forest is clearly alluded to. In the opinion of Weber, "the Dasaratha Jātaka is the old Buddhistic Saga of the pious prince Rāma, which glorified him as an ideal of Buddhist equanimity, afterwards cast by the skilful hand of Vālmīki into a form." He further holds that in addition to the Buddhistic legend it is beyond question that Vālmīki must have had access to other materials for his work.[30] According to Keith[31] the Jātaka is an attempt to turn the Rāma story to pious purposes, and it cannot be held to be an older version or source of the Rāmāyaṇa. In regard to a verse that has been found in this Jātaka agreeing with another in the Rāmāyaṇa, Jacobi concludes that the epic is the source of the Pali verse, while the opposite theory has been maintained by others. Lüders argues for a Prakrit original form for the old verses in such cases. D. C. Sen[32] supports Weber and seeks to find out certain definite factors other than Buddhistic that possibly contributed to the making of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. According to Winternitz, the authors of the ancient Buddhist texts in the fourth and third centuries B. C. had as yet no knowledge of the Rāmāyaṇa, but "they knew ballads utilised by Vālmīki for his Rāma epic and.....on the other hand, the Rāmāyaṇa was

influenced, at least indirectly, by Buddhism."[33] It is, however, difficult to agree with the learned scholar in supposing that the *gāthās* only constitute the original portions of the Dasaratha Jātaka (461) and that the entire prose narrative is the fabrication of the compilers of the commentary (about the 5th century A. D.).[34] There is no definite evidence in support of this view. The existence of a number of different versions of some of the important episodes of the Rāmāyaṇa throws welcome light on the nature of Vālmīki's labours and the materials on which he worked. The Pāṇḍavas are referred to in a Jātaka (536) as sons of Pāṇḍu, Ajjuna being the eldest. It illustrates the alleged insincerity and lust of their common wife and informs us that the disclosure of the disloyalty of the wife made them serious, and they finally renounced the world in utter disgust. It is noteworthy that the story does not make any reference to the Great War of the Mahābhārata, or the Pāṇḍavas' connection with Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa or the death of Jarāsandha. It does not mention also that another name of Ajjuna was Dhanañjaya.

The Yudhiṭṭhila race of the Kuru country with its capital at Indapatta is, however, not infrequently referred to, and we are occasionally told that Dhanañjaya reigned in the city of Indapatta in the kingdom of Kuru.

Vidhurapaṇḍita :

In the Sambhava-J. (515) Banaras is made the home of Vidhurapaṇḍita, 'the wisest man of the age.'

The Kṛṣṇa legend --connection with Mathura :

Another interesting parallelism is supplied by the Jātaka recording the circumstance of the death of Kaṁsa,[35] the glories attained by the ten sons of Devagabbhā with Vāsudeva as the eldest and Baladeva his younger, and the manner of the destruction of the whole royal house of Dvārāvatī. Vāsudeva is only a powerful warrior and a great king ; he has not even sufficient self-control for checking his feelings at the death of his dear son ; and some wise sayings of his brother Ghaṭa Paṇḍita who acts as the Bodhisattva in this Jātaka, restore him to his normal peace of mind. Vāsudeva's father is Upasāgara, a gallant prince from North Mathura. Thus the Purāṇic association of Vāsudeva with Mathura was known. Nandagopa is the maid-servant of his mother and Andhaka-veṇhu, her husband, is a male attendant. A peculiar story is told by a parrot in a Jātaka (546), that Vāsudeva married a Caṇḍāla woman named Jambāvatī who became the chief queen and gave birth to Sivi who was established on the throne of Dvārāvatī after his father's death.[36] In an illus-

trative *gāthā* we are told that 'the men of Viṣṇu race with Andhakas sought Yama's realm' for having offended the sage Dīpāyana, which is in agreement with the Purāṇic account of the end of the famous Yādavas.

The story of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā can be traced in the Kaṭṭhahāri Jātaka (7), (the similarity has already been noticed by others) where king Brahmadatta, while having gone to his park, 'was roaming about looking for fruits and flowers, happened to meet a woman 'who was merrily singing away as she picked up sticks in the grove.' "Falling in love at first sight, the king became intimate with her, and the Bodhisattva was conceived then and there." He gave her the signet ring from his finger and told her if a son was born she was to bring the ring and the child to him. When the king afterwards could not recognise the mother of the boy, there was a mysterious occurrence, followed by a prompt recognition of the child named Kaṭṭhavāhana as his own son and the acceptance of his mother as the queen-consort. After the death of the king, Kaṭṭhavāhana ascended the throne having filled the post of viceroy during his life-time. An allusion to this story is also briefly made in the preamble of the Jātaka (465) by the Buddha.

In the Devadhamma Jātaka (6) we find a legend which closely resembles the memorable story of the Pāṇḍavas' encounter with Vaka, given in the

Mahābhārata. Three sons of king Brahmadatta, Mahiṁsāsa, Prince Moon and Prince Sun, went to forest with a view to escape from a dangerous palace intrigue. In the course of their journey they halted at a place, where the eldest brother took his seat at the foot of a tree and asked Prince Sun to fetch water from a neighbouring pool. The prince, as soon as he got down to bring water, was seized by the Water-sprite, who said to him, "Do you know what is truly god-like?" The prince failed to answer the question; he was made a prisoner and kept in the abode of the Yakkha. Prince Moon was next sent and he also shared the same fate. Next came the eldest prince Mahiṁsāsa in quest of his missing brothers; he solved the question rightly and rescued his two brothers.

The Lomasakassapa Jātaka (433) substantially agrees with the epic story of Romapāda, king of Aṅga, performing a sacrifice with the help of a Kāśyapa named Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and giving his daughter Śāntā in marriage to him, The point of discrepancy is that in the Jātaka version Lomasakassapa, the great ascetic, overcame his passion while the sacrifice was in progress and went away without marrying the daughter of a Brahmadatta of Banaras.

In the Sāma Jātaka (540) we have the story of a blind hunter, whose only son, Suvaṇṇasāma, while engaged in filling a water-vessel from the Migasammatā river, was shot by the poisoned arrow of

Piliyakkha, king of Banaras, who had mistaken him for a Nāga, thus offering a close parallel to the story of the blind sage, killed by Dasaratha of Ayodhyā, which we find in the Rāmāyaṇa.

In the Vessantara Jātaka (547) we find Prince Vessantara being banished from his father's kingdom—a situation closely resembling that of Rāma's exile from Ayodhyā. We must, however, remember that in this story the prince is forced to leave his father's kingdom by the pressure of public opinion against him, which is a notable point of difference from the Rāma story in the Rāmāyaṇa. This prince's advice to his wife Maddī to remain at home and not to follow him to the forest ; the earnest appeal, which she so effectively made for her husband's companionship in spite of the possible dangers attending it ; her ultimate success ; the lamentations of the prince's mother Phusatī, all these are undoubted points of resemblance.[37] Some minor parallels have been noticed by Lüders and Winternitz.[38] In most of these cases similarity of sentiments and also of situations is observable in a striking degree. The story of Usīnara's feeding a vulture and that of Sivi's presenting his two eyes to a Brahmin (499) seem to have been amalgamated to form the basis of the well-known Purāṇic legend about Śivi-Auśinarī. A few other parallel situations and ideas are also noticeable. But as they are of a comparatively insignificant character, it is not necessary

to mention them in this general review. There is a striking agreement between the legend, relating to a certain king of Videha in the 13th canto of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa and that relating to Nimi, found in the Nimi Jātaka (541). In this connection reference may be made to the discussion that took place between Bhīṣma, the *Kuruvara* or the best of the Kurus, and a Brahmin from the country of Kaliṅga, according to a legend of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa[39], which shows a clear affinity to the Kurudhamma Jātaka. The episode of the encounter of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma with two stalwarts, appointed by Kaṁsa, as described in the Ghaṭa Jātaka (454), may be studied along with the account, given in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, with interest.[40] The Yakkha general Puṇṇaka speaks of a precious jewel belonging to the 'universal monarch' in the Vepulla mountain near the city of Rājagaha, which puts us in mind of a similar object, which is said to have come into possession of king Jarāsandha through Bṛhadratha, as mentioned in the Mahābhārata. Jarāsandha made 101 kings prisoners for the purpose of sacrificing them. Curiously, in the Jātakas we hear of more than one king, thinking of putting to death the same number of kings or even more, after having imprisoned them as captives of war.

Chapter II

Historical Tradition and the Age of the Buddha

Paccupannavatthu in the Jātakas. Its depiction of the history of Buddha's time. The Sakkas (Śākyas)—their constitution and government; relations with the Koliyas; Pasenadi of Kosala, the Kosalan embassy; Viḍuḍabha and his visit to the Sakkas; independence of the Sakkas. The Licchavis and their constitution; '500 kings'; a verse in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. The Mallas; Bandhula, the Mallian; a plot to assassinate him; palace-intrigue in Kosala. Udena (Udayana) of Kosāmbi; his connection with the Bhaggas; the Kokanada palace. Political ideas of the Buddha; external relations and internal peace; his conception of an organisation of workers for the promotion of non-violence.

On some of the events of political interest, and details regarding contemporary kings and peoples in the age of the Buddha, much light is thrown by the introductory episodes in the *Paccupannavatthu* portions of the Jātakas. There are copious references to Mahākosala and his son Pasenadi, to Bimbisāra and Ajātasattu, and in a much less prominent manner, to Udayana. We hear of the Śākyas of Kapilavatthu, the Mallas of Kusinārā, the Licchavis of Vaiśālī and the Koliyas, who were the immediate neighbours of the Śākyas.

The introductory episode of the Vesssantara Jātaka (547) tells us that the Śākyas were 'a proud and stiff-necked race' *(mānajātiyā mānatthaddhā).* The Śākyas, who assemble to receive the Buddha on a particular occasion, are called *Sākyarājāno* and he was their *ñātiseṭṭha,* 'the chief of their clan.' The princes and the princesses *(rājakumāre ca rājakumāriyo ca)* who welcomed him, did not at first consider him to be worthy of their respect as he was their younger. The king *(Rājā)* was the first to do obeisance to him and his example was followed by all others present.

The preamble of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka (465) mentions that the Śākyas lived in a territory, subject to the authority of the king of Kosala *(Kosalarañño āṇāpavattiṭṭhāne vasāma).* Due to this fact, though they were extremely proud of their racial purity, they could not afford to be discourteous to the embassy of the Kosalan monarchy, inviting them to offer him one of their daughters in marriage. They were not prepared to provoke his enmity by an act of incivility on their part *(dārikaṁ na dassāma mahantaṁ veram bhavissati).* The Śākyas assembled together to deliberate as to the steps that were to be taken in response to the message sent by Pasenadi. Vāsabhakhattiya, daughter of Mahānāma by a slave woman, is described by the Buddha as a king's daughter *(rājadhitā),* and by Pasenadi as the

Śākya king's daughter *(Sākyarājadhitā)* ; Vāsābha-khattiyā herself is reported to have represented to her son Viḍūḍabha that his grandsires were Śākya kings *(tāta, tava Sākyarājāno mātāmahā)*.

Viḍūḍabha, after his installation as king, set out with a large army with the object of destroying the whole Śākya community. He saw the Buddha seated beneath a tree at a place near Kapilavatthu, and hard by that spot there was a shady banyan tree that stood on the boundary of Viḍūḍabha's realm *(Kapilavatthusāmante.....rukkhamule ; tato avidūre Viḍūḍabhassa rājjasīmāya.....nigrodharukkho)*. In Samuddavijaya Jātaka (466) Devadatta, cousin of the Buddha, laments in a soliloquy that he is forsaken by the multitude of Śākya kings *(Śākyarājakulehi)*. A wholesale massacre of the Śākyas was perpetrated by Viḍūḍabha. "King Viḍūḍabha slew all the Śākyas beginning with babes at the breast" (465).

There was once a quarrel between the Śākyas and Koliyas over the question of the use of the water of the river Rohiṇī, which flowed between the cities of Kapilavatthu and Koliya, for agricultural purposes. The quarrel had been started by the peasants of the two cities, and their kings were getting prepared for a war. In the course of the altercation the peasants of Koliya insulted the Śākyas, saying "Be off with your people of Kapilavatthu, men who like dogs, jackals and such like beasts, cohabited with their own sisters"

(.....*tumhe kavāsike gahetvā gacchatha, ye soṇa-sigālādayo viya attano bhaginīhi saddhiṁ vasiṁsu*). But the Śākyas were evidently proud of their custom, condemned by the Koliyas. "We shall show them how strong and mighty are the men who cohibited with their sisters," said the Śākya labourers when they sallied forth to meet the Koliyas in a battle (*bhaginīhi saddhiṁ saṁvāsikānam thānañ ca balaṁ ca dassessāmā*).[41]

When the dispute had first originated, it was reported by the Koliyas and the Śākyas to the ministers who were in charge of matters, apparently relating to the management and control of the river Rohiṇi, the superintendence of the dam, etc., who again brought it to the notice of the Rājakulas, *i. e.* members of the community of the kings (*tasmiṁ kamme niyutta-amaccānaṁ kathesuṁ amaccā rājakulānaṁ kathesuṁ*).

Finally, the decision was taken that the dispute had to be settled by war. The Buddha who came to prevent the imminent outbreak had to address the *Rājās* who were engaged in making military preparations. The two cities of Koliya and Kapilavatthu each handed over to the Buddha 250 Kumāras or princes (*ubhayanagaravāsino addhateyyāni addhateyyāni kumāraśatāni adamsu*). Buddha was claimed by the Śākyas as the best of their kinsmen (*amhakam ñātiseṭṭho*). Had he not left the world as an ascetic, he would have had an escort of Khattiyas (*tato khattiyaparivāra*

abhavissa, Kunāla-J. 536). The history of the origin of the famous quarrel between the two tribes is given differently in another traditional account, to be found in the same Jātaka, where the following occurs, "gradually the people of the two cities, the serfs and the labourers, the attendants, headmen, councillors and viceroys, all of them sallied forth ready for battle" *(ubhayanagaravāsino dasakammakara c' eva sevakabhojakāmacca-uparājāno ca)*. But the Jātaka accepts the previous version as true and reject this one as unworthy of credence.

After gleaning above the various points which struck us as important in connection with the Śākyas and their relation with other countries, we shall now attempt to discuss briefly the views, put forward by some scholars, regarding the form of government that prevailed among the Śākyas and the exact nature of the connection that existed between them and the Kosalas.

With regard to the first point it should be mentioned that Rhys Davids is of the opinion that the "administrative and judicial business of the Śākya clan was carried out in a public assembly" and "that it was at such a parliament that king Pasenadi's proposition *(i. e. marriage proposal)* was discussed." He further holds that 'a single chief—how, and for what period chosen,—we do not know,—was elected as office-holder, presiding over the sessions and, if no session were sitting,

over the State. He bore the title of *Rājā*, which must have meant something like the Roman Consul or the Greek 'Archon'[42]. It appears to be essentially important for the present discussion to know what was the definite position of the Chief, the existence of whose office has been imagined by Rhys Davids, in view of the fact that the title '*Rājā*' was amongst the Śākyas not the monopoly of a single person but was applied to many. It seems that there was some thing like a *fraternity of Rājās* and that one of them was invested with some superior powers for the sake of administrative convenience.

D. R. Bhandarkar, while discussing the character of the Śākya constitution at some length, lays much emphasis on a passage in the Vinaya Piṭaka,[43] according to which at one time Bhaddiya, a young cousin of the Buddha, was the king of the Śākyas. In his opinion the preambles of the Jātakas are of a much later age than the Vinaya Piṭaka, and cannot, therefore, be relied upon when they oppose the testimony of the canonical text.[44] He concludes that the Śākyas were in truth ruled by a hereditary king, a full-fledged monarch, and summarily dismisses Rhys Davids' theory that their government was carried on by a Chief with the help of a parliament.

We must frankly confess that we do not understand the reason why Bhandarkar has rejected the testimony of the Jātaka preambles in this particular

case, and also fail to see in what respects it contradicts the evidence of the Vinaya Piṭaka, on which the learned professor places so much reliance. In discarding the Jātaka evidence he has, we are afraid, hardly done justice to the other materials brought forward by Rhys Davids in this connection. In many cases the traditions, embodied in the introductory portions of the Jātakas, have been found to preserve much genuine historical material ; hence one has to offer specific reasons to show why the traditions in respect of the Śākyas in particular have represented them wrongly as supposed by Bhandarkar. R. C. Majumdar, who had no opportunity to fully examine Bhandarkar's view when his book 'Corporate Life in Ancient India' was published, strongly advocated the theory that the Śākyas had a non-monarchical constitution. According to him, they were governed in the same manner as the Licchavis. He points out that the number of kings in the Śākya territory 'is not definitely stated but must be held to have been considerable in view of the fact that 250 princes were offered as escorts for the Buddha'[45]. K. P. Jayaswal substantially agrees with the view of Rhys Davids, which we have summed up above, and adds that the Buddha's father was the President of the Śākya *gaṇa*.[46] We must, however, refrain from indulging in wide generalisations regarding the exact character of the Śākya constitution which are not warranted by

the insufficient materials available on the subject. Certain features of that constitution will remain hidden from us so long as positive data are not forthcoming, although it is possible to be satisfied that it differed from monarchy, being a special type of republic. On the whole Rhys Davids' view seems to be reasonably in accord with the Jātaka tradition. One more point should be noticed here. 'Though the Jātaka mentions *uparājāno* or viceroys, we are not prepared, however, to agree with Majumdar in holding 'that this makes it probable that like the Licchavi *rājās*, the Śākya *rājās* were also heads of minor administrative units.[47] It should be pointed out that the Jātaka in question does not mention in its lists the *rājās* along with the *uparājās*, not to speak of the *senāpatis* and *bhaṇḍāgārikas* — an omission which is certainly significant, restraining us from drawing wide inferences and seeking to establish analogies on the basis of them.

On the question whether the Śākyas were enjoying independence or not during the period alluded to, the opinion of scholars, again, is divided. According to one view the Śākyas were dependent upon Kosala as suggested by an evidence,[48] to which R. C. Majumdar draws our attention, and according to another, 'the Śākyas owed some honorary dues' to the Kosala kingdom.[49] Probably the truth of the matter lies in the mean.

Unquestionably, the Kosalas were more powerful than the Śākyas during this age, and admitting

that Kosala had extended their suzerainty over the Śākyas, it cannot be shown that this was of a very real character. The Śākyas in all likelihood continued to enjoy a large measure of independence with their old administrative system adjusted to the new situation arising out of their relations with Kosala. We cannot explain how Pasenadi thought it proper to send an envoy to the Śākyas if they were not regarded as an autonomous or independent people.

Vesāli under the Licchavis enjoyed a good deal of reputation as an extremely prosperous and well-defended city. We are told that 'a triple wall encompassed the city, a league distance from the next and there were three gates with watch-towers.' (*Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka, No. 149, Vesālinagaraṁ gāvuta-gāvutantare tīhi pākārehi parikkhittaṁ tīsu ṭhānesu gopuraṭṭālakayuttaṁ,* etc.,...the distance between one wall and another being a *gāvuta* or a cow's call); and again, in that city there were always 7,707 kings to govern the kingdom and a like number of viceroys, generals and treasurers (*Tattha niccakālaṁ rajjaṁ kāretvā vasantānaṁ yeva —cf. rājūnaṁ sattasahassāni sattasatāni satta ca rājāno honti, tattakā yeva uparājāno tattakā senāpatino tattakā bhaṇḍāgārikā*). The statement that there were 7,707 kings is repeated in the Cullakaliṅga-J. (No. 301—*Vesāliyam kira Licchāvi rājunaṁ vasiṁsu*). The Licchavi kings of Vesāli once mounted in 500 chariots to capture Bandhula,

the Mallian, who had violated the sanctity of a tank which was protected by "a strong guard within and without...and by an iron net which was spread above it, so that not even a bird could find room to get through (465)." This was the famous tank in the city of Vesāli where its *Gaṇa community of rulers (Gaṇarājakula)* used to get water for the ceremonial sprinkling (*abhiṣeka-maṅgala-Pokkharaṇi*,—No. 465).[50] There is a story of a Licchavi prince and his wife in the Bāhiya Jātaka (108).[51]

The constitution of the Licchavis, so far as we can see from the evidence, supplied by the Jātakas, is an engima to us. Rhys Davids took 7,707 *Rājās* as representing an equal number of chiefs, but he did not attempt to define the characteristics of this peculiar system of government. D. R. Bhandarkar and R. C. Majumdar undertook, several years ago, to solve the question with all seriousness and seems to have worked out a common theory. Majumdar writes in his 'Corporate Life' that "while the number 7,707 may be dismissed as a purely conventional one, it may be accepted that the supreme assembly of the state consisted of a large number of members..... Each member of the supreme assembly possesed a full suite of officers, requisite for the administration of a state.....the whole state consisted of a number of administrative units, each of which was a state in miniature by itself—and possessed

a complete administrative machinery." To Bhandarkar it appears that the Licchavi kings had each his separate principality where he exercised supreme power in certain respects with the help of his *uparāja, senāpati* and *bhaṇḍāgārika.* He is of opinion that the Licchavi *gaṇa* 'was a federation of the heads of some of the clans constituting the tribe.'[52]

K. P. Jayaswal makes a mistake in the passage that he has quoted from the Ekapaṇṇa-J. (149),[53] and if this mistake were not committed, we are sure, he would have given us a considerably altered outline of the Licchavi constitution. There is no *'tattakā'* after *'rājāno honti'* in the text in the same manner as shewn in the extract, and so the following translation by Jayaswal is, in our humble judgment, faulty : 'They became President *(Rājāno),* Vice-Presidents *(Uparājāno),* Commanders-in-chief *(Senāpatino)* and Chancellors of the Exchequer *(Bhaṇḍāgārikā).*' The expression *'rājāno honti'* is a part of the preceding sentence, with which it is closed, while the rest of the passage informs us of a different matter from what is said in the previous sentence. How can these 7,707 Rājās, again, be *Uparājās, Bhaṇḍāgārikās* and *Senāpatis* ? Jayaswal is disposed to believe that 7,707 was the number of the inhabitants, probably the 'foundation families' who comprised the ruling class and out of them the four highest administrative officers were appointed, who formed

the Cabinet or Executive authority. How then are these four highest posts mentioned in the plural number in representing the normal constitution of the State ? It is difficult to agree that the passge in question is capable of lending itself to the interpretation proposed by the disinguished historian of Hindu Polity.

The number of kings of the Licchavis is not actually given as 500, as shown in Cowell's translation, but what the text clearly says is that the Licchavi kings mounted in 500 chariots and started to pursue their enemy. The term '*gaṇa*', as applied collectively to the community of *Rājās* of the Licchavi tribe, has been explained by some scholars as 'Republic' (Jayaswal) ; 'independent Political Corporation' (Majumdar) ; a particular kind of Political Saṅgha (Political Saṅgha-Republic, as understood in old Greek Political Philosophy,—the nearest approach to it—Bhandarkar).

Some legendary details :

That the supreme assembly of this most interesting state consisted of a large number of members, each styled a *Rājā*, is undoubtedly clear from the texts but in our opinion it is not permissible to hypothesise that each of these Rājās had a complete suite of officials—Uparājā, Senāpati and Bhaṇḍāgārika, on the lines suggested by Bhandarkar and Majumdar. What the text seems

to say is that there was a certain number of kings to govern the Licchavis and a like number *uparājās, senāpatis* and *bhaṇḍāgārikas*. Where is the suggestion in the text that each of these *Rājās* had under him exactly the three officials as mentioned above ? Just as there were many Rājās, so there were many Uparājās, etc. : this seems to be the sense of the passage, if we have understood it rightly. K. P. Jayswal is inclined to question the correctness of the number, supplied in this passage. The general consensus of opinion, which may be accepted as reasonable, is that it is to be treated as a conventional one. We should be at the same time careful in considering whether or not we are making a miscalculation by inferring that the number of each of the officials, enumerated above, was strictly the same as that of the Rājās on the strength of a legendary statement, unsupported by any other independent evidence. In our opinion the whole statement regarding the number of officials.....$7,707 \times 3 = 23,121$ is as fanciful as the statement regarding the number of kings, to which it was not possibly related as a complement. Let it be admitted that the Licchavi constitution was of a peculiar type with a large retinue of officials as its characteristic feature. A clearer analysis is not possible with the help of the recorded tradition of the Jātakas.

It may be pointed out in this connection that a system of government, based on such a loose

confederation of Rājās, as suggested by the two scholars, is practically unworkable. The text shows in an unmistakable manner that all the Rājās had to stay permanently in the capital town of Vesāli for the conduct of the business of the state. Therefore, the real administration of each of the territorial units, of which every one of the Rājās is supposed to have been master, had to be carried on in his perpetual absence by an *uparājā*, a *senāpati* and a *bhaṇḍāgārika*. This was an age of political ambition. Could not these high officials, with all their resources, often combine and do whatever they pleased in the miniature state of the absentee lord ? Government, to be real, must be infinitely more organised and effective than the one, attributed to the Licchavis.

Such a system might lead to endless confusion, repeated dislocation of the normal business of the state—in a word, it would make the country a breeding-ground of anarchy, born of political opportunism.

If we are asked to describe the Licchavi constitution as briefly as possible, we should say that it comprised a sovereign assembly consisting of a large number of members each of whom, by reason of his connection with the assembly alone, was known by the title of *Rājā*, and that this body was entrusted with legislative powers, etc., essential to a state, assisted by numerous functionaries, all directly under that assembly.

It is interesting to note that the use of the term Rājā' had a constitutinal and functional significance among the Licchavis etc. distinguishing them from corporate organisations like these of the Kāmbojas etc. as shown in a verse occurring in the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya : *Kāmbhojo—Surāṣṭra—Kṣatriyaśreṇyādayo vārtāśastropajīvinaḥ Licchāvika—Vṛjika—Mallaka—Madraka—Kukura—Kurupāñcālādayo-rājaśabdopajīvinaḥ.*[54]

The Mallians are referred to in the Vālodaka-J.-No. 183 (intro.). King Pasenadi's commander-in-chief was Bandhula, who was a Mallian. Stray references are those to King Suddhodana of Kapilapura (Mahādhammapāla-J.-No. 447), the town of Desaka in the Sumbha country (96), to the royal stock of Okkaka (Ikṣvāku), the first great king, to which the descent of Devadatta, the rival of the Buddha is traced (Jambukhādaka-J.-No. 294, intro.).

Some details about Kosala and Magadha :

Pasenadi of Kosala seems to have been the most powerful of the kings, mentioned as contemporaneous with the Buddha. The king of Kosala or his affairs are alluded to in about 40 Jātakas. Some of the more important references only may be noted here. Mahākosala had a son called Kosala and a daughter named Kosalā, whom he married to Bimbisāra. A village in Kāsi was

given to him for bath-money. Bimbisāra was murdered by his son Ajātasattu, who enjoyed the revenues of the village. A war broke out between Kosala and Ajātasattu. Sometimes the uncle was victorious and some times the nephew (Haritamāta J.—No. 239 intro.). Mahākosala's son was Pasenadi and his daughter was named Kosalā. The latter was married to Bimbisāra, to whom, as mentioned above, was given a village in Kāsi, providing the revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money *(mahānacuṇṇamūlaṁ śatasahassuṭṭhāyikam).* He was murdered by Ajātaśattu. Then a quarrel broke out between him and Pasenadi for the possession of the village. Pasenadi was then a very old man and he was defeated again and again. Afterwards, following the directions of the elder Dhanuggahatissa he was able to take Ajātasattu prisoner. Ultimately he was released. Vajirā, the princess of Kosala, was married to his sister's son and she was dismissed with the Kāsi village for her bath-money (Vaḍḍhaki-Sūkara-J.-No. 283, intro.). The Tacchasūkara-J. (No. 492), practically repeats the above story but here we are informed that Pasenadi's daughter Princess Vajirā was given in marriage to Ajātasattu, and not to his sister's son, who was dismissed with great pomp. Two magnates *(mahāmāttas)* of the Court of Kosala are referred to (Kacchapa-J.—273). Queen Mallikā, wife of the Kosalān king (Sujāta-J.-No. 306) paid a visit to the Master

at Jetavana. The king of Kosala's family priest is found driving in his chariot to a village which is included in his estate (Rathalaṭṭhi-J.—No. 332, intro.). The Kosala king did not show much favour to his old soldiers, but was anxious to bestow all kinds of honour and distinction upon strangers,—a fact which was responsible for his failure to quell a frontier disturbance. Afterwards he came to realise his mistake (Dhūmakari J.—No. 413). Queen Mallikā again appears in the Kammāsapiṇda J. (No. 415). She was the daughter of the chief of the garland-makers of Sāvatthi. Once the Kosala king was defeated in a battle with Ajātasattu and he fled from the field. While on his way, he fell in love with Mallikā and returning to his palace he took the earliest opportunity of marrying her, whom he made his queen-consort.

The circumstances leading to the marriage of Vāsabhakhattiyā with Pasenadi are noted in the Kaṭṭhahāri (No. 7) and Bhaddasāla Jātakas (465). The information supplied in this connection may be summed up as follows :—Kapilavatthu was under the control of Pasenadi, and the Śākyas were probably under his subjection. He wanted to take a wife from Kapilavatthu. The Śākyas were a very proud people. But as they could not refuse the proposal of the Kosala king for obvious reasons, they deliberated together and came to the conclusion that Vāsabhak-hattiyā, daughter of Mahānāma by a slave-girl called

Nāgamuṇḍā, should be sent to Sāvatthi in response to the King's offer. In Kosala she took her rank as the chief queen. Pasenadi's son by Vāsabhakhattiyā, was Viḍūḍabha. The low origin of his mother became known when Viḍūḍabha paid a visit to Kapilavatthu, where he was manifestly insulted by the nobility. It was reported to the king by his courtiers, and the result was that 'the mother and son never came outside the palace.' (No. 7) Allowances to Vāsabhakhattiyā and her son were cut off and Viḍūḍhaba took the vow of a terrible vengeance against the Śākyas (465). The Buddha interviewed the king of Kosala and pointed out the unjustness of the treatmant meted out to Vāsabhakhattīya and his son. At the advice of Buddha they were, however, re-instated in the king's favour (465).

The story of Pasenadi's unfortunate end is given in the Bhaddasāla-J. (465). Once the king had gone to pay respects to the Master, then residing near a country town of the Śākyas. During his absence Dīghakārāyaṇa, the Commander-in-chief, raised Viḍūḍabha to the throne. On return the aged king found the gates of the capital shut against him. Lying down in a shed he died the most dishonourable death for a king of his status. It seems that Pasenadi was, to some extent, friendly to the Śākyas, but Viḍūḍabha was determined to destroy them, and in this matter he was encouraged by a section of the ministry. This alone can explain the origin and the *modus operandi*

of the palace intrigue that culminated in the death of Pasenadi. Pasenadi's Commander-in-chief, as we have seen, was Bandhula, a Mallian by birth (465). The Judges of Kosala took bribes ; so Bandhula, a trusted servant of the state, was placed in charge of the court of judgment. But the king came to suspect him of disloyalty without any rhyme or reason. He and his 32 valiant sons were sent to capture the brigands in a disturbed frontier with directions issued to some people to assassinate them in a secret manner. After the death of Bandhula and his sons, Dīghakārāyaṇa, his sister's son, was appointed to the post of Commander-in-chief. It was with his help that Viḍūḍabha ascended the throne of Kosala during the absence of Pasenadi, as described above (No. 465).

We hear of the wives of the king of Kosala and his missing jewel in the Mahāsāra-J. (No. 92, intro.) ; his 16 dreams in the Mahāsupina-J. (No. 77, intro) ; his Brahmin employee, who could tell him which swords were lucky and which not, in (Asilakkhana-J. (126) ; his inspection of the planting of Bo tree, near the gateway of Jetavana in Kāliṅgabodhi-J. (479, intro.) ; his giving a garment of the Śivi country to the Tathāgata in the Sivi-J. (No. 499) ; a courtier of the king Kosala, noted for his integrity in the Mittāmitta-J. (473) ; his taking of bribes from ascetics in the Bharu-J. (213) and of a useful officer intriguing in the harem, which was connived at, in the Khantivaṇṇana-J. (225).

Some of the details supplied regarding Bimbisāra and Ajātasattu of Magadha have already been noted in connection with king Pasenadi. The rest may be mentioned here briefly. We learn of Bimbisāra's interest in Buddha's miracles in the Sarabhamiga-J. (No. 483) ; Buddha telling a story to Bimbisāra as to how formerly princes of a rebellious bent of mind used to be treated ; of the chronic longing in Ajātasattu's mother, the daughter of the king of Kosala, to drink blood from the right knee of King Bimbisāra ; of the Buddha's visit to Bimbisāra when he was fondling the young prince on his lap with the natural love of a father for his child (Thusa-J. No. 338) ; and of his death in the hands of his own son in the Sañjīva (intro.), Haritamāta (intro.), Vaḍḍaki-sūkara (intro.) Jātakas etc. [150, 239, 283, 530, 542]. Ajātasattu's favour to Devadatta is referred to in the Mahilāmukha-J. (No. 26) ; his adherence to 'false doctrines' in the Jātaka (150). He followed Devadatta's wicked advice and slew his father. His chief minister was Jīvaka. He paid a visit to the Buddha (150). At the wish of Devadatta he sent archers to kill the Buddha residing on the Gijjhakūṭa mountain (*542*). And, again, the Magadha king visited the Master (*544*).

Udena :

About King Udena the following references are to be found : his park at Kosambī (Kausāmbī), his

habit of too much drinking and his insulting an elder in a drunken fit (the result of revelry in the park continuing for a period of seven days), are alluded to in a Jātaka (Mātaṅga-J.—No. 497). The Master, during his stay in the Ghosita forest near Kosambi, told a story regarding Bhaddavatikā, king Udena's she-elephant, once much honoured but neglected when old ; Buddha visited Udena and the elephant was restored to the king's favour (497 ; Dalhadhamma-J. No. 409). His son Bodhirājakumāra once stayed in Suṁsumāra-giri in the country of Bhaggas, where he built a palace called *Kokanada*. He put out the eyes of the artisan, who constructed the building lest he should make a similar palace for some other king (Dhonasākha-J.—No. 353, intro.). D. R. Bhandarkar identifies this prince with Bahinara of the Purāṇas.[55] It is quite apparent that the Bhaggas were subject to Udayana of Vatsa.

This chapter should not be closed without a reference to the influence, which the Buddha is reported to have exerted upon the contentious politics of his time. That he was a political thinker in his time with an uncommon insight cannot be denied, if literary evidence is to be relied upon.[56]

Non-violence, not war, was he accustomed to support with the utmost confidence in its suitability for curing the disease of inter-state or inter-tribal misunderstandings as well as for establishing peace, unity and concord. Thus when he visited the Sākyas and the Koliyas with a view to settle

a dispute, which was about to assume a fearful aspect, the people of Kapilavatthu said, "Now that the Master has come, it is impossible for us to discharge a weapon against the person of an enemy." Great was the influence of his personality amongst the masses even when he concerned himself with affairs of a purely secular interest. As soon as he came, all hostile feelings were hushed into calm and the bitterness amongst the people of the two cities ceased to exist (Kuṇāla-J.—No. 536).

The Master's method was argumentative and analytical, rather than emotive which may not always appeal to people bent on war. It was his habit to visit the area, aflame with agitation and excitement, and personally study the factors generating bitterness. He would, as a rule, proceed straight to the real cause of a disturbance. He would instantly enter into a close discussion with the chief supporters of war and upholders of militarism, rather than preach conciliation in some choice expressions and noble maxims in a moralising vein. In course of the discussion he would so corner the people by means of a keen cross-examination as to render them bewildered and unable to maintain their posture in any reasonable way.

Much light is thrown on the procedure, generally adopted by the Buddha, on such occasions, by the Jātaka No. 536, which gives the story of a quarrel between the Koliyas and the Śākyas. It

has already been said that at the mere appearance of the Master in their midst the people of the two cities forgot their enmity. They threw down their arms, saying, 'Let the Koliyas slay us or roast us alive.' But the rulers wanted war to settle the dispute. They visited the Master, and the following conversation took place : –

Question—'What is the quarrel about, Sires ?'
(*mahārājā*).

Answer—'About the water'.

Question—'What is the water worth ?'

Answer—'Very little, Holy Sir.'

Question—'What is the earth worth ?'

Answer—'It is of priceless value.'

Question—'What are warrior-chiefs worth ?'
(*Khattiyā kiṁ agghantīti*).

Answer—'They too are of priceless value.'
(*Khattiyā nāma anagghā*).

Question—'Why on account of some worthless water are you for destroying chiefs of high worth ?'

Organised compaign against violence :

Buddha believed in the efficacy of incessant preachings by organised bands of selfless workers having local knowledge and local connections, being entrusted with the task of emphasising the need of unity and thus slowly eradicating the spirit of violence from the minds of men. In the dispute,

referred to above, the two tribes, offered 250 princes each, who were ordained by the Blessed One.

Buddha and Bimbisāra –an appeal to reason and past history :

Buddha regarded the past as a store-house of illustrations of great practical use for solving the problems of the present. Thus when it was found that Bimbisāra's son was likely to become rebellious, the Master came to him and advised him to take some such steps as had been formerly adopted by kings placed in similar circumstances. What the measure was the Master himself described in the following words : "Formerly kings, when suspicious of their sons, had them kept in a secret place and gave orders that at their death they were to be brought forth and set upon the throne" (Thusa-J.-No. 338, intro. ; Mūsika-J. No. 373, intro., etc.).

He kept himself in intimate touch with the internal politics of the palace. The above is one example of this, and another is supplied in the Jātakas, Nos. 7 and 465. Pasenadi, the king of Kosala, was furious against the chief queen, Vāsabhakhattiyā when her low origin was disclosed, and subjected her and his son Viḍūḍabha to all sorts of indignity. The Master visited the king and silenced him by the following unassailable argument : 'She is a king's daughter, to a king she is wed ; and to a king she bore her son. Wherefore is that

son not in authority over the realm ?' (No. 7). At the advice of the Buddha the mother and the son were restored to the king's favour (465).

A mistake :

So far as the fate of the king and that of the Śākyas were concerned, it must be mentioned, however, that this advice led to disastrous consequences. For, after this had been acted upon Viḍūḍabha was placed on the throne of Kosala by a party, unfriendly to his father ; and if the Jātaka evidence is to be relied upon, his first act, on assuming sovereignty, was the extermination of the Śākyas.

The Buddha showed from the past that a king ought not to take bribes (Bharu-J. No. 213, intro.), and that he should not prefer newcomers to old and trusted servants of the State (Dhūmakāri-J. No. 413). Other sundry pieces of advice are also attributed to him. Thus, according to him a king ought to rule vigilantly ; in all kingly duties he must be to his subjects like mother or father, 'because when a king is righteous those who surround him are righteous also' (Janasandha-J. No. 468). His thinking was based on a clear and profound grasp of facts relating to any political situation, said to have come within his knowledge (Lomasakassapa-J. No. 433).

Fatalism and politics :

To a lay man, by reason of the prophetic words, which he used to give utterance to, as if in a tone of desperation, he may appear to have been a fatalist (cf. for instance, Bhaddasala-J. No. 265) but his prophecies, smacking of fatalism, were the products of his study of historical phenomena as effects of ascertainable causes. Whatever we have said above regarding the Master's intervention in certain political affairs of his time must be understood as subject to the observation that the details, embodied in the traditional accounts, are to be accepted with a good deal of caution.

Chapter III

Geography of the Jātakas

External relations

Islands and continents ; foreign countries ; centres of trade ; political connections ; names of territories ; absence of a paramount power ; inter-state conflicts ; attitude to foreigners, etc.

The geographical knowledge of the Jātakas not only embraced a large part of India extending up to Kāveripattana, a sea-port town in the South, but also places outside India. Those were the days when active sea-borne trade and commerce were carried on between India and a large part of the world outside. The Jātakas were familiar with many islands and oceans, with the country of Suvaṇṇabhūmi (Lower Burma), of Laṅkā[57], the kingdom of Baveru, which Prof. Rhys Davids identifies with Babylon, and of Tambapaṇṇidīpa (probably Ceylon).

'Ekabala' (a foreign country ?) :

To this list may belong the country of Ekabala whose king Saṅkhapāla is mentioned in the Mahāummagga Jātaka (546) in connection with some historical topic, apparently not related to trade.

Thus the wise man, Mahosadha called to a parrot and said, "Friend, go and find out what king Saṅkhapāla is doing in Ekabala, then travel over all India and bring me the news." The parrot went to the aforesaid man...As it passed back through India it came to Uttarapañcāla city.

The Jātakas some times refer to 2000 islands (for instance, Māndhātā-J. No. 258), 12,000 islands and 4 continents (*cf.* Dārimukha-J.-No. 378).

Trade and Commerce :

In India Bharukaccha, Ujjeni, Kāveripattana, Karambiya, Kālacampā were important centres of trade, carrying on commercial intercourse with the world lying outside India. There was direct trade connection between Kālacampā, the chief city of Aṅga, and Suvaṇṇabhūmi. "We are told of traders going from Videha to Gandhāra, from Magadha to Sovīra, from Bharukaccha round the coast to Burma, from Benares down the river to its mouth and thence on to Burma, from Champā to the same destination[58]." Evidences of commercial activities, with which the Jātaka literature abounds, belong more appropriately to a chapter of the economic history of ancient India. It may be useful to make a passing reference to them in the present context as showing a relatively extended geographical knowledge of the Indians during the period concerned, and also implying the existence of close connections

with several foreign countries, identifiable or not, through the medium of trade and commerce.

Political connections and trade :

Foreign trade could not have flourished without some code of inter-state regulations. no matter in what form. It is not impossible to surmise, even though direct evidence is lacking, that political factors played an important part in regulating such inland and foreign trade. Foreign kings were probably represented in the courts of their Indian counterparts by their own messengers. We hear of 'messengers come from foreign countries' in the Saṁvara-J. (462)[59]. The Nāga king of the island of Serumā used to come to Tamba, king of Banaras, to play dice with him and he abducted the queen to his own palace.

The Jātakas were familiar with the three well-known names, *viz.*, Uttarāpatha, Madhyadeśa (Majjhimadesa) and Dakṣiṇāpatha. But the respective boundaries of the divisions indicated by these names are hardly shown in detail. We are told that Videha was a kingdom of the middle country (Gandhāra-J. 406) ; that a Kosala king, wishing to conquer Kāsi, crossed the border of his kingdom and found himself in the middle country *(Janapada-majjham*—Mahāsīlava-J. No. 51). Arañjāragiri was situated in the *majjhimapadesa* i.e. in the central region (Indriya-J. No. 423). The district of Kaṁsa,

of which Kaṁsa, the uncle of Vāsudeva, was the ruler, was a part of Uttarāpatha (Pānīya-J. —No. 459). Avantī was a country of Dakṣiṇāpatha (*Avantī dakkhiṇāpatha*—No. 423), There is a reference to a Brahmin family from the North-West, (*Udiccabrāhmaṇakule—cf.*, for instance, Surāpāna-J.—No. 81 ; Saccaṁkira-J.—No. 73). India, as known to the Jātakas, presents a number of independent states, normally at peace, but occasionally at war with one another. The kingdoms, mentioned in our texts, are noted below with the name of the capital in each case, if available:[60]

(1) Sivi, capital Ariṭṭhapura (499) ; capital Jetuttara (547).

(2) Madda, capital Sagala (546).

(3) Kāsi (Bāraṇasirajjam)—capital Bārāṇasi (Banaras) which was known by different names *viz.*, Surundha or Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahama-vaddhana, Pupphavatī, Ramma and Molinī.

(4) Kosala, capital generarally Sāvatthi, sometimes Sāketa ; the two cities are mentioned together in the Kumbha Jātaka (512), with Sabbamitta ruling over Sāvatthi. Ayojjhā (Ayodhyā) name of a city.

(5) Videha—Mithilā.

(6) Aṅga—Kālacampā or simply Campā.

(7) Magadha—Rājagaha.

(8) Kaṁsa—Asitañjana.

(9) North Mathurā.

(10) Bharu—Sea-port town Bharukacca.

(11) Avantī—Ujjeni, Mt. Ghanasela (*Avantī dakkhiṇāpathe*).

(12) Daṇḍaka—(Kumbhavatī), where stood the Golden Hill. *Daṇḍakahiraññapabbato nāma atthi*).[61]

(13) Kaliṅga—Dantapura, "Khāravela....was.... a Ceta—a name not unknown to literature, as Ceta princes are mentioned in the Vessantara Jātaka."[62]

(14) Suraṭṭha—where flowed the Sātodikā river.

(15) Kampilla or North Pañcāla—North. Pañcāla City or Kampilla.

(16) Kuru—Indapatta.

(17) Gandhāra—Takkasilā.

(18) Mahiṁsaka—Sakula. In some Jātakas (Nos. 533, 524), it is described as being situated outside the borders of the 'realm' of Magadha. (of. Jātaka No. 80 which mentions the kingdom of Mahiṁsaka '*Mahiṁsakaraṭṭham.*' Cowell and Chalmers mention the Andhra country in this place).[63]

(19) Ceti—Sotthivati.

(20) Sovīra—Roruva.

(21) Vaṁsa—Kosambī

(22) Damīla—(i.e., Tāmil). City Kāvirapattana.

(23) Mejjha—*Mejjharaṭṭham* (497); also referred to in a verse (530).[64]

(24) Malla—Kusāvatī.

(25) Assaka—Potali.

(26) Kingdom of Seriva—By crossing the river Telavāha one could come to the town of

Andhapura. "Andhapura must mean the capital town of the Andhra kingdom. The river Telavāha is either the modern Tel or Telingri, both not far distant from each other and flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. This indeed locates the original Andhra country, which must, therefore, have comprised parts of both these provinces."[65]

(27) Arañjara - in the Central Region *(Majjhimapadese).*[66]

(28) Kamboja - included in the kingdom of Gandhāra.

(29) Sindhu (Sind).

(30) Cities of Ayodhyā, and Dvāravatī, Hatthipura, Sihapura, Daddarapura (422).

There are stray references to the Vajjis, once to a Naga[67] king (530), the Dasaṇṇas, the Surasenas, the Andhakas and the Vṛṣṇis, and once an allusion to the Goyaniyas[68] along with the Videhas and the Kurus, and Vethavatī (near the Vethavatī or Betwa river (Mātaṅga—J. 497 ; Vidhurapaṇḍita—J. 545). The Jātakas betray a strange ignorance regarding lands lying to the east of Magadha or Aṅga. Nothing is heard of Vaṅga, Puṇḍra, or further east, of Kāmrūpa. Sumbha (country Suhma) is probably mentioned only once in the introduction to a Jātaka (Telapatta-J. 96) with its town Desaka. Mention is made in the introductory episodes of Kosala, Magadha, Vesāli, Kapilavatthu, the Sakkas, the Koliyas, the Mallas,

the Bhaggas, the country of Vatsa, which have already been noticed in the first chapter.

It is quite in keeping with the usual legendary manner that the Jātakas often speak of 101 kings, ruling in the whole of Jambudvīpa. They do not appear to take this number seriously. The statement that there were altogether 101 kings is commonly met with, but it is curious that they omit the conqueror from the list and some other kings also who could not be defeated or were difficult to be tackled with. Again, the number 1,000 is also given in some places. All such statements can be dismissed as fanciful or conventional. As a matter of fact their geographical knowledge of India hardly goes beyond the list given above.

Absence of a Paramount Power ; ambitious plans :

Though, ordinarily speaking, each state enjoyed independence, yet a discordant note was often introduced by aggressive monarchs, who aspired to 'universal sovereignty'. But the effects of disruption caused by their actions were rather ephemeral in their nature. There is no trace of a paramount authority having been excercised by any particular sovereign and his line for a considerable period of time. Ambitious sovereigns had often their imagination fired by the idea of 'world conquest' and were constantly encouraged by their senior ministers. But it should be noted that few

pursued anything like a systematic and well-directed imperial policy to achieve their object, or had the necessary resources for carrying out their projects. In some cases, however, it appears that successful efforts were made to exercise a real control over other states, though there is nothing to show that the supremacy thus acquired lasted for any appreciable length of time. In the South, King Daṇḍaki, who must have ruled in Daṇḍaka, established his paramountcy over Bhimaratha, Aṭṭhaka and Kaliṅga. In the first chapter we have given our reasons for taking Bhimaratha as a Bhoja king. Thus Vidarbha, Kaliṅga and another unidentified state may have been once subordinate to a single sovereign. In her days of glory Kāsi made a bid for ascendancy over other states. We are told that when the city of Banaras was known by the name of Brahmavaddhana, its king Manoja conquered 101 kingdoms, of which Aṅga and Magadha deserve prominent mention. It is clear from the same Jātaka, which refers to this development, that Avanti and Assaka similarly came under his control. The Assaka Jātaka (207) shows that once there was a king called Assaka reigning in Potali, described as a city of the Kāsi kingdom, which means the subordination of the Assakan prince in the South to the king of Kāsi. Probably the latter country was interested in extending its sway in the North-West also where undoubtedly the most important kingdom

was Gandhāra, with its famous capital Takkasilā. A Kāsi king is reported to have invaded Gandhāra, but he had to come back without achieving his object (Palāyi-J. No. 226 and Dhonasākha-J. No. 353). The political influence of Kāsi was established over a considerable portion of the east and the south, but it was effectivcly checked in the north-west by Gandhāra. This supremacy was probably of a brief duration ; the Jātakas, at any rate, do not throw any light on the point. No information is given as regards the system by which a conquered country was sought to be administered in those days. The evidence of the two Jātakas, referred to above, points out, as already mentioned, that in one case the king of Assaka was subject to Kāsi and in the other, the king of Daṇḍaka had three subordinate princes,—which show that a defeated king was not necessarily pulled down from his throne but that he might be allowed to enjoy it as a vassal by submitting to the victor and paying something by way of tribute. The Sona-Nanda Jātaka (532) informs us that when a battle was raging between the kings of Kāsi and Kosala, a proposal was made to the latter in the following manner, "Great king, be not dismayed. There is no danger threatening you. The kingdom shall be yours. Only submit to king Manoja."[69] The proposal was accepted and the Kosalan king submitted to Kāsi. In this way Manoja made himself master of the kings of

all India. From each royal city he caused to be brought all manner of food. The resources of a single kingdom, whatever its size, could hardly be considered sufficient for carrying on military operations on a large scale. The practice that seems to have been followed favoured the union of the victor's army with that of each king defeated or captured, and the original forces, thus re-inforced, proceeded to the invasion of the next neighbouring kingdom. When this also submitted, its soldiers were forced to join the invading army, which took another kingdom, and so on. Such measures alone rendered protracted military operations feasible (532). It may be presumed that the entire army was not in every case possibly taken away but such forces were left as were sufficient for the defence and protection of the conquered countries, thus affected, when the invader turned back in the further pursuit of his imperial ambition. It is apparent that a vassal king was under the obligation of supplying his overlord with a contingent of soldiers. The idea of a *permanent annexation* of a distant country is foreign to the Jātakas, and scarcely any trace of the knowledge of an administrative machinery, suitable for governing an empire, can be found in them. Sometimes a very hard fate awaited a king who was defeated in battle. It is said that 1,000 kings, conquered by a sovereign of Kāsi, were once put to death. In the Mahāummagga Jātaka (546) a king of Kampilla is advised by his

minister Kevatta to bring 101 kings to his city and kill them, one and all, by offering them poisonous liquor to drink. It is not suggested, however, that all such gruesome details should pass as part of sober history. The idea is common that 'all the kings of India' could be conquered within a period of seven years, seven months, and seven days (532, etc,). The number 7 apparently was a conventional one (cf. '7,707 kings', etc.). Once a king took ten years to be the master of all India.

Conflicts between neighbouring states—a normal feature :

Hostility between neighbouring states was, however, a very common feature. We hear of frequent conflicts between Kāsi and Kosala, of quarrels between Aṅga and Magadha, Assaka and Kaliṅga. A neighbouring king (*most probably of Kosala*) once beleaguered Banaras ; its king mingled with the ranks ; an arrow pierced him and he died. The hostile king was also slain (Vaḍḍhakisūkara-J. 293). In an engagement between Kāsi and Kosala, the latter was defeated. A prince of Kosala, Chatta by name, fled in disguise and afterwards got back his father's kingdom (Brahāchatta-J. 336). Another prince of Kosala, Dīghāvu, whose father had been slain by a certain king of Kāsi, did not retaliate upon him,

though found in a very helpless condition. This act of generosity was ultimately rewarded by his restoration. A certain Brahmadatta of Banaras killed a king of Kosala. The latter's posthumous son was brought up first by a goat-herd and then by a sweeper. He fell in love with Kurańgavī, the princess of Banaras, and when his identity was proved by his own mother he was given his father's kingdom (536). Again, it was the kingdom of Kosala which was victorious on many occasions. The natural hostility which existed between these two kingdoms was at some particular period fomented by an ex-minister of Kāsi, who took service with the Kosala king and gave him all sorts of useful advice. On one such occasion the king of Kāsi was defeated and taken prisoner, but the presence of some mystic virtue in the rival monarch inspired the Kosala king with awe. He asked forgiveness and restored the dethroned king (Ekarāja-J.-303). Again, another Brahmadatta of Banaras was slain by a king of Kosala. His son made good his escape and afterwards blockaded the city at the advice of his mother. It was forced to surrender and the victor occupied the throne of his father (100). A similar story is given in the Kuṇāla Jātaka (536). In all these cases the annexation of the enemy's kingdom was only temporary. Quarrels between Aṅga and Magadha must have been no less frequent. In course of these hostilities some-

times Aṅga and sometimes Magadha won, the result in either case was the annexation of the conquered kingdom. Likewise in the south, Assaka and Kaliṅga fought against each other, but the outcome was similarly indecisive.

Interest in the affairs of neighbouring kingdoms :

Political developments in one country were keenly watched by its aggressive neighbours. It was thought to be an opportune moment to strike the enemy when he was weak or in some natural or temporary disadvantage. Thus a king of Banaras left two sons : the elder was to succeed him to the throne and the younger to be made heir-apparent. The elder brother refused to become king, whereupon the younger ascended the throne. Later the elder brother demanded the throne, but the request was not complied with. On the other hand he was ordered to be put into prison. The brother escaped and took service with another king. Hearing of these domestic troubles, a confederacy of seven kings beleaguered the city of Banaras (Asadise J.—181). The dismissed servant of one state was often warmly received by its neighbour. Such men in many cases proved to be a source of incalculable mischief and injury to the kingdoms which they had once served (303). There were secret agencies to report the military preparations, carried on in distant countries, or even the hostile

intentions confided by a foreign prince to his most trusted minister. The enemy planned his attack or defence on the basis of such intelligence reports, secretly conveyed, regarding the movements of alien kings. When, for example, a king of Kampilla invaded Mithilā, his agents entered the city by its postern gate, charged with the task of carrying all sorts of useful information surreptitiously to their master (546).

Wars with distant kingdoms :

Wars between distant kingdoms, though of rare occurrence, were not unknown. In some cases the ulterior object of an invasion is difficult to understand. It is indeed a question how physical barriers could be so easily overcome in such cases. A Gandhāra king is said to have attacked Banaras, for which no reason has been given. Was it a merely retaliatory measure ? A Banaras king is reported to have proceeded as far as Takkasilā to seize the kingdom of Gandhāra, but in this instance it is not difficult to take the expedition as prompted by an imperial design on the part of Kāsi, of which more tangible evidences are not lacking, as we have already seen. In the case of the war that broke out between Kampilla and Videha (546) after the former had conquered 101 princes, the motive was apparently to round up an imperial career. Amongst the 'ancient'

princes mentioned, Vāsudeva and his nine brothers, first conquered Ayodhyā, and then Dvāravatī at a later date (Ghata-J.-454).

Dynastic connections :

When there was no king in a country, it was regarded as one involved in a dreadful crisis. Such a state of things could not be allowed to last for a long period. A fit person was to be promptly elected to the vacant throne. Generally he was a prince from another country. A Magadha prince thus on one occasion peacefully ascended the throne of Banaras (Darīmukha-J-378 ; Sonaka-J.529), and a Banaras prince is reported to have been elected as king of Takkasilā (Telapatta-J-96). Maddava, a king of Banaras, is called Māgadha. Probably there was once some close relationship between the ruling families of these countries, as testified to by the Dasaṇṇa Jātaka (401). One Banaras king is likewise called Aṅga, which may be due to some unrecorded triumph achieved by Aṅga in her days of glory. Rājagaha is described as a city of Aṅga. This is not difficult to explain, as according to Campeyya Jātaka, Aṅga in its wars with Magadha was often crowned with success. Somewhat mysterious are the statements that Kāsi's glorious king was Vedeha, that prince Sottihisena of the same land was a *Vedehaputta,* and that a certain Brahmadatta Kāsirāja was a *Vedeha* (Cakkavāka J.—

451 ; Sambula J.-519). These stray passages alone do not, in our view, warrant the conclusion that the Brahmadattas were of Videhan origin.[70] It must be remembered in this connection that Kosalan monarchs also had sometimes the epithet of '*Vaideha*' in the Vedic literature.[71]

Pre-eminence of some states :

The Jātaka stories bear witness to the comparatively high status once attained by the two kingdoms of Kāsi and Malla. Thus Banaras is called the chiefest city in all India (Takkāriya-J.-481), and Kusa, king of Malla, is described as the chief ruler 'in all India' (Kusa-J.—531), probably belonging to a branch of the Ikshvāku family. Two more kings deserve prominent mention in this connection. One is Naggaji who ruled over the two realms of Gandhāra and Kashmir, and the other an unnamed king of Magadha.

Matrimonial alliances :

Matrimony was an effective bond of alliance between different ruling families. These alliances were not always uninfluenced by political considerations. Thus a king thinks that if he can enter into matrimonial relations with two royal houses through his daughter and nephew, it will undoubtedly be of much help in establishing the

greatness of his own family (Mudupāṇi-J.-262 ; Asilakkhaṇa-J.-126). The union between Pañcāla and Videha was eagerly sought for and this was effected at the close of a bitter struggle through the marriage of the reigning monarch of Videha with a princess of Pañcāla. Among important royal marriages may be noted those of a Madda princess with a prince of Kaliṅga who afterwards became a 'universal' monarch (479) ; a prince of Videha with a Kāsi princess (No. 489) ; Subhaddā of the Madda king's family with a king of Banaras (513) ; of Pabhāvatī, princess of Madda with Kusa, son of Okkāka of Malla (531). Sometimes the problem of marriage required a judicious and careful handling. A king's anxiety that if he gives his daughter in marriage to some one, all the kings will be enraged, can be easily appreciated (Kāliṅgabodhi-J.-479). A curious episode is related where one wife becomes an object of enjoyment to two kings under an arrangement, which is the result of a compromise, the best that can be arrived at (Kuṇāla-J.-536). The wife of a king, who has given up her husband, may be taken possession of by any other king or more than one king together. Seven kings invest the city of Sāgala and send an ultimatum to the Madda king in the following strain ; "Let him either give Pabhāvatī in marriage to all seven or let him fight us".[72] These probably are not instances of individual sexual aberration or licentiousness, but

of survival of a primitive custom of polyandry in ancient society.

Royal friendship sometimes originated in the early days of youth between princes, receiving instruction from the same teacher at Takkasilā, and subsequently strengthened by the ties of marriage. A royal alliance might be a discreet and popular step to promote the mutual goodwill of the peoples concerned. This is evident from one story (Surucī-J.-489), in which are found the people of the two cities of Mithilā and Banaras, crowding to the courtyard of the king of Videha to offer presents to a new-born babe, the offspring of a happy matrimonial alliance, and again joining the ceremony of installation in a spirit of fellowship. A friendly feeling often grew up between two kings though it might so happen that they had never known each other personally. A common religious career might draw two or more kings together, but such unions could possibly have no political significance inasmuch as these generally happened after they had ceased to take any interest in the affairs of the world. There was no bar to an exchange of courtesies and cordial feelings between rulers of different kingdoms. The door was wide open for a suffering or backward people to receive progressive ideas of various sorts from a relatively advanced country. Thus there is an instance of '*Kurudhamma*' being once carried to the territory of Kaliṅga, which proved a panacea for all evils.

Treatment of foreigners :

In times of peace it was not thought advisable from the moral standpoint to lay hands on the citizens or representatives of other states, even though potentially hostile, when they had laid aside their arms and were engaged in a festivity in a defenceless condition. Such an attack was regarded as both unbecoming and cowardly. Thus "one day when the feast came round on the full moon of the fourth month and the city and the palace were adorned like the city of the gods, Videha's general Alāta spoke to the king", 'Let us gather the gallant army together ; let us go forth to battle with countless hosts of men; let us bring under thy power those *who have kept themselves independent*....' But Sunāma, another high official, spoke thus, 'All your enemies, O King, are met together here,...they have laid aside their strength and behave themselves with submission ; to-day is the chief festival ; war pleases us not !" The enemies, referred to, were most probably representatives of different kings in the court of Mithilā or people from various countries, actively or potentially hostile, who had come there for purposes of trade and commerce. The interests, of traders, again, hailing from different countries, were safeguarded[73] *(cf. Atho pi vāṇijā phītā nānāraṭṭhāto āgatā tesu me vihitā rakkhā,* etc.—Saṁvara-J.-No. 462, verse). It is inevitable to be reminded in

this connection of the six municipal committees, whose functions are described in detail by Megasthenes. Members of one of these boards were required exclusively to attend to the entertainment of foreigners. In ordinary circumstances these outsiders must have been assured of a large measure of security and protection. One story shows that to provide messengers from foreign countries with accommodation was a matter of great concern to a prince anxious to enhance his popularity at home (Sambara-J.-462).[74]

Chapter IV
Kingship

Succesion, election : rôle of ministers and people ; Castes and State ; popular conceptions about king's responsibility ; revolts against tyrannical rulers with limited violence.

According to the prevailing conception of the state in the Jātakas, kingship was a necessary and inseparable factor in the polity. The throne could not remāin vacant for a long time. If there was a failure of male heir, steps were taken at the expiry of seven days at the most from the death of the last king, to fill up the gap by the immediate election of the most competent person as the next sovereign. The king was at the apex of the whole structure. He was the keystone of the arch of the body politic. The virtues which were demanded of him were justness, goodness and impartiality. If he was of the right type, the entire administration would receive its colour from his character and be likewise beneficial to the lives of the people. The whole machinery would then work smoothly and harmoniously, and the equilibrium of the different orders of the state would be kept up, leading to the prosperity and contentment of the people as a whole.

People's right to overthrow a tyrant :

Although the importance of kingship was so deeply and profoundly recognised, yet nowhere was there an attempt to idolise the monarch. The people had an instinctive knowledge, as it were, of how to deal with an unjust and tyrannical king. In exceptional cases they exercised the right of electing their sovereign ; and the phenomenon of a whole people, rising in arms and putting a wicked king to death, is not unfamiliar. We shall discuss these points later on at some length.

Succession to the throne and rights of people :

If a king left a legal heir, he was anointed king by the ministers of the state. That was the usual custom. The death-bed instructions of a monarch regarding succession were followed if he left a host of claimants surviving him, out of whom the ministers were to select one as the new king. But if no heir were left behind, it was considered to be a great calamity, and the people directly interested themselves in the question of the succession (539).

The security of the king's position depended on the manner in which he conducted himself, his character and aptitude. If he proved to be upright and conscientious, he became popular and everything went on quite well. If not, his very existence would be at stake. Such was the organising capacity of the people that within a

short time there would be a spontaneous combination of the different communities, the Brāhmins, the Kṣatriyas, the Vaiśyas, etc.,—a sudden upheaval of the forces of rebellion, and the king would be quickly got rid of (Saccaṁkira J.—73 ; Maṇicora J.— 194 ; Padakusalamānava-J.-432, etc.). This right was so commonly exercised that wise men would often try to mend the character of a vicious prince by a timely warning of the following kind : 'The people of this country will not place you on the throne but uproot like a *nimb* tree and drive you forth to exile' (Ekapaṇṇa J.—149). The death of an oppressive king used to be invariably followed by universal jubilation. The triumphant people would hold festivities and do all manner of merry-making, openly avowing the cause of all this to be the passing away of the 'tyrant' (240). It seems that the people were more intimately concerned with the manner in which the king administered justice than anything else, and any attempt, however revolutionary, to do away with an unjust king, recommended itself as wholly justifiable to the political instinct of the race. On the other hand a king, oppressive to the highest degree, every day imposing new taxes on the people, appears to have had nothing to fear from his subjects, provided he did not act arbitrarily in a court of law. Of course a wave of relief would pass through the whole country at his death, and the people would often give proofs of

the consciousness of the wrongs they had suffered and express their condemnation freely and in the strongest language possible; but it is interesting to note that in such cases they would not be driven by an irresistible impulse to move against the king in a body. On the other hand they would certainly vindicate their rights by taking the extreme step against a sovereign who had flouted justice and entertained no regard whatsoever for even its most elementary principles. This fact seems to be rather anomalous. Probably the people were in some cases so completely deprived of their resources and means of resistance that they were unable to assert themselves against a plundering king.

Castes and the State :

We have been accustomed to regard the four Indo-Aryan castes as so many social units, each having its own duties and functions assigned by the law-makers of ancient India. But the Jātakas in a way give ample evidence to show that the dignity and importance of the three upper castes rested, to a considerable extent, upon the political influence by which they could make their existence felt. Their intrinsic worth is demonstrated more as their being part and parcel of a political system than as mere social communities. The Kṣatriyas had perhaps the sole duty of defending the honour of their country against external enemies, which

Takkasilā where he was unanimously chosen king by the courtiers and the citizens. There is one unique instance of the youngest prince in a story ascending the throne (Saṁvara-J.-462). But it appears to have been clearly in contravention of a well-recognised principle ; such a departure was allowed only under exceptional circumstances. Invariably the eldest son acted as Viceroy during the life-time of his father, and as such, he got valuable opportunities, denied to his younger brothers, of coming into close touch with the different departments of administration. By reasons of experience, therefore, he seemed to be suitably qualified to steer the vessel of state across troubled waters on the death or retirement of his father, specially in view of the fact that personal efficiency of a monarch counted as an effective factor in the career of a monarch.

Election of kings :

It may be asked—where is the people's voice in the matter of royal succession ? There are some instances of even strangers being called upon to rule, and placed on the throne, having no connection with the erstwhile ruling families. This was done by means of some form of popular election. One important exception is, however, furnished by the Pādañjali Jātaka (247), where the ministers set aside the claims of a prince and straightaway elected a different person as king, the people taking no part in the procedure.

On the death of an anonymous king of Gandhāra, a prince from Magadha was once placed on the vacant throne by the joint will of the citizens and the courtiers of Takkasilā (*Sabbe amaccā ca nāgarā ca ekacchandā hutvā*).[78] In the opinion of K. P. Jayaswal, "this was a referendum of the whole city, and not the city-assembly only."[79] One Jātaka (No. 132) speaks of a prince, who was none other than the prince of Magadha, whose activities are described in the Telapatta Jātaka, referred to above, as one on whom a kingdom was conferred *by the people (Takkasilā-nagaravāsihī)*.[80] A king, on the eve of renouncing the world as an ascetic, *directs his people* to elect a successor *(attano rājānaṁ gaṇhathā :* Cullasutasoma-J.-No. 525). Co-operation between councillors and citizens is clearly indicated in a threatened act of deposition (Ekapaṇṇa—J.-149). Apparently popular election in some form or other is not unknown in the Jātaka stories. It is hence impossible to agree fully with Richard Fick[81] when he says that "election by the people, as represented in the Vedas and the epics, is no where mentioned" and that "if there is neither a male heir nor a kinsman who can succeed to the throne, the successor seems to be chosen by the ministers".

Ministers and election :

An instance of a deceased king's 'temporal and spiritual adviser,' being nominated by the courtiers, overriding the candidature of his son and successor, which is supplied by the Pādañjali Jātaka, (247), has already been referred to. It appears from this story that the ministers had the right of refusing the throne to a claimant who was intellectually or otherwise deficient, thus rendering him unfit for the royal office. Here we find how Pādañjali, 'a lazy fellow, an idle loafer,' the only surviving son of a certain king of Banaras, was not allowed to succeed because he was discovered to be 'a blind fool.' Another example is supplied by a Jātaka (284), where the courtiers chose an elephant-trainer (*hatthācariya*). One story (387) says that the child of a poor man, born in the street, was once raised to the throne. The instance of a Brahmin having been anointed king is furnished in the Saccaṁkira Jātaka (73). The observations of Fick[82] deserve attention in this connection :— "The legendary character of this narrative does not allow this to be taken as a proof that kingship did not lie always in the hands of the Khattiyas but that persons belonging to other castes might occasionally be in possession of it. There are, however, some passages which seem to support such a theory.....Even the law-books speak of kings who do not belong to the Kṣatriya caste and understand

by these, kings of low origin who have usurped the throne." It seems that though generally the filling of the vacant throne by choosing a deceased king's successor from his own family was more or less a formal ceremony with the courtiers, yet, as we have seen above, his claims might be disregarded in favour even of a stranger, if he were found wanting in the requisite equipment of a ruler. Ministers are found examining the intelligence of a seven-year old prince before allowing him to ascend his father's throne (257). Brushing aside legendary trappings, a certain usage seems to be fairly indicated, which may persuade one to suppose that there was some sort of a procedure, by which the intellectual and other faculties of the heir-apparent, when these were in doubt, were carefully examined before he was installed as king.

Origin of kingship :

Regarding the interesting but highly controversial question of the origin of kingship the Ulūka Jātaka says that *the first king* was chosen by an assembly of the pople (*atīte paṭhama-kappikā sannipatitvā*), belonging to the first cycle of the world. The man selected, was a handsome figure, a commanding personality, endowed with all the auspicious marks of a perfect being (*abhirūpaṁ sobhaggappattaṁ aṇāsampannaṁ sabbākāraparipuṇṇaṁ*,). K. P. Jayaswal shows that the physical fitness

of the candidate was specially looked to in electing a chief.[83] It was on the grounds of defective appearance that, as the story says, the previous election of '*Mr. Owl*' as the king of birds was set aside on the motion of a crow, who repeated his argument for its cancellation thrice with the permission of the assembly. This had followed the moving of a resolution by another bird to the effect that a vote should be taken on the matter before the decision that *Mr. Owl* had been elected could be accepted as final. This brief report of the proceedings of an assembly of voters is meaningfully interesting for a student of the political institutions of ancient India. It may be reasonably inferred that if the question of electing a sovereign ever came up before an assembly the procedure followed was generally of the type disclosed in this story, and that there might sometimes be different candidates for the throne set up by different individuals or groups of individuals. In such cases of competition, it may be presumed, success of a candidate depended upon the application of a system of voting by means of which a final decision of the House was obtained, bringing the debate to a conclusion.

Popular revolts :

We meet with a spectacle of tremendous outburst of popular feelings against a king and his family-priest in the Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka (542). The people

put the priest to death, and with sticks and stones hurried to kill the king himself in a fit of frenzied glee. His life, however, was spared with great difficulty. He was driven out of the city and thrown into an outcast settlement (542), the only alternative for a death-sentence demanded by the multitude. An eloquent testimony to the capacity for organising the different communities into a common resistance against what was believed to be an arbitrary act on the part of a prince is furnised by the Vessantara Jātaka (547). This Jātaka tells us how its hero, the prince of Sivi, was banished from his father's kingdom at the bidding of the people in spite of the latter's expostulations, because he had given away a dearly prized elephant to the Brahmins of Kaliṅga. Here it is interesting to note that even servants of the king openly joined the movement. The king is addressed as *'the people's friend'* in quite an unceremonious fashion.[84] A mighty concourse, comprising diverse elements, but united in resolve and purpose, boldly asking for an explanation of the prince's conduct, which finally compelled the king by the pressure of their opinion to accede to their demand, presents an impressive picture of public assertiveness, as some extracts from the story will show.

"The prince and Brahmin, Vesiya and Ugga great and small/, Mahouts and footmen, charioteers and soldiers, one and all/, The country landowners, and all the Sivi folk come by/,

Thus to the king did cry.—

'O Sañjay, the people's friend, say why this thing was done by him, a prince of our own, he Vessantara, thy son."[85]

In this instance it may be observed that the people were not making a representation of their case to their ruler in a submissive spirit. If the king failed to redress their grievances, they would not be helpless in that case; they could then, as they held, openly take the law into their own hands and usher in a revolution :

"The bidding of the Sivi folk, if ye refuse to do,
The people then will act, methinks, against your son and you."[86]

The king proposed to sacrifice his throne rather than an affectionate son, but the people demanded :

"Not chastisement doth he deserve, nor sword, nor prison cell,
But from the kingdom banish him, on Vaṅka's mount to dwell."[87]

The king replied : "Behold the *people's will* ! and *that I will not gainsay.*"[88] In the Manicora Jātaka (No. 194) there is an instance of a king being put to death for a grave moral offence committed by him. He was Brahmadatta, a lustful man, who wanted to have Sujātā, the wife of a peaceful villager, for his enjoyment. On coming to know that the woman was married and, therefore, could not be easily got hold of, he indulged in a

savage misuse of his royal power, had the husband arrested on a false charge and sentenced him to capital punishment. In this case the king stood guilty of two charges : first, he had violated one of the elementary rights of a free citizen, *viz.*, his right to live peacefully with his family, unmolested by the state ; and secondly, with his absolute command over the resources of the state, he had engaged himself in a despicable intrigue for the satisfaction of his carnal desires. In the hands of such a king the fair name and dignity of the whole society were at stake. But this nefarious business was so cleverly done behind the screen that the people had no means of getting any scent of it. Sakka, *'the people's god,'* was terribly affected; he came to the rescue. "So descending from the godworld, by his own power he dismounted the wicked king from the elephant on whose back he was riding, and laid him upon his back in the place of execution, but the Bodhisattva he caught up, and decked him with all kinds of ornaments and made the king's dress come upon him, and set him on the back of the king's elephant." The executioners lifted the axe and chopped off a head, but lo, it was the king's head, Thus the king had to pay the penalty of his villainy with his own life, and the Bodhisattva was consecrated king with Sujātā, his wife, as chief queen, by Sakka who now assumed a visible body *(dissamānakaṣarīreṇ'eva,).*[89] The whole procedure was highly applauded by the

ministers, the Brahmiṇs, the *gahapatis* and others *(amaccā c' eva brāhmaṇagahapatikādayo ca.).*[90] Sakka in a verse asks the people to understand the 'reason why this man is slain'.[91] The advent of Sakka is a mythical element in the story, but it is not difficult to follow the different stages in the progress of the narrative from a sensible point of view. Sakka is only a name symbolising on the one hand, higher approval of the regicide which marked the triumph of the people's innate sense of justice and, on the other, the moral and religious basis underlying the duties of a sovereign. The throne of Sakka 'that grew hot' seems to represent the will of the incensed people, strengthened by moral support.

King's duties ; popular ideas and sentiments :

The king's duty, as the people of the Jātakas believe, is to promote and maintain law and order. If he is unjust or wicked, how will law and order be preserved ? Such a king is believed to strike a discordant note even in the harmonious and uniform course of Nature, for a vital screw in the machinery somewhere turns loose and the whole system becomes unworkable or operates in a reverse process. Things forgo their natural attributes, not to speak of the risk of the whole kingdom falling into chaos and sustaining a perceptible loss of vitality.

"In the time of unjust kings, oil, honey molasses and

the like, as well as wild roots and fruits, lose their sweetness and flavour, and not these only but the whole realm becomes bad and flavourless." But everything is restored to its normal and natural state when the ruler is just (Rājovāda-J.—No. 334). The king is believed to be responsible even if his people suffer on account of Nature's failure, as if this were due to some guilt on his part, for which he must sufficiently atone. Thus once in the kingdom of Kaliṅga there was no rainfall at the proper season, which brought about a famine in the land. The people came to the king and asked him to do what his predecessors (*Poraṇakarājāno*) had done under similar circumstances. He must give alms, observe the holiday, take the vows of moral purity and for a period of seven days lie down on a bed of grass in his chamber (*sirigabbhaṁ pavisitvā dabbasanthare*).[92] He passed through all these austerities but yet there was no rainfall. He was next asked by the people to do something else. The prevailing concept of monarchy thus shows that the position of the king was not one to be envied ; for him life was not a bed of roses. An oppressive ruler is held responsible, and is accursed for all sorts of sufferings imaginable, which may ever fall to the lot of man, in addition to those that are visibly the outcome of his own conduct. Thus when an old man's foot is pierced with a thorn, it is held to be due to the king's fault. The anxious mother of two grown-up unmarried

daughters falls down from a tree and cries out in frantic anger, "Oh, when will Brahmadatta die, for long as he shall reign our daughters will live unwedded, for there will be no husband for each maid ?" The ox of a peasant is accidentally struck with his ploughshare, and for this king Brahmadatta again is to blame. The village boys curse him and even a frog does not spare him when it is beaten with a stick (194). When an impious king rules, "God sends rain out of season, and in season he sends no rain". Three kinds of fear overcome men, viz., fear of famine, fear of pestilence, and fear of the sword.[93]

Revolutions, not marked by extreme violence :

It is striking to a degree that such revolutionary changes as the deposition or assassination of a tyrant and the consequential election of his successor, instances of which are to be found in the Jātaka literature, are shown to have been brought about in a peaceful manner, apparently without causing any unnecessary bloodshed or posing a threat to the very foundations of the state. We may pause to enquire how this was possible. The reason was two- fold. Wise men must have possessed something like a grounding in political education which made them anxious almost instinctively to avoid the horrors of a bloody upsurge. Most people appear to have been generally on the side of sanity and

reasonableness, which were not allowed to be sacrificed under the impulse of the moment. Their influence upon the rest of the population could not but be of a restraining nature. They knew how to keep under control the disintegrating forces that usually appear when an attempt is made to change a political order. It need not be supposed that a tyrannical king invariably had no supporters of his regime and that when there was a movement on foot to get him killed or overthrown there was no opposition from any quarter against such attempts. In every case election to the throne, if and when it occurred, may not have been uncontested or unanimous. Group politics with its consequent effects on administration may not have been absent even in remote times. Reference may be made in this connection to the Ulūka Jātaka again, which mainly deals with the conduct of a contested election in an assembly, where it is shown to have been held in an orderly and constitutional process. There might occasionally be partisans of different candidates in responsible quarters. But the truth of the matter is that whatever differences might exist amongst rival groups there was an overriding sense of respect for the essentials of law and justice, as understood by the people, and the established usages of the land. Wise and competent leadership also co-operated in a large measure with the people's appreciation of their own responsibility in keeping peace. The

Jātaka instances of the destruction of entire kingdoms along with their rulers, possibly preserve an earlier tradition of mob violence involving sections of people who had not yet attained the maturity of judgment and the virtues of disciplined action, as exhibited in some stories.

The qualities of the people, to which we have already referred, were not, in our opinion, solely responsible for the preservation of internal peace and order even in the midst of violent outbursts of popular temper. If they bore any grudge it was against their *ruler* only, because it was he who had corrupted the whole administration by his evil influence. There was no intention to use the present uprising as an opportunity for introducing any reform into the existing order and thus confuse the original issues. The overthrow or murder or exile of a king was not an event that necessarily produced any violent effect on the deep-rooted socio-political institutions of the land. These had been modelled or planned on such a permanent basis that the evolved system remained basically unaffected when a wicked king was removed from his throne, only to be followed by a worthy successor. The prevailing system could continue as such without a breakdown or disruption. In fact a king reigning for the time being did not constitute such an element of the stereotyped polity that if any step was taken against him individually it could, by itself bring about chaos and confusion in the administration. Then again by

itself it is to be carefully noted that the powers and prerogatives of kings, according to popular faith and usage, were of a strictly limited character. In a Jātaka (96) where a *Yakṣiṇī*—an ogress, requests a king of Gandhāra to hand over the governmemt to her, the king replies in the following manner : "Sweetheart, I have no power over those that dwell throughout my kingdom, I am not their lord and master. I have only jurisdiction over those who revolt or do iniquity. So I cannot give you power and authority over the whole kingdom." (*Bhadde, mayhaṁ sakalaraṭṭhavāsino na kiñci honti, nāhaṁ etesaṁ sāmiko, ye pana rājānaṁ kopetvā akattabbaṁ karonti tesañ ñevāham sāmiko ti iminā kāranena, na sakkā tuyhaṁ sakalaraṭṭhe issariyañ ca āṇāñ ca dātun).*[94] A king with such a restricted jurisdiction cannot be said to be so indissolubly connected with the constitution that any injury done to him individually may spell disaster to the whole political order requiring it to be refashioned after revolution. The number of cases, where kings are mentioned to have made over the administration to their courtiers without giving rise to any constitutional crisis, is not small (Nos. 406, 459, 496, 499, 504, 539, 544). Revolutions of the kind mentioned in the Jātaka fables did not, therefore, upset the traditional constitution or lead to its reform. In fact, it was not the constitution that was supposed to be wrong but the king who misbehaved. The mentality of the people remained on the whole

unaffected by these temporary political disturbances. The Jātaka material discussed above obviously refers to situations which knew no deification of kings, such as, for example, we find in Manu and other later Smṛti writers. "The picture of king being a deity in human form, as drawn by Manu, should be contrasted with the picture of a king, portrayed as a mere mortal in the Vedas and the Arthaśāstra".[95] Though Shama Shastri, as quoted above, refers to some Jātaka stories in this connection, yet we wish he had made a more prominent mention of them with accent on their manifest importance in preserving the tradition of kingship treated as a human institution in this context. It may be pointed out, however, that the statement made by the Gandhāran king in the Jātaka No. 96, about the limitation of his powers, is not in its entirety borne out by the testimony of some other stories. So far as the *definition of his position as the ruler of Takkasilā* is concerned, there is nothing in the Jātaka texts, as far as we can see, to contradict it; the condition may have been similar wherever popular government existed in some form or other. But when the king of Gandhāra denies having any right of transferring the lordship of his people to another, he may be challenged by a number of princes, who act contrary to that theory in some stories. For instance, we may refer to a Jātaka (254) where the king parts with a half of his kingdom in favour of a horsedealer;

another Jātāka (421), where Brahmadatta divides his kingdom into two parts (*Rājā rajjam dvidhā bhinditvā*)[96], and gives half to 'a jolly poor fellow' ; and, again, to the Kāka Jātaka (140) where another Brahmadatta lays his kingdom at the feet of a Bodhisattva ('one Mr. Crow'), who refuses it. We may here refer to Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, which alludes to a form of government, known as *dvai-rājya*, i. e., "the rule of a country by two kings", which "perishes owing to mental hatred, partiality and rivalry"[97]. Some usage of partnership in royal administration or of division of territory on grounds of expediency may have led to the king's power being magnified in popular imagination, and strange elements introduced in a few stories, giving them an appearance of truth. The offer of the throne, however. to a Bodhisattva in the story referred to above, is a symbolic one with a sequel in which the qualities of a good king are praised.

Chapter V

Princely career and court-life

Birth of a prince ; education at home and abroad ; courses of study ; relations with teachers ; political training ; rituals ; court-rivalry, etc.

Birth and ceremonials :

When a queen conceived, it was made the occasion for the performance of such rites as were proper to her state (*laddhagabbhaparihāro*-No. 151). When Nālakara was conceived by the chief queen in Videha, she brought the matter to the notice of her husband who did what was usual on such occasions (489). Probably the rituals included the ceremony known as *garbharakṣaṇa*[98]. It was usual to give the newborn babe a name on his name-day (*nāmagahanadivase*). From the moment of his birth the prince was taken charge of by the female nurses of the palace. A curious incident is described in the Culla-Palobhana Jātaka (263), taking place after a prince was born with a deep disgust for women as a class. "So soon as he was born, he was bathed and given to a serving woman to nurse" (*dhātiya*). 'As he took the breast,' he cried. He was given to another ; "but while a woman held him he would

not be quiet. So he was given to a man-servant and as soon as the man took him, he was quiet" (*pādamulikassa adaṁsu*[99].—No. 263). After that a man used to carry him about. "When they suckled him they would milk the breast for him, or they gave him the breast from behind a screen."

Career from the 16th year :

Not much light is thrown on the activities of young princes up to the age of 16. On their attainment of the 16th year (*viññutaṁpatvā soḷasavassapadese*-No. 55)[100] they became discreet enough and were considered fit for going abroad with a view to educating themselves at the feet of 'world-renowned teachers.' They generally went to Takkasilā which was noted as the foremost centre of learning and culture in their time. Instances, however, are rare where princes at the age of 16 are mentioned as having already completed their education and holding important posts at home[101] (Dummedha-J.-No. 50). The custom of sending princes to distant countries for their education was not held in disregard, for their parents were opposed to the idea of bringing up their children amidst the environment of a court-life, abounding in luxuries, pleasures and comforts ; they were particularly solicitous for promoting, to the fullest extent possible, the development of the manly faculties of their children. By going abroad for

purposes of education, these princes, it is said, would acquire valuable practical experiences about men and affairs. They would learn to be inured to hardship and discomfort, which would make their physique strong and sound, urging them frequently to bring their spirit of adventure into play, and thus round off the angularities bred by aristocratic isolation. "Now, kings of former times, though there might be a famous teacher living in their own city, often used to send their sons to foreign countries afar off to complete their education, that by this means they might learn to quell their pride and highmindedness and endure heat or cold and be made acquainted with the ways of the world" (Tilamuṭṭhi-J.—No. 252 : *'Porāṇakarājāno ca attano putte evaṁ ete nihatamānadappā sītuṇhakkhamā lokacārittaññū ca bhavissantīti*)[102]. Thus the objects which the system of education was desired to aim at were most practical in their nature, and its effects on individual as well as social life, industries, trade and commerce, may be understood to have been beneficial and progressive.

Courses of study, tutorial fees, etc. :

A conventional list of the subjects of study at Takkasilā is to be found in many Jātakas, comprising the 'three Vedas' and the eighteen or all the liberal arts (*tayo vede sabbasippāni*—No. 338 ;

aṭṭhārasannaṁ vijjaṭṭhānānaṁ—No. 50).[103] These also formed the course of study on the part of a Brahmin student (No. 80). The usual fee *(bhāga)*, which a prince had to offer to his teacher, amounted to a thousand pieces of money (*sahassaṁ*, Pāncavudha-J.—No. 55 ; *kahāpaṇasahassān*—No. 252). There were two classes of students :—those who paid fees to their masters, called *Acariyabhāga-dāyakā*, and those who did not bring any fee but offered their services in lieu of it, known as *Dhammantevāsikā*. The former were a privileged group, treated like the eldest sons in the houses of their respective teachers, and getting their lessons probably at day-time, while the *Dhammantevāsikās* had to attend on their teachers by day and were taught at night.

It was the custom to hand over the fee to the teacher at the commencement of the course. The details noted in the Tilamuṭṭhi Jātaka (252) in connection with the preliminaries which had to be settled between a teacher and his pupil on the eve of a candidate's admission as a student, are, interesting enough to deserve more than a passing reference. "He (*i. e.*, the prince of Banaras) bade his parents farewell, and in due course arrived at Takkasilā. There he enquired for the teacher's dwelling and reached it at the time when the teacher had finished his lecture and was walking up and down at the door of the house. When the lad set eyes upon the teacher, he loosed his shoes, closed his

sunshade and with a respectful greeting stood still where he was. The teacher saw that he was weary, and welcomed the new-comer. The lad ate, and rested a little. Then he returned to the teacher, and stood respectfully by him.

"Where have you come from ?", he asked.

"From Benares."

"Whose son are you ?"

"I am the son of the king of Benares."

"What brings you here ?"

"I come to learn," replied the lad.

"Well, have you brought a teacher's fee ? Or do you wish to attend on me in return for teaching you ?"

"I have brought a fee with me," and with this he laid at the teacher's feet his purse of a thousand pieces."

The system of education in vogue did not favour anybody, whether rich or poor, and the prince from Banaras is found walking alone in the streets of Takkasilā, enquiring about his master's dwelling. He had to come in the robe of an humble student, leaving aside the equipage of a prince, conscious of the fact that he was now placed in a situation which did not recognise any earthly distinctions. Certain lapses on the part of these aristocrats remind one of the notorious pranks of students of mediaeval Europe. However stringent the moral code may have been, it was not always possible for a hot-blooded Kṣatriya youth to be

amenable to an unsparing system of moral and intellectual discipline. If a young prince committed any offence or was unusually boisterous, defying all rules and regulations, then it was believed to be the clear duty of the teacher to offer him advice, chastise him, or even beat him according as the mischief committed was mild or serious. But unfortunately the proud Kṣatriya lad might readily construe all this as an insult, and plan to avenge it by murdering his teacher after his return to his country when, as its ruler, there would be no dearth of means on his part to carry out his evil intention (252). A prince of Banaras, who had been so well-behaved at the beginning, soon displayed a thieving propensity that called for the immediate attention of his professor. The sequel shows how vindictiveness could be secretly nurtured over a period in preparing oneself for the commission of a crime against the teacher in a calculated manner. "Now, one day, he went to bathe along with his teacher. There was an old woman, who had prepared some white seeds, and strawed them out before her: there she sat, watching them. The youth looked upon these white seeds, and desired to eat; he picked up a handful, and ate them. 'You fellow must be hungry,' thought she; but she said nothing and sat".

"Next day the same thing happened at the same time. Again the woman said nothing to him. On the third day, he did it again ; then the old

dame cried out, saying 'the great teacher is letting his pupils rob me!' and uplifting her arms she raised a lamentation. The teacher turned back, 'What is it, mother!' he asked. 'Master, I have been parching some seeds, and your pupil took a handful and ate them'. This he had done to-day, he did it yesterday and he did it the day before! Surely he will eat me out of house and home!' 'Don't cry, mother: I will see that you are paid.' 'Oh, I want no payment, master: only teach your pupil not to do it again.' 'See, here, then, mother,' said he, and he caused two lads to take the young fellow by his two hands, and smote him thrice upon the back with a bamboo stick, bidding him take care not to do it again. The prince was very angry with his teacher. With a bloodshot glare, he eyed him from his head to foot. The teacher observed how angry he was and how he eyed him. The youth applied himself to his work and finished his courses. But the offence he hid away in his heart and determined to murder his teacher. When the time came for him to go away, he said to him, "O my teacher, when I receive the kingdom of Banares, I will send for you. Then come to me, I pray." The story goes on to say how the Brahmin came to Banaras in fulfilment of a previous promise, and how his life was saved from a very cowardly attack at the request of the king's courtiers, who were attracted by a speech which the teacher had delivered on the

usefulness of discipline in the early stages of one's life. In the course of this address he pointed out to the king that if he had not been taught discipline, he would have gone on collecting cakes and sweets, and other such things until he formed a thievish habit through such small acts and changed step by step, a hard criminal process given to robbery and murder. Instances of students' misbehaviour are also to be found in some other Jātakas also.

Teachers' interest in politics :

One teacher advises his pupil, a prince, to suppress the cruelty and violence of his nature, as power, attained by violence, does not last long and when it is lost, one's condition becomes like that of a ship wrecked at sea (Dhonasākha-J.—353 *pharusena nāma laddhaṁ issariyaṁ aciraṭṭhitikaṁ hoti, so issariye vigate bhinnanavo viyo samudde patiṭṭhaṁ nalabhate*).[104] Some teachers in the distant city of Takkasilā certainly took a good deal of interest in procuring information about the internal affairs of the different kingdoms from their representatives, *viz*, the princes who came to study in Gandhāra. On the basis of such reports they tried to form some idea regarding the prospects of their pupils in their own countries and the dangers they were likely to face in the near future. Besides this, they seem to have had a general notion about the

motives that inspired struggles and rivalries in the field of politics and how these could be cleverly countered without any bloodshed. Certain pieces of advice, highly practical and often couched in verses, which teachers offered to their pupils on the eve of their departure for home, proved useful in averting calamities, immediate or remote (338 etc.). With the help of some verses which he had learnt from his teacher a king stupefies a plotting son (462). A teacher at Takkasilā presents five weapons to a prince when he starts for home after the end of his studentship, with the help of which he defeats a very powerful enemy on the way (Pañcaruddhā-J.—55). There is an instance of a king making arrangements for the education of his hundred sons (462), placing each of them under the charge of .a separate courtier. This, we should note, differs from the usual practice of sending princes abroad for education, which we have already described. The courtier who takes charge of the youngest prince in the above story imparts to him something more than a mere academic education. The advice that he gives him at the termination of his course of studies is considerably thoughtful, and secures for the prince the throne of his father, easily barring the claims of his '99 brothers.' We shall have an occasion presently to refer to it in detail.

Completion of courses of study ; affairs at home :

On coming back to his country, the prince succeeds in impressing his father with his varied accomplishments and is appointed to the post of *Uparāja* or Viceroy. If he is the only son of his father, there is no danger ahead and nothing unusual happens. He can confidently expect to be led on to the throne by the choice of the courtiers on his father's demise. But sometimes he has at least one brother, if not more, standing in the way of his succession, and suddenly on the death of the aged father there is an outburst of jealousies, which soon develops into a bitter fratricidal quarrel. The youngest of a king's hundred sons consults some *Pacceka Buddhas* regarding his prospects of succession, but on learning that he has no chance he leaves the country and goes straightway to Gandhāra (Telapatta J.-96). Of the two brothers the elder becomes *Uparāja* on the completion of his education, and the younger is appointed Commander-in-Chief. When the father dies, the elder is placed on the throne and the younger comes to serve as *Uparāja*. A slave reports to the king that his brother is secretly planning to put him to death. He becomes suspicious and keeps his brother a prisoner in a certain house, not far from the palace. The man somehow manages to make good his escape and comes back with a vast army, reinforced by a large number of ardent followers from his own country and invites his

brother either to surrender the throne to him or give battle. A fight ensues, in the course of which the elder brother, the reigning king, is killed and now the younger brother easily ascends the throne (539). In one story (467), the elder brother serves as *Uparāja* during the life-time of his father and the younger as Commander-in-Chief. The courtiers want to make the elder son king by the ceremonial sprinkling, but he is overtaken by a feeling of disgust for the kingdom, which at his suggestion, is offered to the younger brother. Within a short time he gets rid, however of this spell of generosity and is gradually tempted to besiege the kingdom, to which end he proceeds with a host of supporters towards the capital. He tenders an ultimatum to the king, who, finding discretion to be the better part of valour, abdicates the throne and gets himself appointed as *Uparāja* under his elder brother (467). A king on his death-bed recommends that his elder son should be his successor and the younger, Prince Brahmadatta, heir-apparent (*uparajjaṁ dethā*). But as the elder does not like to rule, the younger is consecrated as king. Here too slaves are at the root of the evil ; they raise the suspicion of the king by means of false and unfounded reports against the elder brother, who is taken prisoner. Afterwards in sheer disgust he leaves his brother's kingdom and earns his living by archery in a foreign country (Asadisa-J.-181). A king wants to

arrest his brother who is *Uparāja*. The latter goes āway to save his life (469). A well-known family-intrigue is referred to in the Dasaratha Jātaka (461).

Father and son ; relations unfriendly :

Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra quotes the opinion of Bharadvāja, according to which 'princes like crabs have a notorious tendency of eating up their begetter' (*karkaṭakasadharmmāṇo hi janakabhakshā rājaputtrāḥ*).[105] There are many instances of a like tendency to be noted in the Jātaka literature, showing that the feature was not quite imaginary, having a theoretical interest only, but had a real basis. There, for example, is the story of a prince of 16 years of age, tired of waiting for his father's death. He resolves to kill his father in order to hasten his accession to the throne. He thinks of trying four expedients, one after another:- (1) administering poison to his father's food, (2) taking his stand amongst his father's councillors at the time of the great levee and striking him a blow with his sword, when off his guard, (3) stabbing him at the top of the stairs in the royal closet, (4) hiding himself beneath the couch in the King's chamber on the upper floor of the palace in order to kill him as soon as he enters the room. Three out of these four plans are suggested by his attendants who are of the opinion that it is no good getting a

kingdom when one is old. But every time the impatient prince proeeeds to carry out one or another of these plans, he is checked by the fear of detection at the moment of execution, as his ever-watchful father repeats to himself one of the corresponding stanzas, given below, which he learnt from his teacher at Takkasilā.

(1) "With sense so nice, the husks from rice
Rats keen are to discriminate.
They cared not much the husks to touch,
But grain by grain the rice they ate.

(2) The secret counsel taken in the wood
By me is understood.
The village plot soft whispered in the ear
That too I hear.

(3) A monkey once did cruel measures take
His tender offspring impotent to make.

(4) Thy cautious creeping ways
Like one-eyed goat in mustard field that strays,
And who thou art that lurkest here below,
This too I know."—

The boy finally throws himself down at his father's feet praying for forgiveness. But the king has apparently no faith in the submissive spirit displayed of his son, who is to be judged by his conduct alone. He is bound in chains, put into the prison-house and a guard is set over him. The action taken seems to be quite in agreement with the policy, which, as Kauṭilya tells us, is to be followed according to Viśāḷākṣa in dealing

with princes wanting in filial affection, who holds that "it is better to keep them under guard in a definite place."[106] Another king of Banaras, afraid of his son, bids him leave the city. Accompanied by his wife, the son comes to a village of Kāsi and lives there during the rest of his father's life (233). A similar incident is described in the Succa Jātaka (320), where the father thinks of his son, who is acting as *Uparāja*, in the following terms— "This fellow may do me wrong, if he gets an opportunity." The son goes away from the city and dwells in a village with his wife. The machinations of a young prince, acting as *Uparāja*, are revealed in the Mūsika Jātaka (373). He cannot afford to wait till his father's natural death, when he will be a worn-out old man. His advisers point out the absurdity of the idea of his going to the frontier and openly revolting against his father. Several expedients are proposed : viz., (1) killing him near the bathing *ghat*, (2) stabbing him at the foot of the stairs, (3) killing him by a blow of a 'spoon-shaped instrument' with its long handle poisoned. The son is put in chains and thrown into prison. A king's son who is appointed *Uparāja* after completing his education at Takkasilā, wants to kill his father and when the kingdom is attacked by a foreigner, he leaves the city with the whole population following him, thus making it impossible for the king to defend it against his enemy. He flees away with his wife and priest,

and the son now comes back to occupy the throne (416). A prince actually puts his father to death and in this case also the parricide is helped by his attendants. The thought that made the prince restless and finally drove him to the crime is pithily expressed in the following words :—'My father is more like a brother ; if I shall wait for his death, I shall be an old man before I succeed to the crown. What good will it do me to get the kingdom then ? I will kill my father and make myself king' (530).[107] The four sons of a king are determined to murder him, not for the sake of satisfying any political ambition, but for avenging the death of their mother, who was executed at the command of the king, putting his faith in a scandalous and unfounded report against her (528). The plan is, however, given up at the request of a learned man. In the Bhūridatta Jātaka (543) we have one more instance of a king, who does not feel perturbed in the least in ordering the heir-apparent to accept a life of temporary exile from the city.

King's harem :

Women of the king's harem are very often corrupt and immoral to the extreme. In one instance even the chief queen does not think twice before committing a grave sexual offence. The standard of female chastity is indeed remarkably low

as painted in this branch of Buddhist tradition. The royal household is frequently a den of vices, corruptions and intrigues, which not only disturb the peace of mind of many a king, directly affected, but sometimes cause political turmoil and unrest, fomenting enmity between neighbouring kingdoms. A king, for example, sets out to quell a disturbance on the border of his territory (*paccanta*), and at the request of his chief queen sends one messenger at the end of every league to enquire about her health. He sends 64 messengers in all, but the queen, a woman of easy virtue, misconducts herself with every one of these and then tries to tempt the royal chaplain who is strong enough not to be allured. He relates the story of the queen's conduct to the king on his return from the expedition. The king orders all the 64 men to be beheaded. The chaplain now makes a passionate appeal in their behalf with these words : "The men are not to blame, for they were constrained by the queen. Wherefore pardon them. And as for the queen, she is not to blame, for the passions of women are insatiate, and she does not but act according to her inborn nature. Wherefore pardon her also." It becomes impossible for the king to oppose the logic of this argument (121). The course of politics is so crooked that even a father cannot trust his sons. A certain king, for instance, has seven sons. When they attain their youth, their father begins to entertain suspicions about their movements, and though there is no evidence

of guilt on their part they are one day called to his presence and asked to keep away from the capital till his death, after which they should return and take possession of the kingdom. A courtier in another story carries on intrigues in the harem, but the king is placed in a dilemma as to what should be done ; he cannot dismiss either the minister, whose services are otherwise so valuable or the woman, who is so dear to him. He consults the *Paṇḍita-amacca*, describing the courtier as a jackal, himself as a lion, and the woman in the harem as a happy lake....."sheltered at the foot of a lovely hill." The advice of this councillor was : "Out of the mighty river all creatures drink at will. If she is dear, have patience, the river is river still" (verse : Pabbatūpathara—J.—195). A certain courtier, who is guilty of a similar offence, reports to the king that a servant of his has corrupted the women of his house and thus betrayed his trust. The king gives his opinion in the following verse : "I too a jealous servant have ; and here he stands ! Indeed ! Good men, I trow, are rare enow. So patience is my rede" (verse : Khanti-vaṇṇana-J.—225). A case of abduction of the chief queen of Banaras by a *Garuḍa* king of the island of Serumā is available (360). The son of a royal priest has illicit connections with the wife of king Maddava. With the king's permission he enjoys her company for seven days, and then both of them abscond. The king is afterwards reconciled

to his fate, thus thinking within himself: "If she loved me, she would not forsake her kingdom and flee away. What have I to do with her when she has not love but fled away ?" (401).[108] The king is apparently a genuine champion of free love.[109] A grim story of betrayal by a wife is told in a Jātaka (Parantapa-J.—416). When his kingdom is invaded by an enemy the king flees away with his queen, his household priest and an attendant named Parantapa. They build a small hut in a forest where they live together in disguise. The queen sins with the servant, encourages him to kill her husband in the following words: "If the king knows, neither you nor I would live ; kill him." Asked as to how the murder can be accomplished, she replies, "He makes you carry this sword and bathing dress when he goes to bathe : take him off his guard at the bathing place, cut off his head and chop his body to pieces with the sword and then bury him in the ground." The priest secretly witnesses the murder of the king, but feigns ignorance of it. The post-humous son of the king, on attaining his 16th year, is one day taken near the spot where his father was killed before his birth, and is thereafter trained by the priest in the art of handling a sword. The boy kills Parantapa and thus avenges the death of his father (416). A chief queen falls in love with her step-son, a prince of uncommon beauty, and tries to seduce him but he remains firm, saying, "Mother, my mother you are, and you have a husband living.

Such a thing was never before heard of, that a woman, a matron, should break the moral law in the way of fleshly lust. How can I do such a deed of pollution with you ?" (Mahāpaduma—J.—472).

We have on many occasions referred to the traditional rivalry between Kāsi and Kosala, and it may be useful to remember in the present context the part played in a story by some ex-ministers of Kāsi in the repeated invasions of that kingdom by princes of Kosala. Though the Jātakas are full of such revolting pictures of corruption it should not be supposed that these accounts are not motivated but represent court-life faithfully in every respect. Propagation of a rigid ideal of asceticism perhaps required a focus on human frailties and weaknesses, specially in sexual life. A story of immorality, once circulated, may be easily multiplied in a hundred different forms. It may be suggested, however, that as some of the scandals mentioned seem to be connected with significant consequences, they possibly have a substratum of truth, though, of course, overlaid by exaggerations. We may conclude with the following observation, quoted from Cowell's Preface to the Jātakas,—"Like all collections of early popular tales they are full of violence and craft, and betray a low opinion of woman ; but outbursts of nobler feeling are not wanting to relieve the darker colours".

Marriage :

Princes marry after their return from Takkasilā. *Uparājas* have their wives, who follow their husbands even unto exile. Some matrimonial rules obtaining in royal families need special mention. Marriages between nephews and nieces are referred to in the Mudupāṇi Jātaka (262) ; those between brothers and sisters are celebrated in some Jātakas (Udaya J.—458 ; Dasaratha J.—461) before they succeed as kings and queens in their respective dominions. The son who is destined to become the heir-apparent is to be married before consecration when the husband and the wife are to be installed as king and queen. In a previous chapter we have referred to the fact that instances of matrimonial connection established between different ruling houses are not rare. In some stories, however, even prudent kings do not seem to be demonstrably anxious for preserving the sanctity of the royal blood ; on the other hand, in making their erratic choice they are guided solely by considerations of beauty and health. A king happens to see a country woman (*janapaditthī*), strong, neat and modest. He takes a fancy to her and makes her his chief queen (Bāhiya J.—108). Another king falls in love with a young and beautiful daughter of 'a fruiterer selling jujubes in the streets of Benares' (*paṇṇikadhītā abhirūpā paṭhemavaye ṭhitā*). He

marries this country girl and raises her to the dignity of the queen consort (Sujāta J.—306). But the king must be satisfied that the woman, he takes a fancy to, is still unmarried. What the legends suggest is that any unmarried woman might be admitted into the harem to adorn a new role which a moment before was beyond all her earthly expectations.

Consecration :

A prince may be installed on the throne during the life-time of his father but, normally speaking, he does not actually rule as a king so long as his father lives[110]. It is after his death that he assumes the reins of sovereignty. The ordinary rule was for the prince to wait till his father's death and then to seek election in the hands of the courtiers. We are told that a separate palace was built for a Vaideha prince on the occasion of his ceremonial sprinkling (489). It is likely that at the time of his accession a prince was to be under the obligation of taking an oath of just government, which was regarded as forsworn if he proved a bad ruler (521). The consecration was performed by the royal priest and all kinds of public merry-making marked the event. When Kusa, son of Okkāko, comes to the throne, the occasion of sprinkling is marked by the release of all prisoners. We hear of a drinking feast, held for a period of seven days, in celebration of a royal installation.

Character, hobbies, habits, etc. :

Habits and idiosyncracies, attributed to some kings in the Jātaka legends, call for special notice because they help us to study from the popular point of view their temperamental peculiarities, and also to have a glimpse of the workings of their inner minds when they relaxed from state duties. Indeed they appear to us as surrounded by a naive splendour of crude exaggerations and fantasies, woven round their daily life and character. The popular conception of royal status was evidently not so rigidly formalised as to preclude kings being considered on the human level with all their follies and foibles, exposed in a humorous style. The Jātaka stories contain some fine character-sketches drawn in a manner appealing to the popular mind. A certain king interests himself in knowing the cause of the sudden ailments of the state-elephant *(mangala-hatthi)* called Mahilāmukha (Mahilāmukha J.—26), and another of a state-horse called Pāndava (Giridantā J.—184). A king wants his ministers to proclaim by beat of drum his resolution of realising a vow, that he took in the days of his viceroyalty, of offering a sacrifice in honour of a tree. Nothing can be more ghastly than the purport of the proclamation which reads thus : "All such as are addicted to the Five Sins : to wit, the slaughter of living creatures and so forth, and

all such as walk in the Ten Paths of Unrighteousness, them will I slay, and with their flesh and their blood, with their entrails and their vitals I will make my offering" (Dummedha-J.-50). It is a relief to find that the decree was not executed, as the people were intimidated into giving up their wickedness and were thus able to save their precious lives. It is tempting to note a contrast between the methods of this king and those of Aśoka, the great Buddhist emperor of the 3rd century B. C., though both were, to a certain extent, actuated by the object of carrying on a moral propaganda on an extended scale. Another king of Magadha was strangely jealous of his state-elephant on account of the high praises bestowed upon it by an admiring crowd of citizens, and resolved to kill it by casting it over a precipice (Dummedha-J.-122). Another king 'of a somewhat covetous nature,' possessing 'a brute of a horse' was very much prone to mischief (Suhanu-J.-158). Certain merchants from Uttarāpatha come with 500 horses to sell them to a king who wants to get them at a small price by using violence in which the savage horse plays a prominent part. Thus he advises one of his ministers to carry out his intention, which though cruel, is not devoid of humour : "Friend, make the men name their prince; then let loose Big Chestnut so that he goes amongst them; make them bite them, and when they are weak and wounded get the men to reduce their price." King Dadhivāhana is

found amusing himself by casting a net into a river (Dadhivāhana-J.-186). When the net is drawn out, a mango is found sticking to it. The king does not know what name to give it. Foresters tell him that it is a mango. He eats it up and is delighted with its delicious taste. The joy that attends the discovery is great. The stone is planted in his park and in the course of three years it grows into a big tree bearing fruits. "Great was the worship paid to this tree; milk-water was poured about it; perfumed garlands with five sprays were hung upon it; wreaths were festooned about it; a lamp was kept burning and fed with scented oil.....:..." King Dadhivāhana sends presents of these fruits to other kings, just to arouse the desire of these princes to grow the precious tree in their own kingdoms, taking at the same time sufficient care that the reputation of his own country may not be shared by another. "Dadhivāhana used to prick with a thorn that place in the stone where the sprout would come from, for fear of their growing the like by planting it." This protective measure is, no doubt, inspired by a selfish motive but since the dawn of history has not such narrowness been at once the shame and pride of patriotism even in the most refined souls? Many kings have a great power of appreciation; they are attracted by anything peculiar or extraordinary, and are unstinted in their admiration and patronage (Kapunna-J.—149; Kapi-J.—250; Kuṇḍaka—J.—254; 376, etc.). Talkative kings are known

(Kacchapa-J.—215 ; Kutidusaka-J-331). One king is so garrulous that when he begins to speak, there is no end of his talking, leaving any chance for anybody to get in a word. A minister is on the look-out for a suitable parable to induce the king to give up his talkative habit. He succeeds in convincing the king of the necessity of 'speaking wisely and speaking in season.' In another Jātaka a minister advises his master to avoid prolixity, to be thorough and well-restrained in speech, in the following verse :

"The sage his measured words discreetly guides,
Nor rashly to his second self confides.
Before he speaks will prudent counsel take,
He goes to trap as Garuḍa, the snake."

Instances like these remind one of the stories of the *Pañcatantra,* where kings are taught wholesome lessons with the help of familiar illustrations. A certain king is depicted as fastidiously extravagant and dainty so far as his meals are concerned (Dūta-J—260). "When he ate, he ate not within doors ; but as he wished to confer merit upon many people by showing them the costly array of his meals, he caused a pavilion adorned with jewels to be set up at the door, and at the time of eating, he had this decorated, and there he sat upon a royal dais, made all of gold, under a white parasol with princesses all around him, and ate the food of a hundred delicate flavour from a dish which cost a hundred thousand pieces of money." An indolent king is

corrected by his *'amaccaratna'* while taking a walk in his company in the royal garden (345). A king is about to be initiated into the habit of drinking wine, from which he is prevented by divine intervention. "If he shall drink strong drink, all India will perish : I will see that he shall not drink it" (Kumbha J.—512). One king proclaims by beat of drum throughout the city that he gives protection to all creatures, which is opposed by the people purely for practical reasons. From that time onwards no one dared 'so much as raise hand against beast or bird' (Ruru J.—482). One of the Brahmadattas of Banaras gives 500 hermits, who are his guests, a large supply of the best spirits, knowing that such things rarely come in the way of those who renounce the world and its vanities (Surāpāna-J—81). A king causes an inscription to be made upon a golden plate, which is enclosed in a casket (159—*suvaṇṇapaṭṭe likhāpetvā paṭṭam*). Some kings are over anxious not to devote even a single moment to worldly matters after the advent of old age. Barbers are, therefore, asked to report the appearance of the first gray hair on their heads, which was regarded as a sure symptom of decline of youth (525). A king is overwhelmed with grief at the death of his affectionate wife (Assaka-J.—207). The body is laid in a coffin, and 'the bereaved king lies beneath the bed weeping and mourning without taking any food'. This picture is somewhat unique as in the Jātakas no king loves his wife so dearly

and so single-mindedly. A courtezan named Sāmā, who has 500 female slaves as her attendants, is the favourite of a king of Banaras (Kaṇavera-J—318). This woman is also visited by a young merchant of the city. A king, inordinately greedy of money, takes bribes *(lañcana)* even from ascetics (Bharu J.—213). Another worshipper of Mammon is a king of Banaras, who is spoken of 'as given over to the desire of riches and the lust of the flesh, and greedy of gain' (Kāmanitā-J.—228). A king of the Śivis secretly falls in love with the wife of his Commander-in-chief, and so deep is his infatuation that there is every likelihood that he will die if he does not get her. The general urges upon the king to accept her as a conditional gift, to be restored to him after he has enjoyed the pleasures of her company. The injustice of this proposal dawns upon the king's consciousness ; he sternly refuses the offer, uprooting the unholy desire from his mind (Ummadantī J.—527). A king adopts heretical views (*micchāgahaṇam gahetvā*) as a protest against the conduct of an ascetic and drives away the whole community of mendicants from Banaras, so that in the city there is to be found not a single 'Buddhist or Brahmin ascetic' (*eko pi dhammika samaṇa brāhmaṇo nāhosi*—391). A prince named Sotthisena is stricken with leprosy ; physicians cannot cure it, but his chaste wife, by the performance of 'an act of truth' cures him of this disease (Sambula J.-519). A minister is very talkative, the king is anxious to

make him sober in speech (Sālittaka J.—107). Above all things, kings should be fearless and courageous. But when one dreams a bad dream or hears any unnatural sound, or perceives any *ominous* phenomenon, one becomes unnerved and invites astrologers to explain them fully (314, 418, etc.). A king issues orders for the wholesale destruction of dogs in the city (Kukkura J.—22). One king is endowed with the power of understanding what animals' cries mean (416). Knowing that anything which has a special or novel interest: is bound to attract the attention of the world, a king wants to build a palace, supported by one column. He thinks that other monarchs, who have palaces, supported by many columns, will regard this as a unique achievement of art and praise him as the chiefest king in the whole of India (Bakabrahma J.—405). One king is defeated in a battle on account of his partiality to newcomers. He is curious to have some illustrations from the treasure-house of past history, enquiring if he is the only king 'who has ever been defeated through favour shown to newcomers, or others have had 'the same fate before' (Dhummakāri J.—413).

Palace, court and dress :

We next proceed to give a summary of details regarding the palace. the court, and the royal dress as described in the Jātakas. There is no

doubt that most of the accounts are characterised by exaggeration and poetic fancy, but sureiy there is some element of truth in them. On a study of the available materials, after discarding apparent exaggerations, one cannot but be impressed by the splendour and magnificence of the court-life depicted in some of the stories. Princes used to take delight in their refined tastes and aesthetic sense with the support of an appreciative people. Descriptions of the court, which frequently occur in the Jātakas, also throw interesting hints in regard to the elements present in it. Here the *Amātyas* (Ministers),[1] Brāhmins, *Gahapatis* (house-holders) and others, and nobles of the Kṣatriya caste (*khattiya kumārā*) are constantly in attendance (*amaccā ca brāhmanagahapatikādayo khattiya-kumārā ca*). It is not indicated whether amongst them some were representatives of particular groups with respective duties and functions assigned to them. A king's court is described in the Pañcagaru Jātaka (132), in the following high-flown language, which, however, does not seem to draw an entirely exaggerated picture : "*Tadā pana Bodhiṣatto nagaraṁ pavisitvā rājabhavane pāsāde mahātale samussāpitasetacchattaṁ ratanavarapallaṁkaṁ āruyha devarājatiḷhāya nisidi, amaccā ca brāhmaṇagahapatikādayo khattiyakumārā ca sabbālaṁkārapatimaṇḍitā parivāretvā aṭṭhaṁsu, devaccharapatibhāgā soḷasasahassā nāṭakitthiyo naccagītavāditakusalā uttamavilāsasampannā nacca-gītavāditāni payoje-*

sum, gītavāditasaddena rājabhavanam meghatthamtapūrito mahāsamuddakucchi viya ekaninnādam ahosi".[111] Chalmers translates the passage in the following manner :—"Entering the city, the Bodhisattva passed into the spacious hall of the palace and there seated himself in all his godlike beauty on his jewelled throne beneath the white umbrella of his kingship. Round him in glittering splendour stood his ministers and Brahmins and nobles, whilst sixteen thousand nautch girls, fair as the nymphs of heaven, sang and danced and made music, till the palace was loud with sounds like the ocean when the storm bursts in thunder on its water'.[112] Palaces of kings in the Jambudvīpa are imagined to be seven-storeyed, supported by many columns (*bahūhi thambhehi pāsādakaraṇam* : Bhaddasala J.—465 *Sattabhūmiko pāsādo*[113] : Suruchi J.—489). Vissakamma is appointed to build a splendid seven-storeyed mansion, 'half a league in length and breadth and five and 20 leagues in height, all with stones of price' (489). One king has a palace supported by a single column only. Another king wants to have a palace built according to this plan *(ekatthambhakassa maṁgalapāsādassa)*. Pillars are made of wood (Kusanāli J.—121)[114] and carpenters (*vaḍḍhaki*) are appointed to build them. The palace has always a courtyard attached to it where people of all descriptions gather on various occasions, either to witness some interesting performance or to address a complaint to the king. Through a window

on the terrace of the palace the king often surveys the varied activities of the city and is attracted by the sight of many an interesting object. Golden towers, adorned with wreaths of scented flowers, which a king often visits, 'girt with many a lady fair (verse : *parikiṇṇo itthāgārehi*)', 'the gabled-hall, wreathed with flowers and wrought of gold' (*kūṭāgāraṁ*) is alluded to (Cullasutasoma J.—525), where the king stays in the company of his kinsfolk (verse : *rājā parikiṇṇo ñātisaṁghena)*; his garden 'bright with flowers through all the season-changing colours and the royal lakes overspread with lotus blue, haunts of wild birds' ; his *pātalivana, āmravana, kanikārvana,* etc.,[115] 'eternally delightful', are referred to in a Jātaka (525). Courts resound with the cries of peacocks and herons and the melodious music of cuckoos (531). In a verse attributed to the Master, kings are described as arrayed in robes of the finest silk (*Kāśikāvatthadhārino*), 'with sandal oil bedewed' (532).[116] In the Great Hall of the palace (*mahātala*) where the king sits on his magnificent throne, he is surrounded by bands of minstrels, mimedancers, male and female (*gandhabbanaṭanaccakādiparivuto*—529).[117] A seven-storeyed palace is mentioned, on the terrace of which is a beautiful, well-decorated chamber where a princess sleeps at night (*sattabhūmakapāsādavaratale alamkatasirigabbhe* : Udaya J.—458). The description of a king's court on the occasion of a festival runs as follows :—"the crowd of the king's ministers sat

on one side, on another a host of Brāhmins, on another the most beautiful dancing girls ; Brāhmin panegyrists skilled in festive songs, sang their cheerful odes with loud voices, hundreds of musical instruments were played, the king's palace was filled with one vast sound as if it were in the centre of the yugandhara ocean" (*amaccamaṇḍalaṁ*—the circle of ministers,—*Brāhmaṇagaṇa, Setthiādayo, Brāhmaṇasoṭṭhikārā*—). A difference has been made in the Kummāsapiṇḍa Jātaka (415) between these Brahmins and householders on the one hand, and men of the city on the other *(nagaramanusse)*, probably indicating that the former comprised a group by themselves, distinguished from the latter as regards status. One king invites all the smiths *(kammāra)* of his realm to build an iron house *(ayogharaṁ)*, furnished with rooms and pillars, which is completed within nine months (510).

Kings and Public gatherings ; cultural ties :

Our attention may be next drawn to the material, found in the Jātakas, indicating the scope and opportunities of social intercourse between the king and the different grades of the people in the period represented. One dominant feature of this relation, is its frankness and intimacy, which could not have grown without a positive recognition by the king of their innate worth in the constitution of the state.

Men of varied castes and classes often meet together at the invitation of their king, jostling with one another in a vast crowd, where aristocratic distinctions less their sharpness under its impact, the king with all his people participating together in a grand feast which they enjoy with equal warmth of interest and admiration,—everything in short wearing an unmistakably democratic appearance. If the performance given is not up to the mark, the expression of their condemnation is as emphatic and unanimous as their admiration when the reverse is the case. The king does not enjoy a treat alone in the company of a select few but takes the whole people along with him. This is due not only to the fact of the king's personal instinct of social life being unsubdued by the exclusiveness of the environments in which he lives, moves and has his being, but, equally or to a greater extent, to a compulsion of the age, which required public opinion to be consulted on a wide scale in the adjudication of cultural values. The patronage of the king is not simply a matter of private interest,—it has a great public significance. Rich establishments of dancers, musicians, minstrels, actors and actresses, managed and patronised by the state, are not meant always for catering for the tastes and amusement of the king, the members of his family and the ministers alone, but they draw their inspiration from the loud and confused voice of popular acclamations, thunderous clappings and the throw-

ing away of kerchiefs and purses by an assembly mad with joy. Such open demonstrations of physical and cultural feats brought different classes of people closer to one another and made them feel an affinity of thinking on the merits of such performances. In their popular appeal and as a unifying force these seem to bear a resemblance to the national games and festivals of ancient Hellas. It is impossible to disregard their contributions towards the evolution of certain distinctive cultural institutions and the growth of popular literary traditions and ideals in ancient India. Kings stand out in these legends as great patrons of arts and letters. Most of them get their education in the university town of Takkasilā. Travels and journeys abroad and made them realise their affinity of thought in the criticism of such performances, give them much practical experience about the outside world, and a direct knowledge of the glories and achievements of other lands. When they take the reins of government into their own hands, the more enterprising of them naturally feel inclined to utilise every opportunity for the promotion of culture and efficiency, the cultivation of refined tastes and ideas amongst their own people in the light of what they have seen abroad. Thus Poetry and Arts develop under their patronage. Any Brahmin who can compose a few verses is sure to be properly rewarded by the king. Sometimes the king himself will try his hand at a verse, which turns out to be so

appealing that within a short time the whole people will take it up and commit it to memory. It seems that the people are not prepared to lose anything that has some value, however small that may be, in adding to their stock of ideas. Kings are born and bred up in an atmosphere of poetry, music and dance. We may refer here, for instance, to the great festivities that are held at the time of their birth, installation and marriage. Even when a king goes to his park for enjoying a little leisure, he is to be accompanied by dancers and musicians to keep up his spirits. One story relates that a great musical competition was to be held between two men, Mūsila of Ujjain and Guttila of Banaras at the door of the royal palace of Banaras (Guttila J.—243). At the palace gate a pavilion *(maṇḍapa, raṅga-maṇḍala)* was erected with a throne where the king was seated ; surrounding him were thousands of slaves, women in beautiful dress, courtiers, Brahmins and citizens *(amaccabrāhmaṇaraṭṭhikā-dayo ca).* All the people of the city had assembled together to occupy the seats in the courtyard *(rājaṅgane),* arranged, circle on circle, tier above tier *(cakkāticakke mañcātimañce bandhiṁsu)*.....It was indeed a vast concourse of human beings on every side *(Mahājano parivāresi).* "And when one of the musicians has shown a great triumph over the other, the multitude in thousands waved and waved their kerchiefs in the air, in thousands they shouted applause."

The king does not keep himself away from the audience but feels and acts as they do ; his is perhaps the principal note in the chorus of condemnation that is started against the vanquished. He makes a sign to the multitude, and "with stones and staves and anything that came to hand, they beat and bruise him to death, and seizing him by the feet they cast him upon a dust heap." The sequel will not appear strange if we remember the fate of many a scholar, defeated in intellectual contests in the glorious age of the Upanishads. Another story says how an assembly gathers at the invitation of a king to witness a very interesting competition of archers. The palace-yard is made ready to accommodate a vast crowd and the king takes his seat on the throne with men surrounding him on all sides. Jotipala, the hero of many an intricate feat of archery, is acclaimed with unbounded enthusiasm and wild excitement. The people make "a great uproar, shouting and dancing about and clapping their hands and they threw off their garments and ornaments, so that there was treasure lying in a heap to the amount of eighteen crores" (Sarabhaṅga J.—522). Occasionally a king may, by beat of drum, proclaim his intention to address the citizens on some topic for their moral uplift, thus affording himself and the people an opportunity for mutual contact and communication of ideas ; for the monarch such gatherings outside the constitution may have a use in enabling him to improve his

government and make it more agreeable to the governed. The king declares that it is his determination to show the path of righteousness to the townfolk *(Ambho nagaravāsino, tumhākam.....dhamme desassāmi).* The whole city, as it were, assembles at his courtyard, where the pavilion, erected for the occasion, becomes overcrowded with spectators of both sexes, including the ladies of the royal household. The king from his throne delivers his sermon, emphasising the necessity of almsgiving, of showing respects to Brahmins and *Śramaṇas,* parents and *āchāryas,* of avoiding injury to animal life,—imbued with a sincere spirit of remorse for all the bad and wicked things that he admits to have done in the past in violation of those moral principles, which he now teaches in his address with so much strength of conviction and depth of earnestness. The reader is only to remember certain parallel passages from the edicts of Aśoka to appreciate their agreement with these noble utterances and also the significance of the *Dharma* propaganda, set on foot by the Jātaka prototype of the great Maurya Emperor,—based on a direct appeal to the masses[118]. It is not unlikely that the ideal, with which we get familiar through the edicts of Aśoka, influenced same of the Jātaka examples, as set forth above. There is no doubt that kings in India from remote times made notable contributions towards shaping the moral and intellectual life of the people by playing the role of a teacher themselves and

as patrons of drama and music in which there was a general interest.

A king, in order to attract his son to the pleasures of the world, proposes to have dramas enacted before him *(nāṭakāni'ssa paccupaṭṭhāpetvā vīmaṁsissāmā)*. The prince is brought into a beautiful chamber of the palace *(antagabbhaṁ sirigabbhesu)*, which is filled with the smell of spirituous liquor etc. *(gaṁdhadāma-pupphadāma-dhūpavāsa-madir-āsavā-dihi)*.[118a]

Sports and amusements :

The games and amusements, in which the kings indulge, are hunting, dice-play and those that are available in the seclusion of the royal park. When kings go out a-hunting, it occasions the need of some joint action on the part of his subjects to represent to him that great inconvenience will be caused to their normal occupations by the wild activities resulting from such expeditions. Amongst well-organised communities it is not difficult to devise measures that are calculated to remove a general grievance of this sort. "In those days the king of Benares," so runs the story, "was passionately fond of hunting.....Every day he mustered the whole of his subjects, townsfolk and countryfolk alike, to the detriment of their business, and went a-hunting." His people sustained immense losses and were determined not to tolerate this state of

things any longer. So they met together and deliberated as to the remedy they should adopt. The townsfolk co-operated with the village-people and the result manifested itself in the speedy relief they were able to bring to themselves without any clash with the authorities. Plans and manoeuvres, adopted on a wide scale by the people to get themselves rid of the unavoidable evils, due to the hunting excursions of their monarchs, are referred to in many of the Jātaka stories (385 etc.). Cruel laws must have been in force, restricting the free movements of people throughout the area where hunting operations were carried on. One king going with a great retinue to a forest, a league or two in extent, is said to have proclaimed that if a deer happened to escape 'by any man's post, that man was to be fined the value of the deer' (398).

CHAPTER VI

People and Government

Villages, towns and cities ; Village-council ; Gāmabhojaka—links with the Centre ; King and *Dhamma* ; Ministers; Executive ; Law and Justice ; Army, etc..

The material, to be found scattered in the mass of the Jātaka stories, having a bearing on administrative conditions, though meagre in quantity, is none the less useful for its intrinsic quality. Its inadequacy to serve the purpose of a connected or comprehensive account is to be explained by the fact that, wherever any information on the subject is given, it is limited to the immediate needs of the particular context in which it occurs, and must, therefore, be, as it actually is, stray and fortuitous in character. If the palpable legendary absurdities are overlooked, it may be discerned that the information supplied on any particular occasion, is mostly about a matter in which the commonfolk had a real and practical interest within the range of their usual transactions and experiences, the affairs of their daily life in the pursuit of their avocations and normal behaviour. Its dependability as a witness to real conditions, therefore, rests on a more or less positive basis. The ordinary people, who

could not, however, boast of any political training of an academic sort, had, however, an innate understanding of the differences between a good government and an evil one. They could take concerted action to air their grievances and have them summarily redressed. They knew of the use of apt comments and maxims, forming part of their growing traditional heritage. With the progress of civilisation their country had already become endowed with a net-work of villages and towns. Forests were still to be seen, but their area was being reduced. Even robbers, proverbially known to prefer jungles to well-organised villages or towns for their habitation, are mentioned in some cases to have built their own villages, where they resided as a separate and exclusive community. Thus the necessity of clearing away forests and founding villages or towns according to their convenience was felt even by the anti-social elements. New villages and cities also continued to be established under the direct patronage of kings. Economic factors of an advancing material civilisation must have accounted for the depopulation of many older villages and cities, as centres of activity shifted to other areas.

Villages :

Different types of villages are mentioned in the Jātakas, *viz.*, *nigamagāma*, *gāma*, *gāmaka*, *paccantagāma*, varying in importance and population.

Nigama and Gāma :

A *nigama* might mean both a town and a village if the latter was a township in miniature with at least some of its busy elements of life present in it. In this sense some *gāmas* may have actually amounted to *nigamas* (118). In the Babbu Jātaka (No. 137), we find a reference to a *nigama,* where lived a very well-to-do merchant (*eko mahavibhavo seṭṭhi ahosi*). That this term may not have meant exactly a town in this case is perhaps indicated by the fact that the same *nigama* is alluded to as a village elsewhere in the story (*so gāmopi chaḍḍito apaṇṇabhi etc.*). An attempt is made to keep the sense of an active village distinct from that of a town by the use of the expression '*nigamagāma*', which apparently means a village, full of the bustle of a market-town. "Translations have used market occasionally, but perhaps with scarcely sufficient warrant, e.g. market-town for nigamagāma."[119] A village is generally called *gāma ; gāmaka* means a small village, more appropriately a hamlet.

Population figures :

The population of a village extended from thirty to a thousand families, (Kulāvaka-31 ; *tesām gāmato avidure aññho sahassākuṭiko*—No. 317 : *te ca timsa kulamanussā ;* 402, *taṭṭha timsajanā rājasevakā*

vasanti). The latter cannot possibly mean that the population consisted of 30 men only, but probably of thirty men with their families. Similarly all that we are told in the Jātaka, quoted above, (No. 387) is that the village in question comprised one thousand houses with one thousand masters. The population in such cases may not have exceeded 5,000, each family on an average consisting of five members. Another village is said to have consisted of 500 families (*pañca kulasatāni vasanti*— No. 540).

Paccantagāma :

Paccantagāmas were villages situated on the borders of a kingdom (cf. e. g. Mahāsāroha-J. 302). In view of the insecure condition of the borders, resulting from organised depredations of robbers and marauders, these *paccantagāmas*, where it was difficult to distinguish between a rebel and a loyalist (*rājapuriso coropuriso*—No. 302), could not be expected to flourish in the same way as was possible for a village which was nearer to the heart of a kingdom or which enjoyed the natural privileges of a close proximity to towns and cities (cf. *Vahinagare vaḍḍhakigāmo*-475 ; *nagarato pubbutarayadisaye... gāmo*, etc.). A villager is called *gāmovāsi or janapadavāsi* (529), as distinguished from *nagara-vāsi*, a citizen or resident of a city.

Number of villages in certain regions :

Amongst the resources of the kingdom of Banarās mention is made of the fact that it contained 60,000 villages (529 : *setthi gāmasahassāni paripuṇṇāni).* The kingdom of Mithila could boast of 16,000 villages *(gāmasahassāni paripuṇṇāni solasa...406).* People could live prosperously and in an organised condition in their rural abodes, pursuing trade and agriculture and various other avocations in peace and security. It is no wonder, therefore, that they should come to hold such an important place in the state as we find ascribed to them. The figures given above may seem exaggerated, but if attention is given to the *Gāmaṇi-caṇḍa Jātaka,* where it is said that a certain village was situated at a distance of three *yojanas* from the capital town, starting from which some people are described as passing through a succession of intermediate villages on their way to the king's court (257), it will appear that their number was pretty high in certain areas, specially where urban facilities were available.

Localisation of industries and castes :

"Certain trades were localised in special villages, either suburban and ancillary to the large cities or themselves forming centres of traffic with surrouding villages."[120] Thus we find that there were separate villages of Brahmins (389, 414), of carpenters, smiths,

peasants, hunters, weavers, robbers, Caṇḍālas (472,. 497, 498, 156, etc.) respectively. In this connection it may be pointed out that some of the guilds had their membership thrown open to men of different castes. For instance, in a villege of carpenters there lived a Brahmin carpenter (*brāhmaṇavaḍḍhaki*—No. 475). In another village there was a Brahmin who followed the occupation of a peasant (484). Of course, we learn from Jātaka No. 495 that Brahmins in those days used to follow diverse professions. Villages, occupied exclusively by different guilds, each under the leadership of its *Jeṭṭha* (elder, alderman) within its area of specialisation, as supported by the social needs of their neighbourhood and available local resources might build up a tradition of a homogeneous interdependent economy with administrative sanction of their special laws.

Villages and the Centre :

We may note some of the available details in regard to the inter-relation between the villages and the central government. It seems that there were two kinds of villages, according as the revenues yielded by them were enjoyed by an individual or by the state. It must be pointed out that Fick takes '*gāmabhojaka,*' a term, which we shall presently explain, as meaning an official appointed to collect the revenue of a

village for the king.[121] But we beg to differ from this view. Fick relies upon a solitary passage in the introductory episode of a Jātaka (Kharassara-J.—No. 79) where it is said that a *gāmabhojaka* was once collecting the taxes for a king (*rājabaliṁ labhitva*). But it should not be overlooked that a line of demarcation is to be drawn between the introductory episodes and the *atītavattthu* portions of the Jātakas ; we do not find anything in the allegedly more ancient legends which may go to support the theory put forward by Fick. It may be that the *amacca* in the Jātaka—No. 79 was engaged in collecting revenue, that was once due to the King, but was now being enjoyed by the minister as an assignment, levied at the old rate. It is not a fit place to pursue the controversy over this point any further in the absence of sufficient materials.

Ṭhe Gāmabhojaka as a village lord :

A village offered to anybody used to be styled as *gāmavaram* ; the person who enjoyed the income therefrom was known as a *gāmabhojaka* and the village was designated as *bhogagāma* (e. g. Ratha-laṭṭhi—J. No. 332). It is necessary to remember that those villages which the king's officers visited for the purpose of collecting revenue etc. are not termed as *bhogagāmas* mentioned above. Revenue thus collected was absorbed in the treasury of

the state and it may be that people who got grants of villages were under the necessity of contributing portions of their incomes to the government. Courtiers were very generally the recipients of such gifts. These officers are often mentioned as proceeding to their respective *bhogagāmas* in chariots (332, 509, etc.). The revenue sometimes amounted to one thousand or hundreds of thousands of money (*Satasahassuṭṭhānaṁ*,—9, 533). Excepting ministers, outsiders also, belonging to different castes and professions, were not infrequently rewarded with grants of villages in recognition of personal services rendered to a king or of some meritorious work in any field of life. Already the practice of granting villages to Brahmins in consideration of their piety and learning had become popular. The *gāmabhojakas* were in the enjoyment of large, though not unlimited, powers. One *gāmabhojaka* prohibited the slaughter of animals within his jurisdiction (*maghalam karapesi*) ; another prescribed the sale of wine (*majjavikkayam varetva*). The villages in both the cases had to appeal in a body to these local lords in order to secure a suspension of the interdicts and the restoration of the time-honoured custom (*balikammakāle mahājano sannipatitvā āha : sāmi mayaṁ migasūkarādayo māretvā yakkhānaṁ balikammaṁ karissāma*). The answer was *"tumhākam pubbekaraṇaniyamen'eva karotha,....."* (i. e. the old custom is to be followed).

Gāmabhojaka and Justice :

The *gāmabhojaka* was entitled to a part of the price of intoxicating drinks sold in his village and also to the dues and fines paid by criminals[122] so far as his jurisdiction extended. Thus a village lord thinks : *"aham puvve etesu suram pivamtesu pāṇātipātādīni karontesu cāṭikahāpaṇa-divasena c'eva daṇḍabalivasena ca dhanaṁ labhāmi."* Another headman fined a fisherwoman and she was tied up and beaten to make her pay the fine (139). But the restricted character of his judicial power is evident from the fact that he could not inflict higher punishments or deal with complicated suits arising in the village allotted to him (Kulāvāka-J—No. 31). When he was not satisfied with the conduct of a number of villagers, the law did not permit him to punish them according to his own will and judgment. He went to the king and having got his orders for their immediate arrest, brought them to the court. It was the king who sentenced them to death on his own authority. The Gāmaṇi-caṇḍa Jātaka (257) shows that the administration of justice was a matter in which final authority entirely rested, outside the villages, with the king or his court. We are not told whether the villages, mentioned in this story, belonged to the class of *bhogagāmas*, but the combined evidence of the Jātakas (Nos. 31 and 257), leaves no doubt that administration of justice was

one of the essential links that bound the scattered villages to the central organisation of the state. In the Gāmaṇi-caṇḍa Jātaka there is a passage which implies that there might be suitable arrangements for trying cases in a village, but if one of the litigant parties wanted redress at the hands of the king's court, the case had to be decided by that body. If the other party refused to agree to such a course, he was liable to punishment. "Now this people have the custom that they pick up a bit of stone or a potsherd and say : Here is the king's officer, come along.....If any man refuses to go he is punished." (*Tesu pi janesu yaṁ kiñci sakkharam vā kapālakhaṇḍam vā ukkhipitvā, "ayam to rajadūte ehīti, vutte yo na gacchati tassa rājānaṁ karonti.*)"[123] From what has been said above it appears that so far as the internal administration of a village, the regulation of its trade and commerce and so forth, was concerned, the *gāmabhojaka* had substantial powers and that the central government did hardly interfere in such matters.

His limited powers :

But it will be a mistake to suppose that the authority of the local chief was of an unlimited character. The system in vogue did not allow him to become a tyrant in his own village.

The village committee and its functions :

The village council seems to have taken a recognised place as a local institution, performing utilitarian services, and rendering co-operation to the authorities in regard to matters affecting the common interests of the villagers concerned although it is not possible to say anything definitely about the constitution of such committees. The guild was already a growing force in the economic and social life of the people. Guilds with their elders at the head probably shared with the chiefs or *gāma-bhojakas,* appointed by the king, the responsibility of carrying on the management of rural affairs. If the population of a village was not homogeneous, that is to say, if it consisted of men belonging to more than one profession, the village committee might have comprised a representative of each family dwelling in it. Thus in the hamlet of Macala in the kingdom of Magadha, heads of thirty families, of which its population was composed, are found assembling together and discharging the business of the village *(Tasmim ca gāme tiṁs'eva kulāni honti, te ca tiṁsa kulamanussā ekadivasaṁ gāmamajjhe ṭhatvā gāmakammaṁ karonti*).[124] Thirty again is the number of men transacting the affairs of a village in the Jatāka No. 302. *(Tattha tiṁsa janā rājasevakā vasanti. Te pāto va gāmamajjhe sannipatitvā gāmakiccaṁ karonti*). It may not be improbable, however, that, irrespective of

the total population of a village, the committee usually consisted of thirty members. Meetings of the village committes were held within the village in a hall (*sālam*), provided with boards, seats and a jar of water (*phalakāsanāni.....pāniyacāṭiṁ*).[125] On the nature of the work genarally performed by such assemblies, *gāmakamma* or *gāmakicca* as it used to be called, much welcome light is thrown by the Kulāvaka Jataka (No. 31). Members were in most cases in complete agreement with the leader, who was credited with much initiative, and was ordinarily a talented man *(tiṁsa janā Bodhisattena samānacchanadā ahesuṁ*).[126] One such leader established the members of his committee in the *Five Commandments*, "and thenceforth used to go about with them doing good works. And they too doing good works always in the Bodhisatta's company, used to get up early and sally forth with razors and axes and clubs in their hands. With their clubs they used to roll out in the way all stones that lay on the four highways and other roads of the village : the trees that did strike against axles of chariots, they cut down ; rough places they made smooth ; causeways they built, dug water tanks, and built a hall" (*Te pi ten 'eva saddhiṁ puññāni karonto kālass'eva vuṭṭhāya vāsipharasumusalahatthā catumahāpathādisu musalena pāsāṇe ubbattetvā pavaṭṭenti, yānānaṁ akkhapaṭighātarukkhe haranti, visamaṁ samaṁ karonti, setum attharanti, pokkharaṇiyo khaṇanti sālaṁ*

karonti, etc.).[127] Thus this corporate body was engaged in doing things, which remind one of the duties entrusted to the "*thirty members*" of a municipal town in the time of Chandragupta Maurya, in their collective capacity ; and of those generally performed under the management of the District Boards of British India. The noteworthy features of this very interesting picture are, firstly, the qualities and virtues of a true leader which it discloses, and secondly, the admirable sense of dignity of labour, genuine public spirit and practical appreciation of the value of co-operative ideas actuating the corporate activities of the villages, which it so strikingly reveals. Indian civilisation owed not a small debt to these sturdy realists, who built up the thousand smiling villages, once the most sparkling diamond on the crown of India, and which have long been decaying on account of many forces which had better not be discussed here. Even to-day we cannot give to our country a wider plan of village reconstruction, which is to include, excavation of tanks, repair of old ones, keeping the roads in good order, clearing up jungles and forests, erection of public halls for divine service or for the dissemination of noble ideas amongst the rural folk. There is nothing to indicate that the workers of the Macala village depended upon state grants for carrying on their humanitarian activities. In this connection the following observation by Radhakumud Mukherjee may be found

interesting : "We have here..... a most graphic and complete account of the evolution through all its stages of a village built up by *the communal labour* of its inhabitants. We may notice how the assembly hall of the village figures prominently in its public works as being the indispensable material, requisite for the growth and sustenance of that *larger public spirit* or civic consciousness, which builds up the village itself".[128]

Villages and aristocracy :

Villages were not despised by aristocrats, land-owners and merchants (*cf. Kāsiraṭṭhe ekasmiṁ nigame* ['nigama' here means a village] ; *eko mahā-vibhavo seṭṭhi ahosi*—137 ; *Kāsigāme kuṭumbiko* (459) ; *kuṭumbika* in another village, No. 19 ; *gāmake kuṭumbikakule nibbattitvā*—Tacasāra-J.—368, etc.), who had their residential quarters in them.[129] It is to be noted that these influential men were not mere absentee lords. A *gāmaṇī* (village-chief), surrounded by a host of attendants and amused by dance and song, was a man to be envied (*Gāmaṇi hotu sahāyamajjhe naccehi gitehi pamoda-māno*—488).[130]

The policy of the village-committee might not always agree with the interests of the *gāmabho-jaka.* For example, reference may again be made to the Jāt. No. 31, where the members having by common consent given up the habit of drinking

wine, incurred the displeasure of the village chief, who used to get much money out of the sale of intoxicating liquors and who practically traded on the immorality of his own people.

Government's policy and decline of villages :

Any unhealthy policy, adopted by the government, was not slow to produce baneful effects upon the condition of rural life. Thus some villages are reported to have been destroyed as a consequence of gross misrule and heavy taxation. Villagers are described as fleeing to the woods for the protection of their lives, when everything they had possessed, were taken away either by the king's officer or robbers.

Public opinion :

Villagers, though living far away from their king and, hence, not directly concerned with the head quarters of the central government like the citizens yet had their own opinions about the merits and drawbacks of their rulers whose conduct must have often been a subject of criticism and discussion among them. Kings were sometimes in the habit of ascertaining *incognito* the views of the villagers with the object of improving their own character and conduct in the light of these public criticisms. A modern parallel to this practice is afforded by ex-king

Amanullah Khan of Afganisthan. "He himself sometimes goes out in disguise like the Khalifs of old to see the condition of his subjects with his own eyes and to hear the criticism of his government with his own ears".[131]

Village committee and justice :

We do not see any indication that judicial business formed part of the transactions of the village committee. Nor is there any instance in the Jātakas to show that *the gāmabhojaka* was elected by the villagers themselves. Life-grants of villages are referred to in the Jātaka No. 289. The central government did not follow a strictly non-interfering policy in regard to the internal affairs of a *bhogāgama,* if these required their urgent attention. There are references to show that kings took immediate steps against ministers who grossly absued their powers in the administration of villages, entrusted to their care.

King—his qualities, diplomacy, etc :

The fundamental principle of administration, to which the king was bound to adhere, was that right should never be violated. "If *Right* is destroyed it destroys"[132] (*Dhammonām'esa hato hanati*—422). The term '*Dhamma*' may be taken to mean, with sufficient justification, the whole

bundle of laws that formed the basis of social and political order, which, it was the paramount duty of the king to obey in the conduct of his relations. If any long-standing usage or custom was infringed it would be an act of *adharma* and its effect would be disastrous. The entire polity stood on the support yielded by the recognition of, and acquiescence in, current laws or customs, and the king was primarily responsible for their maintenance. A king properly discharging this function would be regarded as acting in accordance with *dhamma*. In the Chetiya Jātaka (422), which seems to contain some historical fact, a king brought about his own destruction by transferring a right enjoyed by a particular line of priests to a new assignee, which was supposed to be an act in violation of the sanctity of an established practice. Thus we see that the king's obligation to *dhamma* put a curb on an arbitrary use of his powers ; he was not allowed to make a capricious innovation that would go against *Dhamma*. The light thrown on the meaning of the concept of *dhamma* by the Ummadanti Jātaka (527) shows the significance of the qualities demanded of a Kṣatriya sovereign, as mentioned in a few verses of the story where a king is taught to have strict regard for *Dhamma* in his dealings with his parents, his friends or allies and courtiers ; the personnel of his transport department, army ;

the towns and villages, the districts and provinces ; the śramaṇas and Brahmins, etc. ("*Dhammañ cara mahārāja mātāpitusu, khattiya idha dhammañ caritvāna rāja saggaṁ gamissasi. Dhammañ care mahārāja mittāmaccesu khattiya.....Dhammañ cara mahārrāja vāhanesu balesu ca, Dhammañ cara mahārāja gāmesu nigamesu ca ; Dhammañ cara mahārāja raṭṭhe janapadesu ca.....Dhammañ cara mahārāja samaṇe brāhmaṇesu*").[133]

Thus *Dhamma* did not mean an abstract principle of righteousness but a positive standard in the observance of duties, social, economic and administrative, which consisted in the upholding of established rights and usages. Indirectly the above verses point to the fact that *gāmas* and *nigamas, rāsthṭras* and *janapadas* were among those that had their own special laws, which were binding upon the king.

Another wholesome teaching is that a king should eschew the evil ways of an irrational person and that whatever accords with *Dhamma* should be pursued by him.

A king should not make enemies within his own kingdom. He indeed is a friend and protector of his people. With their co-operation he should make his position strong and secure. Above all he must be a man of vigour and action. He must not take advantage of his position and mislead his people at their cost. ("So "*tvam*" *sabbesaṁ suhadayo sabbesaṁ rakkhito bhava*"—*Tasakuma-J-No.*

521. So appamatto akkuṭṭho tāta kiccāni kāraye, vāyamassu ca kiccesu, nālaso vindate sukhaṁ, Mā tāta issaro' mhitī anatthāya patārayi, itthīnaṁ purisānañ ca mā te āsi dukhudrayo.).[134] Slothfulness on the part of a king was regarded as a great vice ; he should shake it off if he really meant to rule, otherwise the kingdom would perish and pass to other hands *(iddhaṁ phītaṁ janapadaṁ corā viddhaṁsayanti taṁ ; khattiyassa pamattassa raṭṭhasmiṁ raṭṭhavaddhana, sabbe bhogā vinassanti, rañño taṁ vuccate aghaṁ).*[135] According to the Jātaka ideal, the king should be unsparing in his labours, be active, industrious and enterprising (cf. the VIth Rock Edict of Aśoka). The King in moulding his policy was advised to consider the opinion of his subjects, broadly distinguished as belonging to the *raṭṭha* and the *janapada*. Thus it is held that he must see things with his own eyes and have regard for well-meaning suggestions of others (*Upassutiṁ mahārāja raṭṭhe janapada cara, tattha disvā ca sutvā ca tato taṁ paṭipajjasīti*— verse in the Gāṇḍatindu J.-No. 520). "Great king, ever open thine ears, and list to what people may say, that seeing and hearing the truth, thou mayst win to good fortune thy way."[136]

The term, *Dasarājadhamma*, i.e., a group of ten royal virtues, is come across but the available references fail to give a true picture of the king, "no idea of the essence of kingly power, of the obligation or functions of the Rājan, because they.....contain

universal prescriptions of morality applicable to the whole Buddhistic laity." A King could please his subjects with the help of the four elements of popularity *(catuhi samgha vatthuhi janam saṅganhanto)*.[137] Of the five elements that constituted the strength of a king the power derived from wisdom was considered to be the best and it was emphasised that he should put the greatest reliance on it. The five fold strength consisted of *bāhubalam* (power of arms), *bhogabalam* (power of possession, government, etc.,) *amaccabalam* (power of counsel), *adhijaccabalam* (power of noble lineage) and *paññābalam* (power of intellect) [*Taṁ balānaṁ balaṁ seṭṭhaṁ aggaṁ a paññābalaṁ balaṁ. paññābalen' upatthaddho atthaṁ vindatī paṇḍito*— verses in Tesakuna-J.-521].[138] Sovereign lords and monarchs are compared to snakes, which may sting holy men...*(Issarānaṁ adhipatīnaṁ na tesaṁ pādato care, āsīvīso so akkhāto brahmacariyassa...)*[139], the analogy being based on the similarity noted between the characteristics of a serpent and the crooked methods of the art of government in which, those in power are expected to excel. In this world, it is said, there is a group of four that can never be satisfied, viz, the ocean, the king, Brahmins and women (*Rājā ca paṭhavim sabbaṁ sasamuddaṁ sapabbatam/ajjhāvase vijinitvā anantaratanocitam/pāraṁ samuddaṁ pattheti, ūnattā hi na pūrati*...536).[140] "A king by conquest holds the world, its mountains, seas and all, the endless

treasures it contains his very own may call, yet sighs for worlds beyond the sea, for this he count too small"..... This characterisation seems to reveal to us the normal attitude of ancient Indian kings to his neighbours. Good men aspiring after moral perfection were taught to avoid the company of kings like serpents. The science of politics must have had its devotees, the *visāradas* who were never satisfied with the council, just as the sea is not satisfied with the rivers, fire with combustibles, or a king with the limits of his own territory... *(Visārado parisāya no tappati, aggi upādānena na tappati, rājā raṭṭhena na tappati : verse, Sattubhasta-J.*—402).[141]

Ministers and high dignitaries :

The number of ministers as given in the Mahāsilava Jātaka (51) is one thousand. It may be noted that these ministers who surround the king, seated on his throne, are sometimes described as "the thousand gallant warriors who would face the charge even of a rut elephant, whom the launched thunderbolt of Indra could not terrify,.....a matchless band of invincible heroes ready at the king's command to reduce all India to his sway"[142] *(Sahassamattā abhejjavarasūra-mahāyodhā honti.....51 ; amacca-sahassena*—51). The Seyya Jātaka (282) mentions five hundred chief warriors *(pañcasattamattā mahā-*

yodhā) who are called his *amaccas* or ministers.[143] In the Cullasutasoma Jātaka (525) a king calls to his presence, 800,000 courtiers, headed by the senapati or commander-in-chief and 60,000 Brahmins, led by the *purohita* or the royal chaplain *(Senāpatimukhāni-asiti-amaccasahassāni purohitamukhāni sāṭṭhi-brāhmaṇasahassāni).*[144] The king's army in the Vessantara-Jātaka (547), consists of 60,000 warriors who constitute his 60,000 ministers *(saṭṭhisahassāni yudhino cārudassanā.)*, and birthmates of his son at the time of his consecration *(sahājāta saṭṭhisahasā amaccā.).*[145] A king wants to have a retinue for his son which is constituted by 500 young nobles born in the minister's houses on the same day as the prince *(mama puttassa parivāra-amaccakulesu jātadārakā).*[146] 500 nurses are appointed to take care of these 500 nobles. Thus the Jātaka evidence persuades us to hold that the term '*amaccakulam*' was not invariably restricted to the sense of a body of ministers, as generally understood, being in charge of different portfolios, but that it was also applied to mean the kith and kin of the Kṣatriya king. They indeed formed a *community of* warriors whose leader he was in a special sense, and who were, therefore, regarded as his counsellors in view of an inherent right to offer him advice when called upon to do so. As shown in some of the cases referred to above the chief warriors only appear to have been called ministers, not the rank and file of the army. Besides these men, who appear to

have enjoyed some special right to be reckoned as counsellors of a king, there were other dignitaries including ministers *ex-officio*, *e.g.*, the treasurer, the valuer, the royal priest, etc. These latter as councillors seem to have constituted a small advisory board which included the Commander-in-chief and a few Kṣatriyas representing the military nobility who were required to give counsel to the king when it was not practicable to call an unwieldy assembly of the amātyas in their entire strength, the designation being used in the widest sense of the term.

Ministers were generally appointed on a hereditary basis, the son succeeding to the post of his father. But exceptions were not unlikely ; for example, a very poor man was once appointed by a king as his Lord Treasurer (*Rājā tassa seṭṭhiṭṭhānaṁ adāsi* : Kundaka-pūva J.—109). In the Nānacchahda-Jātaka (289) the story is told of a king's chaplain, removed from office (*tassa thānata apaṇīto*) being appointed to a position of trust and responsibility by his son in appreciation of a friendly act. A dismissed minister might accept a post in a neighbouring kingdom and try by all means to bring about the destruction of his former master (cf. Mahāsilava J.—51). Some high offices were specially lucrative. For instance, a royal priestly family having enjoyed the position of the 'Master of the Ceremonies in the king's Elephant festival' for seven generations accumulated substantial wealth

(*Hatthimaṅgalakaraṇam nāma yāva sattamā kula-parivattā amhākam*—Susīma J.—47). A royal chaplain was usually a very rich man. In the Sīla-vīmaṁsa Jātaka (290) the priest of a king of Banaras declares that he is in possession of untold wealth consisting of the property of his father, the property of his mother, self-acquired property and the gifts of the king himself (*"mama gehe pitu santakaṁ mātu santakam attanā uppāditaṁ tayā dinnañca bahudhanam..... pariyanto na paññāyati"*—290). A treasurer, who was master of eighty crores, wanted to make over his whole wealth to the king (*seṭṭhiṭṭhanam adāsi—mama ghare asitikoṭi-dhanam atthi taṁ gaṇhā. Sudha bhojana* J.—535). King Kandari of Banaras used to be daily presented with a thousand boxes of perfume by his amātyas (*Amacca gandhakaraṇḍakasahassaṁ āharanti*—536). A minister could resign his post if he was permitted to do so by the king. In the Kakkāru Jātaka (326) where a priest is involved in a deceitful act, the king calls a meeting of his *amātyas* to decide what step was to be taken and accept their suggestion. Administration was not everywhere free from bribery, nepotism and other evils ; there was sometimes an unseemly scramble among ministers for pelf and power (Dhammadhvaja-J.).

The comment that "Verily the king's court is full of evils and abounds in enemies" (*idam rajakulam nāma bahudosam bahupaccā-mittaṁ hoti*), made by a disinterested person, seems to be well

justified (Mahābodhi J.-528). He who made this remark was an ascetic who was appointed by the king to decide cases in the *Judgment Hall.* But five ministers, who had been superseded, grew jealous of him and wanted to put him to death. They said, 'he is seeking sovereignty', and by such insinuations poisoned the mind of the king who ordered : "To-morrow when he comes, and stands inside the door, cut off his head.....and without saying a word to any body throw his body on a dunghill and then take a bath and return here". When this plan failed, the ministers informed the king that stories of an illicit connection between the queen and the ascetic were current throughout the city. Thereupon the queen was put to death. The four sons of the queen, however, knew their mother to be innocent ; they became furious against their father. The ascetic finally emerged victorious out of the terrible struggle that had cost the kingdom its fair name and integrity ; peace and order were restored following the stern dismissal of the five guilty ministers. Their property was confiscated and they were expelled from the kingdom *(sampaticchitvā te sabbaharaṇe* or *sabbassaharaṇe).*[147] "The king stript them of all their property and disgracing them in various ways, by fastening their hair into five locks, by putting them into fetters and chains and by sprinkling cow-dung over them, he drove them out of his kingdom". Shivanath Basu points out that ministers

could even be reduced to slavery in certain circumstances (*cf.* Mahā-ummagga Jātaka).[148] There was no rule that the entire ministry should subscribe to one particular school of thought. This indicated a certain tolerance and freedom from orthodoxy in the policy of the administration that could accommodate five ministers, as in the Mahābodhi Jātaka (No. 528 : *pañcā amaccā atthañ ca dhammañca anusasanti*), professing five different systems of thinking, one of them following the Kṣatriya creed, according to which one's own interest was to be furthered even by killing one's parent (*eko ahetuvādi, eko issarakāraṇavādi, eko pubbekatavādi, eko ucchedavādi, eko khattavijjāvādi*). An interesting scene of court-intrigue is supplied in another Jātaka (547). If a king has ministers (*mantihi*) who cannot be alienated from him (*abhejjarūpahi*), and are pure in character, he will not fall (verse). A wise king and such sincere and steadfast ministers are mutually essential and necessary for bearing the burden of the state like the rafters that hold the roof of a structure (Kukku J.-396). "If there is no peak, rafters do not stand ; the peak does not stand if not held by the rafters, if the rafters break the peak falls" (*kaṇṇikāya asati, gopānasiyo na patiṭṭhanti gopānasīhi asaṁgahitā kaṇṇika na na tiṭṭhati ; gopānasisu bhujjantīsu kaṇṇikā patati*).

Qualifications, essential on the part of a minister, are sometimes hinted at or speculated

upon. Thus it is said that a wise minister is he who is fertile in expedients (*upāyakusalo* : Cullakāliṅga-J.—301). There are sixteen external signs (*amittalakhanam*) by which an intriguing or unfriendly minister could be identified (Mittāmitta—J. 437, C. IV, 122 ; F. IV, 197):

"He smiles not when you seek him, no welcome will be shown.

He will not turn his eyes that way, and answer you with No.

Your enemies he honours, he cares not for your friends.

Those who would praise your work, he stays, your slanderers commends.

No secret tells he to you, your secret he betrays. *("Guyhañca tassa n'akkhati tassa guyhaṁ na gūhati").*

Speaks never well of what you do, your wisdom will not praise.

He joys not at your welfare, but your evil fame. Should he receive some dainty, he thinks not of your name.

Nor pities you, nor cries about 'O, had my friend the same.'

These are the sixteen tokens by which a foe you see.

These, if a wise man sees or hears, he knows his enemy."

A king was advised to take in such men as his councillors as were unruffled (*dhīra*) and had a proper understanding of his interests, were free from the habits of gambling and drunkenness, etc. (*Amacce*

tāta janāhi dhīre atthassa kovide anakkh' ākitave tāta asoṇḍe avināsake (*verse : Tesakuṇa-J.-521*). In the same story which describes *rājadhamma* the king in several verses is asked to deliver instructions to their subjects (*sayaṁ jānapadam attham anusāsa*), so that the state and its resources may not be ruined by unrighteous officials. Thus taking the people into his confidence and keeping them alert about the interests of the state is a significant feature of *rājadhamma.* An old priest in the employment of a young ruler wants to retire from service on the plea that a king carries on best with those who are of his own age (*rajjaṁ nāma samavayehi saddhim suparihāraṁ hoti*). King Saṁvara of Banaras took pride in the fact that he was attended by *Mahāmātras* and *Mantrins* versed in 'artha' (*Mahāmattā ca me atthi mantino paricārakā*— 462).[149]

In the Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka (545) Vidhura is reported to have addressed his friends, enemies, relatives and associates on a text dealing with the qualities needed for the attainment of success and eminence in the king's court. A minister, when he first takes his seat in the court, is naturally regarded as a stranger, but he will gradually win the confidence of his master if he has merit and moral courage. It is not possible for a fool or a small-minded man to distinguish himself amongst a host of rivals. The path leading to success is perilous and full of obstacles, but no

merit goes unrewarded. The king will not hide any secrets from a minister if he finds him capable and trustworthy. "When he is asked to carry out some business, like a well-fixed balance with a level beam, and evenly poised he must not hesitate : if like the balance, he is ready to undertake every burden, he may dwell in the king's court." Thus the novice is to proceed with great caution and self-confidence, ever willing and ready to undertake any work, entrusted to him by the king. He must not, on any account, use things specially meant for his master. "He who sees a path, made for the king and carefully put in order for him, and refrains from entering himself therein, though advised to do so, he is the one who may dwell in a king's court." He must not wear a garment resembling the royal robe. He must not imitate the voice of the king. "If the king sports with his minister or is surrounded by his wives, let not the minister make any allusion to the royal ladies". He should be possessed of insight and resolution. "Let him not sport with the kings' wives nor talk with them privately". He must be temperate in his diet, drinks, etc. He should not try desperately to cultivate intimacy with the king. "Let him prudently keep not too far from him, nor yet too near to him." There should be no mistake about the fact that the king is not an ordinary person and is easily vexed. Hence if he finds anything wrong in his treatment he must hold his patience and

not speak roughly to him. If he gets his opportunity, let him take it when it comes. But kings should never be trusted and, as in the case of fire, the wise man should always be on his guard. The actions of the king should not be immediately criticised, but one should wait for a suitable occasion. "The wise man will keep his belly small like the bow, but he will bend easily like the bamboo." "He ought not to employ or promote a son or a brother who is not honest or virtuous". "Let him employ, in offices of authority, servants and agents who are established in virtue and are skilful in business and can rise to an emergency." "Let him know the king's wish and hold fast to his thoughts." It is his duty to render certain personal services ungrudgingly. "He will rub him with perfumes and bathe him, he will bend his head low when washing his feet. When smitten he will not be angry." What should he do to win popularity and respect outside the environment of the court? "He will make his salutation to a jar full of water, or offer his reverential greeting to a crow, yea, he will give to all petitioners.....he will give away his bed, his house, his home, and shower down blessings like a cloud on all beings". The text on the duties and qualifications of ministers, of which a brief abstract is given above, reveals not an insignificant amount of knowledge of the problems of traditional statecraft. It may not

be easy to say definitely how old this text is. It looks like a popular version of an early speculative tract on polity concerning the relationship between a king and his ministers. It appears to be specially related to an age when there was an aversion in the popular mind against ministers as a class and men of high administrative positions, trying to pose as lords, or even as sub-kings, while they were considered to be far below their master, the sovereign whose good-will had to be earned through dutiful service. It was an age when ministers were looked upon with suspicion ; when a strict watch had to be kept over their demeanour, activities, style of living, etc. as a matter of great concern in the interest of the state, as represented by the king.

Executive :

The Jātakas, as expected, do not give any systematic or detailed account of the nature of the working of the Executive. With the exception of the powers delegated to the villages, the stories seem to show that most of the executive functions were carried on by the king himself, which could hardly have been possible. There is, however, no doubt that now and then sovereigns of a strong personality would look even to the smallest detail of the administration, but it is difficult to imagine that the various officials of the kingdom would have as a rule no initiative or

authority of their own in their respective spheres, and that even in primary matters relating to their duties they were to be dependent upon the orders of the king. It may be presumed that some system existed under which the multifarious actions of central interest were controlled by an advisory committee consisting of leading ministers, and residual and limited functions left to the care of relevant officers such as city governors etc. For the common people it was not possible to make a distinction so that in our stories all these sometimes came to be attributed to the monarch, representing the supreme and the highest executive authority in the state. Perhaps to indicate that even though an administrative machinery, was there, if he was personally approached he could take up any matter and issue such orders as he considered proper. Thus when a theft was committed in a city, the townsfolk are shown to have directly reported it to the king, who gave orders to the governor of the city (*nagaraguttika*) to have the robber arrested. After his arrest, it was the king again who ordered the same officer to have him executed (Kaṇavera J.-318 ; cf. Sulasā J.-419). The normal course of administration was bound to be hampered if such a responsible officer as the head of a city did not have the authority to apprehend even a thief without taking orders from the king.

Criminal laws :

Penalties for crimes were characterised by unmitigted severity and harshness, and no quarter was shown to culprits. But the application of laws was often delayed or even stopped owing to the venality of officers concerned. *Capital* punishment was prescribed even for thieves and robbers (419, 318). Tortures were practised (419). The system of punishment for criminal offences, usually in force, appeared abhorrent to some kings, moved by humane considerations. Thus one king 'opened *prison* door for good and all and the places of execution he destroyed' (468). On a former occasion his father had given a general pardon to all prisoners (*bandhanāgārāṇi sodhāpetvā*).[150] It was the custom to put a garland of red flowers (*vajjhamālā*) round the neck of a criminal, being led to the place of judgment in a hand-cuffed condition (472). Different classes of offenders were sometimes banished from their country in great humiliation with all their property confiscated, or were ordered to live in the *Caṇḍāla* settlement. Shaving the head of a criminal was regarded as a great punishment (542). Offenders were sentenced to pay fines, etc. Prisoners were sometimes treated more as beasts than as men (537). Even Brahmins were not exempted from the operation of laws applicable to other castes. Thus a royal chaplain, feigning

theft, was sentenced to *capital punishment* by the king (86). Thieves and criminals of all sorts are mentioned in some cases to have been hurled down from precipices (472). Mutilations of some kind and physical tortures were resorted to by an oppressive king (Maha-Piṅgala J.—240 : *jaṅghakāhapaṇādigahanena*). Impalement might have been in vogue (444).

Judiciary and Justice :

The administration of justice was one of the main functions of the state, and the importance and necessity of a careful discharge of legal duties is frequently emphasised. The Jātaka stories present popular accounts of legal proceedings, of miscarriages of justice as well as of impartial and thoughtful judgments. Useful instructions are also given for avoiding errors of hasty and improper decisions. Generally the procedure in a trial was simple, but the responsiblity of the judge was hard. When a complaint was lodged he had to employ all his skill to find out the truth by examining the parties involved. Perhaps there is nothing much to add to the basic idea of justice as shown in the Jātakas. What was most important was that he had to give a verdict, which, to all concerned, would appear as fair and just. There is, however, no definite reference to a fixed code of law and its strict application to every suit that came up for consideration ;

personal equations, such as the judge's temperament, habits and character played not a small part in the decision of cases, brought before him for adjudication. There is no evidence pointing to the existence of a regular gradation of courts—only the *Hall of judgment* stands out impressibly as the most conspicuous institution through which the power and authority of the state were expressed. The king was universally regarded as the fountain of justice. Tradition shows that during an early stage of socio-political progress, people carefully considered, before the mantle of sovereignty fell on any person, whether he was endowed with the necessary physical fitness and power for leadership. The Jātaka tradition shows that another question demanding their serious attention was whether he had the qualifications and the mentality of a careful and competent judge. There are many instances showing that kings sometimes personally conducted cases, not as the highest and the ultimate judicial authority merely, hearing appeals and delivering judgments on them, thus bringing to an end the entire judicial process that may have begun in a lower court,—but also in the manner of offering the immediate and the nearest legal remedy without the parties having been required to pass through any intermediate institution (Kokālika-J.—331 ; Ratha laṭṭhi-J.—332). There was, again, the court of judgment, where judges, appointed by the king, had to attend to their daily round of duties.

Litigation considerably diminished if the general policy of the administration itself was pervaded by a spirit of justice and righteousness. It is interesting to note that administration of justice was one of the most effective links that bound the different portions of a kingdom to the central organisation of the state. Thus if a dispute arose in a remote village and if one of the litigant parties wanted redress from the royal court, the other party was bound to comply with the demand and proceed to the capital (Gāmaṇicaṇḍa-J.—257). The practice of having a panel of whole-time judges, exclusively devoted to the duties assigned to their post, was not invariably followed. Not infrequently do we find commanders-in-chief or royal chaplains engaged in doing the work of a judge in addition to their substantive duties as indicated by their official designations (Dhammadhvaja-J.—220 ; 51 ; 1, etc.). One Jātaka gives the number of judges as five. The post of a justice was named as that of a *Viniccayāmacca.*

We may now refer to the nature of cases which generally used to be tried by a king or his court of law and the procedure followed in deciding these suits. No reference need be made to the ordinary cases of theft or robbery, which do not usually present any interesting feature calling for special notice in the current context. An innocent man might now and then be arrested on a charge of theft,—not an uncommon occurrence even to-day.

in countries which may boast of a most perfect administrative system. Inflictions of physical tortures with a view to extorting confessions were well known (Mahāsāra-J.—92). We may easily sympathise with the poor fellow, who is forced to plead guilty to any charge brought against him to avoid the crushing blows being ruthlessly administered to him. "If I deny the charge, I shall die with the beating, I shall get some from these ruffians. I'd better say I took it". So an innocent man had to confess to the theft. Gāmaṇicaṇḍa, a retired government servant, a truly innocent man, had the misfortune of being hauled up as a hopeless criminal under circumstances over which he had no control. He stood charged with four offences including murder, and was brought before the king. The plaintiff in each case having represented the cause of his complaint to the king, he questioned Gāmaṇi about its correctness. The latter on every occasion replied in the affirmative ; but he also told his own story by way of justification without making any secret of it. Then the king in two cases turned towards the plaintiffs and asked whether some points in the statement of the defendant, which struck him as crucial, were true, and the reply was that they were not so. But when pressed they could not deny. Thus both the parties were ultimately found to be guilty ; the charges brought against Gāmaṇi were true, but then the parties

who had instituted the suits were also guilty of wilful suppression or denial of truth. Hence both the parties, plaintiffs and the defendant, deserved to be punished and the decision contained such conditions as ever took the breath of a Shylock away. One of the judgments runs thus: "You failed to return the oxen, and therefore you are his debtor for them. But the man in saying that he had not seen them told the direct lie. Therefore, you with your own hands shall pluck his eyes out and you shall yourself pay him twenty-four pieces of money as the price of the oxen" (No. 257).[157]

In the other suits where Gāmaṇi stood charged with miscarriage and murder respectively they were not offences, wilfully committed but were due to sheer accidents. He was, therefore, released (257). One was to pay a fine for causing an untimely birth or compensation for any loss for which one might be held liable (210). Some boys of a village were charged with the murder of a doctor and were brought before the king for trial. As the case seems to be a rather unusual one a few details quoted from it may not be considered superfluous. As the story says, certain boys were playing at the foot of a banyan tree at the entrance of a village. A poor old doctor at that time, who had no practice, strayed out of the village to this spot, and saw a snake 'asleep in the fork of a tree with its head tucked in'. He thought, "there is nothing to be got in the village. I will cajole these boys and make

the snake bite and then I shall get somewhat for curing them". One of the boys was told by the doctor : "If you were to see a young hedgehog would you seize it ?" The boy answered, "Yes, I would." "See here is one lying in the fork of this tree." The boy climbed up the tree and seized it by the neck, but when he found it was a snake, he did not allow it to turn upon him but 'getting a good grip of it, he hastily flung it from him." It fell on the neck of the doctor and he died instantly (367-368). All the boys were arrested and, as already stated, placed before the king for trial. The whole matter was carefully investigated, and this must have been done according to the current legal procedure. When their innocence was proved, they were set free. In another story a judge is found deciding a suit between a villager and a townsman ; the latter was guilty of wrongful possession of some ploughshare, belonging to the former, who was again guilty of kidnapping the latter's son (Kūṭavāṇija-J.—218). The process of cross-examination for the ascertainment of truth was only imperfectly and vaguely known and was resorted to by the judge himself (Gijjha-J.—164—here one of the parties being a vulture). *Fire-ordeal* for the sake of proving the chastity (*sacca kiriyam katvā aggiṁ pavisitvā*) of a woman is referred to (Aṇḍabhūta—J.—62) but it does not appear from the story that the

method was officially used. Cases of disputed ownership were frequently decided in the court, but justice could hardly be expected from a set of unprincipled and dishonest judges. Rightful owners were frequently defrauded and justice was grossly abused (Dhammaddhvaja-J.—220). Even a commander-in-chief or a royal chaplain who acted also as a judge, had no moral scruples in taking bribes and giving a false judgment (220 ; Kiṁchanda-J.—511). Thus men and women were often reduced to the most miserable condition on account of the corruption which vitiated the atmosphere of the Hall of Judgment. A courtesan once came to the court to take advice as to whether in the eye of the law she was still bound by the terms of a contract entered three years before with a man, who had since not made his appearance. Suits of this sort involving contractual rights and obligations must have been quite commonly tried in the law courts. But it appears that with the growth and development of various trades and professions it must have been realised that the scope of litigation broadened to an extent that required an expert knowledge, on the part of judges, of the special rules and regulations that governed their organisations of guilds and corporations in their internal relations as well as their transactions with the interested public. It was partly to cope with this new situation that a judgeship of merchant guilds was instituted and

it was usually conferred on the Treasurer who was supposed to be competent to hold the post on grounds of his intimate and constant association with the trade and commerce of the country (*sabbaseṇīnaṁ vicāraṇāraharaṁ bhaṇḍagārikaṭṭhānam* : 446).[152] Mrs. Rhys Davids' theory about the origin of this post is suggestive and has generally been accepted.[153]

The proceedings of the court, as already noted, do not anywhere present the picture of lawyers, conducting their cases in a court of law. But there is one Jātaka (No. 155), where a certain Brahmin is described as earning his livelihood by following the profession of a 'lawyer' (*Kāsiraṭṭhe ekasmin brāhmaṇakulanibbatti. Tassa pitā vohāram katvā jivikaṁ kappeti*—No. 155).[154] It seems that the country was actually in need of their services, and its legal apparatus may not have been, as a matter of fact, so simple as described. It is said that a *Book of Judgments* was written by a Bodhisattva, who was none other than a wise pig, after the death of the king whom he had served, and it was declared that in future all suits were to be decided on consulting this authoritative work (Tuṇḍula-J.—388 : *Mahāsatto...vinicchaye potthakam likhāpetvā, "imaṁ potthakaṁ olokenta aṭṭam tīreyyāthā*)."[155] The question of its authorship is difficult to solve but there is no reason why the existence of such useful works i. e. records of precedents should be doubted, when it was held

that one of the foremost duties of a government was to administer justice in the strictest sense of the term. Wrong sentences, delivered by one judge, might be reversed even by a stranger (220, 528) if he judged rightly, and the latter would afterwards be formally appointed by the king as a judge. A king in appointing a judge gave the following directions as to the time he should daily spend in deciding law-suits :—"You need not judge the whole day, but....go at early dawn to the place of judgment and decide four cases : then return.....and after partaking of food, decide four more cases," so that he was required to settle disputes at the rate of eight per day (528). This arrangement, in the particular instance cited, was, however, made for the convenience of an officer whose time was mostly occupied in spiritual work.

The duties and qualities of an ideal judge are repeatedly described with great force and cogency chiefly in verses of the Jātaka stories. If we study them carefully, we shall be convinced that the standard of justice, set up in that remote age, was indeed very high and difficult to surpass. Such descriptions occur in the stories of kings who administered justice personally, but what is there to doubt that it did apply equally to all men besides him who had to perform the duties of a judge ? Speaking of the time in general, to which the stories refer, one might argue that the principles of justice were admirably sound in theory, but the machinery

for carrying them out was not always as efficient or effective as required for the purpose. To award punishments was a duty of the sovereign, as well as of those who were entrusted to settle legal disputes. But only the guilty were to be punished. The Jātakas repeatedly say that the utmost care is to be taken to eliminate the chances of innocent persons being visited with punishments. Every case should be minutely gone into, and all its details mastered. The king should not punish an offence without 'thoroughly sifting it himself in all points, great and small' (*Nādaṭṭhā parato dosaṁ.....issaro panaye daṇḍam sāmaṁ appaṭivekkiya*—No. 472). One who punished the guiltless and released the guilty is compared with the blind man who does not know his way (472). Circumspection (No. 444 : *nisammakārinā bhavittabbaṁ*)[156] is another quality demanded of a judge. Its usefulness is illustrated in a verse, the sense of which is that circumspect and successful action, which is the offspring of a careful policy, is as efficacious as good medicine *(-Nisamma ca kataṁ kammaṁ śammāvatthāya cintitaṁ bhesajjasseva sampatti vipāko hoti*—No. 505). The Jātaka mentality had the greatest abhorrence for four types of men :—

"The idle sensual layman I detest
The false ascetic is a rogue confest ;
A bad king will a case unheard decide,
wrath in a sage can ne'er be justified."

(*rājā na sādhu anisammkārī*)[157]

"The warrior prince takes careful thought and
well-weighed judgment gives :
When kings their judgment ponder well,
their fame for ever lives."

Punishment should be inflicted 'with careful measure,' i. e., it should be strictly proportionate to the offence committed. This rule put a curb upon hasty and arbitrary judgment. Every single thing should be carefully weighed, etc. All these principles and maxims are no doubt genuine and wholesome in theory but the folklore's evidence is not adequate for concluding that a judicial system had already developed for their proper implementation. It seems that a capital punishment could be awarded only by a king, and not others who functioned as judges.

Armies, warfare, weapons, etc. :

Not only there were armies in the capital of a kingdom, but troops were also stationed on its borders (*paccantayodhā*). The insecure condition of the outlying parts, on account of the depredations of robbers and aggressions of neighbouring kings, no doubt kept these soldiers fully occupied. When they failed to cope with a situation, they sent letters to the king, who generally proceeded immediately to the scene of operations even though the season might not be favourable for such a course (176). The fourfold division of the army was a familiar feature in the period indicated (*caturaṅgini-*

-yā senā—230). When a fight ensued, the whole army was assembled for the purpose by a beat of drum about the city (*nagare bheriñ carāpetvā balakāyaṁ sannipātetha*—467),[158] from which one might infer that there were either no fixed quarters for the troops or that they lived in barracks in different parts of the city and were, therefore, required to be collected together through some convenient means of communication. Or was it calling a citizen-militia to arms? Elephants were regarded as most serviceable in wars. There is a reference to archers, clad in mail, also to helms, leather shields and infantry in the following verse :- *Na te abhisaraṁ passe na rathe nāpi pattike, nāssa cammaṁ vā kiṭam vā vammine ca dhanuggahe*-verse : (534).[159] The order of battle array was of three kinds, two of which are mentioned in detail (492), *viz.*, the Wagon Battle and the Lotus Battle (*yuddhaṁ nāma sakaṭavyuhādivasena tividhaṁ hotīti.....padumavyūhaṁ saṁvidahi*, etc.,).[160] How this kind of battle was arranged, between a bear and a tiger is described as an illustration in a legendary manner, as follows :- "In the midst he placed the sucking pigs, and around them their mothers, next to these the barren sows, next a circle of young porkers, next the young ones with tusks just a-budding, next big tuskers, and the old boars outside all. Then he posted smaller squads (*dasavaggam visativaggam*, etc.), often twenty, thirty apiece here and there. He made them dig

a pit for himself, and for the tiger to fall into a hole of the shape of a winnowing basket; between the two holes was left a spit of ground for himself to stand on. Then he with the stout fighting boars went around, everywhere encouraging the boars." The order was a concentric one, based on a careful adjustment and assortment of the varying degrees of strength of the different elements of the army, and the posting of the different grades of the fighting material in such a fashion that the strongest and the most efficient of them always occupied the outermost circle. The skill and energy of fighters were often taxed to the utmost degree in scaling or battering the walls of an enemy city and sometimes they failed to do either, because it happened to be very well-fortified (*appadhamsiyaṁ parehi*-Dhonasākha-J.-353 ; 545 etc.,). There was no lack of attention so far as the building of the fortifications of towns was concerned. Besides the walls, already referred to, they had towers and trenches (*daḷhamaṭṭālakoṭṭhakaṁ*) and were surrounded by moats *(ukkhiṇṇantaraparikhaṁ-458)*, which obstructed the approach of enemies as far as practicable. In one instance, along the rampart of a city watch-towers were constructed at the four gates, and between the watch-towers three moats were dug, *viz.*, a water moat, a mud moat, and a dry moat—(*udakaparikham, kaddamaparikham, sukkhaparikham*—546).[161] An invading army is

thus commanded by the king—"Disperse all about the city, fill up the trenches, break down the walls, raze the gate towers, enter the city, use the peoples' heads like pumpkins cast on a cart, etc." Mighty warriors, belonging to the other party, were roused up ; armed with all manner of weapons, they marched up to the gate and red-hot *missiles,* showers of mud and stones were thrown upon the invaders. When the latter started to destroy the wall from the ditch, men in the gate-towers dealt havoc with arrows, javelins and spears, with the result that the attempt of the invaders ignominiously failed. Strategies and diplomacy played an important part in warfare. Men who could act with shrewd commonsense and requisite knowledge were often placed at the helm of military affairs, and their endless mano-euvres and novel tactics lent considerable interest to martial operations, which were not mere trials of physical strength and military resources between warring parties but also involved a tactical game. Stoppage of the supply of provisions by means of a blockade was a very familiar device, appreciated even by a lay person, by which obstinate resistance could be forced into surrender. In order to prevent the calamity, consequent upon a blockade, elaborate and comprehensive measures were adopted beforehand for storing food, water, and other necessaries by far-sighted ministers and advisers of kings (546). Spies were regularly

employed to watch the activities and preparations going on in the enemy's camp and their secret reports mainly to determine the lines of action which had to be adopted to counteract their movements. There were crocodiles in the moats, and certain places infested with snakes, which were not known to foreigners and hence could be used to bring about the destruction of hostile warriors in quite an unsuspected manner (546).[162] Efforts were made through the help of spies to put the leading instructor in the opposite camp to disgrace in the estimation of his master and so to represent facts as to produce an impression that the whole army had been corrupted by taking presents from the other party, thus leading to the inevitable weakening and disintegration of his forces and a complete failure of his plans. Most of these soldiers were next destroyed by being trapped into the dangerous spots, already referred to, and those who remained fled pell-mell with the king at their head. Construction of *tunnels*, strategic arrangements of cities and various mechanical devices were supposed to be within the range of possibility for a practical solution of military problems, but it is certainly difficult to describe them scientifically and separate the real from the imaginary ones. Flight of the king from the field of battle was an unfailing signal for his party to retreat. But there were also brave kings who could inspire their soldiers with great courage and

enthusiasm (229) by impassioned speeches. The war music is compared to the deep rumble of clouds *(vattat'ajja tumulo ghoso, yathā vijjutā jaladharassa gajjato)*. Women's part in encouraging soldiers is distinctly shown in one Jātaka (546). Masses were not in a disarmed condition as at present but they could readily command rough weapons and fight in the interest of self-protection and freedom.

Towns :

In a kingdom, 300 leagues in circuit, the chief city measured seven or twelve leagues. Thus, Mithila in the kingdom of Videha was seven leagues (489) and the city of Banaras twelve leagues in circuit (282). Towns and cities were well protected, special care being bestowed on the proper defence of the capital against foreign inroads. A city had four gates in the four main directions and was surrounded by a wall *(pākāram)*. An iron town is mentioned (439) which is called *āyasaṁ and daḷhapākāraṁ*, probably meaning that the wall enclosing it was as strong as iron or strengthened with some metallic device. The tower of the city-gate is frequently referred to *(nagaradvāraṭoraṇa*—140). The height of a city-wall was eighteen cubits *(aṭṭhārasahattham pākāraṁ*—469). The tower of the city-gate at Takkasilā was as magnificent as the palace of the king *(nagaradvārakoṭṭhako*—Palāyi J.—229). There

are references to eighty-four thousand cities in a kingdom (Mahāsudassana J.—95) and sixty-three thousand cities in another kingdom (454). A town with eighty thousand shops is mentioned (437). Municipal improvements in a city are referred to (547); a *town* of carpenters consisting of one thousand families is mentioned (406), reminding one of similar occupational villages.

CHAPTER VII

Tales of ancient kings

Aṅga, Arindama, Ajjuna, Bharata, Bharu, Dīghāvu, Dummukha, Dasaratha, Rāma, Dudīpa, Dhataraṭṭha, Janasandha, Kalābu, Kalāra-Janaka, Kaṁsa, Mahāpatāpa, Sagara, Mahājanaka, Mucalinda, Nimi, Vaṅka, Vāsudeva, Vissasena, etc.

This chapter contains a list of kings and princes, and short summaries of their activities, as spoken of in the Jātaka stories of the 'anterior births of Gotama Buddha'. To include the account as a separate chapter may not be quite appropriate, but occasional connecting links between the various legends, from which material has been compiled in the present work may justify the step. Obviously the main interest of the chapter lies in whatever information it gives about the nature of historical tradition, put together in one place for a convenient appreciation of the contents of the other chapters of the text where they have been already touched upon briefly. It is hoped that not many names will be found missing in the appended list, for a special effort has been made to make it comprehensive. It is not suggested that every name incorporated in the list or event connected therewith has a historical basis, but it is surely worthwhile to assemble the

scattered traditions in one place, which may be useful for a comparative study of the general features of Indian mythology based on memories of the past. Unlike the Purāṇas the way of telling old stories in the Jātakas, which deal with previous births, is not prophetic. Notable absentees from the list are the Brahmadattas. They have been generally excluded from this chapter since it is impossible to individualise or identify the kings called by this name, apparently dynastic, in the different Jātakas, with reasonable accuracy. There are some other names like Kekakādhipa, etc. which have, however, been included, for their specification may not be so difficult. Some of the names included here were not really personal names, but are introduced as names of territories, referring to eponymous heroes.

Aṅga—King of Aṅga (Aṅgaraṭṭhe :—Campeyya J.—506). His rival was Māgadha, king of the country of Magadha. The river Campā divided the two neighbouring kingdoms. There were frequent conflicts between them. On some occasions king Māgadha took Aṅga and on others the reverse happened. Once Aṅga defeated Māgadha[163]. The latter, out of shame, drowned himself in the river Campā but was rescued by the Serpent king (Nāgarāja) Campeyyo, with whose assistance king Aṅga was captured and slain. His enemy the king of Magadha then ruled over the two territories.

Aṅgati—A righteous Kṣatriya king of Videha, ruling at Mithilā. He had a daughter named Rujā and three ministers, Vijaya, Sunāma and Alāta. Once he paid a visit to Guṇa of the Kassapa family, a reputed ascetic and scholar. The king imbibed 'heretical' views from him. His daughter Rujā tried in vain to prove the worthlessness of the ascetic's teachings. Nārada Kassapa came from the Brahma world and succeeded in winning him back to the right path (Mahānārada Kassapa, No. 544).[164]

Apacara—also called Upacara, King of Cedi reigning in the city of Sotthivati. The founder of his line apparently was Mahāsammata who flourished in the dawn of history *(paṭhamakappe)*. The names Apacara and his predecessors are shown in the following genealogical table :-

Mahāsammata
|
Roja
|
Vararoja
|
Kalyāṇa
|
Varakalyāṇa
|
Uposatha
|
Māndhātā
|

Varamāndhātā

Cara

Upacara

His chaplain was a Brahmin named Kapila, who had a younger brother of the name of Korakalamba. Korakalamba and the king received their education in the different arts from the same teacher *(ekācāriyakule uggahitasippo)* and while a prince, Apacara had promised to appoint him to the post of his family-priest when he would be installed as king. But the promise was not fulfilled. Kapila retired as an ascetic and his son, who had been recommended by him to the king, was made the family-priest. Later on the king wanted to make Korakalamba, the senior priest and Kapila's son the junior priest *(taṁ mahallakam katvā itaraṁ te kaniṭṭhaṁ karissāmiti)*. This could not be carried out unless he told a lie. "It was a time, they say, when the world told the truth. Men did not know what the word 'lie' might mean." The king lost his supernatural faculties, with which he had been endowed, and, though repeatedly asked to recant, he maintained his position with unshaken obstinacy until his death which came as a punishment. The kingdom of Ceti was banned. At the advice of Kapila the five sons of the deceased king founded five cities in different directions, *viz.*,

Haṭṭhipura, Assapura, Sīhapura, Uttarapañcāla and Daddarapura (422).

Arindama—Prince, son of a king of Magadha who reigned at Rājagaha *(Rājagahe Magadharāja)* by his chief queen. He went to Takkasilā for his education with his friend Sonaka-kumāra, son of the royal chaplain. Returning from Takkasilā after the completion of the course, they chanced to come to Banaras, where the king had died leaving the royal family without any male heir *(aputtakaṁ rājakulam).*[165] Prince Arindama was made king of Kāsi after being approached by the Festal Car. Sonaka, who had turned an ascetic before Arindama's elevation to the throne of Kāsi, came back after a long time to meet his friend. The king now renounced the world and followed his friend leaving the throne to his only son Dīghāvu (Sonaka J.—No. 529).[166]

Ariṭṭhajanaka—The elder of two sons of Mahājanaka, king of Videha, with his capital at Mithilā. During the life-time of his father he was employed as Viceroy, *Uparāja,* and on his death ascended the throne. He was killed by his younger brother Polajanaka ; the widowed queen fled from the kingdom and lived as a sister with a Brahmin scholar at Kālacampā, where she gave birth to Ariṭṭha's posthumous son, Mahājanaka. On attaining age, he came to Mithilā where Polajanaka had been dead sometime past, married his daughter and occupied the vacant throne of Videha (No. 539).[167]

Assaka—King of Assaka, reigning in the city of Potali *(Assakaraṭṭhe Potalinagare).* His contemporary was Kāliṅga, king of the Kaliṅga country, with his capital at Dantapura. Probably the name of the Assaka king was Aruṇa *(cf.* verse : *Aruṇarājassa sīhena susatthena surakkhitam).* Four daughters of the Kaliṅga king were seized by Assaka at the advice of his minister Nandisena, while they were passing his capital. This led to a battle between Assaka and Kaliṅga, which was fought on the frontiers of the two kingdoms *(Ubhinnaṁ rājjānam antare yuddham).*[168] It was prophesied by Sakka that Kāliṅga would be victorious. But Assaka under the direction of Nandisena defeated Kāliṅga who fled from the battlefield. Peace was ultimately restored between the two kings.[169]

Referred to as a king who made vast gifts in the past (verse, Nimi J.—No. 541). His name occurs in a verse along with some others (including Dudīpa, Sāgara, etc.[170]

Potali, the capital of an Assaka king, was once a city under a king of Banaras (No. 207).[171]

Avanti—Mahārāja of Avanti ruling at Ujjain. During his time *'the Great Being'* was born in a Caṇḍāla village outside the city of Ujjain *(Ujjeniyā bahi Caṇḍālagāmako hoti*—No. 498).[172]

Ajjuna—referred to as a 'past king' in the (Jātaka No. 522) ; 'a thousand-armed *(Sahassabāhu)* past king' who perished along with his kingdom for having offended Aṅgīrasa. He slew the holy

Aṅgīrasa, for which act he was thrown into hell (verse).[173]

King of Kekaka *(Kekakādhipa)*, endowed with a thousand arms, and a gigantic size *(atikāya)*, who was a great archer. He brought about his own destruction for an act of misdemeanour against Ṛṣi Gotama (verse : J-No. 530).[174]

A verse in the Bhūridatta J. (543) depicts *Ajjuna* as a performer of fire sacrifices.

A verse illustrates how through such rituals and gifts, bestowed on Brahmins, one can become a denizen of the heaven (No. 543).

Referred to as the *eldest* of the five sons of king Paṇḍu. The five brothers received their education at Takkasilā. They came to Banaras and were married to princess Kaṇhā, posthumous daughter of a king of Kosala who had been killed in battle by a certain Brahmadatta, king of Kāsi. The lady was unchaste and disloyal. Her character was exposed by the eldest prince Ajjuna and the five brothers, Nakula, Sahadeva, Bhīmasena, Yudhiṭṭhila and Ajjuna belonging to the *gotra* of Pāṇḍurāja (*Paṇḍurāja gottato*—No. 536), in sheer disgust, left the world to pass their time in the Himalayas (Kuṇāla Jātaka, No. 536).[175]

Aṭṭhaka—Subordinate to the king of Daṇḍaka, within whose realm his territory was situated. Two other princes enjoying the same status were Kāliṅga and Bhīmaratha. It appears that he was probably, and curiously enough, a contemporary of

Caṇḍapajjota (*Caṇḍapajjota rañño*), mentioned in another place of the same Jātaka (No. 522). These three princes visited the great ascetic Sarabhaṅga on the banks of the river Godāvarī and were influenced by his elevated discourses.

A king who 'belonged to the past', gave immense gifts but failed to get 'beyond the domain of sense' (verse : Nimi J. No. 541).

A righteous king who, by his devoted services in honour of Brahmins and Śramaṇas, obtained a passport to 'Indra's heaven' (verse : No. 544).

Bharu – King of Bharu (Bharu-J). He took bribes from ascetics and decided cases in their favour. At the bidding of the infuriated gods the whole kingdom extending over 300 leagues went under the sea (*tiyojanasatikaṁ Bharuraṭṭhaṁ araṭṭhaṁ akaṁsu* : No. 213).[176]

Lord of the kingdom of *Bharu (raṭṭhe Bharurāja nāma*) which had a seaport town (*pattanagāma*), called Bharukaccha. Here was born Suppāraka Kumāra, son of a leading mariner (*niyyāmajeṭṭhaka*) and himself an expert seaman (*Niyyāmakasippe, niphattiṁ patvā*). The king appointed him to the post of Valuer (*Agghāpaniyakamme*), but he gave up his office, dissatisfied at the low reward offered by the king on a certain occasion. This Jātaka gives a rare picture of the extensive maritime activities of Bharukaccha during his rule (No. 463).[177]

Bhallatiya—King of Banaras. Once he went to the Himalayas on a hunting excursion "with a trained

pack of hounds. He travelled along the Ganges in its upper reaches until he could get no higher, then followed a tributary stream for some distance, killing deer and pig and eating the flesh boiled". While climbing Mount Gandhamādana, he listened to two fairies speaking love to each other. This changed the mind of the king who returned to his country, three-hundred leagues in extent, gave up his hunting habit and made charities to the poor throughout the rest of his life (No. 504).[178]

Bhagïrasa—A king who flourished in the 'past' and made extensive gifts (verse : J. No. 541).[179]

Bharata—A great king, *Mahārāja*, reigning in the city of Roruva in the kingdom of Sovira. His chief queen was a wise lady named Samuddavijayā. At her advice he once distributed gifts among seven *Paccekabuddhas*. This pious king made charities throughout his life (No. 424).[180]

Baka—A king of Banaras. He was infatuated by the soft touch of a village-maiden called Pañcapāpā, whom he used to visit every night in disguise, returning to the palace early in the morning on the following day. Later, through an interesting incident, his connection with the woman was revealed to the people and she was agreeably surprised to find that her lover was none other than the king himself. She was now brought to the palace and raised to the dignity of the chief queen. Afterwards she dreamt a dream, which was interpreted to mean that the death of the king was

impending. At the suggestion of the soothsayers she was placed on board a ship and was left alone to drift down a river. She was accepted by king Pāvāriya as his wife. This led to a misunderstanding between Baka and Pāvāriya, and a conflict was about to break out between them, which was averted due to the wise advice of the councillors of the two kings. It was stipulated that each of them would live with Pañcapāpā alternately for a period of seven days (No. 536).

Caṇḍapajjota—(*cf.* the Pradyotas of Avanti of Purāṇic fame). Sarabhaṅga, a great ascetic living on the banks of the Godāvarī, asked his disciple Sālissara to go to Lambacūlaka, a town in the kingdom of Caṇḍapajjota *(Caṇḍapajjotaraññno vijite Lambacūlakaṁ nigamam)* and to settle there. The kingdom of Avanti in Dakshiṇāpatha *(Dakkhināpathe Avantiraṭṭhe* is referred to in one place but the name of its king is not mentioned there.) His contemporaries were kings Daṇḍaki, Aṭṭhaka, Kāliṅga and Bhīmaratha (No. 522).[151]

Pajaka rāja (Pañcāla rāja) is mentioned in place of this king, to whose country the sage Sālissara is asked to go (No. 423).

Cūḷāni-Brahmadatta—He reigned in Uttarapañcāla city in the kingdom of Kampilla. His adviser was a Brahmin named Kevatta. Following his advice the king started a vigorous career of conquest and established, in the course of a little over seven years, his undisputed sway in the whole

country excepting Videha, by subduing 101 princes who joined his army. Cūlāni's attempt to conquer Videha, however, failed owing to the astute opposition of the minister Mahosodha. Cūlāni now offered to marry his daughter Pañcālacaṇḍī to the Videhan king and invited him to the city with the ulterior motive of putting him to death during his visit to his own capital. But the unfailing alertness of Mahosodha saved his master from the sinister plot to which he was about to fall an unconscious victim. He dug an underground tunnel from Mithila to Uttarapañcāla, got 300 ships ready within a short time and in the most ingenious manner effected the safe passage of his master from the enemy's country to Mithila with Pañcālacaṇḍī who was now his wife, Pañcālacaṇḍa, son of Cūlāni Brahmadatta, and the latter's wife. Ultimately a happy reconciliation was arrived at between the two kings. Mahosadha, after the death of his master, left the kingdom of Videha and passed the remainder of his life with Cūlāni Brahmadatta of Kampilla (No. 546).

Caṭṭa—Son of a king of Kosala who reigned at Sāvatthi. When he was taken prisoner by Brahmadatta of Banaras who had conquered Kosala, Caṭṭa made his escape in disguise, went to Takkasilā and after having received his education there turned an ascetic. He came to Banaras where the king took him into his confidence. He acquired all the treasures of his father, which Brahmadattā

had buried under the ground, and with all his resources went to Sāvatthi and speedily recovered the lost kingdom of Kosala. The city was made impregnable against any possible attack from outside (Brahmacaṭṭa-J.—No. 336).

Cara—The immediate predecessor of Upacara, (Apacara) king of Ceti, who ruled in the city of Sotthivati (No. 422).

Dabbasena—King of Kosala. A minister, who had misconducted himself in the royal harem of Banaras, was driven out of the kingdom and took a post under him. The Kosalan king captured the ruler of Banaras while he was seated in the midst of his ministers *(amaccamajjhe nisinnam)* and subjected him to severe physical tortures as a punishment. Dabbasena, the robber king (corarāja), was visited with an attack of a burning pain and he got rid of it by setting the Banaras king free and restoring the kingdom to its former master (Ekarāja-J.-No. 303).

The dismissed minister was really responsible for the catastrophy which had befallen Banaras as it was he who had instigated the Kosalan king to attack its ruler (Mahāsilava-J.-No. 51).

A Banaras king under a sentence of death from which he made a miraculous escape and was finally restored to his kingdom. The Kosalan king was a usurper (Ekarāja Jātaka—No. 303 connects itself with the Mahāsīlava Jātaka and notes that the Kosalan king, therein referred to,

is Dabbasena : *So Dabbasenaṁ nāma Kosala-rājānaṁ upaṭṭhahanto ti sabbam Mahāsīlava-jātaka-kathitam eva).*[182]

Dīghāvu— (Dīghāyu — Dīghitikosala-Jātaka), Prince of Kosala. His parents were slain by a Banaras king (No. 371). Brahmadatta, the king of Banaras, put Dīghāvu's father Dīghati to death and occupied the kingdom of Kosala (No. 428). When living in disguise the prince happened to meet the Banaras king in an unprotected condition, but such was his self-control that he had no difficulty in denying himself the pleasure of an easy vengeance upon the slayer of his father.[183] The king of Banaras, highly pleased at his conduct, married his daughter to him and returned his father's kingdom. The two kings henceforward lived on friendly terms.

It is the name of the eldest and only son of king Arindama of Banaras who became king on the renunciation of the throne by his father to lead an austere life (No. 529).

It is the name of a prince of Videha, son of Mahājanaka. He became, king on the retirement of his father as an ascetic (No. 539).

Dhanañjaya— A king of Banaras. In his time the Bodhisattva was born as a parrot named Rādhā (No. 329).

A Koravya king ruling over the Kuru country in the city of Indapatta. He was born in the lineage of Yudhiṭṭhila *(Yudhiṭṭhilagotta)* by which name

he was also known (verse). His family priest was Vidhurapaṇḍita (Kurudhamma J.-No. 545 ; 276) who became his "adviser in matters spiritual and temporal" *(Purohitaṭṭhānam labhitvā rañño atthadhammanusāsako).*[184]

The king's policy of showing favour to new-comers *(āgantum kurute piyam)*, neglecting the old and trusted soldiers, which was responsible for his defeat in a battle 'in a disturbed frontier province.' The king found out his mistake with the help of Vidhurapaṇḍita (No. 401).

Dhanañjaya's family-priest was a Brahmin called Sucīrata. The king asked the *Purohita* to enlighten him regarding the character of *attha* and *dhamma*. Sucīrata sought the help of Vidhurapaṇḍita, who according to this Jātaka, lived in Banaras. Sambhava, a lad of seven years, brother of Sañjaya, gave the correct answer which was conveyed to Dhanañjaya who highly appreciated it (No. 515, *cf.* parisāyam).[185]

He was so righteous that 'in his realm it rained every ten or fifteen days (No. 276).

Dhanañjaya's son by the chief queen was called Dhanañjaya. The celebrated minister of his father Vidhurapaṇḍita, continued to be his adviser when he ascended the throne of the Kurus after the death of his father. The king once withdrew into his garden, leaving his court and a company of 16,000 dancing girls, to practise meditation like an ascetic. Here he was met by Sakka, Varuṇa, the Nāga king and the

Supaṇṇa king. The question arose as to who was the most meritorious in this group of four kings, and it was admirably solved by Vidhura to whose judgment they all submitted. Dhanañjaya was famed for his skill in dice. He was defeated in a game by Puṇṇaka, the Yakkha general of Vessavana, by whom Vidhura introducing himself as a slave from his birth, was carried to the Nāga king. He was, however, brought back to Indapatta in the land of the Kurus with a precious jewel which had formerly been carried off by Puṇṇaka from the Vepulla Mount in Rājagṛha, the possession of which implied universal sovereignty. This was given to the Kuru king by Vidhurapaṇḍita (No. 545).

Dummukha—King of Uttarapañcāla reigning in the city of Kampilla *(Uttarapañcālaraṭṭha, Kampillanagare).*[186] He was 'struck by the evils of lust' and abandoned his kingdom to embrace the career of an ascetic. In this new life he had three associates who had all once been kings namely, Karaṇḍu of Kaliṅga, Naggaji of Gandhāra, and Nimi of Vidheha (No. 408).

Daḷhadhamma—King of Banaras. He had a she-elephant which used to carry written messages on her neck up to a distance of 100 leagues and was very useful in battles (Dalhadhamma.J-No. 409).

Dasaratha—Mahārāja—a pious king of Banaras. He had 16,000 queens of whom the chief gave birth to two sons and one daughter. The eldest

son was Rāma Paṇḍita, the second was prince Lakkhaṇa, and the daughter's name was Sītā Devī. On the death of the *chief queen (Aggamahisi)* he placed another queen in her position, by whom he had a third son named Bharata. The king was highly pleased at the conduct of Bharata's mother and wanted to give her a boon. The boon, prayed for, was that Bharata should succeed to the throne in preference to his eldest son Rāma Paṇḍita. The king was horrified at the proposal and thinking that the lives of his sons might not be safe within the kingdom owing to the machinations of the chief queen asked his sons to live outside his realm till his death, which, according to the calculation of the soothsayers, was sure to take place twelve years later. After the expiry of this period they were to come back to Banaras and then Rāma should occupy the throne. The king's advice was acted upon and the loving sister Sītā followed the two brothers, Rāma and Lakkhaṇa to the Himalayas. The king died nine years later. Bharata came to Rāma's hermitage with a view to induce him back to the kingdom. But Rāma, who was determined to follow his father's command to the letter, would not return until the remaining three years had elapsed. Lakkhaṇa and Sītā, however, returned and for the next three years the government was carried on by the straw-made slippers offered by Rāma to Bharata. On the completion of the twelfth year Rāma came back and

began to rule with Sītā as the queen consort (No. 461).

When Rāma went to Daṇḍaka Forest his mother won salvation for her son (verse : J.-No. 513).

Another name of a legendary king of Banaras called Janasandha, father of Adāsa-mukha who became king afterwards (Gāmaṇicaṇḍa-J.-No. 257).

Daṇḍaki—King of a country, the capital of which was the city of Kumbhavatī. Kisavaccha, with the permission of his master, the renowned ascetic who lived in a hermitage on the banks of the Godāvari, took up his abode in this city. The king once dismissed his courtezan but she was restored to his favour. Similarly, the king dismissed his Purohita for same reason and he too was reinstated in his office. These two persons thought that they had got back their offices by insulting Kisavaccha, who was regarded as a veritable embodiment of ill luck (Kālakaṇṇi). Sometime later there was a disturbance on the frontier and the king went to fight it out. At the suggestion of the Purohita, on the eve of the expedition he treated Kisavaccha with great contempt. He won victory but within seven days the whole kingdom of Daṇḍaki, for a space of sixty *yojanas*, was destroyed by 'frightful natural visitations'. The ascetic had already predicted that the whole kingdom would become 'no-kingdom' as a consequence of the god's anger *(Sakalaraṭṭham araṭṭham bhavissati).*[187] The report of the destruction of Daṇḍaki's kingdom

spread throughout the length and breadth of India *(tassa evam vinaṭṭhabhāvo sakala-Jambudīpe paññāyi)*. The three subordinate princes of Daṇḍaki were Kaliṅga, Aṭṭhaka and Bhīmaratha *(Assa raṭṭhassa antararaṭṭhādhipatino)*. It is not probable that he was a contemporary of Caṇḍa-pajjota.

"Daṇḍaki defiling Kisavaccha" was utterly destroyed (verse : No. 530).

Dudīpa—One of a group of nine kings who could not attain salvation by giving gifts *(* verse : No. 541).

He lived a thousand years and had numberless chariots and soldiers at his command. But he became an ascetic at last. "And from his hermitage to heaven he past" (verse : J. No. 543).

A Nāga king associated with the river Yamunā (No. 543).

Dhataraṭṭha—A king who in former times served Brāhmiṇs and Śramaṇas very assiduously and passed to Sakka's heaven after death. Others of this righteous group of former kings are Vessamitta, Aṭṭhaka, Yāmataggi, Usīnara and Sivi (Nārada's discourse : J. No. 544).

Esukāri—King of Banaras. He had no son and wanted, by way of fulfilling a pledge, to make one of the four sons of his Purohita king, but all of them turned out ascetics. The king also embraced a religious life. Formerly he had driven out all ascetics from Banaras in order to protect the young

sons of the chaplain from the compelling influences of their teachings (No. 509).

Janasandha—A king of Banaras. Also known as Dasaratha (verse). Father of Adasāmukha, who succeeded him (Gāmaṇicaṇḍa—J. No. 257).

Son of king Brahmadatta of Banaras by his chief consort. When he became king he built six almonries—four at the four gates of the city, one in the middle of the city and the sixth at the royal gate where he daily distributed gifts to vast numbers of men. His fame spread in the whole of India (Jambudīpa). In the courtyard of his palace he used to give moral discourses (*dhammam*) to the citizens of Banaras twice a month (No. 468, *cf.* Aśoka).[188]

Jayaddisa—Son of king Pañcāla, who reigned in the city of Uttarapañcāla in the kingdom of Kampilla, by his chief queen (*Kampillaraṭṭhe Uttarapañcālanagare*). His son was prince Alīna sattu who tamed an ogre (*yakkha*) who was none other than an elder brother of the king, nursed by an ogress (*yakkhini*) during his infancy. When the identity was revealed the king offered the throne to him, but he refused to accept it and became an ascetic. The king founded a village on a mountain in the neighbourhood of his brother's hermitage, where he excavated a big tank, 'prepared cultivated fields' and settled a thousand families, thus making arrangements for almsgiving to the ascetics (*tāpasānam bhikkhāhāram patthapesi*).

This village grew into the town of Cullakamma-sadamma. Another town which owed its origin to the king's reign was Mahākammasadamma, commemorating the spot where the great transfor-mation of the yakkha was effected (No. 513).

Juṇha—son of Brahmadatta, studied in Takkasilā, 'the fair city of Gandhāra king'. Afterwards he made gifts including a hundred slave girls, 700 kine, more than a thousand ornaments of gold and two wives of equal birth to a Brahmin from Takkasilā (No. 456).

Janaka—King of Banaras (No. 402).

Kāliṅga—King of the country of Kaliṅga ruling in the city of Dantapura. Once in his kingdom a famine broke out consequent upon failure of crops due to drought. A critical situation arose ; the famished people crowded at the king's gate for relief. Such famines were not unusual. Following the custom of former kings he made charities and observed penances for a period of seven days but all was in vain. It was supposed that if anyhow the elephant called Anjana-vasabha, which belonged to the Kuru king Dhanañjaya, could be brought to Dantapura, its very presence would cause a rainfall. Dhanañjaya gave it to the Brahmin sent by Kāliṅga on this particular mission. Next, the rules of virtue, which passed under the general name of *Kurudhamma* and had been collected from different persons of Indapatta, were inscribed upon a golden plate

and brought to Kaliṅga, where the king practised them. The result was seen in the increasing prosperity of the Kaliṅga country.

A ruler of the Kaliṅga kingdom *(capital Dantapura)*. He had two sons, named Mahā-kāliṅga and Culla-kāliṅga. On the death of their father, Mahā-kāliṅga became king. He wanted to have his younger brother arrested, but the latter fled to a forest and turned an ascetic. His son was called Kāliṅga. While in forest, he has married to a Madda princess and on the death of Mahā-kāliṅga came back to Dantapura and took possession of the throne. The fortune-tellers had predicted that he would be an universal monarch *(cakkavatī)* and indeed he became so. His Purohita, Kāliṅgabharadvāja, initiated him into the ten ceremonies, which a universal sovereign was required to perform *(dasa cakkavattivattam)*. He offered worship at the circuit of the great Bodhi tree *(Mahābodhimaṇḍam*—No. 479).

A king, subordinate to Daṇḍaki. He went to the ascetic Sarabhaṅga and was converted (No. 522).

Kalābu—A king of Banaras. On a certain occasion he went to the royal park, surrounded by a large number of dancers. There the nautch girls provided a musical entertainment. The king got heavily drunk and fell asleep. The women then stopped their music and went to the Bodhisattva who was seated in a corner of the park. When the king awoke he became angry missing the girls. He

came to the ascetic and on inquiry learnt that he preached the doctrine of patience. The king, just to put his patience to a practical test, killed him in a cold-blooded manner, and the ascetic died a martyr to his faith. As a consequence of this heinous offence the king was 'wrapped up by a flame and drawn deep down into the earth (Brahmadatta J.—No. 323).

This story was known to kings Khujjavamana, Kāliṅga, Aṭṭhaka and Bhīmaratha, who made an allusion to it (No. 522).

Karaṇḍu—King of Kaliṅga (in the city of Dantapura), who became an ascetic, a *Paccekabuddha*, along with three other kings, *viz*, Naggaji of Gandhāra, Nimi of Videha and Dummukha of Uttarapañcāla. They lived together as ascetics in the Nandamūla cave (Kumbhakārā—J.-No. 408).

Kaṇḍari—A very handsome king of Banaras. His wife was called Kinnarā and his chaplain was Pañcālacaṇḍa. Kinnarā carried on an intrigue with a cripple and this the king came to know with the help of his priest. He travelled all over the country and altogether a very bad impression was produced on his mind regarding the moral character of womenfolk (No. 536).

Kalāra Janaka—He was Nimi's son and successor in the kingdom of Videha, and with him closed the dynasty which had been founded by Makhadeva (No. 541).

Kosambika—Lord of the kingdom of Vaṁsa with capital at Kosambī (No. 444).

Kiki—King, flourishing in the time of Dasabala Kassapa. He had eight daughters—Uracchadā, Samaṇī, Samaṇā, Guttā, Bhikkhudāsikā, Dhammā, Sudhammā and Saṁghadāsī (No. 547).

Koravya—A king of the race of Yuddhiṭṭhila, reigning in the city of Indapatta in the kingdom of Kuru. He used to make gifts indiscriminately. Once he took counsel with minister Vidhura, his adviser on *artha* and *dharma,* regarding persons who deserved royal largesses for their exemplary character. Vidhura exposed the greed, hypocrisy and commercialism and other evil traits which characterised some of the Brahmins of his time, from which the *Pacceka-buddhas* of Northern Himalaya were alone free. They were accordingly invited by the king to receive presents from him (Dasa-Brāhmaṇa J.—495). He had a son by his chief wife called Sutasoma, who afterwards became king (No. 537).

Kaṁsa—Son of Mahākaṁsa who reigned in Uttarāpatha in the city of Asitañjana in the Kaṁsa district *(Kaṁsabhoge).* After Mahākaṁsa's death, he succeeded to the throne and his younger brother Upakaṁsa became viceroy. He had a sister called Devagabbhā, and it was prophesied that her son would destroy the territory of Kaṁsa and, with it, the dynasty of Kaṁsa too. The sister was put into a tower to live a solitary life, attended by a maidservent named Nandagopā and a

servant called Andhakaveṇhu. Upasāgara, a son of the deceased Mahāsāgara of North Madhurā, fled from his brother's kingdom to Kaṁsa, where he was received with honour by the king at the recommendation of his brother Upakaṁsa. Devagabbhā and the new-comer fell in love with each other, and meetings between them were secretly arranged by Nandagopā. Devagabbhā gave birth to a daughter who was given the name of Añjanā. Now the two brothers Kaṁsa and Upakaṁsa allotted to the pair an estate—a village *(bhogagāma)* named Govaḍḍhamāna where they came to live. In course of time ten sons were successively born to them, and they were brought up in secret by Nandagopā. The eldest of them was Vāsudeva, known also as Kaṇha and Kesava. The nine others were Baladeva, Candadeva, Suriyadeva, Aggideva, Varuṇa-deva, Ajjuna, Pajjunna, Ghatapaṇḍita and Aṁkura. "In course of time they grew big and being very strong, and withal fierce and ferocious, they went about plundering, they went even so far as to plunder a present being conveyed to the king." That they were really the sons of Devagabbhā became widely known and reached the ears of the king, who ordered them to fight with two famous wrestlers, *viz.*, Cānura and Muṭṭhika, thinking of putting them to death when well under control. Baladeva, the second brother, quite easily killed the two wrestlers in the course of the match ; and Vāsudeva "threw a wheel which lopped off the heads of" the two giants,

Kaṁsa, the king and his brother Upakaṁsa, the viceroy. The crowd that had gathered to witness the performance at once accepted Vāsudeva as their king. Thus the prophecy that Kaṁsa would die in the hands of Devagabbhā's son was fulfilled (Ghata J.—No. 454).

Kaṁsa is also mentioned as a king of Banaras in a verse.[189]

Kālasena—King of Ayojjhā (Ayodhyā), was taken prisoner by the ten sons of Devagabbhā,—Vāsudeva and others, and the sovereignty of the country thereupon passed into their hands (Ghata J.—No. 454).

Mallika—King of Kosala. Once two royal carriages, one conveying king Brahamadatta of Banaras and the other king Mallika of Kosala, met at a certain spot in a road which was so small that it could not 'allow passage to more than one conveyance at a time'. It was difficult for the two royal drivers to settle which of the carriages should pass first. Both of them were anxious to uphold the honour and dignity of their respective masters. The two kings were equally powerful and glorious. Both ruled over kingdoms, equal in extent, each measuring 300 leagues in length and their resources were equally balanced. But there was one field where a comparison might be instituted between the two kings—it was that of general policy, in which there was a significant difference. The king of Kosala was 'rough to the rough' and 'mild with mildness'

swayed, mastered 'the good by goodness, and paid 'the bad with badness.'[190] The king of Kāsi, on the other hand, conquered wrath by mildness and mastered the bad with goodness. Judged by this standard, Kosala was held inferior to Kāsi. The Kosala king, after this event, tried to follow the example of Brahmadatta (Rajovāda J.—No. 151).

Mahāpiṅgala—A king of Banaras, very cruel and oppressive to all classes of his subjects, who suffered grievously owing to his unjust rule. At his death the people felt relieved and indulged in all kinds of gaiety as they had got rid of a tyrant. His son was the Bodhisattva of the story who became king on his death (No. 240). A genealogy of this line from Mahāsammata down to Mandhātā is to be found in the Mandhātā Jātaka (No. 258).

Mandhātā—He was 'a great king'. Sakka divided the sovereignty of the 'Heaven of the Thirty-three' between himself and Mandhātā. After a time he wanted to exclude Sakka. He fell down from heaven and died (No. 258).

His successors were Varamandhātā, Cara and Upacara, the last ruled over the kingdom of Ceti (No. 422).

Mahāpātaka—A king of Banaras. He had his son Dhammapāla, seven months old, executed for a slight offence on the part of its mother, Canda. The mother died instantly and the king went to hell (Culladhammapāla J.-No. 358).

Maddava—A king of Banaras. He gave his wife

to the young son of the royal chaplain, asking him to live with her for seven days and to return her on the eighth day. But they fled to another kingdom and no trace of them was discoverable anywhere. The king was gradually reconciled to his fate by his two wise councillors, Āyura and Pukkusa. In his country swords, made in *Dasaṇṇa*, were in use amongst the people. Maddava is frequently addressed as a Māgadha (*Janahi Māgadha*) by the two councillors (No. 401).

Mahākaṁsa—A king who reigned in the city of Asitañjana in the district of Kaṁsa, situated in Uttarāpatha. He had two sons respectively named Kaṁsa and Upakaṁsa and a daughter Devagabbhā by name. After his death the throne was occupied by the elder son Kaṁsa, and Upakaṁsa was appointed to the viceroyalty (*uparāja* : No. 454).

Mahāpanāda—King of Mithila, son of Suruci (verse : Mahāpanāda J.—No. 264.).

Mahāsīlava—King of Kāsi, deprived of his kingdom by a monarch of Kosala (Mahāsilava-J.—No. 51).

Manoja—A king reigning in Banaras when its name was Brahmavaddhana. With the help of the supernatural power, possessed by an ascetic named Nandapaṇḍita, who called him the foremost king in all India *(sakala-jambudīpe Manojam aggarājānam)* he received the submission of over a hundred kings including those of Aṅga, Magadha and Kosala. Avanti and Assaka were included in his domimions

(J.—No. 532).[191] He returned to his capital Brahmavaddhana with the host of kings who had submitted to his overlordship. He and the other kings were instructed in the law by Sonapaṇḍita, brother of Nandapaṇḍita (No. 532).

Makhadeva– King of Videha, reigning in the city of Mithila. He told his barber that the moment he found a grey hair on his head, he was to bring it to the notice of his royal master. This occurred after he had reigned for eighty-four thousand years whereupon he left his kingdom and assumed the garb of an ascetic. Afterwards he went to the Brahma world (Makhadeva J.—No. 9).

Makhadeva was again born as king Nimi in Videha. The last of the line, of which king Makhadeva was the first, was Kalāra-janaka (Nimi J. No.—541).

Mahājanaka—He reigned in Mithila in the kingdom of Videha. He had two sons Ariṭṭhajanaka and Polajanaka who had respectively filled the posts of viceroy and commander-in-chief. After his death Ariṭṭha became king as usual, but he was killed by his brother who enjoyed the throne till his death. Ariṭṭha's posthumous son was Mahājanaka who was brought up by her mother in the house of a Brahmin teacher at Kālacampā. After finishing his education Mahājanaka, now a young man of sixteen, sailed for Suvaṇṇabhūmi on a commercial enterprise, in order to earn sufficient money wherewith to recover the kingdom of Videha. The ship

perished in the middle of the ocean. He managed to reach Mithila, where the throne had been lying vacant since the death of Polajanaka, his uncle, who had left a marriageable daughter but no son. Mahājanaka was now married to the princess and raised to the throne. He was a very popular king but, acting under an irresistible religious impulse, he renounced the world notwithstanding the most earnest entreaties of his devoted wife, Sivala-devī, and of the whole people. The king was exhorted to lead a virtuous life by two eminent ascetics, Nārada-Kassapa and Migajina. After his retirement prince Dighāvu, his son, became king of Videha (539).

Mucalinda—One out of a group of nine kings who reigned in ancient times. Noted for their charities they could not 'pass beyond the Peta world'[192] (verse : Nimi-J.—No. 541).

He was an ancient king (Mujalinda), who feasted the Brahmins very well, often performed fire sacrifices and was at last admitted to the heavenly world (verse : Bhūridatta-J.—No. 543).

Nimi—King of Videha,—Makhadeva, reborn as such. He united the scattered family (*ossakkamānaṁ attano vaṁsaṁ ghatetva*)[193] of his forefather Makhadeva and afterwards adopted the life of an ascetic (Makhadeva J.—No. 9).

After eighty-two thousand princes, belonging to the line of Makhadava had successively ruled, Nimi appeared in the world. He visited the hell and

the mansions of various gods in the company of Mātali, the charioteer of Sakka, to see with his own eyes how men fared differently according to their own actions in this world. When his hair began to be grey, he renounced the world, making his son Kalāra-janaka king in his place, and devoting his own time and energies to the development of his moral faculties (Nimi J.—No. 541).

Nimi, king of Videha, turned an ascetic and lived in the same cave with three other kings *viz.*, Naggaji of Gandhāra, Dummukha of Kampilla, and Karaṇḍu of Kaliṅga who had also become an ascetic (Verse : Kumbhakāra J.—No. 408).

Naggaji—He ruled over the two kingdoms of Kashmir and Gandhāra from the city of Takkasilā. He said—"*ahaṁ pana Kasmīra-Gandhāresu dvīsu rajjesu raṭṭhavāsino vicāremi*").[194] Naggaji of the Gandhāras is spoken of in a verse.

Nārada –King of Videha in Mithila. He was the seventh in descent from Sādhina between whom and this king 700 years had elapsed (No. 495).

Nālikīra—(king ?)—He perished having caused ascetics to be devoured by dogs. He fell into the jaws of dogs in hell (Sarabhaṅga Jātaka).

Okkāka—He ruled over the kingdom over Malla from his capital Kusāvatī (*Kusāvati rājadhāniyaṁ*). He had sixteen thousand queens, of whom the chief was Sīlavatī. For a long time he had no son and the people became anxious lest the kingdom should be seized and destroyed by a foreigner. The queen

was exposed before the people but her chastity was guarded by Sakka. She gave birth to two sons, the elder was Prince Kusa, who was married to Pabhāvatī, daughter of a Madda king, who ruled at Sakala. He was anointed as king, and Okkāka ceased to rule (Kusa J.—No. 531).

Pasenadi—King Brahmdatta of Banaras related his dreams in just the same way as Pasenadi had described them (Mahasupina J.-No. 77).

Pajaka—King of a country which comprised the town of Lambacūlaka (Indriya. J.-No. 423 ; cf. Caṇḍpajjota above).[195]

Piliyakkha—King of Banaras. Having entrusted the kingdom to his mother he went to the region of the Himalayas on a hunting excursion. There on the banks of the river Migasammata he fatally wounded a young boy named Sāma, son of a hunter. The King became penitent and offered to nurse the parents of the boy like a slave. Sāma in the end was restored to life (Sāma J.-No. 540).

Reṇu—He reigned in the city of Uttarapañcāla in the kingdom of Kuru *(Kururaṭṭhe Uttarapañcāla-nagare)*. Once a rebellion broke out in the frontier *(paccanta kuppi)*. The king proceeded to suppress it, leaving his only son Prince Somanassa in charge of a knavish ascetic. On his return the ascetic brought a false charge against the prince's character. The king believed his account and the boy was ordered to be executed. He, however, soon discovered that the charge had no

foundation in fact, and that the whole story had been fabricated by the ascetic to further his own wicked ends. The son was disgusted with the king's lack of justice and left home as an ascetic (No. 505).

Suruci—King of Videha, reigning in the city of Mithila. He had a son who was also called Suruci. The son of Suruci II was Mahāpaṇāda (Mahāpaṇāda J.-No. 264.).

Suruci of Mithila—whose son and grandson also bore the same name. The son of Suruci I, while a prince, contracted friendship with Brahmadatta of Banaras at Takkasilā where they had both gone for education. Later on, when Suruci was seated on the throne of Videha and Brahmadatta on that of Banaras, this friendship of early days was strengthened by a matrimonial alliance. Prince Suruci (*i. e.* Suruci No. III), son of the reigning king Suruci II, married Sumedhā, princess of Banaras. Out of this wedlock was born Mahāpaṇāda and there was a great jubilation at his birth in both the kingdoms (Suruci J.-No. 489).

Senaka—Of Banaras (Kharaputta J.-No. 386).

Sabdadatta—Of Banaras, which was known as Ramma city *(Rammanagaraṁ nāma ahosi).* His eldest son Yuvañjaya was given the post of Viceroy *(uparajjam adāsi).* Yuvañjaya and his younger brother Prince Yudhiṭṭhila renounced the world with the consent of the King (Yuvañjaya J.-No. 460).

Saṁvara—Prince, the youngest son of Brahma-

datta of Banaras. On the completion of his education he was asked to choose a province (*Tuyhaṁ janapadaṁ vārehiti*), but at the advice of his teacher, who was a minister, he did not leave the city but chose the old park. He gradually increased his influence and popularity amongst all classes of the subjects till at last though youngest, he was elected to the throne by the ministers on the death of Brahmadatta, whose eldest son was Prince Uposatha. The 99 brothers now joined in an attack against Mahārāja Saṁvara, but their hostility ceased when he divided the deceased king's wealth into a hundred shares and made over 99 shares to the brothers. He ruled wisely and righteously and the Bodhisattva, his former teacher was his guiding angel throughout (Saṁvara J.-No. 462).

Sādhīna—King of Videha. He was a very pious king, and so great was his merit that Sakka brought him to his heaven where he lived for 700 years. Then he was sent back to this world. In Videha, the reigning King was Nārada, 7th in descent from him. The throne was offered to Sādhina but he refused. For seven days he made charities and on the 7th day he died to be born in 'the heaven of the Thirty-three' (Sādhīna J.-No. 494).

Sakula—He ruled in the city of Sakula in the kingdom of Māhiṁsaka. Near the city was a lotus-lake called Manusiya *(Manusiyo name padumasaro ahosi*). It appears that Mount Cittakūṭa was not far from it (No. 533).

Saṁyama—King of Banaras. His chief consort was Khemā who wanted to have some geese from the Cittakūṭa mountain. A fowler was appointed to catch these for the queen. Ultimately, the king thought that it was wicked to destroy life and so set them free (Mahāhaṁsa J.-No. 534).

Sāgara—He is mentioned in a group of nine kings (Nimi J-No. 541).

There is a verse in the Bhūridatta Jātaka (543). translated as follows ;

"Sāgara all the earth in triumph crost,
And raised a golden sacrificial host,
None worshipped Fire more zealously than he
And he too rose to be a deity."[196]

Sāgara is given as the name of Mahāsāgara, a king of upper Madhura, son of Mahāsāgara. His brother Upasāgara fled from his kingdom (Ghata J.-No. 454).

Sela—One of a group of nine kings (cf. verse : Nimi J.—No. 541).

Sāma—A king of Banaras. He had a state horse called Paṇḍava. A lame man called Giridanta was his groom. He was dismissed and an efficient man was appointed in his place (Giridanta J.-No. 184).

Saṁkhapāla—of the kingdom of Ekabala, a contemporary of Culāni-Brahmadatta of Kampilla. He was reported to have been engaged in collecting arms and assembling an army. His movements were watched by a Videha king (Mahā-Umagga J.-No. 546).

Sañjaya—Son of a king who reigned in the city of Jetuttara in the kingdom of Sivi. On his attaining maturity he was married to Phusatī, princess of Madda, and made king by his father Sivi. The son of Phusatī and Sañjaya was Vessantara who was banished from the kingdom by the people of Sivi for having given an elephant to the Brahmins sent by a king of Kaliṅga. Afterwards he returned to the Sivi country (Vessantara J.-No. 547).

Susīma—King of Banaras. When the season for holding the elephant festival came, the Brāhmins in a body came to him and told him that as the royal chaplain's young son was not versed in the three Vedas or in the elephant lore, permission should be accorded to them to conduct the festival. "For seven generations," thought the wife of the chaplain, "we have managed the elephant's festival from father to son. The old custom will pass from us." The lad demanded his right and it was granted (Susima J.-No. 163).

Tamba—King of Banaras. His wife was Sussondi, a woman of great beauty. She was abducted by the king of the Nāga island Seruma, who used to come to Banaras to play dice with him. The king sent his minstrel Sagga to search for her in every country and bring information regarding her whereabouts. Sagga came to Bharukaccha where some merchants were about to sail to Suvaṇṇa-bhūmi. He was allowed a free passage in exchange for music with which he was to entertain the

merchants on board the ship. He reached the island of Seruma and found the queen there. The Nāga king, on coming to know of her misconduct with the minstrel, returned her in disgust to Tamba (Sussondi J.—No, 360).

Udayabhadda—A Bodhisattva, born as prince of Banaras, son of Brahmadatta. At his father's death, he gained the kingdom but divided it in equal shares between himself and a poor water-carrier, for whom he took a strange fascination. Afterwards, this man felt tempted to kill Udayabhadda in order to become the sole monarch himself. But he returned his half of the kingdom to Udaya, just to free himself from the greed which was leading him to such an ungrateful act.

Addressed as Brahmadatta, which was the name of the family of Udaya Rāja *(rājānam kulanāmena ālaptivā* : Gaṅgamāla J.-No. 421)[197] the Bodhisattva, son of a king of Kāsi, who ruled in the city of Surundha by his chief queen married his own sister Udayabhaddā, who was a daughter of the king by another queen. After marriage he became king and Udayabhaddā the chief consort. They abstained from sexual intercourse. When he died there was none who could succeed him to the throne. Udayabhaddā conducted the administration with the help of the ministers *(Udayabhaddāya eva āṇā pavatti, amaccā rajjaṁ anusāsiṁsu)*. Afterwards she renounced the world as an ascetic, and

the sovereignty was then vested in the courtiers *(amacce rajjam paṭicchāpetva—No. 458).*[198]

Usīnara—King Sakka assumed the form of a hunter, and with Mātali, as his hound, came to his kingdom to punish the irreligious and restore religion. He wanted food for his hungry hound but its hunger was not appeased, and Sakka would let the hound devour all those who acted inimically. The whole multitude was terror-struck. "Sakka then revealed his divine character, declared the law and strengthened the waning power of religion" (No. 469).

Waiting diligently on Brahmins and Sramanas, Usīnara went to Sakka's heaven (Mahānāradakassapa J.-No. 544).

Usīnara is mentioned as one of a group of ancient kings (Verse : Nimi Jātaka—No. 541).

Uggasena—King of Banaras, who enjoyed the hospitality of the Nāga king Campeyya. With the latter's help a Magadhan king, who had lost his kingdom, came to rule over the two realms of Aṅga and Magadha (No. 506).

Vissasena—A king of Banaras (No, 268 ; *cf* Āramadusaka J.-No. 46, where the same story occurs, but the king's name is given there as Brahmadatta).

Vaṅka—A king who ruled in Sāvatthī. A minister of king Ghata of Kāsi, was banished from the country and took service with him. At his instigation Vaṅka attacked the kingdom of Kāsi,

conquered it and took its king Ghata prisoner. He was, however, set free and Kāsi was restored to him (Ghata J.-No. 355).

Vasavatti—king whose son Ekarāja reigned in Banaras when it was called Pupphavatī (Khaṇḍahāla J.-No. 542).

Vessamitta—A righteous king who in former times waited diligently on Brahmins and Sramaṇas and went to Sakka's heaven (No. 544).

Vāsudeva—The eldest son of Upasāgara, brother of king Sagara of North Mathura and Devagabbhā, sister of king Kaṁsa. When Devagabbhā was born, a prediction was made that a son born of her would destroy the Kaṁsa line together with the country *(etissā kucchiyaṁ nibbattaputto Kaṁsa bhogaṁ Kaṁsavaṁsaṁ nāsessatīti vyākariṁsu).*[199] Her father king Mahākaṁsa could not put her to death out of affection, and when Kaṁsa came to the throne, he also desisted from killing her for fear of a general outcry of condemnation. She was, however,thrown into a solitary tower, specially built for the purpose. She had two attendants—Nandagopā and her husband Andhakaveṇhu. Then came the gallant prince Upasāgara from North Mathura, his brother's kingdom, where he had been engaged in a sexual misadventure. He paid stealthy visits to Debagabbhā in her solitary prison, overcoming all physical difficulties through the power of love. She became enceinte and when cross-examined by her brothers was compelled to relate the whole

story of her secret love-making. The brothers thought that if their sister gave birth to a son, they would at once kill him rather than put her sister to death and that, if a daughter were born, she would be spared. Arriving at this conclusion, they married their sister to Upasāgara, the discredited young prince from Mathura. This time a daughter was born to her, and she was named *Añjanā Devī*. Some time after she brought forth a male child. On the same day was born a daughter to Nandagopā. The latter passed as Devagabbhā's daughter and the former as the son of Nanda. In this way all the sons of Devagabbhā, ten in number, Vāsudeva Baladeva, Candadeva, Suriyadeva, Aggideva, Varuṇa-deva, Ajjuna, Pajjuna, Ghata-paṇḍita, Aṁkura,—were brought up in the house of Nandagopā as her sons and the ten daughters of Nandagopā similarly passed as daughters of Devagabbhā. The ten brothers, known as the sons of Andhakaveṇhu *(Andha-kaveṇhudasaputtā dasa bhātikā ceṭakā)*,[200] grew up very strong. Full of youthfulness, which knew no mercy to others, they became notorious plunderers. The king came to know of their plundering raids on the country from the people. Their real identity was disclosed, and Kaṁsa thought of putting them to death by inviting them to participate in a wrestling match. Baladeva, the second brother, easily put the two wrestlers, Cānura and Muṭṭhika to death, and Vāsudeva, the eldest, killed Kaṁsa and his brother by throwing a wheel *(cakkam khipi)*. The

crowds, terrified, fell at his feet, and besought him to be their protector (*Mahājano bhītatasito 'avassayo no hothā, 'ti tesaṁ pādesu patitvā nipajji*).[201] The ten brothers next launched upon a career of conquest. First of all, they took Kālasena, king of Ayojjhā, prisoner (the city of Ayojjhā was the seat of this king : *Kālasenarañño nivāsaṁ Ayojjhanagaraṁ*) and made themselves masters of the country. From Ayodhyā they went to Dvāravatī. On one side of this city there was a mountain and on another a sea. There were great natural difficulties which stood in the way of conquering a city that stood so near the sea. Failing to capture it they came to Kaṇhadīpāyana, a sage and a friend of Maṇḍavya (cf. No. 444) for advice. They next posted four iron pillars at the four gates of the city and clamped them with chains of iron, which enabled them to master the physical obstacles which had so long baffled their attempt. They entered the city and killed its king and took the country (*Dasa bhātikā tato nagaraṁ pavisitvā rājānaṁ māretvā rajjaṁ gaṇhiṁsu*).[202] After this they conquered 'three and sixty thousand cities' in the whole of India, killing all the kings by means of their Wheel (*sabbe rājāno cakkena jīvitakkhayaṁ pāpetvā*) and making their own residence at Dvāravatī where they divided their kingdom into ten shares. At the suggestion of Aṁkura his share was conferred upon lady Añjanā. Aṁkura 'became a trader' (*Aṁkura pana vāṇijjaṁ akāsi*) and was exempted from tax (*suṁkam*)[203]

in return for the sacrifice he had made. In course of time their parents died. At the death of a beloved son, Vāsudeva Mahārāja became overwhelmed with grief and kept on mourning, neglecting all his royal business. Ghatapaṇḍita, Vāsudeva's brother, wanted 'the hare within the moon' (verse : *Candato sasam-icchāmi*).[204] 'This was absurd,' pointed out Vāsudeva. Ghata, the wise, showed that his mourning was meaningless. Thus consoled by Prince Ghata, king Vāsudeva ruled righteously over the kingdom. Long after this, the sons of the ten brothers visited Kaṇhadīpāyana gifted with divine insight *(dibbacakkhuka)*. "They procured a young lad, and drest him up, and by binding a pillow about his belly, made it appear as though he were with child." "When, Sir, will this woman be delivered ?" The sage replied, "This man on the seventh day from now will bring forth a knot of acacia wood *(khadiraghaṭikam vjāyissati)*. With that he will destory the line of Vāsudeva." "Ah, false ascetic !", they exclaimed, "a man can never bring forth a child" and they killed the sage at once. Sometime later the kings proposed to enjoy a sport in the water. A big pavilion was built for the occasion ; there they came, ate and drank. Now, they grew quarrelsome and began to fight, dividing themselves into two groups *(didhā bhijjitvā)*. At last one of them picked a leaf from the *eraka* plant, 'which, even as he plucked it, became a club of acacia wood in his hand'. With this he beat many people. Then

the others plucked also, and the things as they took them became transformed into clubs, with which they beat one another until they were all dead. All of them perished with the exception of Vāsudeva, Baladeva and the lady Añjanā, who fled in a chariot with a *purohita* while the fight was proceeding. In the forest of Kālamattika Baladeva was killed by Muṭṭhika, the wrestler who had been born again as a *yakkha*. Vāsudeva with his sister and the chaplain came to a frontier village at sunrise. He lay down in a forest sending his sister and the priest into the village to get some food cooked and bring it to him. A hunter named Jarā was passing by the way. He took him to be a pig and threw a spear, which pierced his feet. The wound proved fatal. Before breathing his last, he taught lady Añjanā a science *(vijjam)*, to provide her with a means of her future livelihood. "Thus excepting the lady Añjanā they perished, every one, it is said" (Ghata J.-No. 454).[204a] Rohineyya was a minister in Dvāravatī, who carried a message to king Vāsudeva. Vāsudeva was also known by the names of Kaṇha and Kesava.[205]

In another Jātaka story Vāsudeva, one of the brothers of the Kaṇhagaṇa clan,—the eldest of them, is mentioned to have married Jambāvatī of the Caṇḍāla caste and made her the chief consort. Their son was *Sivi* who ruled in Dvāravtī after his father's death (as told by a parrot in Mahā-ummagga J.-No. 546).

Yava—Son of Brahmadatta, afterwards king of Banaras. While a student his teacher knew by his power of divination that some danger would befall him through his son. Hence for his protection he gave him three stanzas, to be repeated on three occasions. On the completion of his education he was appointed viceroy and became king after the death of his father. This king had a son, who, when a youth of sixteen, became impatient of his father and thought of obtaining the throne by putting him to death. The son made three successive attempts to kill his father but each time as he was about to carry out his plan, his father repeated one of the three stanzas suited to the occasion, which clearly indicated that his motive had been detected by the king. Baffled in the third attempt, the prince fell at his father's feet, and he was forgiven, "By and bye on the death of the king the young prince was established on the throne" (Mūsika—J.-No. 373).

Yasapāṇi—A king of Banaras. His family-priest was called Dhammaddhaja. The name of his commander-in-chief *(senāpati)* was Kālaka who used to take bribes in deciding law-suits. Once this was detected by Dhammaddhaja who was thence-forward appointed to sit in judgment instead by the Mahārāja *(tumhe va aṭṭaṁ vinicchinatha)*. The commander-in-chief, deprived of his bribes, became jealous of Dhammaddhaja, and excited the king against him by telling him that he was aiming at

the throne. The king grew suspicious but the *paṇḍita* performed certain miracles which restored him to the king's confidence. But so enraged were the people at Kālaka's wickedness that they ultimately put the commander-in-chief to death (Dhammaddhaja—J.-No. 220).

ADDENDA

This supplementary note could not be published along with the Text as the Journal in which it appears had already been printed off before the additional material contained in the former became available. The note was, however, added to the offprints of the article provided for the author's use.

In 'Jātaka Gāthās and Jātaka Commentary', Winternitz[206] discusses the question whether originally a verse-Jātaka existed as an independent work, to which later modifications and other features were introduced, culminating in the production of the Jātaka Aṭṭhakathā. This discussion was necessary in view of the findings of Weller, based on a critical study of the Phayre and two other MSS. of Jātaka verses from Mandalay. The researches of Weller, as admitted by Winternitz himself, have thrown considerable doubt on the existence of a work consisting solely of verses, in which the Jātaka is supposed to have been preserved in its original form. "Dr Weller" he says, "ought not to have doubted that a verse Jātaka ever existed at all," although, 'it must be admitted that

our hope and belief that the original verse-Jātaka is still extant in MSS., has been shaken by Dr. Weller's arguments'. The learned scholar does not controvert the general opinion that the Jātaka commentary in its prose parts 'contains old traditions which in many cases may go back to the same early period as the Gāthās.' His conclusions may be summed up as follows : (1) on the whole, the Jātaka verses have a much stronger claim to be regarded as canonical than the prose of the Jātakas, (2) the prose portions were 'more exposed to changes and enlargements,' (3) the language of the Gāthās is more archaic than that of the prose, (4) several literary types are represented in the Jātaka collection. In this connection Oldenberg's 'Ākhyāna-theory' has been particularly criticised. A critical edition of the Jātaka-verses from the four extant MSS. (three of which have been already noted, the fourth being the one preserved in the Academy of Leningrad) is a desideratum.

Two articles by Mr. Gokuldas De, both published in the Calcutta Review,—entitled (1) 'Original Nature of Jātakas'[207] and (2) 'Bhārhut Jātakas in a New Light' respectively,[208] deserve prominent mention. Mr. De's main object is to prove, to quote his own words, that 'a Jātaka originally consisted of a verse or verses...generally with a moral understood with the help of a prose narration which for the most part remained implicit rather than explicit, changing according to

circumstances.' In support of his thesis, he relies mainly on his interpretation of the evidence gathered from the Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā. The propriety, however, of ascertaining the original nature of the Jātakas from a work believed to be attributable to the 5th century A.D., which cites only fifty-four Jātakas may be questioned by his critics. His observations will be specially useful to those interested in the development of the Buddhist doctrines, specially of the Bodhisattva idea. But even if all the features, supposed to be of late origin, are eliminated from Fausböll's collection the story-part in each Jātaka, including the prose, does not appear to be heavily interpolated. It is to be decided precisely how much of this portion should be used for historical purposes. It cannot be urged without sufficient data that at the time of the final redaction new elements were introduced, thoroughly transforming the character of the original work. Jātaka stories are represented in old tradition to have been used by the Buddha for illustrating his own teachings; and this may be true in a limited sense but cannot wholly explain the problems connected with the texts that appear in the final form. They present an obvious contrast to the Purāṇas which while professing to discourse on the future, in reality concern themselves with the past and are susceptible to later influences in their composition. Leaving aside doctrinal matters in the

Jātakas, atleast the picture of ancient society and economy depicted therein, seems to be a homogeneous one. This does not preclude the idea of old verses having been mixed up with new and the prose considerably enlarged, but the spirit of the old narrative was not sacrificed to novelty, and the literary embellishments, if introduced, did not apparently tend to produce an ill-assorted combination of elements belonging to different ages, as found in many other works.

Regarding geographical materials, contained in the Jātakas, of which a short abstract will be found in Chapter III, we take this opportunity to refer to two important publications, *viz.*, (1) A Note on Śūrpāraka by Jarl Charpentier[209] and (2) the Chapter on Paloura-Dantapura in 'Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India.'[210] Sopara, 'at one time the capital of Aparāntaka,' was undoubtedly a place of considerable importance in the 3rd century B. C. as a fragment of Aśoka's Rock-Edicts has been found there. There is no mention of it in the later Vedic literature and this may well lead to the inference that 'it rose to importance and fame sometime during the later half of the pre-Christian millennium.' Charpentier derives the name 'Śūrpāraka' from Śūrpa—'a winnow, a winnowing basket,' in which sense it occurs in the later Vedic literature and Pāṇini's Grammar. Tradition, embodied in the Mahābhārata, the Sahyādrikhaṇḍa, etc., connect

Śūrpāraka with Paraśurāma. Some early European authors, especially Father Jacob Francis, have also repeated the legend ascribing the origin of the place to the same mythical hero. "The story of Paraśurāma's Śūrpa," concludes Charpentier, "must be one of considerable age, for the name Sūrpāraka must certainly date from at least some centuries B. C." Charpentier's investigations make it amply clear that the criterion for determining the historical value and relative ages of our literary materials has not yet been definitely fixed. It is still in a process of evolving.

The high antiquity of Dantapura[211] in Kaliṅga, another place mentioned in the Jātakas, is not unsupported by facts, gleaned from various sources. It was also called Dantakura and there are traditions connecting it with the tooth-relic of the Buddha or the glories of king Dantavakra. The Purla Plates of Indravarman[212], dated in the [Ganga] year 149, refer to Dantapura as the place where the king resided. Sylvain Lévi[213] identifies it with the Paloura of Ptolemy, the Dandagulla of Pliny, situated in the neighbourhood of Chicacole and Kaliṅgapatam.[214]

My esteemed friend Dr. P. C. Bagchi has kindly drawn my attention to a passage in the Suvarṇaprabhā[215] where the Buddha is said to have held the view that the king is the *devaputra*, that the duty of the subjects is to respect him and that of the king to govern according to the law

(dharmeṇe· śāsyate rāṣṭṛaṁ). In this connection reference may be made to pp. 48—53 of this book where some -political theories and methods, professed to be those of the Buddha, have been discussed.

NOTES

1. Winternitz on 'Jātaka', ERE, VII, 491-494.
2. SBE, XXI, II, 44, 44.
3. Bud. Ind., 202, 207 ; For Bühler's view as quoted see, PRAG, 1897 and 1901.
4. DKA, x-xi.
5. AIHT, 6-7.
6. Ibid., 15-16.
7. PHAI, 51-52.
8. Ait. Br., VIII, 23 ; Ved. Ind., I, 468.
9. DKA, 19, 68.
10. Cf. King Brahmadatta of Kāmpilya, mentioned in Svapnavāsavadattā, ed. Gaṇapati Śāstri, 104 (2nd edition) ; PHAI, 399-400.
11. Ved. Ind., I, 165.
12. Ibid., cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, iii, 7, 6 ; 8, 7 ; iv, 7, 2 ; Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, iv. i ; Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 9 ; Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā, x. 6 ; Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā (Kānva recension), xi, 3, 3.
13. PHAI, 34.
14. CL, 71 ; JBORS, I, 1915, 67 ff ; JPASB (NS), 1913, IX, 259-269.
15. Bud. Ind., 25 ; cf. F. II, 403 ; V, 112 (Bārāṇa-siggaho) ; C. III, 73-74, No. 334 ; PRG, 42-44.
16. JASB, 1914, 55 ; CL, 49, 73.
17. AIHT, 166.
18. 1-32.
19. Mbh, IX ; II, 8, 23 ; Matsya-P, 273, 71 ; Vāyu-P, 99, 454 ; for Māndhātā, descendant of Vikukṣi, see AIHT, 145.
20. Vāyu-P, 92-23 ; 95-41.
21. Verse 34-40 ; cf. Mbh. V. 48. 74 ; 157. 17.

22. PHAI, 56.

23. KA, 11.

24. Viṣṇu-P, IV, 19.

25. Ved. Ind., II, 298. For references to the rulers of the Janakavaṁśa and their proposed identifications, see, Viṣṇu-P, IV. 5. 13 ; F. VI, No. 539 ; Mbh., XII. 17, 8-19 ; AIHT, 149 ; Bud. Ind., 26 ; PHAI, Chap. II.

26. According to B. M. Barua and G. Sinha 'Makhadeva' be equated with 'Mahādeva' which, again, may be converted into 'Mādhava', see Bharhut Inscriptions, 79-80 ; CR. October, 1927, 66 ; Vogel, JRAS, 1927, 594.

27. DKA, 67.

28. Ibid., 66.

29. Ibid., 68.

30. Weber's article on the Rāmāyaṇa translated from German by the Rev. D. C. Boyd, IA. 1872. 120-124.

31. JRAS, 1915, 523.

32. BR, 37-40.

33. HIL, I, 510.

34. Ibid., 508 n3.

35. Cf. Bālacarita ascribed to Bhāsa, Act V, ed. Dr. H. Weller, Leipzig : A. B. Keith. The Sanskrit Drama, 98-100.

36. For refernces to Jāmbavatï and her son Śāmba, see Viṣṇu-P, IV. 15 ; V, 37 ; Matsya-P, chapter 47.

37. Cf. D. C. Sen. The Bengali Rāmāyaṇas. 7-23 (including an English translation of the Dasaratha-J., 9-15).

38. ZDMG, Vol. 58, 1904, 713 ff ; HIL, I, 508-509.

39. III, 7.

40. V, 15.

41. F. V, 413 ; for other instances see Buddhaghoṣa's commentary on the Suttanipāta, Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, I, 158-160.

42. Bud. Ind., 19.

43. VP, II, 181.

44. CL, 161, n3.

45. CLAI, 97 (second edition, 236-38 ; all the other references are to the first edition.

46. HP, 49.

47. CLAI, 98.

48. Bud. Ind., 259 ; Watters, II, 3. Also see Oldenberg-Buddha, 98, translated into English by William Hoey, Calcutta, 1927.

49. CLAI, 96.

50. F. IV, 148. The Licchavi chiefs were 'given to argument and disputation' (*'Te sabbe pi patipucchāvitakkā ahesuṁ'*—Cullakāliṅgajātaka, No. 301).

51. For further information about the Licchavis and others, see B.C. Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India.

52. CL, 155-156.

53. HP, 51 ; cf. F. I, 504.

54. KA, 76.

55. CL, 63.

56. DB, II, 79-85.

57. For Suvarṇabhūmi see, C. VI, 22. No. 539 ; EI, XVII, 31 ; Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, 79 ; cf. Kalidas Nag's view on the significance of the geographical data in the Arthaśāstra,—Theories Diplomatiques, 118, 133. See also Keith, Asutosh Memorial Volume, Part I, 16.

58. Bud. Ind., 104.

59. *Tirojanapadehi āgatānaṁ dūtānaṁ*-F. IV, 132.

60. For identifications see, under different geographical names mentioned above, Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, ed. S. N. Majumdar ; Rhys Davids, Buddhist India ; D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, 1918 (Lecture II) ; H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, (specially the chapter on the Mahājanapadas) and N. L. De, Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India.

61. F. II, 36. Is it not possible to locate Aśoka's Suvarṇagiri in the neighbourhood of this mountain? Daṇḍaka probably represented certain portions of the Mahāraṣṭra region including Nasik. There is a proposal to identify Aśoka's Suvarṇagiri with Kanakagiri, south of Maski (CII, I, xxxviii).

62. R. P. Chanda, MASI, No. I, 10n. According to Megasthenes, as reported by Pliny, there was a distance of 625 miles from the mouth of the Ganges to Cape Calingon (Coringa) and the town of Dandagula. Mc'Crindle holds that the latter should be taken as the same as the Dantapura of the Buddhist Chronicles, which is probably identical with Rājamahendri. If the tradition about the origin of Dantapura is correct, the city under this name can by no means be older than the 5th century B. C. (For a contrary view see CHI, I, 173). The geographical data found in the Jātaka texts emphasise the necessity of caution in determining the question of their antiquity as a whole. Probably it would be the best course to avoid hazarding at present any general theory on the subject. Each story may be judged by itself. (See Mc'Crindle, Ancient India—Megasthenes and Arrian, 144 and fn.).

63. C. I, 203 ; F. I, 356.

64. F. V, 267, verse 28 ; cf. the Monghyr inscription of Devapāla, IA, XXI, 254-267 ; A. K. Maitra, Gauḍalekhamālā, 39—where the Medas are mentioned along with the Andhrakas.

65. The Dekkan in the Sātavāhana period, IA, 1918, 7 and fn.

66. Or Majjhimadese, F. III, 463, No. 423.

67. One cannot be too sure about its significance from the manner of its occurrence in our text. Mc'Crindle's note

on the Maccocalingae may be read with profit—see Ancient India—Megasthenes and Arrian, 134-136.

68. *Purato Videhe passa Goyāniye ca pacchato*, etc. F. VI, 278 ; C. VI, 136.

69. C. V, 167, No. 532.

70. PHAI, 35.

71. Ved. Ind., I, 93, 491.

72. C. V, 157.

73. F. IV, 135.

74. F. IV, 132. *So tathā katvā antonagare kassaci kiñci ahāpetvā bhattavetanaṁ datvā puna Bodhisattaṁ pucchitvā rājānaṁ viññapetvā antonivesane dāsaporisānam pi assānam (or hatthinaṁ) pi balakāyassāpi vaṭṭaṁ (vattaṁ) aparihāpetvā adāsi, tirojanapadehi āgatānaṁ dūtānaṁ nivesanaṭṭhānādīni vāṇijānaṁ sunkāni sabbakaraṇīyāni attanā va akāsi.*

75. Recruitment of soldiers from the four principal castes was allowed in Kauṭilya, but there were differences of opinion as regards their comparative merits. Cf. '*Brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-vaiśya-śūdrasainyānāṁ tejaḥprādhānyāt pūrvaṁpūrvaṁ śreyaḥ sannāhayitum ityācāryāḥ.*' Kauṭilya, however, had a decided preference for Kṣatriya soldiers : '*Neti Kauṭilah .....Praharaṇavidyāvinītaṁ tu kṣatriyabalaṁ śreyaḥ*' (KA, 343). The second 'class', according to Megasthenes, was 'exempted from military service ;' cf. Mc'Crindle, Ancient India, 83 (1926).

76. See J. No. 432.

77. Regarding the question of the succession of the youngest prince, cf. Mbh. I, 85. 22ff. Men of the different castes, headed by the Brahmins *(Brāhmaṇapramukhā varṇā idaṁ vacanamabruban)* demanded an explanation as to why Yayāti had established Puru on the throne in preference to his elder brother Yadu.

78. Telapatta-Jātaka, F. I, 399, No. 96 ; *Chanda*=vote ; see HP, 115.

79. HP, 115. K. P. Jayaswal's inference may not be generally acceptable. There is no doubt as to the importance of this story from the constitutional point of view.

80. F. IV, 470.

81. SGNIB, 125. An instance of citizens, the royal priest and ministers meeting to elect a mere child as their sovereign, is recorded in the Mbh. (I. 44. 6 : *Rājāpuṛohi-tastadā tathaiva te tasya nṛpasya mantṛinaḥ nṛpaṁ śiśuṁ tasya sutaṁ prachakrire sametya sarve puravāsino janāḥ).* Forms of election may have been different in different parts of the country.

82. SGNIB, 126-127. Here we are easily put in mind of the historic case of Mahāpadma's exterminating the Kṣatriyas and ushering in an era of Śūdra Government : *utpatsyate Mahāpadmaḥ sarva-kṣatr-āntako nṛpaḥ tataḥ prabhṛti rājāno bhavisyāḥ śūdra-ṿonayaḥ*—DKA, 25.

83. HP, Part I, 88, 116 ; cf. F. II, 352 ; C. II, 242-3, No. 270 ; PRG, 10-11 ; BBS, 292 n.

84. The translation does not seem to be literal. The text has '*Sivīnaṁ raṭṭhavaḍḍhana*'—F. VI, 490.

85. C. VI, 254. Reference to '*rājaputtā*' in this connection is curious.

86. C. VI, 254.

87. Ibid., 255.

88. *Eso ce Sivīnam chando chandaṁ na pānudamase*—F. VI, 491.

89. F. II, 124.

90. Ibid.

91. C. II, 87.

92. F. II, 368.

93. *Chātakabhayam rogabhayam satthabhayan ti imāni tīṇi bhayāni*—F. II, 125. The text is a little different in the Kurudhamma-Jātaka—F. II, 368, No. 276.

94. F. I, 398.

95. EIP, 146 ; cf. EIP, 145-6 ; Manu, V, 96-7 ; VII, 4-8.

96. F. III, 449, No. 421.

97. KAT, (1929), 353 ; KA, VIII-2 *Dvairājyamanyonya-pakṣa-dveṣānurāgābhyāṁ parasparasaṁgharṣeṇa vā vinaś-yati* ; HP, 96-97 ; cf. Jātaka No. 96, F. I, 398.

98. RLGI, 43.

99. F. II, 328.

100. F. I, 273.

101. C. I, 126.

102. F. II, 277.

103. F. III, 122 ; I, 259.

104. F. III, 158.

105. KAT, 32 ; KA, I. 17.

106. KAT, 32 ; *nṛsaṁsamaduṣṭabadhaḥ kṣatravījavināś. āśca tasmādekasthānāvarodhas-śreyāniti*-KA, I. 17.

107. *Mayhaṁ pitā mama bhātisadiso, sace etassa maraṇaṁ olokessāmi mama mahallakakāle r. labhissāmi, tadā laddhena pi rajjena ko attho, pitaraṁ māretvā r. kāressāmīti*—F. V, 263.

108. *"ahaṁ attano manen' eva purohitaputtassa deviṁ datvā sakamanaṁ sandhāretuṁ na sakkomi, socāmi kila-māmi, na me idaṁ anucchavikaṁ, sace mayi sasnehā bhaveyya idaṁ issariyaṁ chaḍḍetvā na palāyeyya, mayi pana sinehaṁ akatvā palātāya kiṁ tāya mayhan ti"*—F. III, 340-41.

109. The hero of Galsworthy's novel, 'The Island Pharisees', thus speaks ironically : 'If old Halidome showed that he was tired of me, and I continued to visit him, he'd think me a bit of a cad ; but if his wife were to tell him she couldn't stand him, he'd still consider himself a perfect gentleman if he persisted in giving her the burden of his society."

110. The Culasutasoma-J., F. V, No. 525 shows that this practice was not universally followed.

111. Ministers, Brahmins, Gahapatis and others, and Kṣatriya princes ; F. I, 470.

112. C. I, 289, No. 132.

113. F. IV, 153, No. 465 ; IV. 323, No. 489.

I14. F. I, 441 ; C. I. 268.

115. F. V, 189, verse ; C. V, 97, No. 525.

I16. F. V, 323 ; C. V, 170.

117. F. V, 249.

118. Compare, for instance, '*mātari pitari sādhu susrusā ....bāmhaṇasamaṇānaṁ sādhu dānaṁ prāṇānaṁ anāraṁbho sādhu*' (Girnar : RE XI). That predecessors of Aśoka desired to adopt suitable measures for the moral edification of the people is stated in his own edicts : "atikaṁtaṁ aca aṁtalaṁ hevaṁ ichisu lājāne kathaṁ jane anulupāyā dhammavaḍheyā-ti" (PE VII).

118a. F. VI, 9, No. 538.

119. JRAS, 1901, 859ff ; cf. CHI, 200.

129 Ibid.

121. SGNIB, 160.

122. F. IV, 115 ; cf. F. I, 199, No. 31.

123. F. II, 301. S. Oldenberg refers to a Russian variant of the story. See C. III-IV (1957).

124. F. I, 199.

125. F. I, 199. Chalmers' translation of this passage cannot for obvious reasons be accepted as correct.

126. F. I, 199, No. 31.

127. C. I, 78-79 ; F. I, 199.

128. LGAI, 145.

129. F. III, 204, No. 368 ; C. I, 169, No. 19 ; IV, 114, No. 459.

130. F. IV, 310 (verse).

131. 'Forward', Anniversary number, 26th October, 1925, 19.

132. F. III, 460 ; C. III, 275.

133. F. V, 223, Ummadanti-J., No. 527.
134. F. V, 117.
135. F. V, 100, No. 520.
136. C. V, 55 ; F. V, 100, No. 520.
137. F. III, 470 ; C. III, 280, No. 424.
138. F. V, 121, No. 521.
139. F. IV, 223, No. 447.
140. F. V, 450, No. 536.
141. F. III, 342, No. 402 ; C. III, 210-11.
142. C. I, 130 ; cf. F. I, 263, No. 51 ; PRG, 38-42.
143. F. II, 401.
144. F. V, 178 ; '*mittāmacce parisaje*', mentioned in a verse of this story seems to indicate a much bigger body than a mere committee of advisers.
145. F. VI, 588, No. 547.
146. F. VI, 2.
147. C. V, 125-126, No. 528.
148. JBORS, IX, 1923, parts, III and IV, 369-375.
149. F. IV, 134.
150. F. IV, 176.
151. C. II, 212.
152. F. IV, 43.
153. JRAS, 1901, 865.
154. F. II, 15.
155. F. III, 292.
156. F. IV, 30.
157. F. IV, 451, No. 505.
158. F. IV, 170.
159. F. V, 313 ; C. V, 198.
160. F. IV, 345.
161. F. VI, 390.
162. F. VI, 205.
163. C. IV, 281-290 ; F. IV, 454-468.
164. C. VI, 114-123 ; F. VI, 219-255.

165. F. V, 248.
166. C. V, 127-134 ; F. V, 247-261.
167. C. VI, 519-537 ; F. VI, 30-68.
168. F. III, 4.
169. C. III, 1-5 ; F. III, 1-8, No. 310.
170. F. VI, 99.
171. F. II, 155.
172. C. IV, 244-250 ; F. IV, 390-401.
173. C. V, 76 verse ; F. V, 143-44.
174. C. V, 137 verse ; F. V, 267.
175. C. V, 219-45 ; F. V, 412-456. The text of this story "is not very satisfactory" nor is the commentary quite helpful. See C. V, 219 n. 1.
176. C. II, 119-120 ; F. II, 166-173.
177. C. IV, 86-90 ; F. IV, 136-43.
178. C. IV, 271-275 ; F. IV, 437-444.
179. C. VI, 55 ; F. VI, 99, verse.
180. C. III, 280-282 ; F. III, 469-474.
181. C. V, 72 ; F. V, 133.
182. F. III, 13, line 17.
183. F. III, 487.
184. C. III, 241-2 ; VI, 126ff ; F. III, 400 ; VI, No. 545.
185. F. V, 60 ; cf. F. III, 342, No. 402 ; Aśoka's VIth RE ; CII, I, 11 ; PRG, Pt. II, S. V. Parisā, 167.
186. F. III, 379.
187. F. V, 135.
188. F. IV, 176.
189. C. V, 61 ; F. V, 112.
190. F. II, 3, verse.

"*Dalhaṁ dalhassa khipati Malliko mudunā muduṁ,*
sādhum pi sādhunā jeti asādhum pi asādhunā
etādiso ayaṁ rājā....."

191. F. V, 315.

192. C. VI, 108, No. 543 (Mujalinda), verse ; C. VI, 55, No. 541 (Mucalinda), verse ; F. VI, 99, verse.

193. F. I, 139.

194. F. III, 381.

195. F. III, 463.

196. C. VI, 108.

197. F. III, 452.

198. F. IV, 105, 113 ; C. IV, 66ff.

199. F. IV , 79, No. 454.

200. F. IV, 81.

201. F. IV, 82.

202. F. IV, 83.

203. F. IV, 84.

204. C. IV, 55 ; F. IV, 85, No. 454.

204a. For the story of Śāmba, disguised as a woman producing a *muṣala,* the destruction of the Yādavas and the killing of Kṛṣṇa, who had assumed the form of a deer, by the hunter Jarā, etc., see Viṣṇu-P. V. 37.

205. F. IV, 84, 85.

206. IHQ, IV, March, 1928, 1-14.

207. CR, January, 1930, 78-97.

208. CR, 1929, 46-64.

209. JRAS, 1927, 111-115.

210. Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India by Sylvain Lévi, Jean Przyluski and Jules Bloch, translated from French by P. C. Bagchi, published by Calcutta University, 1929.

211. See supra, p. 58.

212. EI, XIV, 361.

213. JA, 1925, 46-57, Notes Indiennes.

214. JA, 1925, 171.

215. Suvarṇaprabha, XIII, 56-63, Buddhist Text Society, Calcutta.

INDEX

Acariyabhāgadāyaka 101
Adāsa-mukha 203, 205
Adharma 153
Ādiparva 10
Afganistan 152
Agghāpaniyakamma 194
Aggideva 210, 225
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8, 10, 15
Ajaka 9
Ajamīḍha 6
Ajātasattu 13, 28, 43, 44, 47
Ajjuna 6, 7, 22. 187, 192, 193. 210, 225
Ākhyāna 232
Alāta 72, 189
Alīnasattu 205
Amaccakulam 158
Amaccaratna 123
Amanullah Khan 152
Amātyas 126
Aṁkura 210, 226
Ānavas 6
Andhakas 24, 59
Andhakaveṇhu 23, 210, 224, 225
Andhapura 59
Andhra 58, 59
Aṅga 1, 10, 12, 13, 25, 55, 57, 59, 61, 64-66, 68, 187, 188, 213, 223
Aṅgaraṭṭhe 188
Aṅgati 189
Aṅgīrasa 192, 193
Añjanā Devī 210, 225, 226, 228
Añjana-vasabha 206
Aṅkura 225, 226
Apacara 1, 16, 189, 190, 198
Aparāntaka 234
Arañjara 59
Arañjāragiri 56
Arindama 10, 187, 191, 199
Arindama Sonasrata 10
Ariṣṭanemi 17, 18,
Ariṭṭha 191, 214
Ariṭṭhajanaka 17, 18, 191, 214
Ariṭṭhapura 57
Arjuna Kārtavīrya 6
Arthaśāstra 28, 42, 96, 97, 109
Aruṇa 192
Asitañjana 57, 209, 213
Aśoka 120, 134, 155, 205, 234

Assaka 6, 9, 10, 58, 61, 62, 64 66, 192, 213
Assapura 191
Atikāya 193
Atītavatthu 4, 143
Aṭṭhaka 6, 8, 9, 61, 193, 196, 204, 208
Aṭṭhakathā Dhammapada 233
Aṭṭhakathā Jātaka 231
Avantī 10, 13, 57, 58, 61, 192, 196, 213
Avantiraṭṭhe 196
Āvīkṣita 6
Ayodhyā 5, 7, 15, 26, 57, 59, 68, 211, 226
Ayojjhā (Ayodhyā) 57, 210, 226
Āyura 213

Babylon 54
Bagchi, P. C. 235
Bahinara 48
Bāhubalam 156
Baka 195, 196
Baladeva 23, 210, 225, 228
Balarāma 27
Banaras 7, 10, 13-15, 20, 23, 26, 56, 57, 61, 64-71, 84, 101, 103, 104, 111, 114, 123, 124, 132, 141, 160, 164, 185, 192-195, 197-205, 207-208, 212-213, 217-224, 229
Bandhula 28, 36, 42, 46
Bārāṇasi 57
Bas-relief 3
Basu, Shivanath 161
Bath-money 43
Battle, Lotus 181
Battle, Wagon 181
Baveru 54
Benares 13, 55, 102, 117, 135
Betwa 59
Bhaddavatikā 48
Bhaddiya 33
Bhaggas 28, 48, 60
Bhagīrasa 6, 7, 195
Bhagīratha 5
Bhallāṭa 14
Bhallaṭiya 14, 194
Bhaṇḍāgārika 35, 38-41
Bhandarkar, D. R. 14, 33, 34, 37-39, 48
Bharadvāja 109
Bharata 6, 187, 195, 202
Bharata Kumāra 20
Bhārhut Jātakas 232
Bharu 57, 187, 194
Bharukaccha 55, 57, 194, 221
Bhaṭṭiya 13
Bhikkhudāsikā 209
Bhīmaratha 1, 8, 15, 61, 193, 196, 204, 208
Bhimasena 193
Bhīṣma 27
Bhogagāma 143-145, 152, 210
Bhoja 1, 15, 16, 61
Bhoja Bhīmaratha 15

Bhoja State 15
Big Chestnut 120
Bimbisāra 13, 28, 42, 43, 47, 51
Bodhirājakumāra 48
Bodhi tree 207
Bodhisattva (Bodhisatta) 23, 24, 89, 97, 127, 177, 199, 207, 212, 219, 222, 233
Book of Judgments 177
Bo tree 46
Brahmadatta 7, 10, 13, 14, 24, 25, 65, 69, 88, 92, 97, 108, 123, 188, 193, 197, 199, 205, 206, 212, 217–219, 221-223, 229
Brahmadatta Kāsirāja 68, 193
Brahmadatta of Aṅga 10
Brahmadatta of Assaka 10
Brahmadatta of Banaras 7, 25, 65, 123, 197, 205, 217-219
Brahmadattas, hundred 1, 14
Brahmadattas of Pañcāla 10
Brahmavaddhana 57, 61, 213, 214
Brahma world 189, 214
Brahmin 16, 46, 76, 78, 84, 87, 104, 124, 126, 127, 129, 134 141-142, 144, 156, 169, 177, 193, 194, 196, 200, 204, 206, 209, 214, 215, 221, 223, 224
Brahmin employee 46
Bṛhadratha 16, 27
Brothers '99' : 106, 219
Buddha 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 24, 28-31, 33, 42, 45, 47-52, 187, 191, 233, 235, 236
Burma 54, 55

Caidya Uparicara Vasu 16
Calcutta Review 232
Campā 12, 57, 188
Campeyya, Campeyyo 188, 223
Canda 212
Candadeva 210, 225
Caṇḍāla caste 228
Caṇḍāla settlement 169
Caṇḍāla village 192
Caṇḍāla women 23
Caṇḍālas 142, 228
Caṇḍapajjota 9, 13, 18, 194, 196, 204, 216
Cānura 210, 225
Cara 190, 198, 212
Car festal 191
Cecca 6, 16
Cedi 6, 14, 189
Central Provinces 59
Central Region 59
Ceylon 54
Ceta 58
Ceti 16, 58, 190, 198, 212
Chalmers, Robert 58, 127
Champā 55
Chandragupta Maurya 149
Charpentier Jarl 234, 235
Chatta 64, 197
Chicacole 235

Cittakūṭa, Mount 219, 220
Commander-in-chief 159, 176
Cowell, E. 39, 58, 116
Crow, Mr. 97
Cūlānī 197
Cūlāni-Brahmadatta 14, 196, 197, 220
Culla-Kāliṅga 207
Cullakammasadamma 206

Dabbasena 12, 198, 199
Daddarapura 59, 191
Dadhivāhana 120, 121
Dakṣiṇāpatha 56, 57, 196
Dalhadhamma 201
Damila 58
Dandagulla 235
Daṇḍaka 15, 58, 61, 193
Daṇḍaka forest 20, 21, 203
Daṇḍaki 1, 6, 8, 9, 15, 61, 196, 203, 204, 207
Daṇḍaki, king 61, 196
Dāṇḍakya 1, 15, 16
Dantakura 235
Dantapura 58, 192, 206-208, 234, 235
Dantavakra 235
Dasabala Kassapa 209
Dasaṇṇa 59, 213
Dasarājadhamma 155
Daśaratha, Dasaratha 1, 5, 7, 20, 26, 187, 201, 205
Dasarājadhamma 155
De, Gokuldas 232
Desaka 42, 59
Devadatta 30, 42, 47
Devagabbhā 23, 209-211, 213, 224, 225
Devaputra 235
Dhamma 137, 152, 154
Dhammā 209
Dhāmmaddhaja 229
Dhammantevāsikā 101
Dhammapada-Aṭṭhakathā 233
Dhammapāla 212
Dhanañjaya 22, 199-201, 206
Dhanuggahatissa 43
Dharma 134
Dhataraṭṭha 6, 187, 204
Dīghakārāyaṇa 45, 46
Dīghati 199
Dīghāvu 64, 187 191, 199, 215
Dīghāyu 199
Dīpāyana 24
Divodāsa 6, 15
Dudīpa 187, 192, 204
Dujīpa 6, 7
Dummukha 7, 8, 187, 201, 208, 216
Dummukha Pañcāla 8
Duṣyanta 1, 6, 24
Dvāravatī 7, 23, 59, 68, 226, 228

Ekabala 54, 55, 220
Ekarāja 224
Elephant festival 159

Epics 1, 2, 5, 13, 18-20
Esukārī 204
Europe 102
European 19
Executive 167

Fausboll, V. 233
Festal car 191
Fick, Richard 4, 83, 84, 143
Fire-ordeal 175
Five Commandments 148
Francis, Father Jacob 235

Gādhi of Kānyakubja 6
Gahapatis 126
Gāma 138, 139, 154
Gāmabhojaka 137, 142-145, 147, 150, 152
Gāmaka 138, 139
Gāmakamma 148
Gāmakicca 148
Gāmaṇī 150
Gāmaṇī 173, 174
Gāmaṇicaṇḍa 173
Gāmavaram 143
Gāmovāsi 140
Gaṇa 38
Gaṇa community 37
Gaṇarājakula 37
Gandhāra 7-9, 55, 58-59, 62, 67, 69, 83, 95, 96, 105, 107, 201, 206, 208, 216
Gandhamādana 195
Ganga year 235
Ganges 195
Garbharakṣaṇa 98
Garuḍa 114, 122
Gāthā 6, 7, 20, 22, 24, 231, 232
Ghanasela, Mount 58
Ghaṭa Paṇḍita 23, 210, 225, 227
Ghata, king 223, 224
Ghata, Prince 227
Ghosita forest 48
Gijjhakūṭa 47
Giridanta 220
Godāvarī 194, 196, 203
Golden Hill 58
Gotama Buddha 187
Gotama, Ṛṣi 193
Govaḍḍhamāna 210
Goyāniyas 59
Great Hall 128
Great War 22
Greek Archon 33
Greek Political Philosophy 39
Guild 147, 176
Guṇa 189
Guttā 209
Guttila 132

Hall of Judgment 161, 171, 176
Hariścandra 5
Hatthipura 59, 191
Hellas 131
Himalayas 20, 193, 202, 209, 217

Hindu 19

Ikṣvāku 42, 69
Indapatta 7, 22, 58, 199, 209
India 55, 57, 69, 155, 204, 205, 234
India, South 15
Indian 19
Indra's heaven 194
Indravarman 235

Jacobi, H. 21
Jahnu 6
Jaina 19
Jambāvatī 23, 228
Jambudvīpa 60, 127, 205
Janaka 16, 17, 206
Janakas 7
Janakavaṁsa 1, 16
Janapada 154, 155
Janapadavāsi 140
Janapaditthī 117
Janasandha 187, 203, 205
Jarāsandha 22, 27
Jayaddisa 205
Jayaswal, K.P. 34, 38-40, 83, 85
Jetavana 44, 46
Jeṭṭha 142
Jetuttara 57, 221
Jīvaka 47
Judgment Hall 161, 171, 176
Juṇha 206

Kahāpanasahassān 101
Khaura 18
Kalābu 6, 187, 207
Kālacampā 55, 57, 191, 214
Kālaka 229, 330
Kālakaṇṇi 203
Kalāra Janaka 16, 187, 208, 214, 216
Kālamattika 228
Kālasena 211, 226
Kālidasa 15
Kaliṅga 8, 27, 58, 61, 64, 66, 70, 71, 87, 91, 192, 201, 204, 206-208, 216, 221, 235
Kāliṅga 8, 192, 193, 196, 206-208
Kāliṅgabharadvāja 207
Kālingapatam 235
Kalyāṇa 189
Kāmarūpa 59
Kāmboja 42, 59
Kampilla 58, 63, 67, 196, 197, 201, 205, 216, 220
Kaṁsa 12, 13, 23, 27, 56, 57, 187, 209-211, 213, 224, 225
Kaṁsabhoge 209
Kaṁsa district 209
Kaṇḍari 160, 208
Kaṇḍari, king of Banaras 160
Kaṇha 210, 228
Kaṇhā, princess 193
Kaṇhadīpāyana 226, 227
Kaṇhagaṇa clan 228
Kaṇkā 193

Kānyakubja 6
Kapila 190
Kapilapura 42
Kapilavatthu 28, 30, 31, 44, 45, 49, 59
Karambiya 55
Karaṇḍu 8-9, 201, 208, 216
Kashmir 69, 216
Kāsi, Kāśi, Kāśī 1, 6, 9-14, 20, 42, 43, 56, 57, 61-65, 68-70, 111, 116, 191, 193, 212, 213, 222-224
Kāsi village 42, 43, 111
Kāsirāja 68
Kassapa, Dasabala 209
Kassapa family 189
Kassapa, Nārada 189
Kāśyapa 25
Kaṭṭhavāhana 24
Kausāmbi 47
Kauṭilya 15, 42, 97, 109, 110
Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra 28, 42, 97
Kāveripattana 54, 55, 58
Keith, A.B. 10, 21
Kekaka 193
Kekakādhipa 188, 193
Kesava 210, 228
Kevatta 64, 196
Khalifs 152
Khāravela 58
Khattiya 31, 84
Khemā 220
Khujjavamana 208
Kiki 209
Kings '500' : 28
Kings, 7, 707 : 37, 38-40, 64
Kinnarā 208
Kisavaccha 203, 204
Kokanada 48
Kokanada palace 28, 48
Koliyas 28, 30, 31, 48-50, 59
Korakalamba 190
Koravya 199, 209
Kosala I, 11-13, 28, 29, 32, 35, 36, 42-47, 51, 52, 56, 57, 59, 62, 64, 65, 116, 193, 197-199, 211-213
Kosalā 42, 43
Kosambī 13, 28, 47, 48, 58, 209
Kosambika 209
Kṛṣṇa 27
Kṛṣṇa; legend 1, 23,
Kṛti 16
Kṣatriya 76-78, 84, 102, 103, 126, 153, 158, 159, 162, 188
Kukura 42
Kumbhāvatī 15, 58, 203
Kuraṅgavī 65
Kuru 6, 10, 22, 27, 58, 59, 199-201, 206, 209, 217
Kuru country 22, 199
Kurudhamma 71, 206
Kurupāñcāla 10, 42
Kuruvara 27
Kusa 69, 70, 118, 217
Kuśamba 16

Kusavati 58, 216
Kusinārā 28
Kuṭumbika 150

Lakkhaṇa 20, 202
Lakṣmaṇa 20
Lambacūlaka 9, 18, 196, 217
Laṅkā 54
Leningrad 232
Lévi, Sylvain 235
Licchavi 28, 34, 35-42
Licchavi (constitution) 37-38
Licchavi gaṇa 38
Licchavi tribe 39
Life-grants 152
Lomasakassapa 1, 25
Lüders, 21, 26

Macala 147, 149
Macdonell, A.A. 10
Madda 57, 70, 207, 217, 221
Maddava 68, 114, 212, 213
Maddī 26
Madhurā 210, 220
Madhyadeśa 56
Madraka 42
Madras Presidency 59
Maga 59
Magadha 1, 6, 10, 12, 13, 42, 47, 55, 57-59, 61, 64-66, 68, 69, 83, 120, 147, 188, 191, 213, 223
Māgadha, king 68, 188, 213
Mahābhārata 10, 14, 15-17, 22, 24, 27, 234
Mahājanaka 187, 191, 199, 214, 215
Mahājanaka I : 1, 16-18
Mahājanaka II : 1, 17, 18
Mahā-Kāliṅga 207
Mahākammāsadamma 206
Mahākaṁsa 209, 213, 224
Mahākosala 13, 28, 42, 43
Mahāmātras 164
Mahānāma 29, 44
Mahānārada Kassapa 189
Mahouts 87
Mahāpaṇādā 213, 218
Mahāpātaka 212
Mahāpatāpa 187
Mahāpiṅgala 212
Mahārāja 195
Mahāsāgara 210, 220
Mahāsammata 189, 212
Mahāsīlava 213
Mahilāmukha 119
Mahiṁsaka 58, 219
Mahiṁsāsa 25
Mahosadha 55, 197
Majjhimadesa 56
Majumdar, R.C. 34, 35, 37, 39
Makhā 18
Makhadeva 18, 208, 214, 215
Malla 28, 58, 59, 69, 70, 216
Mallaka 42
Mallika 12, 211
Mallikā 43, 44

Mallian 28, 37, 42, 46
Mammon 124
Mandalay 231
Maṇḍavya 226
Māndhātā 14, 189, 212
Māndhātṛ 5
Manoja 10, 61, 62, 213
Manu 96
Mānusiya 219
Mantrins 164
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa 27
Marutta 6
Mātali 216, 223
Māthava Videgha 18
Mathura 1, 23, 57, 224, 225
Matsya 16
Maurya, Chandragupta 149
Maurya Emperor 134
Māvella 16
Megasthenes 73
Mejjha king 6, 58
Members, thirty 149
Migājina 215
Migasammatā (river) 25, 217
Mithi 18
Mithi (Purāṇic) 18
Mithilā, Mithila 16, 18, 57, 67, 71, 72, 141, 185, 189, 191, 197, 213-216, 218
Molinā 57
Mount Cittakūṭa 219
Mount Ghanasela 58
Mucalinda 6, 187, 215
Mujalinda 6, 215
Mukherjee, Radha Kumud 149
Municipal improvements 186
Municipal town 149
Mūsila 132
Muṭṭhika 210, 225, 228
Nāga 12, 26, 56, 200, 201, 204, 221-223
Nāga king 56, 201, 204, 221, 223
Nāgamuṇḍā 45
Nagaradvāratoraṇa 185
Nagaraguttika 168
Nāgarāja 188
Naggaji 7-9, 69, 201, 208, 216
Nakula 193
Nālakara 98
Nālikīra 216
Nāmagahanadivase 98
Nanda 225
Nandagopā 23, 209, 210, 224, 225
Nandamūla cave 208
Nandapaṇḍita 213, 214
Nandisena 192
Nandivardhana 9
Nārada 216, 219
Nārada (discourse) 204
Nārada-Kassapa 189, 215
Ñatiseṭṭha 29, 31
Nigama 139, 154
Nigamagāma 138,

Nimi 8, 9, 27, 187, 201, 208, 214-216
Niyyāmajeṭṭhaka 194
Niyyāmakasippe 194
North Pañcāla 58
North west 61

Okkāka (Ikṣvāku) 42
Okkāka 70, 118, 216, 217
Oldenberg, H. 232
Owl, Mr. 86

Pabhāvatī 70, 217
Paccanta 113
Paccantagāma 138, 140
Paccantayodhā 180
Paccupannavatthu 13, 28
Pacceka-Buddhas 81, 107, 195 208, 209
Pādañjali 82, 84
Pajaka 9, 217
Pajaka rāja 196
Pajjunna 210, 225
Pākāram 185
Pali 5
Paloura 235
Paloura-Dantapura 234
Pañcāla 1, 7, 8, 10, 14, 58, 70, 205
Pañcālacaṇḍa 208
Pañcālacaṇḍī 197
Pañcāla city 58
Pañcāla, North 58
Pañcāla, South 14
Pañcālarājā 196
Pañcapāpā 195, 196
Pañcatantra 122
Paṇḍita-amacca 114
Panjab 6
Pāṇḍava 1, 7, 22, 24, 220
Pāṇḍu 22, 193
Pāṇḍurāja 193
Pānini's Grammar 234
Paraśurāma 235
Pargiter, F. E. 6, 7
Pasenadi 13, 18, 28, 29, 32 36, 42-47, 51, 217
Pattanagāma 194
Pauravas 6
Pāvāriya 196
Peta world 215
Phayre 231
Phusatī 26, 221
Piliyakkha 1, 26, 217
Pliny 235
Polajanaka 17, 18, 191, 214, 215
Political Saṅgha 39
Potali 58, 61, 192
Pradyota 1, 9, 18, 196
Prakrit 5
Praśenajit, Prasenajit 1, 18
Pratardana of Kāśi 6
Pratyagra 16
Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian 234
Prince Moon 25
Prince Sun 25

Pṛthuvainya 7
Ptolemy 235
Pukkusa 213
Puṇḍra 59
Puṇṇaka 27, 201
Pupphavatī 57, 224
Purāṇas 5, 6, 13-20, 48, 188, 196, 233
Purāṇa, Mārkaṇḍeya 27
Purāṇa, Vayu 15
Purāṇa, Viṣṇu 27
Purāṇic 1, 2, 7, 14, 16, 18, 19, 24, 194
Purla Plates 235
Purohita 203, 204, 207
Puthujjana 6, 7

Rādhā 199
Raghuvaṁśa 15
Rājadhamma 164
Rājagaha 27, 57, 68, 191
Rājagṛha 201
Rājakulas 31
Rājan 155
Rājās 35, 37, 39-41
Rājās 7, 707 : 36-38, 40
Rāma 1, 5, 7, 20, 21, 26, 187, 202, 203
Rāma Paṇḍita 20, 202
Rāmāyaṇa 14, 17, 20-22, 26
Ramma 57, 218
Rāṣṭra 154
Raṭṭha 155
Rāvaṇa 20
Raychaudhuri, H. C. 8, 10, 17, 18
Reṇu 217
Republic 39
Rhys Davids 4, 17, 32-35, 37, 54, 177
Rock Edict 155, 234
Rohineyya 228
Rohiṇī (river) 30, 31
Roja 189
Roman Consul 33
Romapāda 25
Roruva 58, 195
Ṛṣi Gotāma 193
Ṛṣi Vāmadeva 8
Ṛṣyaśṛṅga 1, 25
Ṛṭujit 17, 18
Rujā 189

Sabbamitta 57
Sabdadatta 218
Sabhāparva 14, 15
Saddharmapuṇḍarika 3
Sādhina 216, 219
Sagala 57
Sāgara 5-7, 187, 192, 220, 224
Sagga 221
Sahadeva 193
Sahassabāhu 192
Sahyādrikhaṇḍa 234
Sakala 217
Sāketa 57

Sakka 89, 90, 192, 200, 204, 212, 216, 217, 219, 223, 224
Sakkas (Śākyas) 28, 59
Śākya constitution 34
Śākya gaṇa 34
Śākyarājāno 29
Śākyas 28-36, 44, 45, 48, 49, 52
Sakula 58, 219
Sakuntalā 1, 24
Sālissara 196
Sāma, Sāmā 124, 217, 220
Samaṇā 209
Samaṇī 209
Sambhava 200
Saṁghadāsī 209
Saṁkhapāla 54, 55, 220
Samuddavijayā 195
Saṁvara 164, 218, 219,
Saṁyama 220
Sañjaya 88, 200, 221
Śāntā 25
Śāntanu 6
Sarabhaṅga, ascetic 194, 196, 207
Śaśabindu 6
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 18
Sātodikā river 58
Sāvatthī 44, 45, 57, 197, 198, 223
Sela 6, 220
Sen D. C. 21
Senaka 218
Senāpati 35, 38-41
Seriva 58
Serpent king 188
Seruma, Serumā 56, 114, 221, 222
Shama Shastri 96
Shylock 174
Sīhapura 59, 191
Sīlavati 216
Sind 59
Sindhu 59
Sītā 17, 20, 202, 203
Sivala-devī 215
Sivi, Śivi 6, 7, 23, 26, 46, 57, 87, 88, 124, 204, 221, 228
Śivi-Auśinarī 26
Somanassa 217
Sonaka 191
Sonaka-kumara 191
Sonapaṇḍita 214
Sopara 233
Sotthivati 58, 189, 198
Sottihisena 68
South 20
Sovira 55, 58, 195
Spies 183
Śramaṇas 134, 194, 204, 223, 224
Śrutāyus 18
Subhaddā 70
Sucīrata 200
Sudassana 57
Suddhodana, king 42
Sudhammā 209

Suhma 59
Sujātā 88, 89
Sumbha 59
Sumbha country 42
Sumedhā 218
Suṁsumāra-giri 48
Sunāma 72, 189
Supaṇṇa 201
Suppāraka-kumara 194
Surasena 59
Surāṣṭra 42
Suraṭṭha 58
Suriyadeva 210, 225
Surpa 234, 235
Sūrpāraka 234, 235
Suruci 213, 218
Suruci I : 218
Suruci II : 218
Suruci III : 218
Suruci of Mithila 218
Surundha 57, 222
Surundhana 57
Susīma 221
Sussondi 221
Sutasoma 209
Suvaṛnaprabhā 235
Suvaṇṇabhūmi 54, 55, 214, 221
Suvaṇṇasāma 25

Takkasilā 58, 62, 67, 68, 71, 82, 83, 96, 99-101, 105, 106, 110, 111, 117, 131, 185, 191, 193, 197, 206, 216, 218
Tamba 56, 221, 222
Tambapaṇṇidīpa 54
Tamil 58
Tathāgata 46
Tel 59
Telavāha 58, 59
Telingri 59
Ten Paths 120
Tooth-relic 235
Treasurer 159, 177
Tṛṇabindu 6

Udaksena 14
Udaya 13, 18, 222
Udayabhadda 14, 222
Udayabhaddā 222
Udayana 1, 18, 28, 48
Udaya Rāja 222
Udena (Udayana) 28, 47, 48
Ugga 87
Uggasena 222
Ujjain 132, 192
Ujjenī 55, 58
Upacara 1, 16, 189, 190, 198, 212,
Upakaṁsa 209-211, 213
Upaniṣad 133
Uparāja 35, 38-41, 107-109, 111, 117, 191
Upasāgara 23, 210, 220, 224, 225
Uposatha 189, 219

Uracchadā 209
Usīnara, Uśīnara 6, 7, 26, 204, 223
Uttara Pañcāla 10, 55, 191, 196, 197, 201. 205, 208, 217
Uttarāpatha 56, 57, 120, 209, 213

Vaideha 69, 118
Vaiśāla kingdom 6
Vaiśālī 28
Vaiśya 76, 78
Vajirā 43
Vajjis 59
Vaka 1, 24
Vālmīki 21, 22
Valuer 194
Vāmadeva, Ṛṣi 8
Vaṁsa 58, 209
Vaṅga 59
Vaṅka 12, 88, 187, 223
Varakalyāṇa 189
Varamandhātā 190, 212
Vararoja 189
Varuṇa 200
Varuṇadeva 210, 225
Vasavatti 224
Vasu 16
Vasu Caidya 6
Vāsabhakkhattiya 29, 30, 44, 45, 51
Vasudeva, Vāsudeva 7, 23, 57, 68, 187, 210, 211, 224, 225, 227, 228
Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa 22
Vatsa 48, 60
Vāyu-Purāṇa 15
Vedas 83, 100, 221
Vedeha 68
Vedehaputta 68
Vedic 1, 2, 10, 17, 69
Vedic Index 10
Vedic literature 10, 17. 69, 234
Vepulla mountain 27, 201, 210
Vesāli 36, 37, 41, 59
Vesiya 87
Vessamitta 6, 7, 204, 224
Vessantara 1, 26, 88, 221
Vessavana 201
Vettavatī 59
Viceroy 191
Vidarbha 1, 15, 61
Videha 7, 8, 15, 18, 27, 55-57, 59, 67, 70-72, 98, 185, 189, 191, 197, 199, 201, 208, 214-216, 218-220
Videhan 16-18, 69, 197
Vidhura 164, 201, 209
Vidhura Paṇḍita 1, 23, 59, 200, 201
Viduḍabha 28, 30, 45, 46, 51, 52
Vijaya 189
Vijita 9
Vikukṣi 15
Village committee 147, 148, 150

Village-council 137, 147
Village of Brahmins 141
Vinaya Piṭaka 33, 34
Viniccayāmacca 172
Viśālākṣa 110
Viṣṇu Pūraṇa 27
Viṣṇu Race 24
Vissasena 14, 187, 223
Viśvaksena 14
Vṛjika 42
Vṛṣṇis 59

Water-sprite 25
Weber 20, 21
Weller 231, 232
Winternitz, M. 3, 21, 26, 231

Yādavas 6, 24
Yakkha 25, 27, 201, 228
Yakṣiṇī 95
Yama 24
Yāmataggi 6, 7, 204
Yamunā 204
Yasapāṇi 229
Yava 229
Yudhiṭṭhila 193, 199, 209, 218
Yudhiṭṭhila kings 7
Yudhiṭṭhila race 1, 22, 209
Yugandhara ocean 129
Yuvanāśva II : 15
Yuvañjaya 218

LIST OF JĀTAKAS

(Jātakas, specially referred to in the book either by name, number or both, are noted below in alphabetical order. Figure inside brackets denotes the Jātaka number quoted from F.)

Āditta (424) 195
Alīna-Citta (156), 142
Aṇḍabhūta (62) 175
Apaṇṇaka (1) 172
Ārāmadūsaka (46), (268) 223
Asadisa (181) 66, 108
Asātarūpa (100) 65
Asilakkhana (126) 46, 70
Assaka (207) 61, 123, 192
Aṭṭhasadda (418) 125
Avāriya (376) 121
Āyācitabhatta (19) 150
Ayoghara (510) 129

Babbu (137) 139, 150
Bāhiya (108) 37, 117
Bakabrahma (405) 125
Bhaddasāla (465) 24, 29, 30, 37, 44-46, 51-53, 127
Bhallāṭiya (504) 14, 95, 195
Bharu (213) 46, 52, 124, 194
Bhikkhā-parampara (496) 95
Bhīmasena (80) 58, 101
Bhisa (488) 150
Brahāchatta (336) 64, 198
Brahmadatta (323) 208
Bhūridatta (543) 6, 112, 193, 204, 215, 220

Cakkavāka (451) 68-69
Campeyya (506) 68, 188, 223
Catudrāra (439) 185
Cetiya (422) 6, 59, 152, 153, 191, 198, 212
Citta-Sambhūta (498) 142, 192
Culla-dhammapāla (358) 212
Culla-haṁsa (533) 144, 219
Culla-Kāliṅga (301) 36, 163
Culla-paduma (193) 79, 111
Culla-palobhana (263), 98, 99, 157
Culla-sutasoma (525) 83, 123, 128, 158

Dadhivāhana (186) 121
Dalhadhamma (409) 48, 201
Darīmukha (378) 55,68
Dasa-Brāhmaṇa (495) 142, 209, 216
Dasaratha (461) 1, 20-22, 109, 117, 203

Dasaṇṇaka (401) 68, 115, 200, 213
Devadhamma (6) 24
Dhajavīheṭha (391) 124
Dhammaddhaja (220) 160, 172, 176, 178, 230
Dhonasākha (353) 10, 48, 62, 105, 182
Dhūmmakāri (413) 44, 52, 125
Dīghitikosala (371) 199
Dummedha (50) 99, 101, 120 ; (122) 120
Dūta (260) 122
Dutiya-palāyi (230) 181

Ekapaṇṇa (149) 36, 38, 76, 83, 121
Ekarāja (303) 65, 66, 198

Gagga (155) 177
Gajakumbha (345) 123
Gāmaṇi-Caṇḍa (257) 85, 141, 145, 146, 172, 174, 202, 205
Gandhāra (406) 56, 95, 141, 186
Gaṇḍatindu (520) 155
Gaṅgamāla (421) 97, 222
Ghata (454) 27, 68, 186, 211, 220, 228 ; (355) 224
Gijjha (164) 175
Giridanta (184) 119, 220
Guttila (243) 132

Harita-māta (239) 43, 47
Hatthipāla (509) 144, 205

Indriya (423) 9, 56, 57, 196, 217

Jägara (414) 141
Jambukhādaka (294) 42
Janasandha (468) 52, 169, 205
Jayaddisa (513) 20, 70, 203, 206
Juṇha (456) 206

Kacchapa (215) 122
Kacchapa (273) 43
Kāka (140) 97, 185
Kakkāru (326) 160
Kālabāhu (329) 199
Kalāya-Muṭṭhi (176) 180
Kāliṅgabodhi (479) 46, 70, 207
Kāma (467) 108, 181
Kāmanīta (228) 124
Kaṇavera (318) 124, 168, 169
Kandagalaka (210) 174
Kaṇhadīpāyana (444) 170, 179, 209, 226
Kapi (250) 121
Kaṭṭhahāri (7) 24, 44, 45, 51, 52,
Khaṇḍahāla (542) 47, 86, 87, 169, 224
Khantivādi (313) 6
Khantivaṇṇana (225) 46, 114
Kharaputta (386) 218
Kharassara (79) 143

Kiṁchanda (511) 176
Kokālika (331) 171
Kosambī (428) 199
Kakkāru (326) 160
Kukku (396) 162
Kukkura (22) 125
Kulāvaka (31) 139, 145, 148, 150
Kumbha (512) 57, 123
Kumbhakāra (408) 8, 201, 208, 216
Kummāsapiṇḍa (415) 44, 129
Kuṇāla (536) 22, 32, 49, 65, 70, 156, 160, 193, 196, 208
Kuṇḍaka-Kucchi-Sindhava (254) 96, 121
Kuṇḍaka-pūva (109) 159
Kurudhamma (276) 27, 200
Kusa (531) 69, 70, 128, 217
Kusanāli (121) 113, 127
Kūṭavāṇija (218) 175
Kutidusaka (321) 122

Lohakumbhi (314) 125
Lomasakassapa (433) 25, 52

Mahābodhī (528) 112, 161, 162, 178
Mahādhammapāla (447) 42
Mahāhaṁsa (534) 181, 220
Mahājanaka (539) 75, 78, 95, 108, 191, 199, 215
Mahākaṇha (469) 109, 185, 223
Mahānārada-kassapa (544) 6, 47, 95, 189, 194, 204, 223, 224
Mahāpadumā (472) 116, 142, 169, 170, 179
Mahāpanāda (264) 213, 218
Mahāpiṅgala (240) 76, 170, 212
Mahāsāra (92) 46, 173
Mahāssāroha (302) 140, 147
Mahāsīlava (51) 56, 157, 159, 172, 198, 199, 213
Mahāsudassana (95) 186
Mahāsupina (77) 46, 217
Mahāsutasoma (537) 169, 209
Mahāummagga (546) 14, 23, 54, 57, 63, 67, 162, 182-185, 197, 220, 228
Mahilāmukha (26) 47, 119
Makhadeva (9) 144, 214, 215
Mandhātu (258) 55, 212
Maṇicora (194) 76, 88, 92
Mātaṅga (497) 6, 48, 58, 59 142
Mittāmitta (473) 46, 163
Mora (159) 123
Mudupāṇi (262) 70, 117
Mūsika (373) 51, 111, 229

Nānacchanda (289) 152, 159
Nandiyamiga (385) 136
Nimi (541) 6, 18, 27, 192, 194, 195, 204, 208, 214-216, 220, 223

Pabbatūpatthara (195) 114
Padakusalamāṇava (432) 76, 79
Pādañjali (247) 82, 84
Palāyi (229) 62, 185
Pañcagaru (132) 83, 126
Pañcāvudha (55) 99, 101, 106
Pānīya (459) 57, 95, 150
Parantapa (416) 112, 115, 125
Phandana (475) 140, 142
Pūtimaṁsa (437) 186

Rajovāda (151) 12, 98, 212 ; (334) 91
Rathalaṭṭhi (332) 44, 143, 144, 171
Ruru (482) 123

Saccaṁkira (73) 57, 76, 84
Sādhīna (494) 219
Sāketā (237) 47
Sālikedāra (484) 142
Sāliya (367) 175
Sālittaka (107) 125
Sāma (540) 25, 140, 217
Sambhava (515) 23, 200
Sambula (519) 68-69, 124
Saṁkhapāla (524), 58
Saṁkicca (530) 6, 47, 58, 59, 112, 193, 204
Samuddavāṇija (466) 30
Saṁvara, (Sambara) (462) 56, 72, 73, 81, 82, 106, 164, 219
Sañjiva (150) 47
Sarabhañga (522) 6, 8. 9, 15, 16, 133, 192, 194, 196, 207, 208 216
Sarabhamiga (483) 47
Sattubhasta (402) 139, 157, 206
Seyya (282) 157, 185
Sīlavīmaṁsa (290) 160
Sīlavīmaṁsana (86) 170
Siri (284) 84
Sivi (499) 26, 46, 57, 95
Somanassa (505) 10, 179, 218

Sonaka (529) 10, 68, 128, 140, 141, 191, 199
Sona-Nanda (532) 10, 62-64, 128, 214
Succa (320) 111
Sūci (387) 84, 139, 140
Sudhā-bhojana (535) 160
Suhanu (158) 120
Sujāta (306) 43, 118
Sulasā (419) 168, 169
Suppāraka (463) 194
Surāpāna (81) 57, 123
Surucī (489) 70, 71, 79, 118, 127, 185, 218
Susīma (163) 160, 221
Sussondi (360) 114, 222
Sutano (398) 136
Suvaṇṇakakkaṭaka (389) 141

Tacasāra (368) 150, 175
Tacchasūkara (492) 43, 181

Takkala (446) 177
Takkāriya (481) 69
Telapatta (96) 42, 59, 68, 81, 83, 95, 96, 107
Tesakuṇa (521) 118, 155, 156, 164
Thusa (338) 47, 51, 100, 106
Tilamuṭṭhi (252) 100, 101, 103
Tuṇḍila (388) 177

Ubhatobhaṭṭha (139) 145
Udaya (458) 117, 128, 182, 223
Ulūka (270) 85, 93
Ummadantī (527) 124, 153

Vaḍḍhaki-sūkara (283) 43, 47, 64
Vālodaka (183) 42
Vaṭṭaka (118) 139
Vessantara (547) 26, 29, 57, 58, 87, 158, 162, 186, 209, 221
Vidhurapaṇḍita (545) 59, 164, 182, 201

Yuvañjaya (460) 218

Additions and Corrections

Page	Line	For	Read
6	22		Delete : 599
9	16		Insert a comma after 'different times'
16	20	Janakavaṁśa	Janakavaṁsa
28	9	Kosāmbi	Kosambī
30	13	Samuddavijaya	Samuddavāṇija
40	9	Jayswal	Jayaswal
44	9	Dhūmakari	Dhūmmakari
	10	Kammāsapiṇda	Kummāsapiṇḍa
55	8	Māndhātā-J.	Mandhatu-J.
	9	Dārimukha-J.	Darīmukha-J.
62	4	226	229
64	22	293	283
68	18	Dasaṇṇa	Dasaṇṇaka
88	2	Sañjay	Sañjaya
106	14	Pañcaruddhā-J.	Pañcavudha-J.
111	6	233	193
114	16	Pabbatūpathara-J.	Pabbatūpatthara-J,
119	22	Giridantā-J.	Giridanta-J.
121	29	Kapunna-J.	Ekapuṇṇa-J.
	29		Add : after Kuṇḍaka : —Kucchi Sindhava
122	1	331	321
124	10	Kāmanitā-J.	Kāmanīta-J.
127	16	Bhaddasala	Bhaddasāla
	17	Suruchi	Surucī
133	24	Sarabhaṅga	Sarabhañga
139	26	317	387

Page	Line	For	Read
143	12	74	79
153	12	Chetiya	Cetiya
154	last line	Tasakumā-J.	Tesakuṇa-J.
155	22	Gāṇḍatindu-J.	Gaṇḍatindu-J.
159	18	Kundaka-pūva	Kuṇḍaka-pūva
	18	Nānacchahda	Nānacchanda
160	2	47	163
	26	Dhammadhvaja-J.	Dhammaddhaja-J.
172	18	Dhammadhvaja-J.	Dhammaddhaja-J.
174	12	157	151
176	6	Dhammaddhvaja-J.	Dhammaddhaja-J.
188	27	Campeyyo	Campeyya
193	25		Against n. 175, add C. V, 219.
194	29	Bhallatiya	Bhallaṭiya
197	23	Caṭṭa	Chatta
198	5	Brahmacaṭṭa-J.	Brahachatta-J.
200	2		Delete : 545
201	22	Vidheha	Videha
204	20	Brāhmiṇs	Brahmins
205	19		Insert a hyphen after Alīna
208	17	Kumbhakārā	Kumbhakāra
212	7	Rajovāda-J.	Rājovāda-J.
214	13	Makhādeva	Makhadeva
217	12	Caṇḍpajjota	Caṇḍapajjota
223	13	Sramanas	Sramaṇas
225	17	Pajjuna	Pajjuma.
231	16		Add footnote 206a to Mandalay
247	20	Add 206a	A 'complete and critical' Text of the Jātakattha-katha was published by

Page	Line	For	Read
			the Burmese some years ago; also a complete edition of the same in Siamese characters appeared in 1924. The importance of these among other materials for the purpose of a critical study of the Texts of the Jātakas is stressed in the Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Vol. XXIX, Part I, 1966, 198-99.
264	List of Jātakas		Select List of Jātakas.

271