

ART XVI.—*Ancient Pātaliputra. Dr. D. B. Spooner's  
Recent Excavations at its site and the Question of the  
Influence of Ancient Persia upon India.*

By

JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A., PH.D.

(*Read on 3rd March 1916.*)

I.

During the last year, our attention has been drawn to the great question of the Influence of Ancient Irān upon India, by two great archæological excavations. Introduction. The first excavation is that of the ruins of the ancient city of Taxālá by Sir John Marshall, and the second that of the ruins of the ancient city of Pātaliputra (modern Patna) by Dr. D. B. Spooner. The object of this Paper is three-fold.—

I. To give a brief account of the history of Pātaliputra and of its past and present excavations from an Irānian point of view.

II. To examine the general question of the influence of ancient Iran upon ancient India.

III. To present a few constructive observations on Dr. Spooner's literary evidence about the influence of Irān, from an Irānian point of view.

I want to speak on these subjects, not from any archæological or architectural point of view, but from a literary point of view, and that from an Irānian point of view. I leave it to archæologists to examine Dr. Spooner's archæological evidences and to scholars of Indian literature to examine his evidences from Indian books.

Before speaking of Dr. Spooner's excavations at Pātaliputra, the subject proper of my Paper, I will say a few words on Sir John Marshall's excavations at Taxālá, where also the question of the influence of Irān on India is connected with the discovery of the ruins of, what Sir John calls, a Zoroastrian temple.

## II.

The ruins of Taxâla are situated at a place called Kalaka Sarâi, near the village of Shah Dheri, about 24 miles from Rawulpindi. I had the pleasure of visiting the ruins on 16th July 1915, on my return journey from Kashmir. Thanks to the kindness and courtesy of Sir John Marshall, I was given an opportunity to see the ruins, though the actual excavation work was stopped owing to the hot weather. What I was most interested in, as a Parsee, in these excavations of Taxâla was the excavation of, the "Mound of Jhandial", so called from an adjoining modern village of that name. Sir John Marshall has excavated there a temple, which he calls "The Temple of Jhandiala," and which he thinks to be an ancient Parsee Fire-temple of the Parthian times.

We gather the following brief account of the temple, from the description, as given by Sir John Marshall, in his Lecture before the Punjab Historical Society<sup>1</sup> :  
 The Account of the Temple of Jhandiala. It is a temple unlike any yet known in India but resembling a Greek temple. The Greek temple was surrounded by (a) peristyle or a range of columns, (b) a *pronaos* or front porch, (c) a *naos, or cella* or sanctuary and (d) an *opisthodomos* or a back porch at the rear. As in the case of some Greek temples, e.g., the Parthenon<sup>2</sup> at Athens, (e) "there is an extra chamber between the sanctuary and back porch." The Taxâla Temple has, (a) instead of a range of columns to support the building "a wall pierced by large windows at frequent intervals, with two Ionic columns between pilasters at the entrance." (b) It has a front porch; (c) then comes the sanctuary; and then (d) a back porch. In place of the (e) extra chamber seen in a Greek temple, here, there is a tower of solid masonry with a foundation of about 30 feet. The temple is unlike any Buddhist, Brahmanical or Jain temple in India. So, it must belong to another religion. The tower was a sort of Chaldæan *Zikurrat* on the summit of which was a fire-altar. From all these considerations, Sir John Marshall thinks the building to be "a temple dedicated to the Zoroastrian Worship." "This is the only plausible hypothesis", he adds, "which seems to me to explain the peculiar structure of the solid tower in the middle of the building and the entire absence of any images. The Persians, as we know, set their fire-altars in high places, and raised on lofty substructures. We know, moreover, that the idea of

<sup>1</sup> Lecture by Dr. J. H. Marshall, C.I.E., delivered before the Punjab Historical Society, August 29th, 1914, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> I had the pleasure of seeing the Parthenon at Athens on 23rd November 1886.

the Assyrian *Zikurrat* was familiar to the Persians, and there is nothing more likely than that they borrowed its design for their fire-temples."

I will quote here, what I have said elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> as my few observations on Sir John Marshall's account of the Temple :

"Not being a student, of archæology, I do not venture to speak with any authority, as to whether Sir John's opinion about that temple is correct. But as an humble student of Zoroastrianism, knowing something about its fire-temples and the customs of the fire-cult, and having examined very carefully the structure of the Jhandiala Temple, I venture to say, that I observed nothing that could be said to go against Sir John's views about the building being a Zoroastrian Temple of old. On the other hand, in main principles, the structure even resembled some of our modern fire-temples.

"But there is one point, on which I have my doubts. The learned archæologist thinks, that the tower is the seat of a fire-altar at the top, and takes, as the ground for this view, the fact that the Persians had their fire altars in high places. Of course, he has the authority of Herodotus, (Book I, 131). But, I think, that that view would not apply to later Parthian times—about 500 years after Herodotus,—to which Sir John Marshall attributes the Temple on archæological grounds. If some further researches lead him to attribute the temple to more ancient times—say the time when Darius the Great invaded India with his large army of Persians and when he passed through this part of the Punjab—then his view of the use of the Tower may possibly, though not assuredly, be held to be stronger. What I mean to say is, that, at one time, when a Zoroastrian Temple stood in the midst of Zoroastrian surroundings, it was possible to let the sacred fire burn in an open place like the top of a tower, but not, when it stood in surroundings other than strictly Zoroastrian, in surroundings associated with Buddhists, Brahmins, Jains and others, as was the case when the Parthians occupied this part of the country at the time attributed to it by Sir John Marshall.

"So, I think, the *naos*, or sanctuary was the place of the fire altar and the dias or platform in it was the place of the utensils at the fire altar, and the place standing over which the priests fed the sacred fire. The tower itself had of course a religious purpose, *vis.*, that of saying prayers in praise of the Sun, Moon, Water, and the grand Nature which led a Zoroastrian's thoughts from Nature to Nature's God.

<sup>1</sup> The *Times of India* of 11th August 1915.

Of all the modern fire-temples of India, the one at present in the old Parsi centre of Naosari seems to suggest this view and seems to come nearer to the Taxālá tower. There, near the place of the sanctuary wherein the sacred fire is burning, there is a small two-storied building, reminding one of a tower, though not exactly a tower, on which the worshippers went to have a look at the distant Purná river and to say their Ardivisura Nyáish, and even the Khorshed and Meher Nyaishes. It was a place which gave them a more open look of the whole of the surrounding nature. The Taxālá temple tower may have been intended for a similar purpose."

### III.

#### I. PĀTALIPUTRA—ITS HISTORY. THE IDENTIFICATION OF ITS SITE. ITS EXCAVATIONS.

It is the second group of excavations, *vis.*, that at Pātaliputra, financed by Mr. Ratan Tata, that has drawn more public attention. When the attention of us here in Bombay was first drawn to the subject, at the close of the year 1914, by a letter, dated 16th October, of the London correspondent of the "Times of India," published in the issue of 9th November 1914, in a para entitled "Parsee Dominion in India," I had the pleasure of writing in that Paper, in its issue of 12th November. I then said: "The Mahomedan Historian Firishta speaks of the conquest, by the old Irānian Kings, of even further east.<sup>1</sup> Even the Vendidād speaks of the India of the Persians as extending to the East, and now the para in your Paper speaks of the modern excavations at Pātaliputra (Patna), as pointing to an actual dominion of ancient Irānians in the east, further than Punjab; but further details will enable us to see properly whether the recent excavations point to an actual dominion extended up to there, or only to the influence of Persipolitan architecture on Indian architecture which is seen in more than one place."

Further details, mostly from a literary point of view, have now been given to us by the learned excavator, Dr. D. B. Spooner. His excavations led him to some inquiries, the result of which he has embodied in a Paper, entitled "The Zoroastrian period of Indian History," published in two parts, in the Journal<sup>2</sup> of the Royal Asiatic Society of England. This Paper of Dr. Spooner has, as it were, to use the words of the late Professor Maxmuller,<sup>3</sup> used on a somewhat similar occasion

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* further than Punjab.

<sup>2</sup> Issues of January and July 1915.

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Maxmuller's article "The date of the Zend Avesta" in the Contemporary Review of December 1893, Vol. XLIV, p. 869.

of, what may be called, literary heresy, thrown a bomb-shell into the peaceful camp of Oriental scholars. This paper and some correspondence I had with the learned author,<sup>1</sup> has suggested to me the subject of this Paper, the main object of which is to show, that there are many facts or evidences which point to the conclusion, that, at one time, ancient Persia had very great influence upon India ; and so, there is a great likelihood of Dr. Spooner's theory of an extraordinary influence being generally correct, though any particular argument or arguments or pleas, here or there, may be incorrect or weak.

Before giving the story of Dr. Spooner's excavations I will give here in brief :

- (A) The history of the old city of Pātaliputra.
- (B) An account of the attempts to identify its site.
- (C) An account of the Identification and Excavations of the ruins of its buildings, referred to by old writers like the Chinese travellers, Fā Hien and Hiuen Tsiang.

#### IV.

##### (A) THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF PĀTALIPUTRA.

The history of this city, as in the case of all old cities or countries, begins with its legendary history or origin. This legendary origin also gives us the meaning of its name.

Pātaliputra (पाटलिपुत्र), the modern Patna, is the Palibothra of Megasthenes, who was the Ambassador of Seleucus Nicator in the reign of King Chandra Gupta, about 300 B. C. It is situated on a confluence of the rivers Ganges and Son or Sena. It was the capital of the ancient kingdom of Magadha. It was also anciently known as Kusumpur (कुसुमपुर) and Pushyapur (पुष्यपुर), both meaning a city of flowers. The name, therefore, corresponds to the name of Florence, and the city is spoken of as "the Indian Florence."<sup>2</sup>

The name Pātaliputra is taken to mean "the Son (putra पुत्र) of Pātali (पाटलि)" *i.e.*, the trumpet flower. The Legend, which describes the origin of this ancient city, and which explains the above meaning of its name, is thus related by the Chinese traveller

<sup>1</sup> Since then, I had the pleasure of two long interviews with Dr. Spooner in Bombay on the 15th and 17th of February 1916, when we had a long exchange of views.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. James Legge in his "Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms," being an Account of the Chinese monk Fā-Hien of his travels in India and Ceylon, 399—414 A. D. (1886), p. 77, n. 1.

Hiuen Tsiang<sup>1</sup> (about A.D. 629) :—“ To the south of the river Ganges there is an old city about 70 li round. Although it has been long deserted, its foundation walls still survive. Formerly, when men’s lives were incalculably long, it was called Kusumapura (K’u-su-mo-pu-lo),<sup>2</sup> so called, because the palace of the King had many flowers. Afterwards, when men’s age reached several thousands of years, then its name was changed to Pātaliputra<sup>3</sup> (Po-ch’a-li-tsu-ch’ing).

“ At the beginning there was a Brahmin of high talent and singular learning. Many thousands flocked to him to receive instruction. One day all the students went out on a tour of observation ; one of them betrayed a feeling of unquiet and distress. His fellow-students addressed him and said, ‘ What troubles you, friend ? ’ He said, ‘ I am in my full maturity (beauty) with perfect strength, and yet I go on wandering about here like a lonely shadow till years and months have passed, and my duties (manly duties) not performed. Thinking of this, my words are sad and my heart is afflicted.’ On this, his companions in sport replied, ‘ We must seek then for your good a bride and her friends.’ Then they supposed two persons to represent the father and mother of the bridegroom, and two persons the father and mother of the bride, and as they were sitting under a Patali (po-ch’a-li) tree, they called it the tree of the son-in-law.<sup>4</sup> Then they gathered seasonable fruits and pure water, and followed all the nuptial customs, and requested a time to be fixed. Then the father of the supposed bride gathering a twig with flowers on it, gave it to the student and said, ‘ This is your excellent partner ; be graciously pleased to accept her.’ The student’s heart was rejoiced as he took her to himself. And now, as the sun was setting, they proposed to return home ; but the young student, affected by love, preferred to remain.

“ Then the other said : ‘ All this was fun ; pray come back with us ; there are wild beasts in this forest ; we are afraid, they will kill you.’ But the student preferred to remain walking up and down by the side of the tree.

“ After sunset, a strange light lit up the plain, the sound of pipes and lutes with their soft music (was heard), and the ground was covered with a sumptuous carpet. Suddenly an old man of gentle mien was

<sup>1</sup> Si-yu-ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World, translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A. D. 629) by Samuel Beal (1884), Vol. II, pp. 82-85.

<sup>2</sup> “ Explained in a note to mean Hiang-hu-kong-sh’ing—the city or royal precinct of the scented flower (kusuma).

<sup>3</sup> “ The text seems to refer the foundation of this city to a remote period, and in this respect is in agreement with Diodorus, who says (lib. II, cap. 39) that this city was founded by Heracles.”

<sup>4</sup> That is they made the tree father-in-law of the student ; in other words he was to marry daughter of the tree, a Pātali flower (*Bignonia suaveolens*).

seen coming, supporting himself by his staff, and there was also an old mother leading a young maiden. They were accompanied by a procession along the way, pressed in holiday attire and attended with music. The old man then pointed to the maiden and said: 'This is your worship's wife (lady).' Seven days then passed in carousing and music, when the companions of the student, in doubt whether he had been destroyed by wild beasts, went forth and came to the place. They found him alone in the shade of the tree, sitting as if facing a superior guest. They asked him to return with them, but he respectfully declined.

"After this he entered of his own accord the city, to pay respect to his relatives, and told them of this adventure from beginning to end. Having heard it with wonder, he returned with all his relatives and friends to the middle of the forest, and there they saw the flowering tree become a great mansion; servants of all kinds were hurrying to and fro on every side, and the old man came forward and received them with politeness, and entertained them with all kinds of dainties served up amidst the sound of music. After the usual compliments, the guests returned to the city and told to all, far and near, what had happened.

"After the year was accomplished, the wife gave birth to a son, when the husband said to his spouse, 'I wish now to return, but yet I cannot bear to be separated from you (your bridal residence); but if I rest here I fear the exposure to wind and weather.' The wife having heard this, told her father. The old man then addressed the student and said, 'Whilst living contented and happy why must you go back? I will build you a house; let there be no thought of desertion.' On this, his servants applied themselves to the work, and in less than a day it was finished.

"When the old capital of Kusumapura was changed, this town was chosen, and from the circumstance of the genii building the mansion of the youth the name henceforth of the country was Pātaliputra-pura (the city of the son of the Pātali tree)."

It seems,<sup>1</sup> that, at the place, where, later on, there arose the city of Pātaliputra, stood a village of the name of Pātali or Pātaligrāma. It was situated on the confluence of the Ganges and the Son. Sakya-mouni, the Buddha, in about the 4th or 5th century B. C., on his way from Rajgriha, the old capital of the district,

<sup>1</sup> I give this early account of the old city, as collected by P. Vivien de Saint Martin in his "Étude sur la Géographie Grecque et Latine de l'Inde" (1858), *Troisième Mémoire, Appendix V Pātaliputra*, pp. 439 *et seq.*

to Vasali, on crossing the Ganges, passed by this town. On seeing the village, he predicted that the village was destined to become a great city. The words of the prophecy, as given by Col. Waddell, run thus :

' Among famous places, busy marts and emporiums, Pātaliputra will be the greatest ; (but) three perils will threaten it—fire, water and internal strife."<sup>1</sup> Rājā Ajātasatru, the son of Bimbisāra, who had become the king of the country, about 8 years before the death of Buddha, had his capital at that time at Rajgir (Rajgriha). He got this village or town of Pātaligrāma duly fortified with an eye to the future, as it was in the midst of several provinces and small republics. It stood at a point of great commercial and strategical importance at or near the confluence of all the five great rivers of Mid-India, namely, the Ganges, the Gogra, the Rāpti, the Gandak and the Son."<sup>2</sup>

The Vāyu Purāna attributes the real foundation of Pātaliputra to Rājā Ajāta Satru's grandson, Oudaya or Oudayāçva. It was he who first removed the capital there from Rajgriha. This happened then during the last part of the 6th century B. C., because Oudaya came to throne in 519 B. C., about 24 years after the Nirvāna of Buddha. Ajāta Satru is said to have fortified the old city with a view to check "the rigorous invading Aryans," who were the Lichhavis of Mithila.

Both, Megasthenes (about B. C. 300-302), the ambassador of Seleucus Nicator at the Court of Chandra-Gupta, and Chanakya, Chandra-Gupta's minister, have left us some accounts of the magnificence of the royal court at this city in the time of Chandra-Gupta (the Sandrakottos of the Greeks, Sandrakoptus of Athenæus, and Androkottos of Plutarch's Life of Alexander the Great). In the same way as some supernatural or divine powers were associated with the founding of this city, some divine powers were attributed to the rise of Chandra-Gupta to the throne from an humble origin.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Buddha's prophecy, quoted by Col. Waddell at the beginning of his Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra (1903) p. 1. cf. Buddha's way of describing the city, and its curses or evils with the way in which Ahura Mazda describes the foundation of the 16 Iranian cities in the first chapter of the Vendidad, wherein, with each city, a mention is made of the accompanying evil or curse.

<sup>2</sup> "Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra" by Dr. L. A. Waddell (1903), p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Col. Waddell's Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra (1903), p. 3.



Strabo, in one place, includes Megasthenes, from whom the Greeks knew much of India, among "a set of liars,"<sup>1</sup>

(a) Strabo. and says, that no faith can be placed in him. He coined "the fables concerning men." Strabo seems to have condemned Megasthenes and with him also Deimachus, the Greek Ambassador in the Court of Altirochades, the son of Sandrocottus, (Chandragupta), because they coined or described many fables. In another place, he follows the account of Megasthenes without showing any doubt about that account. He thus speaks of Palibothra: "It is in the shape of a parallelogram, surrounded by a wooden wall pierced with openings through which arrows may be discharged. In front is a ditch, which serves the purpose of defence and of a sewer for the city. The people, in whose country the city is situated are the most distinguished of all the tribes, and are called Prasii. The King, besides his family name, has the surname of Palibothrus, as the king to whom Megasthenes was sent on an embassy had the name of Sandrocottus."<sup>2</sup>

Arrian speaks thus of Pātāliputra and the Manners of the Indians :

(b) Arrian. "It is further said that the Indians do not rear monuments to the dead, but consider the virtues which men have displayed in life, and the songs in which their praises are celebrated, sufficient to preserve their memory after death. But of their cities it is said, that the number is so great, that it cannot be stated with precision, but that such cities as are situated on the banks of rivers or on the sea-coast are built of wood instead of brick, being meant to last only for a time—so destructive are the heavy rains which pour down, and the rivers also when they overflow their banks and inundate the plains—while those cities which stand on commanding situations and lofty eminences are built of brick and mud; that the greatest city in India is that which is called Palimbothra, in the dominions of the Prasians, where the streams of the Erannoboas and the Ganges unite, the Ganges being the greatest of all rivers, and the Erannoboas being perhaps the third largest of Indian rivers, though greater than the greatest rivers elsewhere; but it is smaller than the Ganges where it falls into it. Megasthenes informs us that this city stretched in the inhabited quarters to an extreme length on each side of eighty stadia,<sup>3</sup> and that its breadth was fifteen stadia,<sup>4</sup> and that a ditch encompassed it all round, which

<sup>1</sup> The Geography of Strabo, Book II, Chapters I, 9. Hamilton and Falconer's Translation, 1854, Vol. I, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Book. XV, Chapter 1, 36, Vol. III, p. 97.

<sup>3</sup> *i. e.*, 9.2 miles.

<sup>4</sup> *i. e.*, 1.7 miles.

was six hundred feet in breadth and thirty cubits in depth, and that the wall was crowned with 570 towers and had four-and-sixty gates. The same writer tells us further this remarkable fact about India, that all the Indians are free, and not one of them is a slave. The Lakedæmonians and the Indians are here so far in agreement. The Lakedæmonians, however, hold the Helots as slaves, and these Helots do servile labour ; but the Indians do not even use aliens as slaves, and much less a country-man of their own. ”<sup>1</sup>

Pātaliputra seems to have risen to its zenith in the time of Chandragupta’s grandson, the great Asoka (about B. C. 250), “the greatest of Indian Emperors,”<sup>2</sup> the contemporary and ally of Antiochus II of Syria, Ptolemy of Egypt, Antigonus Gonotus of Macedon, Magas of Cyrene, and Alexander of Epirus, as referred to in some of his (Asoka’s) inscriptions. Stone is not found in plenty in this part of India. So, most of the royal buildings of the preceding times were built of wood. It is Asoka, who introduced the use of stones. Col. Waddell thus speaks on the subject : “The buildings previous to his epoch, as well as the walls of the city, seem all to have been of wood, like most of the palaces, temples and stockades of Burma and Japan in the present day. The change which he (Asoka) effected to hewn stone was so sudden and impressive and the stones which he used were so colossal, that he came latterly to be associated in popular tales with the giants or genii (*yaksha*) by whose superhuman agency it was alleged he had reared his monuments ; and a fabulous romantic origin was invented for his marvellous capital. It was possibly owing to Asoka’s gigantic stone buildings that the Greeks ascribed the building of the city to Hercules, for they had several accounts of it subsequent to the time of Megasthenes. It is also possible that this legend of the giants may have partly arisen through Asoka having made use of sculptured figures of the giants to adorn his buildings.”<sup>3</sup>

With the downfall of the dynasty of Asoka, the city also had its downfall due probably to fire, flood and internal quarrels, the three curses or evils said to have been prophesied by Budha. The older wooden buildings of the city may have led to frequent fires, and the peculiar position of the city on, or near the place of, the confluence of several rivers may have led to frequent floods. From the

<sup>1</sup> The Indica of Arrian X (Ancient India, as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, Translation by J. W. McCrindle 1977, pp. 304-8).

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Waddell’s Report of the Excavations at Pātaliputra, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*, p. 7.

third to the fifth century A. D., it continued, however fallen, to be the capital of Gupta kings, some of whom patronised Buddhism.

Fa-Hien, who had visited it (about B. C. 399-414), thus speaks of  
 6. History in Magadha, the City where Asoka ruled": "The  
 Fa-Hien's time. royal palace and halls, in the midst of the city, which exist now as of old, were all made by spirits which he employed, and which piled up the stones, reared the walls and gates, and executed the elegant carving and inlaid sculpture-work in a way which no human hands of this world could accomplish."<sup>1</sup> Though fallen, Pātaliputra was still a seat of learning, and as such, it was visited by him. He stayed and studied there for three years.

We have given above the account of Hiuen Tsiang (695 A. D.) on  
 the supposed origin of Pātaliputra, which also  
 7. History in gives the meaning of the name. This Chinese  
 Hiuen Tsiang's time. traveller saw the city in ruins. He further says :  
 " To the north of the old palace of the king is a stone pillar several tens of feet high ; this is the place where Asōka (Wu-Yau) rājā made ' a hell '. In the hundredth year after the *Nirvāna* of Tathāgata, there was a king called Ashōka (O-shu-kia,) <sup>2</sup> who was the great grandson of Bimbisāra rājā. He changed his capital from Rājagriha to Pātali (pura) and built an outside rampart to surround the whole city. Since then many generations have passed, and now there only remain the old foundation walls (of the city). The Sanghārāmas<sup>3</sup>, Dēva temples and *stūpas* which lie in ruins may be counted by hundreds. There are only two or three remaining (entire)."<sup>4</sup> Hiuen Tsiang then describes, how Asoka, on ascending the throne, was, at first, a cruel tyrant, and how he constituted here a hell for torturing people, how a pious Sramana escaped death at the hell, feeling the boiling caldron as cold as a cool lake, how king Asoka himself, having inadvertently come at the place, narrowly escaped being killed at the hell in conformity to his own order: " that all who came to the walls of the hell should be killed", and how he at length destroyed the hell. In Hiuen Tsiang's time, the city, though in ruins had a circuit of about 12 to 14 miles.

<sup>1</sup> A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, being an account of the Chinese Monk Fa-Hien, translated by Dr. James Legge (1886), p.77. Chap. XXVII. Diodorus, the Sicilian (His. III, 3) also refers to its supernatural foundation thus: Hercules "was the founder of no small number of cities, the most renowned and greatest of which he called Palibothra."

<sup>2</sup> "O-shu-kia is the Sanskrit form of Wu-yau; the latter in the Chinese form signifying 'sorrowless'."

<sup>3</sup> *i.e.*, the monasteries.

<sup>4</sup> Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World, translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A. D. 629) by Samuel Beal (1884), Vol. II, pp. 85-86.

Coming to Mahomedan times, we find that it continued to remain deserted for a number of centuries. It was Shir Shāh, who, in about 1541 A. D., occupied it again as a royal city and built a fort there. It then came into importance under its modern name of Patna (Sans. पटना) *i.e.*, the town or city. It is even now the capital of Behar.

## V.

## (B) AN ACCOUNT OF THE ATTEMPTS TO IDENTIFY THE SITE OF PĀTALIPUTRA.

Pliny, among the ancients, was the first to point to a particular place as the site of Pālibothra. He placed the city at 425 miles from the confluence of the river Jomanes (Jumna) and Ganges.<sup>1</sup> He thus speaks of the city: "More famous and more powerful than any nation, not only in these regions, but throughout almost the whole of India, are the Prasii, who dwell in a city of vast extent and of remarkable opulence, called Palibothra; from which circumstance some writers have given to the people themselves the name of Palibothri, and, indeed, to the whole tract of country between Ganges and the Indus. These people keep on daily pay in their king's service an army consisting of six hundred thousand foot, thirty thousand horse, and nine thousand elephants, from which we may easily form a conjecture as to the vast extent of their resources."<sup>2</sup> Thus we see, that Pliny placed Palibothra (Pātaliputra) somewhere about 425 miles below the confluence of the Ganges and the Jamna.

European scholars began to attempt the identification of the site of Pātaliputra in the latter half of the 18th century.<sup>3</sup>

The first European in the field of identification was the well-known French Geographer D'Anville (1697-1782), who published in 1768, his "Géographie Ancienne Abrégée." This work was translated into English in two parts in 1791, under the name of Compendium of Ancient Geography. D'Anville, who erroneously identified the river Erannoboas, mentioned by the Greek writers who referred to Palibothra (Pātaliputra), with the Jamna, instead of with the river Son, placed Pātaliputra somewhere near Helabas (Allahabad). He was misled to this mistaken identification also by the name Prasii, which, according to the Greek writers,

<sup>1</sup> Pliny's Natural History, Book VI, Chap. 31. Bostock and Riley's Translation (1855), Vol. II, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter 22, p. 45.

<sup>3</sup> Col. Waddell gives us a short account of these attempts in his "Report of the Excavations at Pataliputra" (1903), p. 9, *et seq.*

was the name of a great nation living there. He took this name Prasiî to be the same as Praye (Prayâg), which is another Indian name of Allahabad.<sup>1</sup> D'Anville said : " Pâlibothra, the most considerable city of India. It was situated on the Ganges, at the place where this river received a contributory stream, which appears the same as the Jomanes,<sup>2</sup> although called Erannobas.<sup>3</sup> To this position corresponds that of Helabas,<sup>4</sup> which by the vestiges of antiquity, and the tradition of having been the dwelling of the parent of mankind, is a kind of sanctuary in the Indian paganism. The most powerful nation of India, the Prasiî occupied the city under consideration ; and the name of Praye,<sup>5</sup> which we find applied to Helabas, seems to perpetuate that of the nation."<sup>6</sup>

Rennell (1742-1830), the most celebrated of English Geographers, who has been held to be to England, what D'Anville was to France and Ritter to Germany, was the first to identify the site of modern Patna as that of the ancient Pâtali-putra, (Palibothra). In his " Memoir of a Map of Hindoostan," published in 1788, he says, that, at first, he thought that Canoge (Kanouj) was the ancient Palibothra, but he gave up soon that first erroneous identification. He says : " Late enquiries made on the spot, have however, brought out this very interesting discovery, that a very large city, which anciently stood on or very near the site of Patna, was named Patelpoot-her (or Pâtali-putra according to Sir William Jones) and that the river Soane, whose confluence with the Ganges is now at Moneah, 22 miles above Patna, once joined it under the walls of Patelpoot-her. This name agrees so nearly with Pâlibothra, and the intelligence altogether furnishes such positive kind of proof, that my former conjectures respecting Canoge must all fall to the ground."<sup>7</sup> Later on, he confirms this and says " Pliny's Palibothra, however, is clearly Patna."<sup>8</sup>

Thomas Pennant (1726-1798), a known antiquary, began publishing in 1798, a work entitled "Outlines of the Globe." He published only two volumes. The other two were published by his son David Pennant in 1800. He, agreeing with

<sup>1</sup> " Compendium of Ancient Geography " by Monsieur D'Anville, translated from the French (1791), Part II, p. 543.

<sup>2</sup> Jamna.

<sup>3</sup> The Greek form of Hira myabaha, i.e., "The Golden-armed," the ancient name of Son.

<sup>4</sup> Allahabad,

Prayâg.

<sup>5</sup> D'Anville, p. 543.

<sup>7</sup> Memoir of a Map of Hindoostan by James Rennell (1830), p. 50.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

Rennell, identified the site near modern Patna with the ancient Palibothra or Pātaliputra. He said : " Mr. Rennell ..... very justly places it near Patna, and supposes, not without reason, that the Soane had once flowed near its walls and that Pālibothra was seated on the forks of both rivers " <sup>1</sup> ( the Ganges and the Son ).

Col. Wilford, at first, in 1798, thought that Pālibothra was the same as Rāj-griha (lit. the royal mansion) which was at first the capital city. One Bala-Rama "rebuilt it and assigned it as a residence for one of his sons, who are called in general Baliputras or the children of Bala. From this circumstance it was called Baliputra, or the town of the son of Bala; but in the spoken dialects it was called Bali-putra, because a putra, or son of Bali, resided in it. From Bali-putra, the Greeks made Pali-putra and Pali-bothra." <sup>2</sup> Then, in 1822, he thought that Pālibothra and Pātaliputra were two different towns, though near one another. He said "Pālibothra and Pātaliputra now Patna.....these two towns were close to each other exactly like London and Westminster." <sup>3</sup>

Col. W. Francklin in 1815, identified the site of Pātaliputra with Bhagulpoor. He thus summed up his discussion :  
 William Francklin, Buchanan Hamilton and others. " If the evidence afforded by the hills which appear in the neighbourhood of the town and through a very great extent of what formerly constituted the Prasian kingdom, prior to the expedition of Alexander the Great ; if these and other connecting circumstances, as well local and historical as traditional, be conceded, it will, I think, be also conceded to me, that they apply, in every instance throughout the discussion, as more naturally indicative of the town of Bhagulpoor possessing the site of Pālibothra and the metropolis of the Prasii, than either Rajmahal, Patna, Kanouj or Allahabad." <sup>4</sup>

In 1808, Dr. Buchanan Hamilton collected information from the priest near Patna which seemed to confirm Rennell's identification. This information was, that the oral tradition of the priests said, that the ancient name of the place was Pātaliputra.

After this time, there came to light the two itineraries of the Chinese travellers who were Buddhist monks, Fa Hien and Huien Tsiang.

<sup>1</sup> " Thomas Penant's Outlines of the Globe," Vol. II. The View of Hindoostan, Vol. II. Eastern Hindustan (1798), p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> Asiatic Researches (1798), Vol. V, p. 269.

<sup>3</sup> Asiatic Researches (1822), Vol. XIV, p. 380.

<sup>4</sup> " Inquiry concerning the site of ancient Pālibothra," by William Francklin (1817), part II, Preface p. III.

Their accounts of PĀtaliputra have been referred to above. The details of their accounts about PĀtaliputra, which they had visited as ancient seats of Buddhist learning, confirmed Rennell and Buchanan Hamilton's views that Patna was the site of the ancient PĀtaliputra. Though the topography of the place has been much changed, most of the geographical particulars of the Chinese travellers confirmed the above view and it was taken that the river Son<sup>1</sup> formerly joined the river Ganges at this place. The old bed of the river is still known as Mar-Son, *i.e.*, the dead Son.

## VI.

(C) AN ACCOUNT OF THE IDENTIFICATION AND EXCAVATIONS OF  
THE RUINS OF THE BUILDINGS, REFERRED TO BY THE  
CHINESE TRAVELLERS.

The site of the old city of PĀtaliputra being settled as that at Patna, the next question was that of identifying the old Mauryan buildings referred to by old writers and by the old Chinese travellers, Fa-Hien and Hiuen-Tsiang. Col. Waddell gives an interesting brief narrative of these identifications.<sup>2</sup>

(a) In about 1845, Mr. Ravershaw declared that the mounds near Patna, known as Panch Pahari (lit. five mountains or hills) were the ruins of the bastions of the city of Pataliputra. The general opinion of the officers of the Archæological Department at that time, was, that, though old PĀtaliputra stood close to modern Patna, the traces of the old city did not exist at all, being carried away by river Ganges.

(b) In 1876, whilst digging a tank in a part of Patna, "the remains of a long wall" and "a line of palisades" of timber were first discovered. Mr. McCrindle notes this discovery in his *Ancient India*<sup>3</sup> (1877).

(c) In 1878, General Cunningham, who has left his mark in the annals of the Archæological Department of India, differing from the general view of his department, affirmed, that most of the remains of the old city did still exist at Panch Pahari and Chhoti. He assigned the ground between these two places as the site for Asoka's old palaces, monuments and monasteries. The above-said general view continued to exist in spite of Cunningham's opinion. (d) But Col. Waddell, as the result of a hurried visit in 1892, with the aid of the accounts of the above-mentioned two Chinese pilgrims, confirmed Cunningham's view, that most of the remains of PĀtaliputra remained and were not washed

<sup>1</sup> The *Erranoboas* of the Greeks. *Hira myabaha* or the *Golden-Armed*, the ancient name of Son, seems to have given to the Greeks the name *Erranoboas*.

<sup>2</sup> Report on the Excavations at PĀtaliputra.

<sup>3</sup> *Ancient India*, as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, by J. W. McCrindle (1877).

away by the river Ganges. He not only confirmed Cunningham's view, but also identified the sites and land-marks of some of the buildings of the old city,<sup>1</sup> such as Prince Mahendra's Hermitage Hil, the Raja's Palace, Asoka's Palace, etc. He made two visits in 1892. His further excavations in subsequent years further identified many ancient buildings<sup>2</sup>. Mr. P. C. Mukerjee also had made some preliminary investigations.

## VII.

### THE STORY OF DR. SPOONER'S EXCAVATIONS.

The story of the excavated building, as described by Dr. Spooner in his accounts of the Excavations<sup>3</sup> is briefly as follows :—

Dr. Spooner's excavations have been made at a place known as Kumrahar at Patna, where, about 24 years ago, Col. Waddell<sup>4</sup> had carried on some operations and had found some fragments of an Asokan column. He had then identified the spot, as that of one of the two Asokan pillars, referred to by Hiuen-Tsiang<sup>5</sup> as the Nili<sup>6</sup> Column. His discovery led the Government to think of further excavations at Pātaliputra. The costliness of the work caused some hesitation which was removed by Mr. Ruttan Tata's generous offer of an annual gift of Rs. 20,000 to the Government of India on certain conditions. It was resolved to spend this sum at Pātaliputra, and Dr. Spooner was entrusted with the work there. Col. Waddell, in his preliminary survey of the site, had, in a field near the village of Kumrahar on the south of Patna, found some fragments of polished stone with curved surfaces, which he thought were those of Mauryan pillars of Asoka. The reference, in the statements of the abovementioned two Chinese travellers, to two inscribed pillars of Asoka at Pātaliputra, had led Col. Waddell to this identification.

<sup>1</sup> Discovery of the exact site of Asoka's Classic Capital of Pātaliputra by L. A. Waddell, (1892).

<sup>2</sup> Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra (Patna), (1903).

<sup>3</sup> Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, for 1912-13, 1913-14 and 1914-15.

<sup>4</sup> "Discovery of the exact site of Asoka's classic Capital of Pātaliputra, the Palibothra of the Greeks, and description of the superficial remains" by L. A. Waddell (1892), p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> "To the north of the old palace of the King is a stone pillar, several tons of feet high; this is the place where Asoka (Wu-yau) Rāja made 'a hell'.....The Saṅghārāmas, Deva temples, and *stupas* which lie in ruins may be counted by hundreds. There are only two or three remaining (entire)" (Buddhist Records of the Western World, by Beal, Vol. II, pp. 85-86).

<sup>6</sup> *Vide* Ibid, Vol. I, Introduction, p. LVIII.



Dr. Spooner began his excavation on 6th January 1913, and soon found, that the polished fragments did not belong to any inscribed edict-pillar of Asoka, but to a Mauryan building. He then located the columns of such a building which was a large pillared-hall, the massive imperishable portions of which had disappeared by sinkage, due to the softness of the underground, the result of sub-soil water rising higher in later times. The perishable wooden portions, *vis.*, the roof, the floor, etc., were destroyed by fire as evidenced by layers of ash, found there. This ash was specially noticeable in the vertical spaces of the columns that had sunk. The tangible evidences of the existence of a pillared-hall, as seen at present, are few, but it is on what are called stratigraphical evidences that Dr. Spooner has based his inquiry. For example, he found that (1) heaps of pillar fragments lie in rows at regular intervals across the site, (2) that underneath these heaps of stone, descending holes occur, filled from above, and (3) that these holes are always round and of fixed diameter, and regularly spaced. From these and similar evidences he traces the existence of a pillared-hall on the site. As Dr. Spooner says, "the actual structure of the Mauryan hall has almost, if not entirely, disappeared. The excavation is thus thrown back upon the minutest possible scrutiny of the soil itself and those portions of debris which remain, for a determination of both the nature and position of the Hall and the process of its decay."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Spooner, at first, located eight rows of monolithic polished pillars. Subsequently, he found a ninth row and hopes to find a 10th row as well. Each row has 10 pillars. As said above, all the pillars have disappeared by sinkage and their existence and position are determined only by the above said stratigraphical evidences. But, fortunately, one of the pillars has escaped sinkage. It has been recovered and supplies data, (a) not only for measurements for the rest, but (b) also for the nature and design of the lost palace. Thus, from the tangible evidence found on the site and from the tangible evidence of the one pillar that has been recovered and from the stratigraphical evidence, what is seen and determined is as follows: It seems, that at some time about the third century B. C., one of the early kings of the Mauryan dynasty built at Kumrahar several buildings within his palace enclosure. One of such buildings was this hundred-columned hall. The stone columns "presumably square" were arranged in square bays<sup>2</sup> over the entire area. They were 3 ft. 6 in. in diameter at base and about 20 ft. in height, placed each at the distance of 15 ft. or 10 Mauryan cubits from the other in rows

<sup>1</sup> Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, for 1913-14, pp. 45-46

<sup>2</sup> *i.e.*, principal compartments or divisions marked by some leading architectural features, such as buttresses or pilasters on the walls, the main arches or pillars, &c.

which also were 15 ft. apart. The building, as shown by the ground plan, that was determined by the excavations, was one unlike any other ancient building in India. The superstructure was of sal wood. The building was in use for several centuries. At some time, in one of the early centuries after Christ, the building met with some mishap. One of the many columns seems to have fallen. Even after the mishap, the building was used, though restrictedly. Latterly, the building seems to have been destroyed by fire at some time about the 5th century A. D. The lower portions of the columns were somehow saved from the fire. Subsequently, attempts seem to have been made for some further use of the floor, and for that use, the stumps or the unburnt portions of some of the columns seem to have been forcibly broken by the new occupants. These broken portions were further broken into smaller fragments for pavement and for other building purposes by the new builders. Thus, the site was built over in Gupta times, at some time in the 8th century after Christ.<sup>1</sup> But, as with the advance of time and with the upward advance of the sub-soil water, some of the stumps of the columns, which were saved, sank below, the walls of the Gupta buildings built over the site gave way, and the site again became desolate. Since the fall of the Gupta houses, which, in many cases, must have been sudden, and which must have looked mysterious, the site has not been much built upon.

Such a building was unparalleled in ancient India. If so, the natural conclusion is, that it must have been modelled on some building of a foreign country. What was that foreign country and which was that building ?

Now, it has long since been known, (*a*) that Asoka's edicts were on the model of the edicts of the Achæmenian Darius of Persia (*b*) and that the style of the sculptured capitals<sup>2</sup> of his buildings was modelled on that of Darius' capitals at Persepolis. (*c*) Again, it has been, since some time, inferred, and that especially by Sir John Marshall from the Sarnath<sup>3</sup> capital, that the stonework of the Mauryan buildings was worked by foreign masons. That being the knowledge and experience of Indian archæologists, from the facts, (*a*) that the plan of the excavated building was altogether un-Indian or foreign and (*b*) that its "columns showed the peculiar Persian polish," Dr. Spooner thought, that, (*c*) in its design also it must have been influenced by Persia.

<sup>1</sup> Annual Report of the Archæological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, for 1913-14, p. 49. At first, Dr. Spooner (Report of 1912-13) thought, that this happened in the 5th or 6th century, but, after subsequent re-consideration in consultation with Sir John Marshall, he has modified his first view.

<sup>2</sup> From caput the head. The heads or the uppermost parts of columns, pilasters, &c.

<sup>3</sup> In the N. W. Provinces, Benares district.

Among the obligations, which Dr. Spooner so gracefully acknowledges in his Reports and papers, one that draws our special notice is that to his wife. It shows, how an educated wife, who participates in the noble aspirations of her husband's life work and studies, can, besides being helpful to her husband individually, be also helpful to the public generally. Her husband's plan of the Mauryan building, which he excavated, reminded Mrs. Spooner of what she had seen in the plan of Persepolis. Her suggestion easily led Dr. Spooner to a comparison of the plan of his building with "the so-called hall of hundred columns at Persepolis, the throne-room of Darius Hystaspes." He soon noticed several similarities, of which the following are the principal ones :—

1. There was a square hall with 10 rows of 10 columns evenly spaced in square bays (*i.e.*, with equal spaces between).
2. The Orientation or the process or aspect of fronting to the east and determining the various points of the compass was similar.
3. The mason's mark on the one column that has been recovered is similar to the mason's mark on Persepolitan columns.
4. The distance between the columns was regular. Darius's columns were 10 Persian cubits apart. The Mauryan columns are 10 Indian cubits apart.
5. The intercolumniation, *i.e.*, the space between two columns in the Indian building, though not identical, was one essentially Persepolitan.
6. Though no capitals or pedestals have been recovered at Patna for comparison, the stratification suggests (perhaps bell-shaped) pedestals of Persepolitan type, round in plan and about 3 ft. high.

These and other evidences of similarity suggested to Dr. Spooner for his operations, a working hypothesis, *viz.*, that the Pātaliputra building had a Persepolitan building for its model.

7. The next thought, that suggested itself to Dr. Spooner was, that, if the Indian building was on the Persepolitan plan, it must not be isolated but must have other buildings near it, just as the Persepolitan palace of Darius had. Speaking in the known Roman style of *veni, vidi, vici*, we may say, he conceived, he measured and he conquered. With the plan of the Persepolitan palace, given by Lord Curzon in his monumental work on Persia,<sup>1</sup> in his hand, he measured, he dug and

---

<sup>1</sup> Persia and the Persian Question, Vol. II, p. 150, plan of Persepolis.

he soon found that the Indian palace or Sabha had some buildings equally distant from the main building as in the case of the pillared palace of Darius. He determined this fact from (a) the discovery of several mounds which were in positions equally distant from the site of the pillared hall, as were the other buildings of Darius from his Persepolitan Hall. (b) Again, these buildings stood on a raised area corresponding to the artificial terrace at Persepolis. (c) The whole plateau seemed to have been surrounded at one time, by a moat. These and other matters showed, that this Indian palace and the surrounding group of buildings had several essentials that were common to the Persepolitan palace and its surrounding group.

On the strength of some of these and other similarities, Dr. Spooner thought : " Enough was clear, however, to show us that not only was our original pillared hall strongly reminiscent of the Persian throne room, even in matters of detail, but that its surroundings also showed a parallelism to the Achæmenian site which could not possibly be explained except by the assumption that the one reflected the other definitely."<sup>1</sup>

8. Dr. Spooner says, that stone not being easily procurable in this part of the country, wood was used. Arian, as said above, assigns another reason for the use of wood. But according to Fergusson, wooden architecture was the characteristic of Persia. He says : " We know that wooden architecture was the characteristic of Media, where all the constructive parts were formed in this perishable material ; and from the Bible we learn that Solomon's edifices were chiefly so constructed. Persepolis presents us with the earliest instance remaining in Asia of this wooden architecture being petrified, as it were apparently in consequence of the intercourse its builders maintained with Egypt and with Greece. In Burma, these wooden types still exist in more completeness than, perhaps, in any other country. Even if the student is not prepared to admit the direct ethnographic connection between the buildings of Burma and Babylon, he will at any rate best learn in this country (Burma) to appreciate much in ancient architecture, which, without such a living illustration, it is hard to understand. Solomon's house of the forest of Lebanon is, without mere difference of detail, reproduced at Ava or Amarapura ; and the palaces of Persepolis are reduced infinitely more intelligible by the study of these edifices "<sup>2</sup> It appears from this, that the builder of

<sup>1</sup> Journal Royal Asiatic Society, January 1915, p. 69. The discovery of the line of rampart was made subsequent to the date of the article. *Vide* the Annual Report of 1914-15.

<sup>2</sup> A History of Indian and Eastern Architecture by the late James Fergusson, revised and edited by James Burgess and R. Phené Spiers (1910), Vol. II, pp. 369-70.

the Mauryan palace, in using wood for a greater part of the work, did not depart from the practice of the Achæmenians.

Such is the interesting story of the excavations of Dr. Spooner ; and we, laymen, read the story with wonder and amazement,—wonder and amazement, not only for all the events in the history of the building and its surroundings, but also for the daring flights of thought with which the comparatively modern science of archæology advances at present. The attempts of some of the archæologists at tracing the history and meaning of some buildings are, if not equal, at least akin, to the wonderful attempts of deciphering the cuneiform inscriptions by men like Rawlinson.

The meaning of this “Mauryan replica of Persepolis” was this :  
 The influence of Iran upon India was much more than it is ordinarily supposed. This newly recovered building presented the monumental evidence of this influence in a much more stronger light than hitherto presented. Several known archæologists had, ere this, seen monumental evidence, in various matters, such as the capitals, pilasters and what is called *motifs*. But, compared to what Dr. Spooner now presents before us, these are small matters. The evidence produced by Dr. Spooner's excavations is on a grand or monumental scale. In addition to these, Dr. Spooner produces literary, numismatic, and other evidences to show, that there was the probability, well-nigh amounting to certainty, of a very powerful influence of Irân upon India.

## VIII.

### THE GENERAL QUESTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF ANCIENT IRÂN UPON SURROUNDING COUNTRIES.

Scholars often discuss the question, as to how far, in ancient times, the West was influenced by the East, and the East, influenced by the West. The “East and West” are comparative terms. Greece and Rome formed the West, in comparison with Persia and India. In the case of these two latter countries, Persia formed the West and India the East. So, questions like these also have often arisen : “How far India was influenced by Greece and how far by Persia ? How far these two were influenced by India ? How far Persia was hellenized and how far Greece was iranized ? How far India and Persia jointly or singly influenced Greece and Rome, and through them the western countries ?” Scholars differ to some extent in these various

questions. The special question for us to-day is that of the influence of ancient Persia upon India. In order to better understand this particular question, we will first examine the general question of the influence of ancient Persia upon the countries with which it came into contact.

Ancient Persia had a great influence upon the countries with which it came into contact. It had its influence on Greece, Rome, Egypt, India and other adjoining countries. Among other influences, one was that of their religion, and, in this matter, they are spoken of as "The Puritans of the Old World."<sup>1</sup>

I have spoken at greater length on this subject in my paper "Zoroastrianism. Its Puritanic Influence on the Old World."<sup>2</sup>

Herodotus, while speaking of the Persians, says: "They have no images of the Gods, no temples nor altars and they consider the use of these a sign of folly. This comes, I think, from their not believing the Gods to have the same nature with men, as the Greeks imagine."<sup>3</sup> In this passage, Herodotus seems to point to the superiority of the ancient Persians over his Greeks, in this, that, while the Greeks imagined their gods to be like men, the Persians did not believe so, and that, while the Greeks had images of their numerous man-like gods, the Persians had none. Here, we see, as it were, a germ of the appreciation of the Puritanic influence of the ancient Persians.

On the possible influence of the purer faith of Persia upon Greece, had Persia won in its war with Greece, the late Prof. Max Muller said as follows: "There were periods in the history of the world, when the worship of Ormuzd threatened to rise triumphant on the ruins of the temples of all other Gods. If the battles of Marathon and Salamis had been lost, and Greece had succumbed to Persia, the State religion of the empire of Cyrus, which was the worship of Ormuzd, might have become the religion of the whole civilized world. Persia had absorbed the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires; the Jews were either in Persian captivity or under Persian sway at home; the sacred monuments of Egypt had been mutilated by the hands of Persian soldiers. The edicts of the great King—the king of kings was sent to India, to Greece, to Scythia

<sup>1</sup> "Alexandria and her School" by Rev. Charles Kingsley, (1854), p 11. *Vide* for a similar view, "A Narrative of the operations of Capt. Little's Detachment" by Lieut. E. Moor (1794), p. 384.

<sup>2</sup> This paper was read before the first Convention of Religions, held in Calcutta in 1910. *Vide* my "Dante papers" pp. 92-122.

<sup>3</sup> Bk. I, 131. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. I, p. 269.

and to Egypt ; and if ' by the Grace of Ahura Mazda ', Darius had crushed the liberty of Greece, the purer faith of Zoroaster might easily have superseded the Olympian fables".<sup>1</sup>

Iran's puritanic influence on Greece, and through Greece on other Westerners, though checked by the defeat of Persia, from spreading itself on a grand scale, had its limited effect. It seems to have continued even after the downfall of the Achæmenians under Alexander the Great. Persia had two great libraries, (1) the Daz-i-Napisht (*i.e.*, the Castle of Archives) at Persepolis, and (2) the Ganj-i-Shapigān or Shaspigān (*i.e.*, the treasury of Shapigān) somewhere near Samarkand. The first was destroyed in the fire set to one of the royal palaces by Alexander. Many of the books of the latter were, according to the tradition recorded in Parsee books, translated into Greek.<sup>2</sup> These translations may have exerted some puritanic influence upon the Greek mind and prepared the way for Christianity.

Before the time of Cyrus, it were the Semitic people who ruled the East. Cyrus made the rule Iranian or Aryan. Mr. G. B. Grundy, while speaking of the importance of the Median Kingdom of Persia, thus refers to the change of rule in the East: "Its chief importance in history is, that its kings are the first of that series of Iranian dynasties which, whether Median, Persian or Parthian, were paramount in the eastern world for many centuries. From this time forward, the Iranian took the place of the Semitic as the Suzerain of the East".<sup>3</sup> It was King Cyrus, the founder of the Achæmenian dynasty, who, as it were, paved the way for the subsequent greater influence of Persia over India. His policy, to a certain extent, aimed at gathering together in unity most of the Aryan races against the Semitic races. Mr. Grundy thus refers to this policy: "His (Cyrus's) campaign in the East was a prolonged one. He seems to have extended the borders of his empire to the Thian-shan and Suleiman ranges, if not into the plains of India itself. His aim can hardly have been the mere acquisition of these enormous areas of comparatively unproductive territory. The reason lying beyond his policy was, in all probability, the fact that the races of this region were near akin to his own, and that he wished

<sup>1</sup> "Chips from a German workshop," and Ed. (1880), Vol. I, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* my Paper on the Cities of Iran, as described in the old Pahlavi treatise of Shatroiha-i-Airan (Journal B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XX, pp. 161-62). *Vide* my Asiatic Papers, Part I, pp. 153-154.

<sup>3</sup> "The Great Persian War and its Preliminaries." A study of the Evidence, literary and topographical by G. B. Grundy (1901), pp. 15-16.

to advance against the Semitic peoples at the head of a forced coalition of the Iranian races".<sup>1</sup>

On the subject of the influence of Persia under Cyrus and his successors upon Greece, Mr. Grundy says as follows: "The hardy races from the mountains of Iran had many natural customs which were in strong contrast to the typical civilization of the Euphrates plain. Though far from ideal, there were certain grand elements in it, which struck the imagination of some of the finer minds of Greece, and which, through them, must have influenced Greek life, though in ways which it is not possible now to trace. Had the Greek come much under its influence, that influence, though it would have been disastrous in many respects, would not have tended wholly for evil. The civilization was, indeed essentially of an eastern type..... The Medo-Persian was a strange product for an Asiatic soil. He was an Asian apart. His religious belief was alone educated to make him remarkable among his contemporaries. The Asiatic of this time had a natural tendency towards polytheism. The monotheism of even the Israelites was spasmodic. But with the Persian, monotheism was the set religion of the race. It had a legendary origin in the teachings of Zarathushtra, or Zoroaster, as he appears in Western History. Ahura Mazda was the one God. There were, indeed, other objects of worship,—the stars, the sun, the moon, and fire, beautiful and incomprehensible works of Ahura Mazda; but he was God alone. Other spiritual beings there were, too, represented as deified virtues and blessings—Good Thought, Perfect Holiness, Good Government, Meek Piety, Health, and Immortality; and these stood nearest to Ahura Mazda's throne."

Dr. Cushman on the Influence of Iran upon Greece. Dr. H. E. Cushman divides the time of Greek philosophy into three periods:<sup>2</sup> 1. The Cosmological Period 625—480 B. C. 2. The Anthropological Period 480—399 B. C. 3. The Systematic Period 399—322 B. C. Of these, it is the second, *viz.*, the Anthropological period, that is very important. As Dr. Cushman says: "It starts with a great social impulse just after the victories of the Persian wars (480 B. C.).....The period is called Anthropological, because, its interest is in the study of man and not of the physical universe"<sup>3</sup>

After the battle of Marathon, there sprang up a distinct impulse towards knowledge all over Greece. What makes the Persian wars particularly important is that they are the starting point in the mother-

<sup>1</sup> "The Great Persian War and its Preliminaries," by G. B. Grundy, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 37-34.

<sup>3</sup> A *Beginner's History of Philosophy*, by Dr. Cushman, Vol. I, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* p. 13.



land of the movement in the study of man and human relations. Dr. Cushman, while giving an account of the ancient philosophy of the early Greek, thus speaks of the hold the Persians had upon Greece in the Achæmenian times. "The sixth century was a momentous one for Greece. In both, the East and the West, there arose mighty empires, that threatened to wipe out its civilization. The expansion of the Persian power (on the one hand) had suspended a stone of Tantalus over Hellas, and it seemed likely that Greek civilization might be submerged in an Oriental Monarchy."<sup>1</sup> Cyrus had laid the foundation of Persia by taking Media in 550 B. C., Lydia in 546 B. C., Babylonia in 538 B. C. Egypt was added by Cambyses in 528 B. C., and Darius organized the Great Persian possessions in his long reign from 528 to 486 B. C. On the west, Carthage was threatening the Greek cities of Sicily, and, at the close of this period, was acting in conjunction with Persia to obtain possession of the Mediterranean.<sup>2</sup>

Count Gobineau, the celebrated French writer on the History of Persia, seems to regret that Greece triumphed over Persia at the battle of Marathon, and says, that Persia under the Achæmenian Darius gave to the Greeks much that was good. He says<sup>3</sup> :

Count Gobineau on the Influence of ancient Persia over Greece.

"Darius made great things. He instituted a powerful organization. The West had never seen anything like that..... That, which it had only in the Augustan century, is an intellectual development of a value analogous to that which determined the formation of Mazdeism and animated the philosophy and the arts of antiquity. All that which the Greeks learnt, all the serious things which Plato taught, all that which the archaic schools produced of masterpieces, had, at the time of Darius, its home and its prototype in Western Asia. But that which the Romans did not know and never practised, not even in the most celebrated reign of Antony, was the systematic kindness shown in governing the people, which became the rule since (the time of) Cyrus, and to which Darius showed himself faithful (*i.e.*, which he followed faithfully). Not only were the subjects treated with particular care, but (even) the rebels found extended to them an indulgence which circumstances permitted."

In the war with Alexander, though Persia was conquered, it was not hellenized, but, on the contrary, it iranized Greece. It continued its influence on Greece, which it had begun in its previous wars with that

Darmesteter on the influence of Persia over Greece.

<sup>1</sup> "A Beginner's History of Philosophy, by Dr. H. E. Cushman, Vol. I, pp. 15-16.

<sup>2</sup> Bury, History of Greece, p. 311.

<sup>3</sup> I Translate from his "Histoire des Perses" Vol., II, p. 143.

country. Professor Darmesteter<sup>1</sup> considers the victory of Greece over Persia, not only the victory of Greece, but the victory of humanity. But still, he admits, that though Greece conquered, her victory was only material, not intellectual or spiritual. He says : " In the war of revenge Greece did not win sufficiently. Her victory over Persia has been only a material victory, out of which she herself has suffered more than her victim. Alexander dreamed of uniting the West and the East. He succeeded only half ; he Persianised Greece ; and he did not hellenise Persia." <sup>2</sup>

Similarly, in Egypt, Persia had prepared the soil for Ptolemy the First's " New Deity." The object of this Egyptian monarch, known as Ptolemy Soter, *i.e.*, Ptolemy the Saviour, was to supplant the old Egyptian deities and to create " a new deity," by means of which he could consolidate his new rule in the country. He tried to do in Egypt, what Akbar tried to do, several centuries later, in India. He succeeded where Akbar failed. In his attempt, Akbar tried to assimilate directly in his new religion some of the elements of the Zoroastrian faith. Ptolemy did not do anything of the kind, but rested on the silent work of the Iranian Mazdayasnans, who had preceded him as rulers in Egypt. Rev. Charles Kingsley thus speaks of his work : " He effected with complete success a feat which has been attempted, before and since, by very many princes and potentates, but has always except in Ptolemy's case, proved somewhat of a failure, namely, the making a new deity. Mythology in general was in a rusty state. The old Egyptian Gods had grown in his dominions very unfashionable, under the summary iconoclasm to which they had been subjected by the Monotheist Persians,—the Puritans of the old world, as they have been well called." <sup>3</sup>

Though Greece, and, through it, Europe escaped from the direct influence of what Max Muller calls " the purer faith of Zoroaster," both had some indirect influence exerted upon them through the Greek colonies in the East, with which the ancient Iranians came into more frequent contact. It was this influence, however indirect or small, that paved the way for Christianity. Christianity was a puritanic improvement upon the religion of the Greeks and Romans, and the early Iranians had a hand in that improvement, inasmuch as it prepared the soil for Christianity. Later

Iran's religion prepared the way for Christianity in Europe.

<sup>1</sup> Coup de œil sur L'Histoire de la Perse, par Darmesteter (1885), p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> " Il a persisé la Grece, il n'a pas hellénisé la Perse " *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Alexandria and her Schools, by Rev. Charles Kingsley (1854). pp. 10-11.

on, Persian Mithraism, though a rival of Christianity, further prepared the soil. As said by Dr. Adeny, Mithraism brought about what he calls "the awakening" and "religious revival" which made the way of Christianity a little easier.<sup>1</sup> This Mithraic influence was exerted even up to the shores of England. The late M. Renan said: "If the world had not become Christian, it would have become Mithraistic."<sup>2</sup>

## IX.

## THE SPECIAL QUESTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF IRĀN UPON INDIA.

The above short survey of the Influence of Irān upon Greece and Egypt, prepares us for the consideration of the present question of the Influence of Irān upon India. If, as said by Darmesteter, Irān, though conquered by Alexander, was in a position to iranize Greece instead of being hellenized, it is much more likely, that it should iranize, to some extent, a country like India that was conquered by it, and that was more nearly akin to it.

Many writers have referred to the influence of Irān upon India. Dr. Smith, who is one of the best authorities on the History of Ancient India, is of opinion, that the Achæmenian Persians had a great influence upon Mauryan India.<sup>3</sup> The Sassanians had also exerted great influence,<sup>4</sup> but we have not to deal with that later influence in the present case. Dr. Smith thus speaks of the Achæmenian influence in the times of Chandragupta and his immediate successors:

"The Maurya Empire was not, as some recent writers fancy that it was, in any way the result of Alexander's splendid, but transitory raid. The nineteen months which he spent in India were consumed in devastating warfare, and his death rendered fruitless all his grand constructive plans. Chandragupta did not need Alexander's example to teach him what empire meant. He and his countrymen had had before their eyes for ages the stately fabric of the Persian monarchy, and it was that empire which impressed their imagination, and served as the model for their institutions, in so far as they were not indigenous. The little touches of foreign manners in the court and institutions of Chandragupta, which chance to have been noted by our fragmentary authorities, are

---

<sup>1</sup> "Greek and Eastern Churches by" Dr. Adeny, pp. 10-11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> "The Early History of India from 600 B. C. to the Muhammadan Conquest including the Invasion of Alexander the Great" by Vincent Smith, 2nd edition (1908), pp. 136-37, 153, 285. *Vide* also his article entitled "Persian Influence on Mauryan India" in the *Indian Antiquary* (1905), p. 201.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 253-255.

Persian, not Greek ; and the Persian title of satrap continued to be used by Indian provincial governors for ages, down to the close of the fourth century A.D. The military organization of Chandragupta shows no trace of Hellenic influence".<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Smith has pointed out several evidences to show, that Achæmenian Iran had a strong influence on Mauryan India. Some of these are the following :—

1. Influence of Iranian architecture on Indian architecture.
2. The Achæmenian practice of inscribing on pillars and rocks and the style of the inscriptions, which were followed by Asoka in his inscriptions.
3. The Kharoshthi script came to India from the Aramaic clerks of the Achæmenians.
4. Some of the features of the Mauryan administration and polity were taken from the Achæmenians.
5. Some of the Mauryan court customs were taken from the Achæmenian Iranians.

It has been long since known, that the Mauryan architecture was, to a certain extent, influenced by Iranian architecture. This is seen in several ways. (a) The style of some of the sculptured capitals of Asoka had its origin in the capitals of the Persepolitan palace of Darius. (b) The style of the huge monolithic sand-stone and other pillars of Asoka is also Persian. (c) The bas-relief sculpture of some of the Mauryan buildings, resembles that of the Persepolitan Persians.

Fergusson specially points to the capitals in the caves at Bedsa, about 10 or 11 miles south of Karlé, near Lonavla, and says : " Their capitals' are more like the Persepolitan type than almost any others in India, and are each surmounted by horses and elephants, bearing men and women."<sup>2</sup> The Hindu artists, from their natural aptitude for modifying and adapting forms, very soon replaced the bicephalus (*i.e.*, two headed) bull and ram of Persian columns by a great variety of animals, sphinxes and even human figures in the most grotesque attitude."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* Fergusson's History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, revised and edited by James Burgess and P. Spiers (1910), Vol. I, p. 139. Woodcut No. 64.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 138, n. 2.

According to Fergusson, the other caves or places, where capitals of the Persepolitan type are seen, are the following :—

1. At Bhaja, about 4 miles south of the Karlé cave, near Lanovla.
2. At Jamalgarhi, about 36 miles, north-east of Peshawar, where side by side with columns having classical capitals and bases, there are forms of Perso-Indian pillars.<sup>1</sup> Here “ the capitals of the old Perso-Indian type have new forms given to them—the animal figures being changed, whilst the pillars themselves are placed on the backs of crouching figures with wings.”<sup>2</sup>
3. The Tâtvâ-gumphâ caves near the Khandgiri hill in Orissa, where, “ the doors are flanked by pillasters with capitals of the Persepolitan type.”<sup>3</sup>

Mr. J. Kennedy, in his interesting article on “ The Early Commerce of Babylon with India, 700—300 B. C.,” thus speaks on the subject of the style of the monolyths and bas-relief : “ If the elementary conceptions of the art and architecture (of India) was purely indigenous, there was abundant scope for the borrowing of detail ; and as a matter of fact, most of the details were borrowed from Persia. The pillar, indeed, was the only lithic form Persia had to “ lend.” It survives at Bharhut and in Asoka’s monolyths, and it re-appears in the case of Western India. . . . The borrowings in sculpture are much more numerous. The lotus and honeysuckle, the crenellations and mouldings, the conventional methods of representing water and rocks, are all taken from Persia. . . . But the debt of India to Perso-Assyrian art is most strikingly apparent from two general observations.

“ *First.*—The sculpture of India proper—the India of the Gangetic valley—is mainly bas-relief. . . . The Indians apply their bas-reliefs after the Persian fashion. Their sculpture is lavished chiefly on the doors and vestibules, and the most important single figures guard the entrance of the gateways in India, as in Persia ; the sculptured users of the Jamalgarhi monastery recall, the inclined ascents to the palaces of Darius and Xerxes. Even the inscribed basreliefs of Bharhut—unique alas ! in Indian art—have their counterparts at Persepolis and Nineveh.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* Vol. I, p. 178, Woodcut No. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 215.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Vol. II, pp. 17-18.

“*Second.*—The decoration of the late Vihāra caves. . . . was Persian, and that not so much after the fashion of the Sassanians as of the Achæmanids.”<sup>1</sup>

Asoka followed Darius in various ways in the matter of his edicts. (a) It was the practice of Darius to erect stelæ or pillars in the different countries which he conquered or through which he passed. For example, we learn from Herodotus, that in his march against the Scythians, he “surveyed the Bosphorus, and erected upon its shores two pillars of white marble, whereupon he inscribed the names of all the nations which formed his army.” Again, we know of Egypt, that while digging the modern Suez Canal, some stelæ or pillars of Darius have been discovered near the canal, the inscription on one of which has been pretty well deciphered.<sup>2</sup> Asoka in his pillar edicts has followed this practice of Darius.

(b) Darius also inscribed on the sides of mountains. The best known instance is that on the rock of the Behistun mountain. Asoka also has some of his inscriptions on rocks; for example, the one at Junagadh, at the foot of the well-known hill of Girnār.<sup>3</sup>

(c) Among the several points of similarity suggested between the form of the inscriptions of Darius and the form of those of Asoka, there is one which strikes us most. It is that of the introductory sentences. Darius commences every part of his edict with the words “Thatiy Darayavaush Khshâyathiya, *i.e.*, “Thus sayeth Darius the King.”<sup>4</sup> Compare with these, the words of Asoka, introducing the different parts of his edict: “Thus saith His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King.”<sup>5</sup>

(d) Again, as pointed out by Dr. Smith, “the idea of inscribing ethical dissertations on the rocks in the guise of royal proclamation seems to be of Persian origin. In the matter of the second mutilated inscription of Darius at Naksh-i-Rustam, Sir Henry Rawlinson thought that it contained “The last solemn admonition of Darius to his countrymen with respect to their future conduct in polity, morals and

<sup>1</sup> Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1898, pp. 283-86.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, Book, IV, 87. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. III, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* “Le Stele de Chalouf” by M. Menant. *Vide my Paper on “The Ancient History of the Suez Canal”*, read before the B. B. R. A. Society on 15th April 1915, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, pp. 163-184.

<sup>4</sup> I had the pleasure of seeing this rock inscription on 27th October 1909.

<sup>5</sup> “The sculptures and inscriptions of Darius the Great on the Rock of Behistun in Persia,” by the Trustees of the British Museum (1907), p. 1, *et seq.*

<sup>6</sup> The Edicts of Asoka, by Dr. Vincent Smith, p. 3, *et seq.*

religion." The language of the inscription on the "stèle de Chalouf" on the Suez Canal is altogether religious. It is in the line and spirit of the prayer of Grace to be recited at meals, as given in the 37th Chapter of the Yaçna.<sup>1</sup>

The Kharoshti script of writing was introduced in India by the Achæmenian kings through their Armaic clerks.<sup>2</sup> The Kharoshti writing seen on the coins of the Western Khshapas (satraps) of Saurâshtra (Kathiawad) point to the northern origin of the kings.<sup>3</sup>

Some of the features of Mauryan administration and of the society of the times, as described by Megasthenes, are Persian in their character. Dr. Vincent Smith thus speaks on the subject: "The civil and military institutions of the Mauryan Empire as described by Asoka in his edicts and by the Greek writers were essentially Indian, modified in some particulars by imitation of Persian practices."<sup>4</sup> Dr. Smith adds: "The Mauryan sovereigns and their subjects were open in many ways to the influence of Iranian polity and civilization."

Kautilya's Artha-Shastra<sup>5</sup> which was written by Chandragupta's Minister Chanakya, spoken of by Professor Jacobi as the Indian Bismark,<sup>6</sup> shows that Megasthenes had, for the source of his account of the court of Chandragupta, not only his own experience in the Indian Court, but also an Indian work like the Artha-Shastra. This book shows us that the Hindu nation of the time had, not only some dreaming spiritualists among them, but also some practical economists.<sup>7</sup>

Dr. Vincent Smith<sup>8</sup> points to two court customs of the Mauryas, as having been taken from the Achæmenian Kings. One of these is the custom of observing birthdays by the kings. Herodotus, while speaking of the Persians, says: "She (Amêstris, the wife of King Xerxes) waited, therefore, till her husband gave the great Royal banquet, a feast which takes place once every year, in celebration of the King's birthday. 'Tykta', the feast is called in Persian tongue,

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* my Paper on the Ancient History of the Suez Canal read on 15th April 1915. J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XXIV, No. 2, pp. 163-84.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* the Mysore inscription, by Mr. Rice, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* The catalogue of Indian Coins, by Professor Rapson, Introduction, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Asoka Notes, by Vincent A. Smith, in the Indian Antiquary of September, 1905, Vol. XXXIV, p. 200.

<sup>5</sup> *Vide* Law's Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity. *Vide* also the recently published book: "Public Administration in Ancient India," by Pramathanath Banerjea.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, Introduction, p. XX.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, p. X.

<sup>8</sup> The Indian Antiquary of September 1905, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 202-3.

which in our language may be rendered 'perfect'—and this is the only day in all the year in which the King soaps his head, and distributes gifts to the Persians. . . . The law of the feast . . . required that no one who asked a boon that day at the King's board should be denied his request."<sup>1</sup> This passage of Herodotus on the subject of the King's birthday requires some remarks.

Firstly, according to Herodotus, the observation of the birthday as a great day was common among all Persians. He says: "Of all the days in the year, the one which they celebrate most is their birthday. It is customary to have the board furnished on that day with an ampler supply than common. The richer Persians cause an ox, a horse, a camel, and an ass to be baked whole and so served up to them: the poorer classes use instead the smaller kinds of cattle. They eat little solid food but abundance of desert, which is set on table a few dishes at a time."<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, as to Tykta, the word for the King's birthday feast, George Rawlinson says: "No satisfactory explanation has been yet given of the word."<sup>3</sup> I think, that the word is some old Iranian form, from which comes the modern Persian *تخته* (*takhta*, a board), a table. This word *takhta* itself is a form that comes from Pahlavi *takht*, modern Persian *takht* *تخت* *i.e.*, a throne, a seat. The Pahlavi *takht*, Persian *takht* is derived from Avesta *thwakhshta*<sup>4</sup> which itself comes from the Avesta root '*thwakhsh*,' Sans. *tvakhsh* (त्वक्ष),<sup>5</sup> to pare, hew, cover. If we take the word Tykta, not for the birthday feast, but for birthday itself, I think (a) the word can be derived from the Avesta root *tak*, Sans. (तक), from which comes the modern Gujarati verb (તકવું) to endure, to continue, to last. So, the word 'Tykta' may mean "the day of having continued or lived in this world for a particular period, *vis.*, a year." (b) Or the word may be derived from the same root (P. *تَاخْتَن*) which means to flow, to run, to hasten. Thus the word would mean "the period of life which has run," *vis.*, "a year." (c) Or perhaps it is some old Iranian word from which comes the Pahlavi word *takht*,<sup>6</sup> Persian *takht* *تخت* throne; and it means a particular day in honour of the occupant of the *throne*, *i.e.*, of the King.

<sup>1</sup> Book IX, 110-11. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol IV, pp. 47, 574.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Book I, 133, Vol. I, p. 271.

<sup>3</sup> Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. IV, p. 473, n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide* Mr. Steingass's Persian Dictionary, the word 'takht.'

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Apte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary (1890), p. 552.

<sup>6</sup> *Ardai Viraf*, Chap. II, p. 26.



Thirdly, as to the importance of the day, on which the king has an unusual bath and soaps his head, I think, it is a reference to a scared bath. Upto a few years ago, many Parsees had, and even now, some in Bombay and many in the Mofussil have, a sacred ceremonial bath (*nān sans स्नान*) once a year. Now-a-days, it is generally taken on the Parsee New Year's day or the preceding day of the New Year's eve, or taken by some during any one of the last 10 days of the year. A few take it on their own birthday. In this sacred ceremonial bath, they apply to their body consecrated *nirang* or urine and a little sand. Herodotus refers specially to the head. Now, the Vendidad,<sup>1</sup> when it refers to the sacred bath for purifying the body, says that the washing should begin from the head (*bareshnu*). A particular sacred bath is, from that fact, still known as *Bareshnum*. The place, where that bath is given, is known as *Bareshnum-gāh*.

This above-mentioned custom is believed<sup>2</sup> to have been the source from which the following Indian custom referred to by Strabo was borrowed: "Historians also relate that the Indians worship Jupiter Ombrus (or the rainy), the river Ganges, and the indigenous deities of the country; that when the King washes his hair, a great feast is celebrated, and large presents are sent, each person displaying his wealth in competition with his neighbour."<sup>3</sup>

Strabo thus speaks of the Indians of the time when Megasthenes was in India: "The Indians wear white garments, white linen and muslin, contrary to the accounts of those who say that they wear garments of a bright colour; all of them wear long hair and long beards, plait their hair and bind it with a fillet."<sup>4</sup> This Indian custom of keeping long hair among the Mauryan Kings is believed by Dr. Smith to have been taken from the Achæmenian Iranians. The ancient Iranians kept their hair long. They seldom cut them. Even now, the priests are enjoined to keep beards which they are not to cut.<sup>5</sup> Old Iranian sculptures show that the Iranians kept long beards.

Herodotus thus refers to the Iranian custom of keeping the hair long: "For once upon a time, when the Argives had sent to Delphi to consult the God about the safety of their own city, a prophecy was given them, in which others besides themselves were inter-

<sup>1</sup> Chap. VIII, 40.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Vincent Smith. *Indian Antiquary* of September 1905, Vol. XXXIV, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> *The Geography of Strabo* Book, XV, Chap. I, 69. Hamilton and Falconer's Translation, Vol. III, p. 117.

<sup>4</sup> *Strabo* Bk., XV, Chap. I, 71. Hamilton and Falconer's Translation, Vol. III, p. 118.

<sup>5</sup> *Vide* for further particulars my "Presidential Address," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, Vol. X, No. 5, p. 343. *Vide* my "Anthropological Papers," Part II.

ested ; for while it bore in part upon the fortunes of Argos, it touched in a by-clause, the fate of the men of Miletus. I shall set down the portion which concerned the Argives when I come to that part of my history, mentioning at present only the passage in which the absent Milesians were spoken of. This passage was as follows :—

‘ Then shalt thou, Miletus, so oft the contriver of evil,  
Be to many, thyself, a feast and an excellent booty :  
Then shall thy matrons wash the feet of long-haired masters ;  
Others shall then possess our lov'd Didymian temple ’

Such a fate now befel the Milesians ; for the Persians who wore their hair long after killing most of the men, made the women and children slaves ”<sup>1</sup>

We find an allusion in the Vendidad also to show that the ancient Persians kept their hair long. There, while speaking of a ceremonial bath of purification, it is mentioned that the hair and the body may be cleansed by *Nirang*. The fact, that the hair and body (*vareçaoscha tanāmcha*)<sup>2</sup> are spoken of separately, is significant. We generally take it, that “hair” forms a part and parcel of “body” and so when body is spoken of, hair is included in it. But here, the washing of the hair and body is spoken of separately. Thus, we see that the washing of the hair had its own special signification.

## X.

### THE LITERARY PART OF DR. SPOONER'S RESEARCHES ON THE SUBJECT OF THE INFLUENCE OF IRAN UPON INDIA. THE WAVE OF PERSIAN ADVANCE IN INDIA, AS SHOWN BY INDIAN LITERATURE.

The principal interest of Dr. Spooner's above-mentioned paper consists in its literary part, which seems to have thrown a bomb-shell, as said above, in the camp of Orientalists. In support of the discovery, that the Mauryan building at Pataliputra was copied from an Iranian building, he advances a good deal of literary evidence. That evidence is intended to show, that “upon the threshold of the historical period, a dynasty of almost purely Persian type”<sup>3</sup> ruled over India. That dynasty was the Mauryan dynasty, the founder of which, Chandragupta, “the first great Indian Emperor”<sup>4</sup> was a Persian Aryan, a Parsi.<sup>5</sup> He had Persepolis as his ancestral home. The

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus Book VI, Chap. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Vendidad, Chap. VIII, 11, Ś. B. E., Vol. IV.

<sup>3</sup> Journal Royal Asiatic Society of January 1915, p. 72.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, July Number, p. 416.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, July, p. 429.

Mauryan dynasty was Zoroastrian.<sup>1</sup> Not only that, but Dr. Spooner, further on, says,<sup>2</sup> that Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, was an Iranian sage and as such was Persian.<sup>3</sup> He affirms, that the palaces referred to in the Mahābhārata are the Mauryan structures at Pātaliputra, that the Asura Maya, to whose supernatural powers the construction of the structures is attributed, is the Ahura Mazda of the Zoroastrians, whom Darius often invokes in his Persepolitan inscriptions. He attempts to show, that the influence of Iran upon India was much more than what is ordinarily believed in by scholars. It was not confined to architecture. It was also in matters of religion. Buddha, the founder of Buddhism and Chandragupta, the founder of the Mauryan dynasty of India, and even his Minister Chanakya, were Persian, if not by birth at least by descent.

Dr. Spooner traces in the Mahābhārata a reference to the attempt of the Mauryans, to build an Indian palace under the superhuman auspices of the Iranian Deity, Ahura Mazda. This reminds us of other attempts to trace references to Persia in the Rigveda and even of attempts to trace therein, the influence of Persia.

(a) According to J. Kennedy,<sup>4</sup> Dr. Brunnhoffer has, in his "Iran und Turan", turned the first three strophes of Rigveda V, 13, into a song of triumph over captured Babylon by the Medes, who were Iranian Aryans.

(b) Again, according to Mr. A. B. Keith,<sup>5</sup> Dr. Carl Schirmeisen "finds in the Rigveda, the work of three peoples", the first of whom were the Iranians, "whose influence is seen in the second, fifth and seventh books." He "decides that books II and III were first composed by the Iranians and the mixed people (the second of the above three peoples)."<sup>6</sup> In support of this theory, "Brunnhoffer's theory, that the dog is Iranian, is accepted as proving that Grtsamada Saunaka, and therefore the second book of Rigveda are Iranian."<sup>7</sup>

In connection with Dr. Spooner's assertion, about Buddha being an Iranian sage, there is one fact which requires to be noticed. It is this: "The story of Buddha is said to have passed to the West through Persia, in later times. In some of the various versions of the transference of that story, Abenner, a king of the Indians, is the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 409.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 406.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 437.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal, Royal Asiatic Society of 1898*, p. 262.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, *Journal of 1910*, p. 218;

*Ibid.*, p. 217.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

father of Joseph (Buddha). According to Joseph Jacobs, in the particular form of this Abenner's belief, "clear reference is to be found to the tenets of Mazdeism under the later Sassanides of Persia. The idolaters are spoken of as Chaldeans, and their faith as worship of the elements. There is a chief of the Magi referred to, whose relations with the king of the 'Indians' exactly corresponds to the position of the supreme Mobed in the Sassanide kingdom."<sup>1</sup>

What are said to be the "tenets of Mazdeism" in the Sassanian times, may be the tenets of old Zoroastrianism of the Achæmenian times. Anyhow, the father of Joseph (Buddha), an Indian King, is said to have some relation with a Chief Magi, a Mobadan Mobaḍ. Thus, we see, that, in the later version of the story of Buddha on its way to the West, we find a reference to his connection with ancient Persia. A Chief of the Magi, a Mobadan Mobad, an Archimagus was in his Durbâr. Perhaps, he was to Buddha's father what Chânakya (taken to be Persian by Dr. Spooner) was to Chandragupta.

The Parsees have, on the one hand, reason to be proud to know, that their motherland of Irân had such an influence on their country of India, which their forefathers of the 8th century adopted as their own. On the other hand, if all that Dr. Spooner advances as the result of his literary studies be true, they have, as well, a reason to be sorry that the early followers of their faith, like Buddha and Asoka or their fathers, seceded from the stock of their parental belief. We know good deal of the three Magis, who, from their literal belief in the tradition of the coming apostle Saoshyos, went from Persia to see infant Christ and were converted. But, if all the new theory of Dr. Spooner be true, in Buddha, Chandragupta and Asoka, we have, including the doubtful case of Chandragupta, an early secession, previous to that of the three Magis of the Christian scriptures. Seceders though they were, they exerted a great Iranian influence upon India, especially as they were in the company of not a few but hundreds and thousands of Persians, who had, as it were, colonies of their own in India.

One of Dr. Spooner's main points, based on various literary evidences, is, that bands of Persians had in old times, even in times anterior to Asoka and Chandragupta, spread in India and had gone even up to Orissa and Assam. The temple records of Jagannath, says: "That the Yavanas invaded Orissa<sup>2</sup> between 458 and 421 B. C. and again in the period between 421 and 300 B.C." Dr. Spooner tries to show that these Yavanas "were Zoroastrian tribes

<sup>1</sup> Barlaam and Josaphat, by Joseph Jacobs, (1896). Introduction, pp. XXI-II.

<sup>2</sup> Journal Royal Asiatic Society, July 1915, p. 431.

from some part of the Persian realm."<sup>1</sup> In connection with this matter, it is interesting to note, that according to Fergusson, the Tātva Gumphā caves near the Khandgiri hill in Orissa, have doors "flanked by pilasters with capitals of the Persepolitan type."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Spooner adds Assam also to "the list of early Magian centres."<sup>3</sup> In short, the theory, depended upon by Dr. Spooner, on the authority of Indian evidence, *i.e.*, evidence from Indian literature, is this, that the ancient Persians had, long before the Mauryan dynasty, settled in various parts of Northern India, from the frontiers of Punjab in the west to Assam and Orissa in the east, and from the valley of Nerbudba in the south to the valley of Kashmir in the Himalayas to the north.

## XI.

### IRANIAN EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF THE INDIAN EVIDENCE.

Now we find, that there are several, what may be called, Iranian or Persian evidences which tend to support this theory of the presence of Iranians in India long before the Maurya dynasty. These evidences are the following :—

- I. The Old Avesta Writings.
- II. The Cuneiform inscription of King Darius the Great.
- III. The History of Herodotus.
- IV. The Numismatic evidence of the Punch-marked coins.
- V. Later Pahlavi and Persian Writers.

## XII.

In this connection, I would like to refer my readers to a paper of mine, entitled "India in the Avesta of the Old Avesta Parsees",<sup>4</sup> read before the Bengal Asiatic Society at Calcutta, on 2nd July 1913. I have shown there, that India is referred to in the old Avesta writings in four different places—(1) the Vendidad, Chapter I, 19 ; (2) Yaçna (Sarosh Yasht) LVII, 29 ; (3) Meher Yasht 104 ; and (4) Tir Yasht, 32. Of these four, the reference in the Vendidad is the oldest and the most important.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 434.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture of Fergusson*, revised and edited by Burgess and Spiers (1910), Vol. II, pp. 17-18.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal R. A. S.*, July 1915, p. 434.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal Bengal Asiatic Society*, November 1913, Vol. IX, No. 10 (N. S.), pp. 425-436.

To the Iranians of the times of the Avesta, five countries of the then world were known. They were roughly speaking Irān (Airyanām dakhyunām), Turān (Tuiryanām dakhyunām), Rum or Asia Minor and Eastern Europe (Sairimanām dakhyunām), China (Sāininam dakhyunām), and the country of the Dāhæ, a people of Central Asia (Dāhinām Dakhyunām).<sup>1</sup> Among these five, the first, Iran, the country of the Âiryas or Âryas, included several places or countries. Out of these, the principal 16 are named, the first being Airyana-Vaeja or Irān Vej, the Irān proper, and the 15th, or the last but one, being Hapta Hindu or India.

Now the question, why India is mentioned as the 15th in the list, depends upon the question, as to what the first chapter of the Vendidad, wherein the 16 places are mentioned, is intended for. Scholars differ on this subject, and on the subject of the order in which the places are mentioned. Rhode, Lassen, Haug, Baron Bunsen and others thought, that the 16 places were the places to which, one after another, members or sections of the great Aryan or the Indo-Iranian race migrated. Spiegel thought that this first chapter of the Vendidad was merely a list of the countries known to the ancient Iranians. Darmesteter took it as an enumeration of the countries belonging to Iran (Ces seize contrées appartiennent toutes à l' Iran).<sup>2</sup> Others like Heeren, and Bréal took it to be a list of the places of the march of Iranian colonists, commencing from somewhere in Central Asia.<sup>3</sup> Harlez said that the first chapter of the Vendidad, wherein these places are mentioned one after another, is merely an enumeration of inhabited places (une simple énumération d'endroits habités)<sup>4</sup> and the writer only meant to establish the principle of his doctrine, that Ahura Mazda was solicitous for his people, but that Ahriman meant harm for them. Again, he adds, the writer had the object in view of giving the list of the countries in which Zoroastrianism had spread at this time. (Tout en poursuivant ce but il nous donne la liste des contrées dans lesquelles le Zoroastrisme s'était propagé à cette époque<sup>5</sup>). I agree with Harlez in this, that it may be an enumeration of places, where, one by one, Zoroastrianism spread. I think, that this view may be held even with that of the idea of migration. The very fact, that the

<sup>1</sup> Farvardin Yasht (Yt. XIII), p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Le Zend Avesta, Vol. II, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Le Zend Avesta, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

writer says, that, besides these 16 places named, there were other beautiful prosperous places (henti anyāoschit asāoscha shoithrāoscha srīrāoscha),<sup>1</sup> shows, that the writer has typically selected for mention the names of those famous places where Zoroastrianism had more or less spread. Thus we see that, as said by Harlez, India was one of the places where Zoroastrianism prevailed at the time when the Vendidad was written. The question is what was that time?

The Vendidad, more especially the first chapter of it, wherein India is referred to, seems to be as old as about 1200 B. C. I will quote here, what I have said in the above paper about the antiquity of this writing.

“As stated by Dr. Haug, at least two facts lead to show, that the Vendidad, in which the name of India occurs as Hapt-Hindu, was written many centuries before Christ.

“Firstly, we learn from Herodotus, that Deioces of Media had founded Ecbatana (Agabatana, Hamdan). That was in B. C. 708. This great city of ancient Persia is not mentioned in the above list of the cities of the Vendidad. This fact, therefore, shows that the Vendidad, or at least this chapter of the Vendidad, was written long before B. C. 708.

“Secondly, the city of Balkh, which is named as Bākhdi in the Vendidad, is spoken of there as the city of “Eredhvo-drafshām”, *i.e.*, the city of the exalted banner (drapeau). This statement shows, that it was still at that time the capital city of Bactria, and carried the royal banner. Now, we know that Bactria fell into the hands of the Assyrians at about B. C. 1200. So then, this particular chapter (Chap. 1) of the Vendidad must have been written long before B. C. 1200, when its exalted banner fell at the hands of the Assyrians. These facts then show, that India was known to the ancient Iranians as Hapt-Hindu, *i.e.*, as “the country of the seven rivers of the Indus, a long time before 1200 B. C.” Major Clarke also, in his article on Merv in the Encyclopædia Britannica, places the Vendidad “at least one thousand two hundred years before the Christian era.”<sup>2</sup> Anyhow we can safely say that it was written long before the time of Buddha.

<sup>1</sup> Vendidad, Chapter I, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> 9th edition, Vol. XVI, pp. 44, Col. I.

The general concensus of opinion among Iranian scholars is, that the extant Avesta is a faithful remnant of the Grand Avesta of the Achæmenian times. A few scholars doubted its antiquity. The late Professor James Darmesteter was spoken of by Professor Max Muller as throwing a bomb-shell in the camp of Oriental scholars in this matter, inasmuch as he said, that, in some parts, the Avesta was post-Alexandrian.<sup>1</sup> But even he admitted, that the Vendidad belonged to the Achæmenian times or even to earlier times. Under the heading of Achæmenian and earlier elements he says : "There are essential doctrines in it (Zoroastrianism), the existence of which can be traced back far beyond the Parthian period and the Greek conquest, with historical evidence. One may, with certain accuracy, distinguish in Zoroastrianism what is old, pre-Alexandrian, or Achæmenian in form from what is late, or post-Alexandrian. The fundamental basis of Mazdeism, the belief in a Supreme God, the organiser of the world, Ahura Mazda, is as old as anything we know of Persia"<sup>2</sup> He then adds : "The Vendidad may be taken as the best specimen of the texts imbued with the pre-Alexandrian spirit, as its general laws are Achæmenian in tone, and a great part of it may be interpreted by means of classical testimonies regarding the Achæmenian age."<sup>3</sup> He gives some principles or elements which determine, from his point of view, which particular part of the Avesta is Achæmenian and which not. Among such principles, one is that of the so-called dualism. He says : "The principle of dualism is pre-Alexandrian. This is implied, in the time of Darius, by the great king stating that Ahura 'created welfare (shiyâtim) for man'; in the time of Herodotus, by the religious war waged by the Magi against the ants, snakes, and other noxious creatures, which shows that the distinction of Ormazdian and Ahrimanian creatures was already in existence. Moreover, at the end of the Achæmenian period, Aristotle knows of a Good Spirit and the Evil One, Zeus—Oromazdes and Ades—Areimanios."<sup>4</sup>

Now, this principle of two conflicting supreme powers, one good and the other evil, Ormazd and Ahriman, is seen to be prominent in the Vendidad, and pre-eminently prominent in its first chapter which treats of the 16 countries belonging to Iran. For every good thing associated with the 16 countries, Ahriman associates an evil. In the

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* my Paper on "The Antiquity of the Avesta", Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XIX, pp. 263-87. *Vide* my "Asiatic papers", Part I, pp. 41-136.

<sup>2</sup> S. B. E., Vol. IV, 2nd edition, p. LX.

<sup>3</sup> S. B. E., Vol. IV, 2nd edition, Introduction, p. LXV.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. LXI.



case of India, the 15th in the list, the evils are that of the state of early abnormal menses in women and excessive heat, which we find even now. Thus, we see, that even if the Vendidad be placed not so early as the time before the 12th century B. C., it has been placed in Achæmenian or pre-Achæmenian times by a scholar like Darmesteter who doubted the antiquity of the extant Avesta as a whole.

The very name by which the country of India, the Bharata varsha or Bharat's continent, was and is known to the civilized world, points to a very old connection between the two countries and to the influence of Iran upon India. We know, that the river Indus first gave its name to the country watered by it and its tributaries, as Industan or Hindustan. At first, only the country of Punjab and the country surrounding it, which was and is watered by these rivers, was known by that name. Even now, it is not rare to hear people, coming here from the North, from the Punjab and the neighbouring country, say, that they came from Hindustan. Then, latterly, the name began to be applied to the whole peninsula.

Now, the Sanskrit, or what may be called the indigenous name of the river Indus is Sindhu, not Hindu from which the word Indus has come. The Rigveda<sup>1</sup> speaks of the Indus with its tributaries as Sapt-Sindhavas (*i.e.*, the country of the seven Sindhu rivers), not as Hapt-Hindavas. It is the ancient Iranians, the followers of the creed of Zoroaster, who first spoke of the river as Hindu and called the country as Hapta- Hindu.<sup>2</sup> We read in the Vendidad :

Panchadasêm asanghãmcha shôithranãmcha vahisstem frâthweresem, azem yô Ahurô Mazdâo, yô Hapta-Hindu, hacha ushastara Hindva ava daoshatarem Hindûm. Âat ahê paityârem frâkerentat angrô mainyush pouru-mahrkô arathwyãmcha dakhshata arathwimcha garemãmum.

Translation :—I, who am Ahura Mazda, created, as the fifteenth best place and country, (the country of) Hapta Hindu, (which extends) from the East of the Hindu (river, *i.e.*, the Indus) up to the West of the Hindu. Then, the evil spirit created therein, as counter-acts (against its excellence) excessive menstruation and excessive heat.

<sup>1</sup> Mandala (Book), IV, Hymn 28 अहिं अरिणात् सप्तसिंधुन्. *Vide* Max Muller's Text of the Hymns of the Rigveda (1873), p. 286, Book IV, Hymn 28. *vide* "The Hymns of the Rigveda" by Ralph T. H. Griffith (1890), Vol. II, p. 140.

"Allied with thee in this thy friendship, Soma, India, for man made waters flow together, Slew Ahi, and sent forth the seven rivers (Sapta Sindhu), and opened as it were the obstructed fountains."

<sup>2</sup> "Hapta Hindu repond aux Sapta Sindhavas des Vedas" (Le Zend Avesta par Darmesteter, Vol. II, p. 14, n. 42).

We learn from this passage of the Vendidad, the following facts about India :—

- (1) That India was the fifteenth of the 16 Āryan countries known to the early Iranians, as created or blessed by God.
- (2) It was known as Hapta Hindu.
- (3) The country watered by the Indus formed India, and its boundary latterly extended further both ways, towards the East and the West.
- (4) It had, as it were, two curses or miseries associated with it.

Let us now examine these facts. We find, that the country is known, not only by foreigners but by the people of the country itself, not by its old indigenous name which should be *Sindhustān*, but by its Iranian or Zoroastrian name *Hindustān*. The people of the country also are known by their Iranian or Zoroastrian name, 'Hindus,' and not by its old indigenous name which should be *Sindhus*. 'India,' the western or the European name of the country was first taken up by the Greeks from the Iranians, who called it 'Hindu.' The Greeks gave the name to the Romans. These two countries subsequently gave it to the whole of the western world.

In the old Testament of the Bible, the country of India is thus referred to : " Now it came to pass in the days of Ahasuerus (this is Ahasuerus which reigned, from India even unto Ethiopia, over an hundred and seven and twenty provinces)."<sup>1</sup> In the original of this version, the old Hebrew word for India is *Hoddu*. The Hebrew form *Hoddu* is said to be contracted from *Hondu*,<sup>2</sup> another form of *Hindu*, the Avestaic name of the Indus or the *Sindhu*. Again, we must note, that in this book of the Old Testament, the Persian king Ahasuerus (*Xerxes*, B. C. 485-465) is believed to reign over India.

From all this, it follows, that, if ancient Persia gave its Iranian or Zoroastrian name to India and replaced its indigenous name, it must have had very great influence upon the country in various spheres of its activity.

<sup>1</sup> The book of Esther, Chap. I, 1. *Vide* also Chap. VIII, 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* the word *India* in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.

## XIII.

Next to the Avesta, we have the authority of the Cuneiform Inscriptions to say, that India had come under the influence of Irân as one of the satrapies of Darius the Great. In his two inscriptions, those of Persepolis,<sup>1</sup> and Nakhs-i-Rustam, <sup>2</sup> Darius mentions, among his conquered countries, the name of India as Hidush <sup>3</sup> or Hindush. The fact of this mention in his inscriptions suggests, that with its conquest, Persia must have exercised a great influence upon India.

II. The authority of Cuneiform Inscriptions.

## XIV.

Next to the Cuneiform inscriptions, we have the authority of Herodotus to say, that India was one of the satrapies, and that the richest, of Darius, and that as such, it must have been under the powerful influence of Iran. Herodotus says: "The Indians who are more numerous than any other nation with which we are acquainted, paid a tribute exceeding that of every other people, to wit, three hundred and sixty talents of gold dust. This was the twentieth satrapy."<sup>4</sup>

The value of a talent differed in those times in different countries. Rawlinson says: "If the later Attir talent was worth £243 15s. of our money, the Euboic (silver) talent would be £250 8s. 5d. and the Babylonian £292 3s. 3d".<sup>5</sup> Taking it, that the Persians counted by the Babylonian standard, the Indian tribute to Darius came to (360 by £292 3s. 3d.) £105,178 1s., *i.e.*, Rs. 15,77,670-12-0, *i.e.*, in round figures to about 16 lacs of rupees. Thus, India which paid the largest tribute to Persia, must have come under some powerful influence of the paramount power.

We must remember, that Darius was not a flying conqueror of India, who overran the country, amassed wealth and retired. No, he wanted to explore and to retain the country for the good of his own country of Persia and of his conquered country of India. He directed his Admiral Scylax to explore the whole country watered by the Indus from Cashmere down

Darius, not a flying conqueror.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Tolman's Guide to the old Persian Inscriptions, pp. 77 and 144.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 79 and 146.

<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew old Testament gives the name of India as Hoddu. In the inscriptions as given by Tolman, the letter 'n' is included in brackets. Is it that the letter is omitted by the engraver by mistake? and if so, is it that the writer of the book of Esther followed that mistaken engraving?

<sup>4</sup> Book III, p. 94, Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. II, p. 485. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 482, n. 5.

to the sea, and from there along the coast to the Persian Gulf. He developed commerce between Persia and India. With that object, he connected the Red and the Mediterranean seas, by a canal, ending at this extremity at Suez. His was the first complete Suez Canal,<sup>1</sup> which ran from one sea to the other, *via* a branch of the Nile.

## XV.

Punched or Punch-marked coins, *i.e.*, the coins in which the design is punched into the metal, are long since referred to as pointing to Iranian influence in India. Pandit Bhagvanlal Indrajī said on the subject of these coins : "Some of the Sassanian Kings (between the 6th and 8th centuries) may have established their rule somewhere in these districts (Malwa) and had their currency issued, and their successors (the Chauda and Chalukya of Anhilwāda) retained and copied the same type for their coinage."<sup>2</sup> A similar influence is inferred from the Godhra coins of India. But it is now pointed out, that the punch-marked coins belong to the monetary system of the Achæmenides who are believed to have taken the type from the Babylonians.

Mr. J. Kennedy speaks of these punch-marked coins as Purānas and gives an interesting account of "the Babylonian shakels, punched for giving and receiving" in which they had their origin *via* Persia.<sup>3</sup> In connection with this matter, Mr. J. H. Decourdemanche, in his Paper on "The Ancient punch-marked coins of India"<sup>4</sup> says that the Persians had some relations with India even before the conquest of India by the Achæmenides. He thinks that the introduction of the system of punch-marked coins into India<sup>5</sup> from Persia may have taken place even before the Achæmenian conquest. The conclusion, which this writer comes to on several grounds, is this : "Nous croyons avoir démontré que les *punch-marked* d'argent et de cuivre constituent simplement une variété hindoue du monnayage perse achéménide. Cette variété ne diffère de celui ci que par l'empreinte."

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* my paper on the Ancient History of the Suez Canal. Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (1915).

<sup>2</sup> Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XII, pp. 525-526.

<sup>3</sup> Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of England of 1868. Article on "The Early Commerce of Babylon with India" pp. 277-82.

<sup>4</sup> "Note sur les Anciennes Monnaies de l'Inde dites 'punch-marked' coins et sur le système de Manou," by M. J. A. Decourdemanche. Journal Asiatique Dixième série, Tome XIX 1912, pp. 117-132.

<sup>5</sup> Punch-marked silver and copper coins have been recently found at Rajgir in the district of Behar (Journal, Behar and Orissa Research Society, Vol. II, pt. I, p. 3).

The punch-marked coins have the following symbols : (1) A single solar symbol ; (2) A complex solar symbol, containing the " taurine as an element " ; (3) A branch ; (4) A humped bull with taurine ; (5) and a chaitya. Dr. Spooner explains the symbolism of some. Of the second symbol, he says : " What the second complex symbol is, I cannot say, but it contains the taurine element."<sup>1</sup> I will here explain the symbolism from a Zoroastrian point of view.

Two symbols refer to the Sun. If we take them to be Zoroastrian symbols, they represent the Khorshed and the Meher, the Hvarekshaeta and the Mithra of the Avesta. The Parsees, when they recite their prayers of adoration to the Sun every morning, recite the Khorshed and Meher Nyâeshes together. Khorshed is the presiding Yazata over the Sun himself. Mithra or Meher presides over light, both physical and moral. A Parsee never recites the prayer in honour of Khorshed alone. Such a recital is incomplete. The prayer in honour of Meher, or Mithra must also be recited. Both go together. " Khorshed Meher karvi " (lit. to do Khorshed Meher) is a colloquial form for reciting the daily prayers of the three day-periods. The symbolic connection of Mithra with bull is well-known. Mithraic bulls played a prominent part in Iranian sculpture.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Spooner takes the third symbol of the branch to represent Haoma. But it must be taken to represent the Barsam which is still used by Parsee priests in liturgical services. At one time, they were made of the twigs of a tree, but, now-a-days they are made of metallic wires, which may be of copper or even of silver or gold. They are used now in the long prayer of grace (Bâj) which the Parsee priests recite before meals when they hold the *khub* for a higher liturgical service. It appears from Firdousi and Nizami, that the ancient Persian kings used this Barsam as a religious requisite when the prayer of grace was recited on the royal table. Such a use by Chosroes II (Khushru Parviz), in the presence of a Christian Ambassador from the Court of his Royal father-in-law Maurice, the Emperor of Rome, had led to a conflict.<sup>3</sup>

The humped bull, I think represents the Moon, which is spoken of in the Avesta as *gao chithra*, i.e., cow-faced or with the origin of cow.

<sup>1</sup> J. R. A. S. of July 1915, p. 412.

<sup>2</sup> Even in some visions of St. Michael, whose account resembles somewhat that of Mithra, we find references to bulls. *Vide* my Paper " St. Michael of the Christians and Mithra of the Zoroastrians," *Journal Anthropological Society of Bombay*, Vol. VI, No. 5, pp. 37-53. *Vide* my " *Anthropological Papers*," pp. 175-190.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* my " Glimpse into the work of the B. B. R. A. S. Society during the last 100 years ", pp. 83-97.

The crescent of the moon represents, as it were, a figure formed by the uplifted horns of a bull.<sup>1</sup>

The last symbol is the Chaitya which is taken to demonstrate a mountain. That is possible from a Zoroastrian point of view. A mountain may be taken to symbolize land or earth. The Jamyād Yasht, (Yt. XIX), which, according to its name, refers to land, contains an enumeration of mountains of the then known world. It also principally refers to the Kharenangh or Khoreh, *i.e.*, the Glory or Nimbus of the Iranian kings. As such, then, the symbol of a mountain, which in its turn symbolizes land or the earth, can very appropriately be represented on the coins of kings. Thus, we see, that the symbols of the punch-marked coins, which are traced from the Achæmenian kings of Persia, represent the grand objects of Nature,—the Sun, Moon, Light in general, the earth and the great vegetable world, which all, as grand objects of Nature, lead the mind of a Zoroastrian from Nature to Nature's God.

Though the punch-marked coins had their first origin in Babylon, as far as the punching or marking was concerned, it were the Achæmenians that modelled the Indian coins. One can easily find this from the account, given by Mr. J. Kennedy, in his above article of the Babylonian coins. The symbols in the punch-marked coins of India are more Zoroastrian than Babylonian.

The conclusion that we come to from the consideration of the above four evidences of the Avesta, the Cuneiform inscriptions, Herodotus, and the Punch-marked coins, is, that India was under a strong influence of Persia long before the Mauryan dynasty of Chandragupta. These evidences support the view of Dr. Spooner, that Persia had greater influence upon India than what is ordinarily supposed. Persia had that influence not only upon India's architecture, but also upon its people, its administration and polity, and upon its religion.

## XVI.

The fifth class of evidence, upon which I am now going to speak, may be held, and that very properly, not to be very important. In itself, some may hold it to be very weak. But still it requires some consideration, because, though it may appear weak in itself, standing alone, it has a value of its own in connection with the above

V. Later (A)  
Pahlavi and (B)  
Persian writers.

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Dr. Louis H. Gray's very interesting paper on "Māongha Gāochitra" in the Spiegel Memorial Volume, edited by me, pp. 160-68.

evidence as showing the tradition of later times in the matter of the connection between Persia and India, and of the consequent influence. At first, we will examine the Pahlavi writings of the Parsis.

Of course, looking to the times in which they were written, they cannot be taken as an authority upon a subject

(A) Pahlavi writers. of older times—Achæmenian or pre-Achæmenian—we refer to. But we must bear in mind, that they had some older books before them—some of the lost *nasks* or parts of them—for their materials. So it is worth collecting and examining some passages of the Pahlavi books.

Some Pahlavi and Persian writings speak of a future Zoroastrian apostle, Behrām Varjāvand, as coming from India. In the Pahlavi *Mādigān-i-Binā-i-Farvardin Yum-i Khordād*,<sup>1</sup> this future apostle (*Vahrām-i-Varjāvand*) is predicted to appear from among the Hindus (*min Hindukān*). The Pahlavi Bahman Yasht,<sup>2</sup> also refers to this passage

I think the whole passage referring to this coming apostle is worth quoting. It may lead to some inquiries and investigations from an Indian point of view :

“Aôharmazd spoke thus : O Zaratûsht, the Spîtāmān ! when the demon with dishevelled hair of the race of Wrath (Aisham or Khashm or Hasham) comes into notice in the eastern quarter, first a black token becomes manifest, and Hûshêdar, son of Zaratûsht, is born on lake Frazdān. It is when he comes to his conference with me, Aôharmazd, O Zaratûsht, the Spîtāmān ! that in the direction of Chinistān, it is said—some have said among the Hindus—is born a prince (*kai*) ; it is his father, a prince of the Kayān race, approaches the women and a religious prince is born to him ; he calls his name Vahrām the Varjāvand, some have said Shahpûr. That a sign may come to the earth, the night when that prince is born, a star falls from the sky ; when that prince is born the star shows a signal. It is Dâd-Aôharmazd who said that the month Āvān and day Vâd is his father's end ; they rear him with the damsels of the king, and a woman becomes ruler. That prince when he is thirty years old—some have told the time—comes with innumerable banners and divers armies, Hindu and Chini, having uplifted banners—for they set up

<sup>1</sup> The Pahlavi Text by Dastur Dr. Jamaspji Minocherji, p. 105, ll. 7-8. *Vide* the K. R. Cama Memorial Volume (p. 127,) edited by me, for the translation by Dastur Kaikhusbrû.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. III, 14, S. B. E. V., p. 220 The Text of the Pahlavi Zand-i-Vohuman Yasht by Dastur Kaikobad Adarbad, p. 15, l. 5.

their banners—having exalted banners, and having exalted weapons ; they hasten up with speed as far as the Veh river,—some have said the country of Bambo,—as far as Bukhâr as the Bukhârans with its bank.”<sup>1</sup>

The Persian Zarthosht-nameh<sup>2</sup> of Zarthosht Behram Pazdô also speaks of the future apostle (Behram Varzāvand) as appearing from India. He will, at the age of 21, take an Indian army to Persia and spread peace and plenty.

I think, that the fact, that the Pahlavi writers expected, perhaps on the authority of some older writings, the appearance of an apostle in the land of India, shows, that they took it as granted, that at one time, India, or at least a large part of it, was Zoroastrian, and therefore a likely place to give birth to a new apostle.

The Pahlavi Dinkard<sup>3</sup> (book IV, p. 26) speaks of some Zoroastrian books as “scattered among Hindus,” and of Shapur I, the son of Ardeshir Babegân (Artaxerxes the founder of the Sassanian dynasty) collecting them for his work of the Iranian Renaissance. This fact also shows, that India was looked at as a country that had passed under some Zoroastrian influence, and therefore in a position to contain some Zoroastrian writings.

There is one other subject in the Pahlavi-Pazend books, which draws our special attention, and that is that of King Gustasp sending his son Asfandyâr and his brother Zarir to India to spread Zoroastrianism. This subject is recorded in the Pahlavi Shikand Gumanik Vijar.<sup>4</sup> There we read “Kai Spudakht Spendadad-u-Zargar (Zarir). . . . . Hindukân bê-keshwar pa din ravânidâri farnaft hend”, *i.e.*, “Princes Asfandyar and Zarir roamed about out of their country to the country of the Hindus for the spread of religion.” This statement of the Pahlavi book is supported by Firdousi’s Shahnâmeh and other Persian books, and it shows, that from the very time of the prophet and immediately after, the Zoroastrian religion was believed to have begun exerting some influence on India.

<sup>1</sup> The Bahman Yasht, Chap. III, 13-17. West, S. B. E., Vol. V, pp. 220-221.

<sup>2</sup> Vide “Livre de Zoroastre de Zartusht-i Bahram ben Pajdô, publié et traduit par Frédéric Rosenberg, St. Petersburg, 1904, pp. 76-77 for the text; pp. 76-79 for the French translation.

<sup>3</sup> S. B. E., Vol. XXXVII, Pahlavi Texts, Part IV, p. 414.

<sup>4</sup> Chap. X, pp. 67-68, Drs. Hoshang and West’s Pazend Sanskrit Text (1887), pp. 74-75. S. B. E., Vol. XXIV, p. 171.



## XVII.

After having examined the Pahlavi writers, all of whom were Parsees, we will now examine some Persian writers, (B) Persian writers. some of whom were Parsees and some Mahomedans.

There is the tradition of an Indian Brahmin, named Changragâch, having gone to Persia to oppose Zoroastrianism. (a) The Tradition of Changragâch. It may be connected with the above tradition of the work of Asfandyâr. When the learned Brahmin saw Persians coming to India to turn his people to the faith of Zoroaster, he, as it were, thought of carrying war into the enemy's country. He went to oppose, but returned convinced about the new faith. The tradition is referred to by the Desatir and the Dabistan, and recorded at some length in a Persian treatise known as Changragâch-nâmeḥ by Zarthusht Behram Pazdu. This treatise is believed to claim a Pahlavi source for its materials.<sup>1</sup> The tradition<sup>2</sup> says that Changragâch returned to India fully convinced, and, in his turn, converted about 80,000 Indians into Zoroastrianism.<sup>3</sup>

In view of this tradition of Changragâcha and in view of the present theory of Dr. Spooner, that the Mauryans were Zoroastrians, may I put forth the suggestion of the equation of Changragâcha and Chandragupta? Pahlavi scholars can very easily understand, that the first part of these two names can be read both as Chandra and Changra, because the Pahlavi 'd' can be read 'g' also and *vice versa*. Then the 'p' of the latter part of the Indian name Gupta can also be read as 'ch'. Then the last 'ta' can be taken as dropped. We have several instances of such omissions. For example, the Avesta Takhmarupa has latterly become Tehmuraspa and then Tehmuras in Persian, the last 'p' being dropped. Thus the equation of Chandragupta and Changragâcha can stand well. Pahlavi readers can well understand the equation, step by step, thus :—Chandragupta=Changraguḡpta=Changragachta, Changragacha.

But one may point out this difficulty, that tradition connects Changragâcha with the times of Zoroaster, while Chandragupta belongs to later times. But that does not present much difficulty. The

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Professor Jackson's "Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran," p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> Anquetil Du Perron in his "Vie de Zoroaster" makes much use of this Persian book according to which, Jamasp, the minister of Gushtasp, had, at first, taken some lessons from him on miscellaneous subjects. (Zend Avesta, Tome I, Partie II, pp. 47-53.)

tradition of later times may have taken Changragâcha (Chandragupta) to earlier times. We have the instance of an event of the reign of king Minocheher. When the Pahlavi Bundelesh<sup>1</sup> connects the event of the king's confinement in the fort of Padashkvârgar with king Minocheher, the Persian Shah-Nameh<sup>2</sup> connects it with his successor king Naotara or Naodara. Cases like this often happen, especially in the case of great historical personages. Events that have happened in later times are attributed by the people of subsequent times to eminent personalities of the preceding ages. For example, take the case of the very Persepolitan palace of Darius which is shown to have served as a model of the Mauryan palace at Pâtaliputra. In later times, people began to attribute that palace to king Jamshed, and the ruins of the buildings are still known by the Persians as those of Takht-i-Jamshed, *i.e.*, the throne of Jamshed. Jamshed was a great monarch of the Peshdadian times. Many an institution of old Persia had been founded by him. So, in later ages, people who had forgotten much of what Darius had done, attributed his and his successors' palatial buildings, which they thought no ordinary human beings could build, to the great Jamshed.

History supplies another instance of this kind in Alexander the Great, who was a great personality of his times and whose exploits had left a powerful mark, upon the minds of many. People attributed to him some divine origin and he himself allowed that belief to be spread. The extraordinary works of many a person of later ages have been attributed by tradition to Alexander. For example, we find from Anquetil Du Perron,<sup>3</sup> that the Brahmins in the Salsette, attributed the caves of Jogeshri, Monpeser and Kanneri, situated at about 15 to 20 miles from Bombay, to Alexander the Great.<sup>4</sup> The Brahmins even said, that their books said so.<sup>5</sup> Many a wise saying of later times, have been attributed to King Solomon and to other great kings. Thus, it is no wonder, if the tradition of a later age, of Chandragupta (Changraghâcha) being an Iranian or Zoroastrian, has been carried subsequently to the earlier times of Zoroaster himself.

<sup>1</sup> Chapter XXXI, pp. 21-22, S. B. E., Vol. V, pp. 135-36.

<sup>2</sup> Mohl, Vol. I, p. 424.

<sup>3</sup> Zend Avesta Tome, 1, Partie 1, p. 392.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide* my Paper "Anquetil Du Perron, Bombay, as seen by him." Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, XXIV, No. 2.

<sup>5</sup> "Les Brahmes prétendent qu'il est écrit dans leurs Annales, que les excavations de Djeguesseri et de Monpeser, ainsi que celles de Keneri, sont l'ouvrage d'Alexandre le grand; mais ils ne produisent pas ces Annales; et leur folie est d'attribuer à ce Prince ou aux Dews, ce qui leur paroît au-dessus des forces ordinaires de l'homme (Zend Avesta, Tome I, Partie 1, p. 392).

One may doubt the authority of the Changragâch-nâmeh of Zarathusht Behram Pazdu, as being that of a later Persian writer. But we must know, that though he is a later writer, he had materials of a much earlier age before him. He was also the author of the traditional life of Zoroaster in Persian, known as Zarathusht-namêh. We know by comparison, that most of what he said about the traditional life of Zoroaster, has been confirmed by Pahlavi books like the Dinkard and Zâdsparam, written in Persia long before him.<sup>1</sup> Take a specific instance. He says, that while all children wept on birth, Zoroaster laughed.<sup>2</sup> Now, that matter has been referred to, not only by the Pahlavi Dinkard<sup>3</sup> and Zadsparam<sup>4</sup> but also by other Persian writers like those of the Shahrastani, Dabistan,<sup>5</sup> and Rauzat-us-safa.<sup>6</sup> It has been also referred to by Pliny<sup>7</sup> and Plato<sup>8</sup> and also by the writer of the Scandinavian Eddas.<sup>9</sup> These facts show, that one is not to disregard altogether the traditional statement of a writer like Zarthosht Behram Pazdu, simply because he was a comparatively much later writer.<sup>10</sup>

The Dabistan thus refers to the tradition of Changragâcha : " Zarathusht Behram, the son of Pazhdû, relates that, at the time of the promulgation of the pure faith in Iran, there lived in India a sage of profound learning, named Jangranghâchah,<sup>11</sup> whose pupil Jamasp had been during many years, a circumstance which procured him great distinction. On being informed of Gustasp's conversion, he wrote an epistle to the great king, to dissuade

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* the S. B. E., Vol. XLVII.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* F. Rosenberg's *Livre de Zoroaster*, l. 187. *Vide* p. 10 for the Persian text, p. 9, for the French translation.

<sup>3</sup> Bk. VIII., Chap. III, pp. 2 and 25. S. B. E., Vol. XLVII, pp. 35, 41.

<sup>4</sup> Chap. XIV, 12, *Ibid* p. 142.

<sup>5</sup> Shea and Troyer's Translation, 1843, Vol. I, p. 219.

<sup>6</sup> History of the early kings of Persia from the Persian of Mirkhond, translated by D. Shea, p. 286.

<sup>7</sup> The Natural History of Pliny, Book VII, Chap. 15. Bostock and Riley's translation (1855), Vol. II, p. 155.

<sup>8</sup> Scholion on the first Aleibides.

<sup>9</sup> *Vide* Jackson's *Zoroaster*, pp. 286-287.

<sup>10</sup> The tradition about Changragacha is referred to in the Dabistan and the Desatir. It appears doubtful, whether to include the writers among Parsee writers or Mahomedan writers. The name of a Mahomedan, Mohsan Fani, is connected with the Dabistan, but that seems to be more as a compiler or a collector or publisher than original writer. However these books are permeated with some later Parsee thoughts—with the thoughts of a particular sect of Parsees.

<sup>11</sup> Troyer thinks that it is a Persian corruption of Sankara Acharya.

him from the profession of the pure faith. By the king's command, this sage came to Iran to hold a disputation with Zardusht.....When he heard the solutions of his questions he..... adopted the pure faith."<sup>1</sup> The Desatir<sup>2</sup> also refers to this matter.

The Dabistan and the Desatir on the tradition of the Indian Biās becoming a Zoroastrian.

Besides, Changraghācha, there is another Indian sage, Biās (Viās) by name, who also is traditionally said to have been converted to Zoroastrianism. The Dabistan thus speaks of this sage : "When the report of Jangranghācha's having adopted the faith was published abroad, a sage, by name, Byāsa,<sup>3</sup> came from India to Iran... ..Byasa listened to the words of God, and having made profession of the pure faith, returned to Hindustan".<sup>4</sup>

The Desatir thus speaks of the traditions of Changraghācha and Bias : "Changragāch was a sage. He was known for his wisdom and intelligence.....When he heard about Zarthush Asphentaman, the prophet of God, he came to Iran to overthrow (Zoroaster's) good religion . . . . .When Changragāch saw such marvels, he entered into the good religion and returning to the country of India, he remained firm in this auspicious religion.....They say when Bias, the Indian came to Balkh, Gustasp called Zarthosht.....When he heard the replies of all that he asked and understood all, he bowed before God, and entered into the good religion and returned to India."<sup>5</sup>

Of course, we must not attach to these later books an importance more than what they deserve. But their authority is useful so far as they record a tradition that is supported by what we read in older works of the spread of Zoroastrianism in India.

Coming to Mahomedan Persian writers, we have several, whose writings refer to the tradition of the ancient connection between Persia and India, and of the consequent influence of Persia over India. We will not refer to all, as our subject will then be very long. Firdousi's Shah-nameh stands in the front rank. There are numerous references in it to the subject of the connection between Persia and India. We will not enter into all, but simply say that he begins the connection of India with Persia from the time of the Peshāddian Faridun. Faridun's

Mahomedan Persian writers on the tradition of the Ancient Iranians having come to India. Firdousi.

<sup>1</sup> The Dabistan, translated by David Shea and Anthony Troyer, Vol. I., pp. 276-77.

<sup>2</sup> The Desatir with a Gujarati Translation by Mulla Kaikobad bin Muncherjee (1848), p. 248.

<sup>3</sup> Troyer thinks that this name is Indian Vyasa.

<sup>4</sup> The Dabistan, translated by Shea and Troyer, Vol. I, pp. 280-283.

<sup>5</sup> I give my translation from the text, given in the Desatir by Mulla Kaikobad bin Muncherjee (1848), pp. 247-48, and p. 280. *Vide* also for the text quoted, Dastur Peshotan B. Sanjana's Zarthosht-nameh, and edition, (1902), pp. 67-68. *Vide* an edition of Desatir by Mr. Hataria (1887), pp. 147 and 156.

mother Frânak, sent her infant child, Faridun, to Hindustan to save him from the murderous hands of Zohâk, who invaded and conquered Persia.

The Âin-i-Akbari gives the following account of the kings of Persia who had come to India : Hoshang, the founder of the Peshadadian dynasty, the author of the *Jâvidân-i-Kherad* (Eternal Wisdom), was the first Irânian monarch to come to India.<sup>1</sup> The second Iranian king, who visited India, was Jamshed. He is said to have gone to China from India *via* Bengal. The next king was Zohâk. Then came Kershâsp and then Asfandyâr. Nariman son of Kersasp, Sam son of Nariman, Zal son of Sam, Framroz son of Rustam, and Bahman son of Asfandyar, are also mentioned as having come to India, for conquest. It is said, that Kersasp was told by his astrologers, that his heirs' rule over Zaboulستان would be overthrown, and that his and his heirs' remains would be disinterred by somebody. So, to avoid this mishap he had ordered that his remains may be buried at Kanauj in India. This was done. His example was also followed in the case of Nariman, Sam and Rustam ; Bahman, after overrunning Zaboulستان and killing the members of the family of Rustam in revenge of the latter killing his father Asfandyâr, came to Kanauj in India to destroy the remains of the above Zabouli grandees, all of whom had a lot of treasure buried with them and had tablets on their tombs, beseeching the conqueror not to meddle with their remains. Bahman was so overcome with the rich gifts and the exhortations, that he did not disturb the remains. He abstained from his original intention of destroying the remains in revenge.

Ferishta, who represents Krishna, as the first known Indian Raja, makes him a contemporary of King Tehmuras of Persia and says that there existed good relations between these Indian and Persian kings.<sup>2</sup> A nephew of this Maharaja Krishna had sought shelter with King Faridun. This Persian king sent his General Kersasp bin Atrud<sup>3</sup> to India and compelled the Maharaja to give a portion of his territories to his nephew.<sup>4</sup> After this time, Sam Nariman invaded Punjab at the direction of the

<sup>1</sup> Jarret's Translation, Vol. III, p. 325 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> " Paëvasté ba pâdshâhân-i-Irân tarîkeh-i mohbat va dâd masluk midâshht " (Naval Kishore's Lithographed Text of *Tarikh-i-Ferishta*, p. 10, l. 26).

<sup>3</sup> Kersasp Atrat of the Nam-grahan of the Afringân prayers of the Parsees. Briggs, in his translation of Ferishta's History represents Kersasp as the son of Faridun. That is a mistake. Ferishta does not say so. Briggs does not seem to have properly understood this name.

<sup>4</sup> Briggs gives the name of the nephew as Dongersen. I do not find that name in Naval Kishore's text. (Briggs Ferishta, I, Introduction).

Persian king. He was opposed by one Mahraj Mulchand, who at last sought peace. From this time forward, Punjab remained in the hands of the descendants of Faridun. It was governed by Kersap and by the members of his family, the ancestors of Rustam. It formed a part of the country of Kabul, Jabul,<sup>1</sup> Sind and Seistan, which was under the federal sway of Rustam's family. Kesurāi, the successor of Rājā Māhārāj, had asked the help of King Minocheher against some of his rebel kings. Minocheher sent Sam Nariman to his help. He met Kesurāe at Jallander<sup>2</sup> and helped him in subduing his tributary kings. Kesurai was succeeded by Firujrae.<sup>3</sup> He turned ungrateful to Iran. Taking advantage of its weakness during the times following the death of its great general Sam Nariman,<sup>4</sup> when Afrasiab invaded Iran, he rebelled against the suzerainty of Persia, and freed Punjab from its yoke. He took Jallander under his own sway<sup>5</sup> and then sending messengers to the Court of Afrasiab, offered his allegiance to him. Up to the time of King Kaikobad, Panjab remained independent under its Indian kings. Rustam then invaded India, and the Indian Raja, the successor of Firouzrāe fled to the mountains of Tirhoot. The Raja fled to the countries of Cheharkehand and Kundvareh and died there. Rustam placed one Suraj on the throne. It was in his time, that Hindus who hitherto revered the sun like the Persians, became idol worshippers at the instance of a Brahmin. Later on, Kedar Raja paid a tribute to Kaus and Kaikhusroo. Ferishta then traces the connection of Persia with India from the time of Ardeshir Babegan to that of Khushro Parviz.

The statement of Fireshta about the occasional conquests and rule of the Persian monarchs over India is supported by the tradition, heard on the frontiers in connection with the name of the fort of Jamrud in the Khyber Pass. I had the pleasure of going up to Ali Masjid in the Khyber in the spring of 1887, and on my way there, of seeing the fort of Jamrud.<sup>6</sup> While there, I heard the tradition, that the fort was connected with

<sup>1</sup> Naval Keshore's Text of Ferishtas' History, p. 11, l. 6. Briggs' copy gives the name of "Tibet" instead of Jabul.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11, l. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Briggs' Manuscript gives the name as Munirāe.

<sup>4</sup> Briggs attributes the weakness of the country to the death of Minocheher, but that seems to be a mistake, as it was in the time of Minocheher that Afrasiab had invaded Persia.

<sup>5</sup> "Jalahunder rā qar mumalik khud sākt".

<sup>6</sup> In a short account of my travels in Northern India in 1887, given by me in the "Jamshed" of Bombay, I have given the traditional etymology of the name of Jamrud. Latterly, I gave it in a paper, read before "La Société Asiatique" of Paris and entitled "L'Étymologie populaire des noms des étapes entre Pichaver et Kabul" (Journal Asiatique, Huitième-série, Tome, XIV (1889), p. 527.

the name of King Jamshed of the Peshdadian dynasty of Persia. The late Professor James Darmesteter, when he was in India, visited the place, when at Peshawar a short time before me, and he records as having heard the same tradition.<sup>1</sup>

## XVIII.

Professor Satis Chundra Vidyabhusana, in his interesting Paper, entitled "Persian affinities of the Liechavis,"<sup>2</sup> says: "That there was intercourse between Persia and Tibet in the ancient days, is evident from Kalidas's (Sanskrit) Raghuvamsa, Canto IV (verses 60—81), in which the foreign conquests of Raghu are described. Raghu, after describing the Pārsika (Persians), Huna (Huns), and Kamboja (the inhabitants of the Hindukush mountains, which separate the Gilgit valley from Balkh), ascended the Himalayas ..... This conquest of Raghu is perhaps a mere fiction, but it shows that in the days of Kālidasa, about 500 A. D., the people of India were aware of a route existing between Persia and India on the one hand and Persia and Tibet on the other."<sup>3</sup> According to this Professor, some Tibetan books speak of the earliest kings of Tibet as belonging to the *Li-tsa-byi* race. This word *Li-tsa-byi* is "a modified form of Liechavi."<sup>4</sup> "It is possible that during the occupation of Sogdiana,<sup>4</sup> and the neighbouring places by Alexander the Great, by the Bactrian Greek kings, and subsequently by the Scythians (the Yue-chi) about 150 B. C., some Persian people from Nisibis (off Herat)<sup>5</sup> immigrated to Tibet into the Himalayan regions, where they established a monarchical system of Government on the model of the Government in Persia."<sup>6</sup>

Mr. Vincent A. Smith says of this Liechavi tribe, that they are a Tibetan tribe, but Professor Sarat Chundra Vidyabhusana says that "they were a Persian tribe, whose original home was Nisibis, which they left for India and Tibet in the 8th century B. C. and 4th century B. C. respectively."<sup>7</sup> This Nisibis is thought to be the Niçaya of the Vendidad,<sup>8</sup> the curse of which city was scepticism (*vimano*, Pahl *gomān*, Persian *gumān*). The Professor adds: "The earliest reference to the people of Nisibis in Indian writings occurs

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* his lettres sur l'Inde. Huitieme lettre. La Coupe de Djemchid, pp. 153-75.

<sup>2</sup> *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXVII, March 1908, pp. 78-80.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> *The Sogda of the Avesta*, Vendidad I, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> *The Haroyu of the Avesta*, Vendidad I, p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> *The Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXVII, March 1908, p. 79.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>8</sup> Chap. I, p. 8.

in the famous Brahmanic Sanskrit work, the Manusamhitā (Chap. X, verse 12), in which they have been designated Nicchibi, which is, no doubt an Indian form of the Persian word Nisibis.<sup>1</sup> Manu describes the Nicchibis as *Vrātya-ksatriyas*, or an outcaste royal race, and names them along with Khasa, Karana and others. In the Bhavisya Purāna, Chapter 139, verses 33-65, Niksubhā is described as a daughter of the sage Rijisvā of the Gotra or Solar clan, and under the name of Hāvani as married to Surya, the Sun-God. I imagine that Niksubhā represents the name of a Persian girl of Nisibis, who worshipped the Sun-God, like other members of her race. In the Indian Pali works, they have been called Liechavi or Liechivi,<sup>2</sup> which is only a softened form of Nicchibi or Nisibis, and have been mentioned as living in a large number in Vaisāli (in Magadha)."<sup>3</sup>

The learned Professor attributes to the presence of the ancient Persians, the following three facts in connection with Tibet:— (a) "The Bam-yik variety of the Tibetan alphabet" which, he thinks, derives its name from Bāmyān<sup>4</sup> (off Nisibis) which was visited by the Chinese traveller Hiuen-Thsiang in 630 A. D. (b) The custom of exposing the dead before flesh-eating animals. (c) The ancient Bon religion, supposed to have been originated from the Tajiks who were Persianized Arabs. The magical arts, exorcism, witchcraft, &c., of the Tibetans are said to have come to them from the Magi of Persia. "Sen-rah, who was one of the most prominent Bon teachers, had among his spiritual descendants a Persian sage, named Mu-tso-tra-he-si."<sup>5</sup>

It is very likely, that even in later Buddhistic times, Persia may have had some influence on Tibet. Mr. R. F. Johnston says on the subject: "Chinese Buddhism has drawn its doctrines from many sources and from many schools of religious and philosophic thought. India, Central Asia, Persia, and China itself have all contributed to the final result."<sup>6</sup> We know that the Haoma plant, referred to in the Avesta<sup>7</sup> had as its home, among other countries, the country of Western Tibet.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The original Avesta form of the name is Niçaya.

<sup>2</sup> The letter 'N' of the word Niçaya (Nisibi) when written in Pahlavi, can be read as 'L.'

<sup>3</sup> Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXVII, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> The Bamikān mountain of the Pahlavi Bundelesh, Chap. XX, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXVII, March 1908, p. 80.

<sup>6</sup> "Buddhist China" by Reginald F. Johnston, p. 15.

<sup>7</sup> Yasna, Chaps. IX-XI.

<sup>8</sup> Vide my Paper on the "Haoma in the Avesta" Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay, Vol. VII, No. 3, pp. 202-221. Vide my Anthropological Papers, p. 230, n.



In connection with the question of an early connection or relations of Tibet with ancient Persia, there is one other story to be noted. Rai Sarat Chandra Das Bahadur, in his interesting article, entitled "Contributions on the Religion, History, etc., of Tibet,"<sup>1</sup> while speaking of the early history of Tibet (Chap. I), relates a story of Nah-thi-tempo, "the first of the Tibetan kings, who established universal sway over Tibet" that, "the parents packed it (the child) up in a copper vessel and floated it away on the river Gangā. A farmer finding it, carried it to his wife, who nursed it." One can compare the story of this marvellous escape of the first King of Tibet with that of Cyrus, the founder of the Achæmenian dynasty of Persia, who, as a child, was exposed to death, but was saved.

When Persia is believed to have influenced the Buddhism of the further East, of Tibet, of China, it is possible it may have influenced the country of the nearer East, India.

We thus see from a number of different evidences—the Avesta, the Cuneiform inscriptions of Persia, Herodotus, the Old Testament, Punch-marked coins of India, Pahlavi and Persian writers, the tradition as recorded in the Changragach-nameh, the tradition heard at the fort of Jamrud and the intercourse between Persia and Tibet—that the ancient Persians had a close connection with the Iadians, not only in the Achæmenian times but long before. These evidences prepare us for the theory of Dr. Spooner, that the Mauryans may be Persians.

## XIX.

### III.—A FEW CONSTRUCTIVE OBSERVATIONS ON THE LITERARY PART OF DR. SPOONER'S PAPER.

The *Māhābhārata*<sup>2</sup> speaks of certain Indian palaces as "the palaces of the Dānavas". They are spoken of as being built by Asura Maya. Dr. Spooner says that (a) this reference is to the Mauryan palaces at Pātali-putra, (b) that the Asura Maya is the same as Ahura Mazda of the Persians, (c) that the Dānavas of the *Mahabharata* were the Achæmenian kings of Persia, who, he says, spoke of themselves as Airayavo-Danghavo and (d) that the *Mahabharata* Dānava is the same as the Iranian or Achæmenian Danghavo (Airyavō Dānghavō), thus taking the meaning of the word Danghavo to be a race or people. He takes all these matters to support his theory, that the *Mahābhārata*

<sup>1</sup> Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. L, Part I (No. 3, 1881), p. 213.

<sup>2</sup> *Mahābhārata* II, l. pp. 14-17.

refers to the Pātaliputra buildings, and says, that they were built by Asura Maya (Ahura Mazda) for the Dānavas (the Airyavō Danghavō) who were Iranians. Let us examine, how far Dr. Spooner's deductions or assumptions are correct, and, if all are not correct, which are correct. In the case of those that are not correct, let us see, whether they go against his theory or can be otherwise explained.

In the first place, Dr. Spooner<sup>1</sup> lays aside as apocryphal and unsatisfactory, the Indian explanation of the derivation of the name Maurya from the name of a Sudra woman Murā, supposed to be the mother of Chandragupta. He connects the name with Mount Meru of the Purānas, which, as said by him, the Encyclopædia Britannica seems to identify with Merv, the Mourva of the Vendidad. According to the first chapter of the Vendidad, it is one of the 16 places of the Irānian migration, where, one by one, Zoroastrianism flourished. In his theory of comparing the hundred-columned buildings of Chandragupta at Pātaliputra with the hundred-columned building of Darius at Persepolis, Dr. Spooner tries to locate Merv, not at the modern Merv (Avesta Mouru), but at Persepolis itself where we find the name in Mervdasht or the plain of Murgab.<sup>2</sup> But looking to the fact, that, in the Vendidad, Mouru (Merv) is mentioned together with other places like Irānvez, Sogd (Sogdiana near Samarkand), Haroyu (Herat), Bākhdi (Balkh), &c., it is certain, that, at least the Mouru of the Vendidad is the Central Asian Merv and not the Merv of the Mervdasht or Murgab in the West. It is more probable, that the Hindus may have localised their Mount Meru in a nearer place like that of modern Merv in Central Asia, than a more distant place like the country of the Mervdasht or Mergab near Persepolis. It is certain, that the Vendidad Mouru or Merv is not the Persepolitan Merv, but the Central Asian one. It is true, that, as pointed out by Mr. Oldham who is quoted by Dr. Spooner, Merv "is merely an oasis" on the edge of a desert, remote from any mountains of importance; but one must remember that the physical geography of Central Asia now is not what it was in those early times and the present boundaries of places and districts also are not the same. The country of modern Merv has now lost much of its former fertility. Considerations like those, suggested by Mr. Huttington's interesting book "Pulse of Central Asia," make us pause, before coming to any hasty conclusion on the ground of the present physical condition of places.

<sup>1</sup> Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of July 1915, p. 406.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 400.

Again, I think, that when Darius speaks of Margu (Merv) in his Behistun Inscriptions, he refers to the Merv far away from his capital than to any Merv near Persepolis. He speaks of it in one place (Behistun III, 3) thus: "There (is) a region Margus by name: it became rebellious to me; one man Frada, a Margianian, him they made chief; afterwards I sent forth Dadusis by name, a Persian, my subject, satrap in Bactria against him, &c."<sup>1</sup> Darius would not have spoken of it in this way, had he in his mind any Merv near his home and capital. He speaks of sending the satrap of Bactria, which was near Central-Asia Merv, to suppress the rebellion. This fact, and the style of the order, both show that Darius referred to the distant Merv and not to any place of that name near his capital. Spiegel, Rawlinson and Tolman all take the Inscription-Merv to be the Central-Asian-Merv.

I think that the names Merv-dasht and Murghâb, which we find applied to places near Persepolis, are more modern, not Achæmænian or old Iranian. It is possible, that, just as new settlers now-a-days give to their new settlements, the names of old countries, *e.g.*, New England, New York, &c., the later Iranians—whether conquerors or settlers—may have given the name of the old Central-Asian-Merv to their new country near Persepolis. But even if it is shown, that the names Mervdasht or Murghâb, which on their face seem to be later, are old, I think that the references to Mount Meru in the Indian books and to Mouru in the Avesta and to Margu (Merv) in the Behistun Inscriptions, are not to the Western Merv in Mervdasht but to the Central-Asian-Merv.

But all these considerations do not necessarily, in my view, vitiate the theory of Dr. Spooner, that the Mauryan palaces of Pātaliputra had the Persepolitan palaces for their models, though one of his arguments to prove that theory does not seem to me to be correct.

The Mahābhārata attributes some Indian structures, such as those that form the subject of Dr. Spooner's excavations, to the demon Asura Maya. Dr. Spooner thinks, that this Asura Maya of the Mahābhārata is the Ahura Mazda of the Iranians. Just as Darius the Great attributed his exploits and his works to Ahura Mazda, the Mahābhārata attributed such buildings to Asura Maya. He says: "The equation of Asura with Ahura needs no defence. That much is palpable enough. Nor does the equation of Maya with Mazda involve

<sup>1</sup> Tolman's Guide to the old Persian Inscriptions (1892), p. 128.

any serious difficulties.”<sup>1</sup> Then, after explaining some phonetical changes, he further says: “This, then, justifies us in re-writing the form of Asura Maya as Ahura Maya, and the closeness of this to Ahura Mazda thus becomes apparent. Given Ahura Mazda in the mouths of imported masons, Asura Maya with a j sound, is what might normally have been expected as the indianized form of the name.”<sup>2</sup> I think that Dr. Spooner’s equation is quite possible. The final ‘da’ in Ahura Mazda is dropped, even by Parsees in their later books, wherein the name is found as Hormaz (زرمز). Some Persian dictionaries give the word as Hormaz. The name latterly began to be applied to places and to persons also in a contracted form. Take, for example, the name of the town of Hormuz or Ormuz in the Persian Gulf. Here, the final ‘d’ is dropped. Again some Iranian kings had their names as Hormaz. In the modern Parsee name of Hormaz (ji) or Horma (ji), the final ‘d’ and even at times, the last but final ‘z’ is dropped.

I would suggest, that the Asura Maya of the Mahābhārata may be a form of Asura Maha, *i.e.*, the great Asura, and that this form Asura Maha is the Indian form of Ahura Maza, *i.e.*, the ‘great Ahura,’ where ‘Ahura’ is an equivalent of ‘Ahura Mazda’. In the Avesta we often come across the single word Ahura for Ahura Mazda.<sup>3</sup> The word *maza* is the positive degree form of the superlative *mavishta*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *mahishṭa*, which is often applied<sup>4</sup> as an appellation to Ahura Mazda. The Avesta *maza* would be Sanskrit (मह) *maha*.

In connection with this name, Dr. Spooner says, that the imported Persian masons of Zoroastrian faith “made this name (Ahura Mazada) familiar to the Indian population in this connection specifically.” I beg to give one modern instance of thus familiarizing Zoroastrian names among non-Zoroastrians. I remember, one morning about 3 or 4 years ago, passing through a field in one of my morning walks at Naosari, where I had gone for a short change. A Hindu field labourer in his conversation, more than once used the word Dādār Hormuz for God. He had served under Parsee landlords and had thus taken up the name from them.

To meet the objection, which one may very likely raise, *vis.*, “How can Ahura Mazda be taken as an Architect?” Dr. Spooner says:

<sup>1</sup> Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of January 1915, p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 79.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. K. E. Kanga in his Avesta Dictionary says under the word Ahura, that it is, “the word for God in the Avesta; either Ahura or Mazda or Ahura Mazda is used for the same,” p. 72, col. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Ormazd Yasht, Yt. I. p. 19. Ashishang Yasht, Yt. XVII, p. 16.

"It is also true, of course, that in Persia itself Ahura Mazda, being the great Spirit and Creator, was not necessarily more closely connected with architecture than with other human undertakings. Presumably he was always invoked in every work man undertook, and all that mankind wrought at all was wrought by the Grace of Ormuzd." Dr. Spooner's assumption is right. A Parsee even now commences many an ordinary work, reciting the name of Ahura Mazda. His scriptures—the Ormazd Yasht,<sup>1</sup>—ask him to do so at all times, even when he takes his seat or when he leaves it, when he goes out of his house, out of his town or out of his country.

Again, one must bear in mind, that in the Avesta,<sup>2</sup> God is often spoken of as *tashan*, Sans. तक्षन, तक्षक, *i.e.*, the Maker, Architect, Creator. The modern Free-masons, who connect their craft with ancient masonry,<sup>3</sup> even now speak of God as the Great Architect.

Dr. Spooner says : "The Mahābhārata assigns the evidently Mauryan palaces to certain foreign kings called Dānava. (c) The Indian Dānavas and the Iranian Danghavō. The Mauryas originated from Persepolis and were perhaps of Achæmenian descent. The Achæmenian kings speak of themselves in their inscription as Airyavō Danghavō." Dr. Spooner takes this fact as significant, and, with some diffidence, takes the Dānavas to be the same as Danghavō, whose Sanskrit equivalent is Dasyavah. I think this identification is not correct. Dr. Spooner seems to have been misled by a statement in an article in the Encyclopædia Britannica where it is said that "the followers of the Zoroastrian religion in their earliest records never give themselves any other title but Airyavō Danghavō".<sup>4</sup>

The word *Danghu* in the Achæmenian inscriptions, occurs as *dahyaush* (Nom. singular). Both in the Avesta and in the Achæmenian Cuneiform, it is used in the sense of "a country, province or region." Its Avesta form is *dakhyu*. Its Pahlavi form is *dahyu*. The later or modern Persian is, ده *deh*. Never have these words been used in the sense of "people". Whenever they wanted to speak of the people, they used separate words for that. For example, in the Farvardin Yasht, we read "Airyanām dakhynām narām ashaonām fravashayō yazamaidē"<sup>5</sup> *i.e.*, we invoke the spirits of the holy men (narām नराम)

<sup>1</sup> Yt. I, p. 17, S.B. E., Vol. XXIII, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Yasna, XXIX, 2. *Vide* also Yasna, XXI, 9. XLVI, 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* my Paper on "The Legendary and the Actual History of Freemasonry" in my book of Masonic Papers.

<sup>4</sup> 9th edition, Vol. XVIII, p. 653. Article on Persian language and literature.

<sup>5</sup> Yt. XIII, p. 14j.

of the countries of Airyana (Iran). Again, we have the word often <sup>1</sup> used in an ascending grade, as nmâna, viça, zantuma, and dakhyu, *i.e.*, the house, street, village and country. This grade also shows, that the word danghu (Avesta dakhyu) in the Achæmenian inscriptions means a country. It is never used in the sense of "people." The Sanskrit word, desh देश, a region, a country, corresponds to this word. Dastur Neryosangh, in his Sanskrit translation of the Avesta, always translated the word as desh (देश).<sup>2</sup> When King Darius says : "(I am) Darius, the great King, the King of Kings, King of Persia, King of the countries (khshayathiya Persaiy khshayathiya dahyunâm), he means to say, that not only is he the King of Persia, but also of all other countries besides Persia. He speaks of Persia as Parsaiy. We must remember that Persia has taken its name from the small region or country of Pars. He seems to mean therefore that he is not only the King of Pars (Persia proper), but also of all other countries attached to it or dependent upon it. It is something like the words in the British kings' Declaration, that they are kings of Great Britain and Ireland and also of the Colonies and Dependencies.

I have spoken at some length on this subject to show, that Dr. Spooner is not right in taking any help for his view from a supposed identification or equation of the word Dâna in the Mahâbhârata, where the Mauryan palaces are referred to, with the word Danghava in the inscriptions of Darius. That identification must be given up. But Dr. Spooner's line of view in the matter of these words, may, I think, be otherwise upheld. The Achæmenian kings spoke of their countries other than that of Pars, as their "Dahyu," *i.e.*, "their countries". Thus, they applied the word "Dahyu" to their dominions in, and on the borders of India. The ancient Hindus often hearing the word 'dahyu' applied to the Iranian dominions on their frontiers, may have begun using the word for the occupants or the people of those dominions or countries. In this application, they may have used their Sanskrit equivalent 'Dasyu' in place of the Iranian Dahyu or 'Dakhyu'. We have instances of words, that are at first common nouns, being used gradually as proper nouns. For example, the Persian word Velâyet, which means one's own country, has, to some extent, come to be used for a proper noun. The first English settlers, when they went to England, very properly used 'Velayet' for their country of England. But latterly, the word has come to be used for England even by non-Englishman. It is not rare to hear now : "Such and such a person goes to Velâyet," thereby meaning England.

<sup>1</sup> Atash Nyâish Yasna LXII, 5, Aiwicruthrem gâh, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Yasna XXXI, 18. *Vide* "The Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsee," by Ervad Sheriarji D. Bharucha, Part II (1910), p. 69, l. 3.

Thus, the ancient Hindus may have used the word 'dasyu,' their equivalent for the Achæmenian word 'dahyu,' at first as a proper noun for the Iranian territories on their borderland. Then, the next step may have been that of using the name of the country for the people of that country. We have an instance of such a kind. For example, when we say "England or France invades Germany" we mean the people, the Englishmen or the Frenchmen. Sir Walter Scott, in his *Talisman*, makes Richard, Cœur de Leon, say to the King of France, "Peace with thy remonstrance France." Thus, he uses the word 'France', the name of the country, for its king.

We saw above, that though Dr. Spooner's identification or equation of the Mahâbhârata Dânavas with the danghvô of the Achæmenian inscriptions is not correct, still his theory, based on a possible identification, may be otherwise supported. But, I think, it can be better supported by taking the Mahâbhârata Dânavas with the Avesta Dânu.<sup>1</sup> The accusative plural of the word is Dânavô.<sup>2</sup> It is spoken of in the Avesta as a Turanian tribe, opposed to the Iranians, but that does not necessarily imply that they were non-Zoroastrians.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Haug says: "The name Dâna is given, both in the Vedas and Zend Avesta, to enemies with whom wars are to be waged. Compare *Yasht V*, p. 73 and *Atharvaveda IV*, 24, 2."<sup>4</sup> The Vedic Dânavas were "descendents from Danu by the sage Kashyapa. They were giants who warred against the gods."<sup>5</sup> According to Dr. Spooner's theory, the Dânavas were taken in the Mahâbhârata to be a foreign nation. So, when we read in the Mahâbhârata, that the palaces (the Mauryan palaces as supposed by Dr. Spooner) were built by Asura Maya for the Dânavas, we may take it, that by the word Dânavas here, were meant the Iranians who were disliked by the Indians and who were held to be foreigners or hostile to them.

From the Avesta point of view, it may be said: "How can the Dânavas be Iranians, because according to the Avesta, the Dânavas were the people who were hostile to the Avesta people—to the Iranians themselves. They were enemies common to India and Iran." This consideration does present a difficulty at first. But it seems, that the Dânavas, having come at first from the West for their inroads in

<sup>1</sup> *Yasht V*, 73; *Yasht XIII*, 37-38, S. B. E., Vol. XXIII, pp. 71 and 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Yasht V*, 73.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* the word Dânu, in my *Gujarati Dictionary of Avesta Proper Names*, p. 111.

<sup>4</sup> Haug's "Essays on the Parsees," 2nd edition, p. 279.

<sup>5</sup> *Dowson's Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology, &c.* (1879), p. 80. The word Danavas.

India, their name may have latterly lost its signification as a proper name for a particular people and began to be applied to the Irânians also, who also came from the West as a conquering or hostile nation. We have other instances of words thus assuming broader significations. For example, take the word "Guebre." The Mahomedans first applied it to the Persians as an equivalent of fire-worshippers. Then, in India, they began to apply it to the Hindus also, in the ordinary common sense of *kafars* or disbelievers. Again, take the word *Firangi*, as used in India. At first, it was applied to the first Westerners, the Portuguese. Then, it began to be applied to all Europeans who came from the West. Again, we must bear in mind, that, though the Avesta uses the word for a hostile tribe, yet it does not follow that all the Dânus or Dânavas were non-Zoroastrians. Again the Dânus are referred to only twice in the Avesta, in the Aban Yasht,<sup>1</sup> and in the Farvardin Yasht.<sup>2</sup> In both the places, they are spoken of as the Turanian Dânus (Dânavô Tura). These words show, that there may be Iranian Dânavas also as opposed to Turanian Dânavas.

In his attempt to prove the equation of Ahura Mazda and Asura Maya, Dr. Spooner says as follows:—"Is not the great Ishtar, perhaps the most popular divinity among the Persians, peculiarly associated with these very Asuras or Dânavas? Witness the compounds *asuraguru* 'teacher of the Asuras' and *Dânavapûjita* 'worshipped by the Dânavas', both of which are Sanskrit names for Venus, well-attested".<sup>3</sup> This statement of Dr. Spooner suggests several thoughts from the Iranian or Zoroastrian point of view.

"The Great Ishtar,<sup>4</sup> perhaps, the most popular divinity among the Persians" which, according to Dr. Spooner, is associated with the Asuras and Dânavas, is the Ardvîçura Anâhita of the Avesta, the Aphrodite (Venus) of the Greeks. It is the word 'Anâhita,' that has produced the later Persian word 'Nâhid' for Venus. This Ardvîçura Anâhita is much associated with Ahura Mazda, who has created her for the welfare of the house, the street, the town, the country. Ardvîçura Anahita is also the name of a great Iranian river. I identify this river Ardvîçura with the great Oxus. The name Oxus seems to have come from Aksu, a great branch of the Oxus, and I think that this name Aksu can be properly derived from Ardvîçura.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Yasht V, 73.

<sup>2</sup> Yasht, XIII, 37-38.

<sup>3</sup> Journal Royal Asiatic Society, January 1915, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> For this Babylonian name, *vide* Rawlinson's article "Ishtar called Nuna at Babylon." Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. I, pp. 634-6. Appendix to Book I.

<sup>5</sup> *Vide* my "Glimpse into the work of the B. B. R. A. Society" (1905), pp. 26-27.



It is in the description of this river Ardvīçura Anāhita,<sup>1</sup> that we find an account of what an Iranian palace on the bank of a river was. It was a palace with 100 well-formed windows, 1,000 lofty columns and 10,000 well-built fine pillars.<sup>2</sup> The districts of Wakhar, Sharikul and Kanjut are situated on the banks of the Oxus. According to Wood<sup>3</sup> and Gordon,<sup>4</sup> remnants of Zoroaster's creed were seen there till about 500 to 700 years ago. It is also in an account of the Ardvīçura Anahita, that we find a reference to the Iranian Dānus or Dānavas. There, the worshippers pray and implore Anāhita to subdue some leaders of the Turanian Dānus (Dānavô Tura-Vyākhnâ)<sup>5</sup>. In the Farvardin Yasht also, the worshippers pray to overcome the Turanian Dānus (Dānunām Turanâm) <sup>6</sup>.

Mr. E. W. Gosse, in his article on Denmark in the Encyclopædia Britannica,<sup>7</sup> says: "The original form of the word Denmark is Dan mörk, the march" or border of the Danir; but whence the name Danir or Danes, proceeded, is undecided and has given rise to endless Antiquarian discussion." I think, it is this Avestaic name Dānu, the Vedic Dānava, that has given its name, not only to the country, Denmark, and to the people, the Danes, but also to the rivers Danube, Dneiper, Dneister, Don, &c. Denmark is "the country of the Dānus (Dānes)". Danube is "the river (Avesta āp., Sanskrit अण, Lat-aqua, Perian āb, *i.e.*, water) of the Dānus.

It is significant to note that the name of the river Danube in the lower part of its course is Istar, which is the classical name of a goddess who is the same as the Irānian Anāhita, later Persian Nāhid (Venus). It is also significant to note that the word Dānu in the Avesta also means a river (*e.g.*, Danu-Drājangha,<sup>8</sup> *i.e.*, as long as a river).

<sup>1</sup> Aban Yasht, Yt. V. 101, S. B. E. Vol. XXIII, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Darmesteter translates the word *fraskemb* as "balconies."

<sup>3</sup> Wood's journey to the source of the river Oxus, 1st edition, p. 333. Wood speaks of three Kaffer forts there, which according to the natives there, were erected by the Guebres or fire-worshippers.

<sup>4</sup> Speaking of the country of Shignan and of the time between 500 and 700 years ago, Gordon says: "The country was at that time in the hands of the Zardushtis (ancient Guebres fire-worshippers), a powerful and learned race." (The Roof of the World by Col. Gordon, (1876), p. 141).

<sup>5</sup> Yasht V, 73.

<sup>6</sup> Yasht XIII, 37-38.

<sup>7</sup> 9th edition, Vol. VII, p. 84.

<sup>8</sup> The word "march" is the same as Persian *مرز* *marz*, country, The English word Marquis is similar to the Persian word, Marzbān.

Yasna LX, 4; Yt XIII (Farvardin), 30.

Hindu books speak very rarely and very little of the Maurya kings.

(d) Silence of the Hindu books about the Mauryas. Rājatarangini's nameless and fameless kings.

Some say, that the silence was due to the fact that they were Buddhists, and so, they were not liked by the Brahmin writers of books. If so, why is Chandragupta not mentioned. "Chandragupta certainly was not a Buddhist, and as the first great Indian Emperor, we should not have been surprised to find him deified and in course of time identified with Vishnu or with Shiva". Dr. Spooner assigns the oblivion of his and his family's name to the fact, that he was a Persian, a Zoroastrian, and as such, was not liked by the Hindus. In connection with this matter, he refers to the Rājatarangini of Kashmir, where the "fifty-two nameless and fameless kings of early days" are ignored as those "whose praises no poet could be hired to sing. . . . The Great Asoka seems to be among these infamous monarchs." Dr. Spooner thinks that those early monarchs were not found praiseworthy, because they were foreigners, they were Irānians, they were Zoroastrians.

The Rājatarangini<sup>1</sup> refers to a King Mihir Cula, as a wicked monarch, in whose reign, the Mlech'has had an ascendancy<sup>2</sup>. He founded the temple of Mihreshwara and the city of Mihrapur in which "the Gandhāra Brahmins, a low race. . . . were permitted to seize upon the endowments of the more respectable orders of the priesthood"<sup>3</sup>. These Gandhāra Brahmins (गन्धारा ब्राह्मण) of the Malechha dynasty (मलेच्छवंश) seem to be a class of priests of the Zoroastrian faith. The Gandhāras, referred to by the Rājatarangini, were the Gandārius referred to by Herodotus<sup>4</sup> as a people of one of the satrapies of Darius Hystaspes. They were the same as the Sogdians who "had the Bactrian equipment in all respects",<sup>5</sup> and formed a part of the army of Xerxes. That they were a class of Zoroastrian priests from the West, appears from several facts.

1. Firstly Kalhana, the author of the Rājatarangini, gives a here-say about them (ainsi dirent quelque uns),<sup>6</sup> that these Gandhāra Brahmins had the next-of-kin marriages among them. This is an

<sup>1</sup> Book I, Shlokas 306 *et seq.* Troyer's French Translation of 1840, Vol. I, p. 33, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Vide my Paper "Cashmere and the Ancient Persians" Journal B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XIX, pp. 242-44. Vide my "Asiatic Papers" (Part I), pp. 103-5.*

<sup>3</sup> Wilson's Essay on the "Hindu History of Kashmere" in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XV, (pp. 1-119) p. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus *Ibid*, Book III, 91.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, Book VII, 66.

<sup>6</sup> Shloka 308. Troyer's French Translation.

allusion to the so-called custom of the next-of-kin marriage among some ancient Persians,<sup>1</sup> a custom supposed to have been connected with the matriarchal custom which may be tribal with some Magi<sup>2</sup>. (2) Secondly, the Râjatarangini speaks of a number of flesh-devouring birds following the army of the foreign king.<sup>3</sup> This, I think, is an allusion to the Parsee mode of the disposal of the dead wherein the bodies are eaten by birds.

As it is, the Râjatarangini's reference to the Iranian Brahmans, (Mobads) encroaching upon the domain of the Indian Brahmans, is about times later than that of the Mauryas. But one cannot depend upon the chronology of Kalhana. He may have transferred to later times, an event which actually may have occurred much earlier. He connected the event with a known King, Mihiracula, of later times. This Mihiracula is supposed to be the Hunnic king referred to in Indian History<sup>4</sup> and in the book of travels of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang<sup>5</sup>. The Chinese pilgrim<sup>6</sup> speaks of him as having lived "some centuries ago." This confirms my above statement that one cannot depend upon the chronology of Kalhana's Râjatarangini, whose Mihirakula is identified with the Mihiracula of the Indian history and of the Chinese traveller. However, whoever the Mihiracula may be, he may be an Iranian, and he may be a Mazdayacnân. Even if we take him as a Hunnic king, in spite of being one of the Huns, he may be a Zoroastrian by faith. When we say, that he may be a Zoroastrian, we do not necessarily mean that, such as he is represented to be, he was a true and good Zoroastrian in his character. But, anyhow, he may be said to have belonged to the fold of Zoroastrianism. We have the authority of the Avesta<sup>7</sup> to say, that some of the Hunnic leaders who fought against the Iranians, observed well nigh the same forms of ritual and worship.

<sup>1</sup> The Shloaka, referring to this custom, is omitted by Dr. Stein from his Text, but is found in Troyer's text, p. 38. Dr. Stein refers to this omission in the foot-note. As to Mihiracula, Dr. Stein also thinks that the name is Iranian.

<sup>2</sup> For this custom, *vide* a Paper on "Royal Marriages and Matrilineal descent" by Miss Margaret Murray (Journal of the Anthropological Institute of England, July-December, 1915.)

<sup>3</sup> Shloaka, p. 291.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Vincent Smith's History of India, 2nd edition (1911), pp. 316-317.

<sup>5</sup> Si-Yu-Ki. Buddhist records of the Western World, Bk IV, translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A. D. 629) by Samuel Beal, Vol. I, p. 167.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168.

<sup>7</sup> Aban Yasht.

When Chandragupta defeated the last king of the Nanda dynasty and drove him away from his dominions, the Nanda king is said to have sought the help of six Rajas or kings. Five of these were Hindu Rajas and the sixth is said to be "the great King of the Malechhas or Parasikas (Parsis)."<sup>1</sup> This shows that some Parsee Kings had a Kingdom in the close neighbourhood of India. Lassen <sup>2</sup> thought, that this Parsee King was Seleucus, the successor of Alexander the Great, who was then reigning over Persia. As he ruled over Persia, the country of the Parsees, he came to be known as a king of the Parsees, though himself a Greek. Even if we agree with Lassen and say, that by "the king of the Parasikas or Parsees" Seleucus, the Greek was meant, the fact is very significant. It shows, that the Parsee conquerors of the Achæmenian times, who had preceded Alexander and his Greeks in the conquest of India, had made such a strong impression upon the mind of the Hindus and had so strongly influenced them, that they knew a later Greek ruler of their Persian country as a Parsee.<sup>3</sup>

But, I have my doubts about Lassen's interpretation, that by the "King of the Parsees" Seleucus was meant, as he occupied the throne of the country of the Parsees. If that interpretation is correct, why was not Alexander the Great himself, a greater conqueror and ruler than Seleucus, who first conquered and ruled Persia, spoken of as "the king of the Parasikas or Parsees?" I think some real Parsee sovereign or ruler in the neighbourhood was meant. He must have influenced the Hindu people, and so it was, that his help was sought by the Nanda King.

Dr. Spooner supposes, that Chanakya, the Minister of Chandragupta, also was a Persian, an Âtharvan himself. Among the Vedas, the Âtharva Veda is given a lower place by old Hindu writers and their followers. Why so? It was so, because, therein, you find much foreign non-Hindu element and influence. "There were in early India, Kings of Persian race who brought their own priests with them." We saw above, that Mihiracula was one of such kings. The rites and ceremonies of these foreign priests are preserved in this Atharva-veda. For

<sup>1</sup> Journal B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. III, No. XIV, p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Lassen was the well-known author of "Die alt-persischen Keilenschriften von Persepolis" (1836) and the editor of the first five chapters of the Vendidad (1852).

<sup>3</sup> Vide my "Glimpse into the work of the B. B. R. A. Society," p. 143.

this reason, the Atharva-veda was held in lower estimation. The Atharvans, the foreign priests also were held in lower estimation. Chānakya, who was a foreign Atharvan priest in the Court of Chandra-gupta, himself held to be a foreigner, was also therefore not held in high estimation by old Hindu writers. Chanakya, however, was held in estimation by his monarch and he thus founded the tradition of their being held in some esteem. "This tradition would soon establish itself, and soon no king however purely Hindu in his race, would dare dispose the Atharvan from his rank." <sup>1</sup>

The Atharva-veda, though it had a foreign Persian origin, "is a mixture or a blend of imported Magian doctrines, with those other similar and harmonious beliefs which the Magians found among the Hindus of their time." There may have been a certain jealousy and friction between the rival schools at first, but as the Magi grew acclimatized, community of interests will have fused the two<sup>2</sup>.

Now "the name of the Atharva-veda is a two-fold one—Atharvāngirasas we find it called. Both elements in this compound name, it will be recognized, are equally good Persian".<sup>3</sup> According to the Vishnu-purana, "Angirasa is one of the vedas in Shāka-divipa, *i.e.*, it is a Persian scripture. The warrior-caste in Shāka-divipa, curiously enough, are known as Māgatha. The Brahmins are called Magas, and the Kshatriyas Māgadhas . . . . In the Atharva-veda itself, in a passage suggestive of that early friction . . . . the Māgadhas are spoken of contemptuously." In another place Magadha is spoken of as "inhabited mostly by foreigners."

In connection with this question of friction between the Indian Âtharvans and the Iranian Âthravans, a passage in the Yaçna (Chap. IX, Haoma Yasht, 24) is very significant. Therein, we read of hostility between a foreigner, one Keresāni, and an Iranian, Haoma. As to the foreigner, Keresāni, Dr. Mills compares him with "the Vedic Krishānu archer and demi-god, who guarded the Soma." (S. B. E. XXXI, p. 237, n. 4). As to the Iranian, Haoma, we know from the Avesta that he was a priest and was associated with the Haoma-drink. Keresani is represented as having been overthrown by Haoma. Thereupon, he (Keresani) prayed: "May no Âthravan teacher move about in my country for spreading (his faith) (nôit me apām Âthrava aiwishtish vêrêdhyê danghavê charât)." Taking the above two proper names as typical or as representatives of their class, what we find is this:

<sup>1</sup> Journal Royal Asiatic Society, July 1915, p. 421.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 421-22.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 421 (*vide* Haug's Essays on the Parsis, and ed., p. 294, for the same view).

Here we have a clear reference to some friction or hostility between two classes of priests. The Indian priests wish, that there may be no more of missionary work in their country by the Iranian Âthravans.

The meaning attached to the word 'Keresani' by some later Pahlavi translators and commentators is significant. They took the word to be a common noun in the sense of Kilisyaka, *i.e.*, Christians, which is an instance of anachronism. But the fact seems to be this: The antagonism between the Indian priests and the Iranian priests was so marked, that the word Keresani came to be latterly used for all "enemies of Zoroastrian religion," and even for all enemies in general. During the times of the Pahlavi writers, there had arisen hostility, both political and religious, between the Christians of the Eastern Roman Empire and the Zoroastrians of Persia. The word used for Christians was Kilisyaka which is a corrupted form of "ecclesiastus." So, latterly, the Pahlavi commentators, forgetting the old schism and friction with the Indian opponents, the Indian Athravans, took the word for the later Christian opponents. The word Kilisyâk itself seems to have undergone a similar change and exchange of idea. So, we find some later writers speak of Alexander the Great as a Kilisyâk. As the Christians were coming from the West, they, "by anachronism," took Alexander, who also had come from the West, to have been Christian. Or, more probably, they began using the word Kilisyâk also in the sense of "religious opponents", and so, applied the word to Alexander who had given a great blow to their country and religion and of whom they often spoke as the gazashta, *i.e.*, the accursed.

After a long statement of his views on the subject of the Âthra-  
veda, suggested by the Âthra-  
vana minister of  
Chandragupta, Dr. Spooner refers to a passage  
(g)References in the  
Bhavishaya Purana  
to Zoroastrians. in the Bhavishaya-purâna, referred to by Wilson  
in his Vishnu-purâna. Wilson says: "There  
is some curious matter in the last chapter relating to the Magas, silent  
worshippers of the Sun from Sâka-dvipa, as if the compiler had  
adopted the Persian term *Mugh* and connected the fire-worshippers of  
Iran with those of India".<sup>1</sup> I will refer here to a few points mentioned  
in the Bhavishaya-purana, which are also referred to in Iranian  
books :—

1. "The tradition . . . which records the introduction of the  
worship of the Sun into the North-West of Hindustan by Samba, the  
son of Krishna."

2. "This prince having become a leper . . . . . resolved to retire into the forest and apply himself to the adoration of the Surya . . . . . Samba . . . . . retired to the celebrated grave of Mitra (Mithra), where by fasting, penance and prayer, he acquired the favour of Surya and was cleaned of his leprosy."

3. "Gauramukha (white face), the Purohita of Ugrasena, king of Mathura, advises that the Magas may be sent for, to officiate at the temple founded by Samba as a mark of gratitude, in honour of Surya whose worship cured him of leprosy. Samba himself went on the bird Garuda to Saka-dvipa and brought 18 families of Magas to India. Wilson says at the end: 'There are other particulars mentioned, which are of a more explicit tenour . . . . . Enough may be extracted (from the Bhavisha-purāna) to establish the identity of the Magas of the Purana with the followers of Zoroasters.'"<sup>1</sup>

(a) According to the Bhavishya Purāna, it was Samba, the son of Krishna, who introduced Sun-worship into the North-West of India. Fireshta, the well-known Mahomedan historian of India, says, that Sun worshippers entered into India from Persia, in the time of Mahārāj, the son of Krishna.<sup>2</sup> So, both say, that Sun worship came to India in the reign of the son of Krishna. According to Fireshta, idol-worship came into operation, later on, in the reign of a King named Suraj.

(b) The Bhavishya-purāna connects leprosy with Sun-worship, and says, that that worship, carried out in the grove of Mithra, cured the disease. Compare with this what Herodotus says of this connection. He says: "If a Persian has the leprosy, he is not allowed to enter into a city, or to have any dealings with the other Persians; he must, they say, have sinned against the Sun. Foreigners attacked by this disorder, are forced to leave the country."<sup>3</sup> According to Ctesius, Megabyzus, a Persian general, escaped being arrested, by pretending that he was a leper. The Persians were so afraid of the disease that they let him run away rather than arrest him. Leprosy was one of the diseases of which the ancient Persians were most afraid. King Yima (Jamshed) prays for its extinction in his *vara* or enclosure.<sup>4</sup> The Ābān Yasht enjoins that consecrated food shall not be given to persons suffering from leprosy.<sup>5</sup> The Bhavishya-purāna refers to the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 445.

<sup>2</sup> Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. I, p. LXIV.

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus, Book I, p. 139. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Vol. I, p. 27<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> *The Vendidad*, Chapter II, p. 29.

<sup>5</sup> *Yasht V*, p. 92.

Sun being worshipped in the grove of Mithra for the cure of leprosy. We have no direct reference to Mithra in connection with leprosy in the Avesta, but in the Meher Yasht, the Yasht in honour of Mithra, we find a reference to all virulent diseases, suggesting that the worship of Mithra may alleviate these. Leprosy may be one of such diseases.

The word Gauramukha (white face), as the name of the Purohita, who advised that the Magas may be sent for to officiate at the temple in honour of the Sun, seems to me to be significant. This name, which Dr. Spooner thinks to be obviously Magian, reminds us of the word "gaura" गौर occurring more than once in the 16 Sanskrit Shlokas, said to have been composed by the early Parsee settlers who landed at Sanjan. The line which runs more than once in the Shlokas is गौराधीराः सुवीरा बहुबल निचयास्तेवयं पारसीकाः. Here the Parsees speak of themselves as the "white faced."

•(h) A few particulars given by Wilson to establish the identity of the Magas of the Puranas with Zoroastrians. Dr. Spooner gives a number of particulars, which, according to Wilson, go to establish the identity of the Magas of the Puranas with Zoroastrians. They are the following:—

1. The wearing of the *Kurcha*.
  2. The Maga custom of eating in silence.
  3. Their being called Vachārchā, *i.e.*, Sun-worshippers.
  4. Their having four vedas, including the Angirasa.
  5. The use of the Avyāṅga or Parsi girdle.
  6. Their use of the Varsma or Varsama.
  7. The prohibition of touching the dead.
  8. The prohibition of casting a dead dog on the ground.
  9. The necessity of worshipping the Sun just before death.
10. A Maga (a) "should let his beard grow (b) should travel on foot, (c) cover his face in worshipping and (d) hold what is called purnaka in the right hand and the Shankha (conch-shell?) in the left; (e) and he should worship the Sun at the three Sandhyas and the five festivals."

These particulars, says Wilson, "are more than enough to establish the fact that the Bhavishya purāna intends by Magas, the Mughhs of the Persians, the Magi of the Greeks and the Parsees of India." Let



us examine their similarity in details. (a) The Kurcha (No. 1) may be something like the Sudrah or sacred shirt of the Parsees. (b) The *Avyāṅga* (5) is the Avesta *aiwayālonghana*, the modern Kusti. (c) The *Varsama* (6) is the Avesta *Baresmana*. The ancient Persians used it ceremoniously while saying their grace at meals. Its use at a banquet given in honour of Nyatus, a Christian ambassador from the Roman Emperor Maurice at the Court of Khusro Parviz (Chossors II) led to a quarrel between the Roman ambassador and a Persian magnate Banduy. (d) The two prohibitions (7) and (8) are referred to in the *Vendidad*.<sup>1</sup> (e) The Persians have special prayers in honour of the Sun which they are required to say three times a day. The three details Nos. 3, 4 and 9 are not sufficiently clear. We do not clearly see what similarity Wilson sees in them. (f) The four Vedas (4) may refer to the *Nyāyashes*, *Yashts*, the *Yaçna* and the *Vendidad*.

A part of No. 10 is not clear. (a) The custom of letting the beard grow is still prevalent among the Parsee priests.<sup>2</sup> (b) The injunction of travelling on foot implies the prohibition of a long sea or river voyage. Tacitus refers to this old custom as observed by Tiridates, the King of Armenia, who was a vassal of the Roman Emperor Nero. Even now, Parsee priests, who perform the inner liturgical services, are prohibited to go on a long sea voyage. Even while travelling on land with ceremonial religious requisites used in ritual, they have to observe certain observances. To observe this, they prefer walking to going in carriages. (c) The reference to covering the face in worshipping is a reference to the use of *paitidāna* or *padān*. The *Flamines*, the ancient Roman fire-priests, also had a similar custom.

According to Maçoudi, the custom (No. 2) of holding silence at meals among the Iranians, is very old. It arose during the reign of Kaiomars. Kaiomars advised, that the object of taking food was to nourish the body. If a man, at the time of meals, talks and thinks, all the parts of the body are not well-nourished and digestion is impeded. The process of thought takes away something which ought to go for the process of digestion.<sup>4</sup>

Maçoudi thus describes the origin of the custom : " On rapporte que Keyomert fut le premier qui prescrivit le silence pendant le repas. La nature, disait-il. reçoit ainsi la part qui lui est due. Le

<sup>1</sup> *Vandidad III, V, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> *Vide my Presidential Address before the Anthropological Society of Bombay. Journal, Volume X, No. 5, pp. 343-44 and n. 1.*

<sup>3</sup> *Vide my " Glimpse into the work of the B. B. R. A. Society."*

<sup>4</sup> Maçoudi, traduit par B. De Meynard, Vol. II, p. 108.

corps profite des aliments qu'il prend. Les esprits vitaux retrouvent alors le calme ; chaque membre est apte à concourir, par l'absorption des sucs alimentaires, au bien-être et à la santé du corps ; le foie et tous les organes de l'appareil digestif reçoivent leur nourriture, et toutes les fonctions de la vie sont régulières. Au contraire, si l'homme, quand il mange, est distrait par une préoccupation quelconque, la digestion se trouble, les aliments sont inégalement répartis, et il en résulte un mélange et un trouble très-préjudicibles aux esprits vitaux et à la santé. A la longue, ce désordre doit amener une scission entre la faculté pensante et raisonnable et le corps humain ; la pensée l'abandonne et il devient incapable de se conduire avec discernement."<sup>1</sup>

Garuda was one of the vehicles by which the Magi entered India.

(i) The bird Garud and Avesta Garô-nmâna.

Dr. Spooner says, he was impressed "with the striking iconographical resemblance between the sculptured images of Garuda in India, and the customary figure of Ahura Mazda in ancient Persian art". He sees some relation between the Garud and the Garô-nmâna, the abode of Ahura Mazda in the Avesta.

One cannot very properly connect this word Garud with the Avesta Garô-nmâna, because one has to take the Avesta 'n' for the Indian 'd'. But in the Gathas, the older writings, we find 'd'. There the word for Garô-nmâna is Garo-demâna (Yaçna XLV, 8, L, 4 ; LI 15) (*Vide* Le Zend Avesta par Darmesteter Tome I, p. 251, n. 6, pp. 298, 336). So, from Dr. Spooner's point of view, the word Garô-demâna would be better than Garô-nmâna for the sake of comparison.

But, I think, that this comparison of a Garud (a bird) with Garô-demâna (paradise) appears rather far-fetched. I think, that instead of comparing the *words*, one may better compare the *ideas*. Garuda (a bird ; hence the idea of a fast-going vehicle) was meant for a fast journey. The Avesta (Farvardin Yasht, Yt. XIII, 71), while describing the coming of the Fravashis (or the Farohars, the guiding spirits) from the other world to this world, speaks of their coming in the form of a bird (mânayen yatha nâ meregho hupareno, *i.e.*, like a person in the form of a good-winged bird). This signifies a quick flight. No sooner the spirit is invoked, it responds and is there. The figure of Ahura Mazda (I think it is rather that of the Fravashi of Ahura Mazda, not of Ahura Mazda himself) is represented as a winged-bird. The Fravashi or Farohar comes down from Garô-nmâna as a bird. That idea seems to have been taken from the above notion of the Farvardin

<sup>1</sup> Maçoudi Vol. II, pp. 108-109.

Yasht, that the Divine or Heavenly beings come quick, as it were, in the form of birds. So, I think, it would be better to compare the idea of flight or a quick march on the back of the bird Garud in the Puranas, with the idea of flight of Heavenly beings from the Garô-demâna in the Avesta. We may note, that in the Parsee scriptures, the Garô-demâna or Garô-nmâna is the seat not only of Ahura Mazda, but also of his Ameshâspands or Archangels and of the Fravashis or Good Holy Spirits. According to the Vendidad also (Chapter II, 42), there is a bird Karshipt which is allegorically represented as teaching religion in the country of Yima.

Dr. Spooner's reference to Oriya, Bengali and Assamese as Orissa, Bengal, languages, and to Orissa as a centre of Iranians, etc., as a centre etc., reminds us of the introduction of the of the Iranians. Târikh-i-Ferishta, (*vide* Briggs' translation of the Tarikh-i-Ferishta, Vol. I, p. LXIV, *et seq.*). According to Mahomedan authors, as said above, the ancient Iranians were connected with India from very ancient times even Achæmenian times. They had more than once extended their conquest even up to Bengal (*vide* my "Glimpse," etc., p. 145, for a short summary of what Ferishta says).

(j) A few further notes. I will conclude my Paper with some few short notes on some further observations of Dr. Spooner.

Dr. Spooner agrees with Goldstücker, who said that the word 'Yavana' as used by Panini, meant "the writings of the Persians, and probably the cuneiform writings." Thus, we find that the word Yavana was used for the Parsees. Dr. Spooner thinks that the name Bhagadatta was a Persian name. The Sanskrit Bhaga was an equivalent of Avesta Baga, God. We learn from Herodotus, that there were several Persian names which were derived from Bhaga or Baga. For example the following: Bagæus, Bagapates, Bagaśaces, Bagoas and Bagaphanes.

The Sâka-dwipa of the Indians is the Sekastan, Sagastan, Sagistan or Siestan of the Persians. The Sanskrit द्विप dwipa, corresponds to the Avesta *Stâna*, Sans. स्थान, *i.e.*, place. Sakastan is the place of the Sakas. The same letter in Pahlavi can be read k, g, j and i. Hence, the different forms of the name. We have a treatise in Pahlavi, named "Afdih va Sahigih-i Seistan", *i.e.*,

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Rawlinson's Note on "Proper names of Medes and Persians, Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. III, p. 553."

“The Wonders and Marvels of Seistan”<sup>1</sup>, which shows, that Seistan was a seat of Zoroastrianism in early times and that the early teachings of Zoroaster were associated with it. Rustam, the national hero of Persia, was ruling here as a vassal of the Shāh of Iran. So, he was a Saki. His enemies, playing, as it were, a pun upon the word, taunted him as Sagi, *i.e.*, a dog.

Dr. Spooner quotes the Mahabharata to say, that in Sāka-dwipa, there is no king. From what we learn in the Avesta, about the city where lived Zarathushtra as the spiritual head of the community, we find, that there also, there was no separate ruler. Zoroaster himself was the temporal as well as the spiritual leader or head. In the Yaçna,<sup>2</sup> they refer to the city of Ragha (Rae) which is associated with the early life of Zoroaster. It is said there, that for the administration of a city, there are five heads or rulers : 1. The house-owner, who is the head or ruler of his own house (nmāna), 2. The head of the street (viç), 3. The head of the village (Zantu), 4. The head of the city or country (danghu), and 5. Zarathushtratemo (the spiritual head). But, in the city, where Zarathushtra himself lives, there are only four heads, because, Zoroaster being on the spot, he is both the temporal head and the spiritual head.

But, if we look to the above statement of the Mahābhārata, from another point of view, *viz.*, a reference to a Republican form of Government, then the statement about the 16th place mentioned in the Vendidad is significant. That country is not specifically named but is mentioned after India, and it is said of it, that it is a place where people “live without a head or ruler” (Asārō aiwyākhshayēnti).<sup>4</sup> Bearing in mind, that Sakastān or Seistan is the country which is chiefly associated with the work and teaching of Zoroaster in the above Pahlavi treatise, one can apply this reference of the Vendidad to that country. The river Rangha, referred to in connection with this matter in the Vendidad, is identified by Dr. Geiger with Rasho of the Vedas and by Windischman with the Indus.

<sup>1</sup> Title for its translation my “Aiyādgīrei Zarirān.” &c.

<sup>2</sup> Journal R. A. Society, July 1915, p. 438.

<sup>3</sup> Yaçna XIX, p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Vendidad I, 20.

ART. XVII.—*A Note of Correction for the Paper "A Persian  
Inscription of the Mogul times" (Journal, B. B. R. A.  
Society, Volume XXIV, No. 1, pp. 137-161.)*

By

SHAMS-UL-ULMA Dr. JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A., Ph. D.

(*Read on 30th March 1916.*)

I had the pleasure of reading a Paper before this Society, on 18th March 1915, under the title of "A Persian Inscription of the Mogul times on a stone found in the District Judge's Court at Thana." I had sent a copy of it to Mr. H. Beveridge, I C.S. (Retired), a well-known writer on the subject of Mogul History. In his letter, dated 1st December 1915, acknowledging the receipt of that Paper, he writes that "the inscription is a valuable one," and kindly draws my attention to a mis-reading of the inscription and to a consequent mistake in my translation. I thank Mr. Beveridge for this, and take this early opportunity for correction.

In my above Paper, I had said : "I do not presume that my decipherment is altogether correct. There are a few difficulties in deciphering it quite correctly. One can see, both from the stone and the impression which I produce, that the slab is a little broken. It has lost a slip in a somewhat vertical line. So, words and letters, here and there, are lost. This is the principal cause of the difficulty of an altogether correct decipherment. Another cause is the difficulty of deciphering the nuktehs ( *نکته* ) or points occurring in Persian letters. It is difficult to determine whether a particular part of the slab bears a nukteh or only a scar as the result of the wear and tear or a careless handling of the stone. However, in spite of these petty obstacles, there is no great difficulty in deciphering the inscription, as far as the sense of the whole inscription is concerned. One may decipher a word or a letter, here and there, in a way, different from the one which I beg to submit, but I think that, that will not make much difference in the matter of the general signification of the inscription." <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Journal B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXIV, No. 1, p. 140.

The error, to which Mr. Beveridge, from his vast knowledge of the history of the Moguls, draws my attention, occurs in the fifth line of the inscription. The error arises from the above alluded difficulty of the nuktehs or points. In the fifth line there is a word, the last letters of which bear no nuktehs. I took two nuktehs under a letter and read it as تہیہ *tahiyé* (*tahaiyat*), in the sense of "preparation, arrangement." But as said by Mr. Beveridge the word is تہہ "Tatta" He says: "The word is not Tahir تہیر but تہہ Tatta, and the meaning of the passage is that Raja Gopaldas and his son Balaram were both killed at the siege of Tatta in Scinde." Mr. Beveridge then gives references to works which refer to the siege of Tatta and the connection of Gopaldas and his son with that siege. I thankfully accept his reading of the word as Tatta, which is supported by historical references given by him. I would, therefore, correct my translation of this portion, and translate the words درجنگ تہہ بکار آمدند as "they fought<sup>1</sup> in the battle of Tatta or "they became useful in the battle of Tatta."

Shâh Jahân had laid siege to Tatta, and in that siege, both Gopaldas and his son Balaram, referred to in the inscription, had proved themselves very useful. Raja Sivram Gor راجہ سیورام گور was the son of Balaram and grandson of Gopaldass. While speaking of him the Maâsiru-l-Umara<sup>2</sup> says thus:

راجہ سیورام گور—پور بلرام بن راجہ گوپال داس  
 است چون پدر و پدر کلان او در عہد شاہزادگی اعلی  
 حضرت بہنگامئہ یرزش تہہ بکار آمدند او بیش از پیش  
 مورد التفات گردید

*Translation.*—Raja Sivram Gor. He is the son of Balaram, the son of Rajâ Gopâldâs. As his father and grandfather, in the time of the principedom of His Most Exalted Majesty had fought (or had become very useful) during the period of the siege of Tatta, he was more and more honoured with favours.

---

<sup>1</sup> کار kâr, war, battle. بکار آمدن also means to be useful. So, the sentence may also mean "They became useful in the battle of Tatta."

<sup>2</sup> The Maâsiru-l-Umarâ (Histories or traditions of the noblemen) by Nawâb Samsan d-Daulab Shâh Nawâz Khan, edited by Maulavi Abdur Rahim and Maulavi Mirzâ Ashraf 'Alî. (1890), Vol. II, p. 261.

Again, while speaking of Raja Bithadass (Vithaldas) Gor, the second son of Gopaldas, the above work says thus <sup>1</sup>:—

راجہ بیتھلداس کور—پسر دوم راجہ گوپال داس کور  
 است: کہ در ایام مراجعت سلطان خرم از بنگالہ و ورود  
 بیروہالپور قلعہ دار آسیر بود پس از آن شاہزادہ اورا نزد  
 خود طلب داشتہ سردار خان را بجای او گذاشت و در  
 محاصرہ تہہ باپسر جانشین خود بلرام نام بمردانگی جان  
 نثار گردید—

*Translation.*—Raja Bithaldas Gor. He is the second son of Raja Gopaldas Gor, who in the time of the return of Sultan Khurram from Bengal, and arrival at Barhanpur, was the fort-commander of Asir. Afterwards, the prince, calling him before him, appointed Sirdar Khan in his place, and in the siege of Tatta, he with his son (and) heir, Balaram by name, sacrificed his life in a manly way.

This passage then shows, that Gopaldas and his son Balaram had not only fought bravely in the siege of Tatta, but were gloriously killed. So, Shâh Jahân showed all possible favours to the other sons of Gopaldas.

This corrected reading will add an event to the number of events, referred to in the inscription, on which I have dwelt at some length in my previous paper. I will describe that event here, at some length, resting on the authority of the *Ikbâl-Nâma-i-Jahangiri*, as referred to in Elliot's History :—“ Shâh Jahân, with a small party of adherents, had proceeded to Thatta. . . On approaching Thatta, Sharîfu-l Mulk, the Governor of the country, and a devoted son of Shahriyâr's, came forward arrogantly with 3,000 or 4,000 horse, and 10,000 infantry, collected from the country, to oppose Shâh Jahân's progress. The Prince had with him only 300 or 400 horse; but Sharîfu-l Mulk was afraid to attack them, and retired into the fortress of the city. The fortress had been lately repaired, many guns had been mounted and chosen parties of men held the various bastions, prepared to make a vigorous defence. Shâh Jahân forbade any attempt upon the fort, and desired to avoid a sacrifice of life from the fire of the fortress. A party of his brave fellows, not heeding his prohibition, made an attack; but the works were too strong, and the fire too heavy, so they were repulsed. Some days later another party, unable to repress their ardour, made their attack. The ground round the fortress was level and open, with

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 250-251.

not a mound, a wall, a tree, or any kind of shelter. So they placed their shields in front of them and rushed forward. They came upon a broad and deep ditch, which was full of water. To advance was impossible, to return still more so. Trusting in Providence as their fortress, there they stayed. Shâh Jahân sent to recall them, but they did not retire. Some of his most devoted servants went to bring them back ; but each one that went took part with them, and choosing the road to death, never returned" (Elliot, VI pp. 432-33.)

Mr. Beveridge draws my attention to two more points in my paper, not for correction, as they require no correction, but for further elucidation. These points do not refer to the inscription, but still it is worth while to draw to them the attention of the readers of my paper.

(a) I have referred to Raja Roz-Afzun. <sup>1</sup> In the abovenamed Maâsir-u-Umara, <sup>2</sup> we have a long account of this Raja. He is there spoken of as the son of Raja Singram ( راجہ سنگرام ). In the Ain-i-Akbari, <sup>3</sup> this Singram is spoken of as the Raja of Kharakpur (Bihar). He had a Mahomedan name, because, though Hindu by birth, he had turned a Mahomedan. <sup>4</sup>

(b) I have referred to a seditious person, Kutb, whom I have compared with the Pseudo-Smerdis of the Achæmenian times of King Darius of Persia. This Kutb (Qutb), is thus referred to in the Tuzuk-i-Jehangiri or Memoirs of Jehangir. <sup>5</sup> "On the 19th Urdibihisht, in the fifth year of my reign . . . . . there occurred a strange affair at Patna . . . . . An unknown man of the name of Qutb belonging to the people of Uch, who was a mischievous and seditious fellow, came to the province of Ujjaiyoja (Bhojpur) . . . . . represented to them that he was Khurram who had escaped from prison and conveyed himself there . . . . . He showed those deceived ones the parts about his eyes."

There are two references to Raja Mândhâta in the Maasir-i-Alamgiri. <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Journal Vol. XXIV, p. 145. Page 9 of my Paper. <sup>2</sup> Vol. II, p. 218. ;

<sup>3</sup> Blochmann's Translation, Vol. I, p. 446. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, n. 1.

<sup>5</sup> The Tuzuk-i-Jehangiri, translated by Alexander Rogers and edited by Henry Beveridge (1909), p. 173.

<sup>6</sup> Pages 207 and 517, Bengal Asiatic Society's Text (1871). (a) In one place he is spoken of as holding the Thanehdâri of Gorband ; (b) in another as the son of Râokanku.



My previous paper has drawn the attention of another gentleman, Rai Bahadur B.A. Gupte. He thus writes to me from Belvedere, Alipore, (P.O. Calcutta), on 16th January, 1916 :—

“ In connection with the Persian inscription found near the District Judge’s Court at Thana, published in Volume XXIV, No. 1, (1914-1915), of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, I know the following particulars: In the house now called the Chāndraseniya Kāyasth Prabhu Social Club (No. 7 Ganpatrāw Jairām Street), there lived in the fifties, an old gentleman, named Dādā Sāheb *Asirkar*. He was our neighbour as between his residence and my family house, there intervened only one building. I knew his grandson who was a little younger than myself. His name was Ramchandra, one of his arms was injured and much shorter than the other. The *Asirkar* family finally shifted to Bhivandi in the Thana district. My grandfather Ganpatraw Janardan Gupte was the first Government Prosecutor of the Thana District Court. He was a friend of this Dādā Sāheb *Asirkar*, and I remember to have heard the members of that family, talking of their official connection with *Asirgad*. I was only 6 or 7 years of age at that time, but I think that in the south-east corner of his compound, there lay a stone with some letters on it. I have asked Mr. B. V. Kharkar, B.A., who lives in the intervening house, to trace this *Asirkar* family and to try to get some information about their connection with *Asirgad* and *Māhuli*. I will send you further particulars with pleasure, if I get them. I do not know whether Dādā Sāheb *Asirkar* was employed in the District Court, nor do I know how the stone was taken to the District Court. But one thing is certain that the family left Thana soon after 1858. I also know that the late *Atmaram Mahipat Paralikar*, *Mamlatdar* of *Bassein* (and subsequently of *Poona*) had in his possession a long roll of the account of building a fort, but I am not sure whether it was *Parali* or *Māhuli*. I have a faint idea that, that fort was somewhere in the *Nasik* District in which my grandfather was a *Munsiff*. Mr. *Atmaram*’s son is employed in the *Baroda* State. I have written to him too.”

This letter seems to suggest, how the stone may have come to Thana. The *Asirkar* family, which had derived its name from its official connection with the fort of *Asir* in the Thana district, may also have been connected with the *Mahuli* fort in the Thana district. So, it is possible, that some member of that family may have brought the stone to Thana.

*P.S.*—After writing and reading the above correction Note, I have received another letter from the same gentleman, which shows further

the connection of the Asirkar family with some forts in the Thana district. They may also have been in charge of the Mâhuli fort and may have brought the stone from there to Thana. We do not know how it passed from their house to the Court house. In this second letter, from Belvedere, Alipore, Calcutta, dated 12th April, 1916, Rai Bahadur Gupte says :—

“ I have at last been able to trace the history of the Asirgad stone. Mr. Purshottam Vaman Likhite Asirkar, a descendant of the Dadasaheb I mentioned in my last, lives at Thana, in the house known as Mulki's Vada. He says, that his ancestors held the hereditary Potnishment of Fort Kohaj, about 7 or 8 miles from Asir Mahal in the Mahim Taluka of the present day. There is a Fort called Asirgad in that locality.

“ After the British conquest, his ancestor Laxman Ranchandra Likhite lost the hereditary appointment, and became talati of Asirgad. He was subsequently made Mahalkari of Nagothana, Mamlatdar of Pen, and finally Mamlatdar of Mahim, his ancestral tract.

“ After the retirement he lives in house No. 7, Kharkar Ali, *viz.*, that I have described in my last. It is quite possible that as a Mamlatdar, he may have brought down the old stone of that house, where I saw it.”

The following facts about Tattah may be mentioned. It was founded by Nandu Bâhiniya, a chief of the tribe of Samma, who had received the title of Jâm (Târikh-i-Tâhiri by Mir Tâhir Muhammad Nasyâni of Thatta who lived in the beginning of the 17th century. Elliot I, p. 273). Firoz Shâh attacked and took it (Târikh-i-Firoz Shâhi, Elliot IV 12). Shah Beg took it in about 1520 (*Ibid* I, p. 500). Mujahid Khan took it in 1574, on behalf of king Akbar (*Ibid* I, p. 241). In the Maâsir-i Alamgiri, the city is called Thatta (The Bengal As. Society's Calcutta edition by Mahmud Saki Mustakhan (1871), p. 517).

ART. XVIII.—*The Early History of the Huns*  
*and*  
*Their Inroads in India and Persia.*

BY  
SHAMS-UL-ULMA DR. JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A., PH.D.  
(Read on 28th August 1916.)

I.

During the present war, we have been often hearing of the ancient Huns, because some of the ways of fighting of our enemies have been compared to those of these people. Again, the German Emperor himself had once referred to them in his speech before his troops when he sent them under the command of his brother to China to fight against the Boxers. He had thus addressed them:—"When you meet the foe you will defeat him. No quarter will be given, no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy. Just as Huns, a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Attila, gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historic tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again dare even to look askance at a German."

Well-nigh all the countries, where war is being waged at present, were, at one time or another, the fields of the war-like activities of the Huns. Not only that, but the history of almost all the nations, engaged in the present war, have, at one time or another, been affected by the history of the Huns. The early ancestors of almost all of them had fought with the Huns.

The writer of the article on Huns in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*<sup>1</sup> says, that "the authentic history of the Huns in Europe practically begins about the year 372 A.D., when under a leader named Balamir (or Balamber) they began a westward movement from their settlements in the steppes lying to the north of the Caspian." Though their strictly authentic history may be said to begin with the Christian era, or two or three centuries later, their semi-authentic history began a very long time before that. They had powerful monarchies and extensive empires, and illustrious conquerors and rulers. They had a glorious as well as an unglorious past during a period of nearly 2,000 years. According to the *Avesta* and *Pahlavi* books of the Parsees, they had fought with the ancient Persians of the times

---

<sup>1</sup> 9th edition, Vol. 12, p. 381.

of Zoroaster and even with those of times anterior to him. The History of the Huns, is the history, as said by M. Deguignes, "of a nation almost ignored, which established, at different times, powerful monarchies in Asia, Europe and Africa. The Huns, who, later on, bore the name of 'Turks,' natives of a country situated on the North of China, between the rivers Irtysh and Amur, made themselves, by degrees, masters of the whole of the great Tartary. Since 200 B. C., several royal families have successively reigned in these vast countries. They had empires more extensive than that of Rome, illustrious emperors, legislators and conquerors who have given rise to considerable revolutions."<sup>1</sup> It is the history of a nation, who has, through its one branch or another, "contributed to the destruction of the Roman Empire, ravaged France, Italy, Germany and all the countries North of Europe, ruined the empire of the Khalifs, and possessed the Holy land."<sup>2</sup> Their Empire, which, at one time, extended to Western Europe in the West, and to China in the East, has left, as it were, its marks in the names of places like *Hungary* in Europe and *Hunza*<sup>3</sup> in Asia. In the name of Hungary, we see its old Chinese name, *viz.*, Heungnoo or Huingnu. They were "a people who lived with glory during more than 2,000 years."<sup>4</sup> Gibbon<sup>5</sup> speaks of them as "the terror of the world." It was more than once, that they had shown themselves to be the terror of the world. It was during, what may be called, their second period of terror in Europe, that their name was associated with Attila.

At different times and at different places, they were the subjects, the allies and the enemies of Rome. Gaul was at different times open "to incursions of Vandals, Germans, Suevi, and savage eastern Allani." Of these, the Allani were "perhaps pressed into the Empire by the advance of the Huns from their Scythian steppes."<sup>6</sup> Britain was long ruled by Rome. But it was the pressure of various eastern tribes, and, among them, that of the Huns, which compelled Rome to look after its own home in Italy and to withdraw its army and its protection from Britain. In about 406 A.D., Rome withdrew its legions from

<sup>1</sup> I translate from "Histoire Générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols, et des autres Tartares occidentaux, &c., avant et depuis Jesus Christ jusqu' a present," par M. Deguignes (1756) Tome premier, partie premiere, Preface p. V.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. VI.

<sup>3</sup> Lit, Place (Jâ) of the Huns. It is also known as Kanjud. It is a State on th Upper Indus, forming a part of the country of Gilgit.

<sup>4</sup> Histoire des Huns, &c., by M. Deguignes, p. XXV.

<sup>5</sup> Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, (1745) Vol. II, p. 342.

<sup>6</sup> "Leaders and Landmarks in European History," by A. H. R. Moncrieff and H. J. Chaytor, Vol. I, p. 149.

Britain.<sup>1</sup> They had long wars with the ancient Romans, the ancient Germans and with other nations of Europe. During these wars, they had advanced up to the further West of Europe. Their wars and their inroads had even forced some of the people of the West to cross over the sea and to go to Africa. Again, they had frequent wars with the ancient Persians from very early times to the later times of the Sassanians. Coming to India, they had made more than one inroad into the country. Not only had they made inroads, but had made a long stay and ruled for a number of years over various parts of the country, extending from Kathiawar<sup>2</sup> to Pataliputra. They had their capital at Sialkote. They are even said to have imported into India alien Brahmins from the West.

History has recorded inter-marriages of the princes and princesses of some of the nations of the West and the East with the princesses and princes of the Huns. The fact of these royal marriages suggests, that there must have been inter-marriages among their respective subjects also. From all these facts and considerations, which we will examine in this Paper, one may say, that the blood of many of the branches of the above nations, both of the West and the East, has been mixed with that of the Huns. In connection with this subject, one may read with great interest, Mr. R. Bhandarkar's very interesting article in the Indian Antiquary,<sup>3</sup> entitled "Foreign elements in Hindu population," wherein, the learned author points to the Huns also, as forming a foreign element in the Indian population. It is in the company of these Huns, that the tribe of the Gujars is said to have come from without to India—the tribe that gave its name to our Gujarat in the West of India, and to Gujarat and Gujranwala in the Punjab.

## II.

It is such a people that forms the subject of my Paper. I propose to speak of them, not only from the Western point of view, but also from the Iranian and Indian points of view. The object of this Paper is, not so much to give any running history of this people, as to refer to some events in their history which had some far-reaching results. The subject was suggested to me during my study for a paper on "The Hunas of the Indian books in the Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees," contributed for the coming memorial volume in honour of our vener-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> For their relations with Kathiawar, *vide* the recent (1916) interesting book on "The History of Kathiawar," by Captain H. Wilberforce Bell, pp. 32, 37, 40.

<sup>3</sup> Indian Antiquary of January 1911.

able and esteemed Sanskrit scholar, Dr. Sir Ramcrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. This Paper is based on collateral notes collected during the study for that paper. It contains only a passing reference to the special subject of that paper.

In the few centuries before and after Christ, there existed the following great kingdoms :—

- 1 China in the East, 2 Rome in the West, 3 Persia under the Parthian rule and 4 India. The last two stood between the first two, as connecting links.

The Huns, under different names, had relations with the nations of all these four great kingdoms, and lived, at times, now and then, here and there, on the frontiers of these four great kingdoms, harassed their people and had long wars with them. Again, at times, they lived as subjects of these kingdoms and at times, as their allies. We will speak of the relations of the Huns with these four great powers at or about the commencement of the Christian era.

Our sources of information on the History of the Huns are various.

Sources of information. 1. Firstly, as to their relation with China, we have to look to the Chinese annals, which give us also a glimpse into their origin and very early history. We find a good account based on these annals, in the "Histoire Générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols, et des autres Tartares occidentaux, &c.", by M. Deguignes. In this connection, we must bear in mind, that the Huns were known in different countries and in different ages by various names, such as, Turcs, Mongols, Tartares, Haetalites, &c.

2. For their relations with Rome, in whose decline and fall, they had a strong hand, we have to look to various classical writers, whose accounts have been presented to us by various recent writers. Gibbon has spoken of them in his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

3. As to Persia, we have references to them in the Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees, where they are spoken of as Hūnus. I will not speak of these references here, as I have referred to them, as said above, in a separate paper in the Bhandarkar Memorial Volume. Several Mahomedan writers on the history of Persia, such as Firdousi, Maçoudi, and Tabari, have spoken of them. But they have not spoken of them under their original name of Huns but as Haetalites, Turcs, &c. I will refer to them, when I speak of the inroads of the Huns in the Sassanian times.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We get a very good account of them in the late M. E. Drouin's "Mémoire sur les Ephtnalites dans leurs Rapports avec les Rois Perses Sassanides" (1895).

4. Coming to our own country, India, they are referred to in Indian books and in Indian inscriptions. Just as they had, following the inroads of the German and Gothic tribes, a strong hand in bringing about the downfall of the Roman Empire, and just as they had, followed by the Arabs, a hand in the downfall of the Sassanian Empire of Persia, they had a hand in the downfall of the Indian Empire of the Gupta dynasty. Again, their inroads into India should not be taken as a separate event in their history. Just as in times before Christ, the check, which they had received in their inroad into China by the construction of the Great China Wall, had forced them to turn to the West, towards the countries of the Roman Empire, so the check, which some of their tribes received in Europe, partially in, and mostly after, Atilla's time, drove them back towards the East, towards Persia and India. Though their inroads into Persia had weakened the Persian Empire, they had a substantial check there and it was this check again that drove them strongly towards India.

### III.

Before coming to the subject proper of this Paper, *viz.*, their inroads into the countries of the above four great kingdoms in the first century before Christ, we will say a few words on their origin and earlier history, for which subject the Chinese annals, as studied and described by M. Deguignes, are our main authority.

Origin and early history. Their movements guided by the want of Bread and Butter.

The writer of the article on Huns in the Encyclopædia Britannica<sup>1</sup> says: "We have no adequate philological data for conclusively determining the ethnological position of the ancient Huns.....The Huns, in all probability, belonged to the Turkish branch of the great Turanian race." The Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees support this view.

Tartary has been the name by which a very extensive part of Asia, north of India, has been known. It has been divided into Eastern Tartary and the Western Tartary. Their people, the Tartars, and especially the Western Tartars, are known as Huns. The Eastern Tartars have played an important part in the history of Asia, forming powerful empires here and there, but it was very rarely that they marched towards Europe. The Avars, who latterly played some important part in the history of Western Asia and Eastern Europe, are the only branch of the Eastern Tartars who went to the East. But, though they themselves did not go to the West, it is they, who, as it were,

<sup>1</sup> 9th Edition, Vol. XII, p. 382.

forced the Western Tartars, the Huns, to go to the West. They invaded the country of the Western Tartars and made them fly to the West. It is the Western Tartars who marched towards the West, towards India and Persia in Asia, and towards Rome, France, Germany, etc., in Europe, that are known as Huns. They are called Hûnus by Iranian writers, Hunas by Indian writers and Huns by Roman writers. In Tartary itself they bore the name of Hiengnou.<sup>1</sup> M. Deguignes identifies them with the Heungnoo or Hiungnu, who, according to Chinese writers, owned a great empire from the Caspian to the frontiers of China. This empire then fell into a state of anarchy and lost all its influence at the end of the first century A.D. One section of this fallen race went to the West, settled in the country near the river Ural and became the ancestors of the Huns, who, 300 years after, re-asserted their power and influence under Balamir and came into contact with the Romans.

Thus, what we see is this : The Huns leave their Asiatic country and advance towards the West as well as towards the East. In the West, they drive tribes after tribes from their countries. These tribes, being driven from their countries, enter, at times peacefully, but generally, fighting into other regions and drive away the people thereof. The people, thus driven in their turn, force others to leave their places. It is something like what would happen in a crowd. Those behind push those in their front. These in their turn, push those before them and so on. Thus, the slightest push or rush behind produces a rush all along the line and even in the distant front. This was what happened in the case of the inroads of these people towards the West—in Europe as well as in Asia.

Now, what is at the bottom of these grand national or tribal pushes, is the demand for Bread and Butter. Dr. Ellesworth Huttington has very well illustrated this fact in his "Pulse of Asia. A Journey in Central Asia, illustrating the Geographical basis of History." He dwells upon, and illustrates, what is called "the Geographic Theory of History." Applying this to the History of Europe, what we find is this : The Huns who lived in Asia, were, owing to a change in the physical condition of their country, obliged to leave their country in search of bread. They gradually dispersed in large numbers. Some went to the East and some to the West. In their search for bread, they drove away by force the people of the country where they found bread. The people thus displaced, proceeded further and drove away the people of the country they occupied. Thus, it was that the Huns had driven

---

<sup>1</sup> " Histoire Générale des Huns " by M. Deguignes, Tome I, Partie I, p. 213.



away some of the German tribes, who, in their turn, went to other countries.

M. Deguignes begins their history, on the authority of Chinese accounts, at about 1200 B. C.<sup>1</sup> Though it is since 209 B. C., that we get some proper materials for their history, they flourished long before that time. Their first empire was destroyed by the Chinese and it was restored by Teon-man-tanjou, who was their first Emperor, known in history. He died in 209 B. C. M. Deguignes gives a long list of his successors from B. C. 209 to A. C. 93.<sup>2</sup> During the reign of one of these successors, Pou-nou-tanjou, who came to the throne in 46 A.D., a great famine devastated their country and weakened their empire. During the time of weakness and difficulty, they were driven to the North by the Eastern Tartars. The Chinese also attacked them and compelled them to leave their country. Some of them went towards Kashgar and Aksou. Thus, their empire in Tartary, in the north of China known as the country of Turkestan, was destroyed.

It was a branch of these early Huns, that latterly went to Europe at the time when Emperor Valens was ruling at Rome. They were then ruled by their chiefs, of whom Balamir was the principal (A.D. 376). M Deguignes<sup>3</sup> gives a list of the dates of his reign, and of his successors' or contemporaries' reigns as follows :—

Balamir...	...	...	...	A. D. 376.
Uldes	...	...	...	„ 400. A prince named Donat was his contemporary.
Aspar	...	...	...	„ 424.
Roilas	...	...	...	„ 425.
Roua or Rugula	...	...	...	„ 433.
Attila and Bleda (the nephews of Roua)	...	...	...	Bleda died in 444. Then Attila ruled alone and died in 454.

Some of these may be contemporaries ruling over different tribes.

Ellac, Denghisic, Hernack, the three sons of Attila, divided the countries of Attila among themselves and among their two other relatives, Emnedzar and Uzindar. These princes were defeated by the Romans and the power of the Huns in Europe was destroyed in 468 A.D. Some Huns preserved their power round about Georgia. Some

<sup>1</sup> "C'est aux environs de l'an 1,200 avant J. C. que nous devons placer le commencement de l'Empire des Huns." "Histoire des Huns." Tome I, P. I., p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 218.

others ruled in the country near the Danube and continued there up to the time of their chief Zambergam who became Christian in 618 A. D. Since that time, the Huns have been mixed up with the Avars above referred to, who were an offshoot of the Eastern Tartars.

The above named Pou-nou-tanjou (46 A. D.) had, in order to secure the succession to the throne, to his son, got murdered another rival prince. Another prince of the family of Pe, King of Gesui, closely related to the murdered prince had raised a revolt. He ruled in the south in the countries close to China. His country formed the Empire of the Huns of the South. He declared himself the Tanjou or Emperor of that kingdom. He made an alliance with the Chinese and took an active part in weakening the Huns of the North. But, in return, they were much weakened by many of their tribes joining with the Huns of the North. So, in the North, at about 48 A. D., another powerful dynasty was formed. Deguignes gives us a list of these rulers from 48 to 216 A. D. <sup>1</sup>

#### IV.

Now, we will speak, one after another, of their relations with, or inroads into, the territories of the Chinese, Persian, Roman, and Indian Empires.

##### I.—THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE CHINESE EMPIRE.

According to the Chinese writers, in the third century B. C., their rule extended from the Caspian Sea to China. One of the Chinese Emperors, named Cheng, built in the 3rd century B. C., a great wall to prevent their frequent inroads into his territories. This emperor had come to the throne in 246 B. C. at the age of 13. He drove away the Huns in 215 B. C. and then built the Great Wall. By an irony of fate, China was up to late, ruled by the princes of the Manchou Tartars who were the descendants of the very race against whom the Chinese wall was built. It is said of this Great Wall that about 30 lacs of men were engaged in building it. An army of 3 lacs of men was engaged to defend the labourers. It was more than 1,500 miles long. It was 10 to 40 feet in height and 15 feet in breadth. One of the reasons for the Fall and Decline of Rome (and also of the check of the rising power of the then Germans to a certain extent) was this Great Chinese Wall. Of course, the inroads into Italy of the Teutonic tribes, which formed the German nation in the 5th century, formed, one of the reasons—one of the principal reasons, perhaps the principal reason—of the downfall of the Roman Empire. But, we will see later

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 219.

on, that these German hordes were dispersed and driven towards Italy by these Huns, the barbarian hordes of Central Asia.

The Pyramids, the Great wall of China, and the Himalays are spoken of by some to be the three greatest Wonders of the World. Of these three, one—the Himalays—is the work of Nature. It is the Great Wall of India, built by the hand of no Emperor, but by God, that Emperor of Emperors, that Grand Architect of Architects. Had it not been so placed or built, imagine what would have been the trouble of our rulers to protect the country from Northern invaders. This wall of Nature gives one an idea of the importance of the Chinese Wall to the great Chinese Empire. The Pyramids form a grand work of man. But they are mere mausoleums, and had and have no practical use, proportional to the great expense of money and trouble spent over them. But the Great Wall of China had the practical purpose of defending the country, thus saving enormous military expenditure. The Romans under Julius Cæsar built a wall on the Rhine, about 200 years after the Great Chinese Wall. It was on a smaller scale and it was to protect the frontiers of the Roman Empire against some barbarian German tribes. Perhaps, the idea of this wall was suggested to Rome by the Chinese Wall. This Roman Wall on the Rhine was broad enough on the top to serve as a military road. But it did not serve its purpose as a practical work. The German hordes were too strong for it. But the Chinese Wall served its purpose against the Huns. The Chinese Emperor, who began building it, died in 210 B. C., while the Wall was being built.

Being stopped in their frequent inroads into China in the East, the Huns turned their attention to the West. They gradually advanced to the West. It was not a sudden march from the East to the West, but was a work of years, nay of centuries. Those were not the times of regulated Transport or Commissariat departments in the East, especially in the case of wandering tribes like those of the Huns. What they did was this : When they were stopped in their advances at one place, they turned to another. They stopped there and continued to live there as long as they comfortably could. Feeling some kind of pinch, they advanced further. In these advances, at times, the tribes or the people whose country they occupied, advanced further in search of fresh fields for food.

The Great Chinese Wall, having prevented the Huns from making frequent encroachments on the Chinese territories, forced them to turn towards the West in the direction of Asiatic and Greek Kingdoms, and towards the south-west where lived the Yue-chi. These Eastern Huns, at

first attacked the U-suivi tribes, who in their turn attacked the Yue-chi. These Yue-chi, being thus pushed by the Huns, turned towards the West and attacked the Su living on Lake Balkash. The Su tribe, which was thus attacked, consisted of the different Turanian tribes, such as the Messagatæ, Tochari and Dahæ, who lived on the frontiers of Persia on the shores of the Upper Jaxartes. The Dahæ seems to be the Dahi of the Dâhinâm Dakhyunâm of the Farvardin Yasht<sup>1</sup> of the Parsees, which speaks of the five known countries of the then world. The Su tribe, being attacked by the Huns, advanced to the Caspian from the Oxus. The Su tribes, who included the Dahæ and the Messagatæ then attacked the Greeco-Asiatic Kingdom of Bactria and the Asiatic state of Parthia. All this began to happen from about 50 years after the erection of the Great Chinese Wall. The Parthians opposed the above tribes. Thereupon, they turned back. The Scyths, Su and Yue-chi invaded India and made their settlements in Punjab. These inroads of the Huns on the Asiatic tribes postponed their inroads for a time in Europe.

## V.

### II.—THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Claudius Ptolemy, the well-known Egyptian Geographer, who lived at Alexandria in the early part of the second century A. D., refers to the Xoivoi Chuni (Chænoi) a tribe of the Huns, as living between the tribes of the Basternæ and the Roxalani on the Dneiper?<sup>2</sup>

Dionysius Periegetes, who lived at some time about 200 A. D., is said to have referred to Huns living on the borders of the Caspian. But doubts are entertained about these references to the earlier presence of the Huns in Europe, and the authentic history of their progress in the West begins in the 4th century after Christ. Their settlements were known to exist in the north of the Caspian. They advanced westwards in 372 A. D. Under the leadership of the above referred to Balamir, they defeated the Alani who occupied the district between the Volga and the Don. They then enlisted these Alani into their own service. They, afterwards, invaded the country of the Ostrogoths (Eastern Goths), ruled over by Ermanaric or Hermanric, in 374 and subjugated them in the time of Hunimand, the son of Hermanric. They advanced further and defeated the Visigoths (or Tirvingi). For 50 years, they thus conquered the various tribes in the north of Italy, which was then not only free from their attack, but, at times

<sup>1</sup> Yasht XIII. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Nobbe's Text (1843), p. 172, Bk. III, Chap. V, 25.

received their help in its war with others, *e.g.*, the Ostrogoths. In 404-5, the Huns under a chief, named Uldin, helped the Roman general Honorius in his fight with the Ostrogoths under Radagaisus or Ratigar. They spread in Dæcia, which is now called Hungary after their name. In 409, they invaded Bulgaria. In 432 or 433, their King Ruas or Rugulus received from Theodosius II an annual tribute of £350 of gold, *i.e.*, 14,000 £ sterling and the rank of a Roman general.

Aetius, a promising young Roman, was one of the hostages, given to this Hunnic King, Ruas or Rugulus. Having acquired some influence with the Huns, he led an army of 60,000 Huns to Italy to advance his own interests in his country. Differences soon arose again between Theodosius and Ruas. Ruas objected (*a*) to the Romans making alliances with some tribes on the river Danube, which tribes, he said, were his subjects, and (*b*) to their allowing refuge to some of his unruly Huns. These differences would have renewed hostilities, but Ruas died soon after. On his death, his nephews, Attila and Bleda or Belda, succeeded him.

Let us cast a glance at the history of England at this time, and see, how it was affected by that of the Huns. Britain formed a part of the Roman Empire, and, as such, had a Roman army for its protection. Some German legions also formed a part of this army. The Zoroastrian Mithraism of ancient Persia, several monuments of which have been found in London, York, Gloucestershire, New Castle and other places, is said to have been introduced into England by, among others, these German legions of the Roman army of occupation.<sup>1</sup> Rome, when it began to be invaded by eastern tribes, had to look to the safety of its own home than to that of distant dominions like Britain. It had its difficulties first with the Goths and then with the Huns. So, Britain was much neglected. The Scots and the Picts often invaded England in the 4th century A. D. In 368 A. D., they had penetrated as far as London. Rome, owing to its own home difficulties, could not attend to the appeal of Britain to send troops for its protection. Rome withdrew the last of its regular army from England, in about 406 A. D. But, at the earnest demand of the people, it sent its legions again in 418 A. D. to protect the country against the inroads of the Scots and the Picts. The legions drove away the invaders, repaired British fortresses and instructed native Britons how to defend themselves and returned to Rome.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cumont's Mithraism. *Vide* Legge's Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity.

The Scots and the Picts again invaded England. The people, under their Gaulish Bishop, St. Germaine of Auxaine, defeated them in 429 A.D. The victory at this battle is known as, "the Halleluja Victory" on account of the well-known cry of Hallelujah<sup>1</sup> being raised at it by the soldiers. In 446 A.D., the Britons again asked for help from Rome against the invading Scots. But Rome itself was then rapidly falling on account of its wars with the Huns. The letter to Rome asking for help is known as "the groans of the Britons." Actius, the Roman General, commanded the army of the tottering empire of Rome, which was threatened by Attila. The Romans having refused the required help, the Britons called for help the Saxons who lived on the North-Western coast of Germany. They were to a certain extent as bad barbarians at that time as the Picts and the Scots, but, in times of difficulty, were looked to as saviours. The Saxons themselves were feeling the pressure of the advancing Huns on the continent; so, perhaps, they eagerly grasped this opportunity to save themselves as well as the Britons.

As said by Mr. Moncreiff, "it has been surmised with some probability, that it was the pressure of Attila's conquest that drove our Saxon forefathers to make settlements in Britain. He is said to have formed an alliance as far east as China, and thus to have neutralized another Tartar host that would have pressed him from that side as he pressed upon the western tribes. Not for the first nor the last time now did Asian hordes overflow from their steppes into Europe."<sup>2</sup>

Attila or Etzel, born in 406 A.D., became the king of Huns in 434 A.D. He was the son of Mundzuk, the brother of Attila, the last Hunnic king, Ruas or Rugulus, whom the Roman King Theodosius paid the annual tribute of £14,000. Before he came to the throne, the Romans and the Huns were on the point of war, which, however, was avoided by the death of his uncle King Ruas or Rugulus. Attila, on coming to the throne, made a treaty, the treaty of Margus, near modern Belgrade, said to have been made by both sides on horseback. By this treaty, the Romans of the Eastern Empire under Theodosius consented to pay double the original tribute, *i.e.*, £28,000 sterling. Certain other terms acknowledging the power of the Huns were accepted. Among these terms were the following:—(a) The Romans were to return to the Huns some of their subjects who had taken refuge in Roman country; (b) a fine of £8 to be paid by the Romans

---

<sup>1</sup> Hallelujah is Hebrew Alleluiah, *i.e.* 'Praise (you) Jehovah' ('halal' to praise and 'yah', an abbreviation of Yehovah).

<sup>2</sup> *Leaders and Landmarks in European History from early to modern times (1914)*, by A. R. H. Moncreiff and Rev. H. J. Chaytor, Vol. I, p. 151.

for every fugitive not to be traced ; (c) several markets were to be open both to the Huns and the Romans ; (d) Rome was to make no alliance with any tribe that may be at war with Attila. After this temporary peace with Rome which lasted for 8 years, the Huns reduced Scythia to subjugation and then thought of attacking Persia again. They had at one time already ravaged Media, a part of Persia. They also advanced westwards to the Rhine and fought with the Burgundians. The Roman Empire was at the time divided into two Empires, the Eastern and the Western. They invaded both (A. D. 441). They attacked Constantinople, but peace was soon made, whereby Attila was offered thrice the previous annual tribute, *viz.*, £84,000 and a large sum as indemnity. Bleda died in 445 A. D. So Attila ruled alone. During the above negotiations, Theodosius had plotted for his assassination. Attila censured him for want of honour and courage, but, before he could do anything, Theodosius died and was succeeded by Marcian, who refused to pay any tribute. Attila did not mind this refusal, because his attention in the meantime was drawn towards the Western Empire where Princess Honoria, the sister of Valentinian, who was once confined at Constantinople for her frailties, tired of unmarried life, sent to him her ring and an offer of marriage. He accepted that offer and then began to claim half the Roman Empire as her dowry. The Visigoths were then hostile to the Romans. The Vandals offered to join him against these Visigoths under Theodoric. So, in 451, he led an army of 700,000 men through central Germany, and crossed the Rhine. He defeated the Burgundians and passed through Gaul, and was checked jointly by the Visigoths under Theodoric and the Romans under General Aetius at Chalons<sup>1</sup> on the Marne. In the great battle that was fought, Theodoric was killed. His son Thorismund retrieved the fortune of the day and drove Attila back to his camp. Attila is said to have lost from 160,000 to 300,000 men. But this is believed to be some exaggeration, as this defeat was not a crushing defeat for the Huns, who withdrew for the time to their headquarters at somewhere near modern Budapest. Next year, Attila invaded the country on the Adriatic. Venice owes its foundation to this inroad of the Huns. The fugitives from his ravages went and founded this city in the lagoons of the Adriatic Coast. Attila then marched against Rome, which would have fallen, had it not been saved by the embassy of Pope Leo. It is said that Pope Leo boldly came to him and threateningly warned him saying : " Thus far and no further." It is believed that St. Peter and St. Paul also appeared miraculously before Attila and threatened him. Attila at once withdrew from any further attack on Rome. The motive of the withdrawal is not known. He

---

<sup>1</sup> Some writers say that the place of his defeat was Mory and not Chalons.

was moved more by superstition at the serious words of a priest than by mercy, and abstained from entering into Rome. This event saved the Roman civilization from the hands of the Huns. Shortly after, he died (453 A.D.) from the bursting of a blood vessel on the very night of his marriage with Ildiko or Hilda, a beautiful Gothic maiden. Under the banner of Attila's Huns, there fought, at one time, some of the German tribes—the Ostrogoths, Gepidæ, Alani, Heruli and many other Teutonic tribes. His Huns ruled over countries extending from the Rhine to the frontiers of Chalon. His men looked at him with a superstitious awe as a god possessing the iron-sword of the god of war. He is said to have assumed the name of the "Scourge of God" or "the Fear of the World." He was buried in a golden coffin, covered over by a silver coffin, which, in its turn, was put in an iron coffin. His Huns got his grave dug by war-prisoners, who then were killed immediately, so that the place of his tomb may not be known to others.<sup>1</sup>

The great German national epic, known as Nibelungenlied, refers to Attila. According to this epic, Kriemhild was the widow of one Siegfried, who was murdered out of jealousy by Gunther, her brother, the King of Burgundy. On her husband's death, she married Attila and thought of avenging the death of her first husband. She asked Attila to invite her brother and his nobles to dinner at Buda Pesth. She then asked her friends to attack them. They all were killed by sword or fire. She also then died.

It was the invasion of Europe by Attila preceded by that of Allaric, that gave a strong blow to Mithraism that had spread in Europe from the Persian towns of Asia Minor, &c., the disseminating medium being the Roman legions, the Syrian and other merchants and slaves, the imperial officers, &c.<sup>2</sup> Mithraism had spread even in Britain, where several Mithræa have been excavated.<sup>3</sup> It had spread in Germany<sup>4</sup>, and it is said, that it were the German legions who formed a part of the Roman army of occupation in Britain that had a great hand in its spread there, in various places like York, Gloucester, Chester and even as far in the

<sup>1</sup> For some further particulars about Attila, *vide* "Leaders and Landmarks in European History" by Mr. Moncreiff and Rev. Chaytor, pp. 151 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> "The Mysteries of Mithra" by Prof. Franz Cumont, translated from the second revised French edition by Thomas J. McCormack (1903), pp. 40 *et seq.*, 61 *et seq.*, 74 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> "Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, being Studies in Religious History from 330 B. C. to 330 A. D." by F. Legge (1915), Vol. II, p. 230, n. 3.



north as Carlisle and New Castle.<sup>1</sup> Like many other legions of the army of the great Roman Empire, these German legions also seem to have kindly taken to Mithraism, when they came into contact with the Persian soldiers in the frequent wars of the Romans with the Persians. The Cult of Mithra, in one form or another, is said to be very old. The recent discovery of some inscriptions leads to show, that Mithra "was one of the most exalted deities of the presumably Aryan Hittites or Mitannians at a date not later than 1272 B.C."<sup>2</sup> One scholar carries the date of one of the inscriptions to 1900 B. C.<sup>3</sup>

The outline, in which Mr. Legge sums up M. Cumont's account of the spread of Mithraism, enables one to see properly the part that Alaric and Attila and their Huns played in giving a blow to this Mithraism, and in preparing Europe for the further spread of Christianity of which it was a principal rival.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50 et seq.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I. Introduction, p. LXII.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Legge's outline runs as follows:—

"As usual, the official form of religion in the Roman Empire had for some time given indications of the coming change in the form of Government. The sun had always been the principal natural object worshipped by the Persians, and a high-priest of the Sun-God had sat upon the Imperial throne of Rome in the form of the miserable Heliogabalus. Only 33 years before Diocletian, Aurelian, son of another Sun-God's priestess and as virile and rugged as his predecessor was soft and effeminate, had also made the Sun-God the object of his special devotion and of an official worship. Hence Diocletian and his colleague Galerius were assured in advance of the approval of a large part of their subjects when they took the final plunge in 307 A. D., and proclaimed Mithras, "the unconquered Sun-God," the Protector of their Empire.

"In spite of this, however, it is very difficult to say how Mithras originally became known to the Romans. Plutarch says indeed that his cult was first introduced by the Cilician pirates who were put down by Pompey! This is not likely to be literally true; for the summary methods adopted by these sea-robbers towards their Roman prisoners hardly gave much time for proselytism, while most of the pirates whom Pompey spared at the close of his successful operations he deported to Achæa, which was one of the few places within the Empire where the Mithraic faith did not afterwards shew itself. What Plutarch's story probably means is that the worship of Mithras first came to Rome from Asia Minor and there are many facts which go to confirm this. M. Cumont, the historian of Mithraism, has shown, that long before the Romans set foot in Asia, there were many colonies of emigrants from Persia who with their magi or priests had settled in Asia Minor, including in that phrase Galatia, Phrygia, Lydia, and probably Cilicia. When Rome began to absorb these provinces, slaves, prisoners, and merchants from them would naturally find their way to Rome, and in time would no doubt draw together for the worship of their national deities in the way that we have seen pursued by the worshippers of the Alexandrian Isis and the Jewish exiles. The *magi* of Asia Minor were great supporters of Mithradates, and the Mithradatic wars were no doubt responsible for a large number of these immigrants.

"Once introduced, however, the worship of Mithras spread like wild-fire. The legions from the first took kindly to it, and this is the less surprising when we find that many of them were recruited under the earliest emperors in Anatolian states like Commagene, where the cult

It is pointed out that "the strictly monarchical doctrine" of Mithraism had appealed greatly to the Roman emperors who saw that "in a quasi-Oriental despotism lay the only chance of salvation for the Roman Empire."<sup>1</sup> In passing to the West and in spreading there, it had undergone such a change from its original form, that, according to Mr. Legge, "Western Mithraism was looked upon by the Sassanian reformers as a dangerous heresy."<sup>2</sup> This rather gave to the Roman emperors "an additional reason for supporting it."<sup>3</sup> Dacia, the country of modern Hungary and Roumania, had become the centre of many Mithræa in the time of Trajan who favoured Mithraism "as an universal and syncretic religion."<sup>4</sup> So, a short time after, with the desolation of Dacia at the hand of the Goths and the Vandals, Mithraism, which had its principal seat there, centred in the midst of a number of Mithræa, received a great blow. When Aurelian abandoned Dacia in 255 A. D. to the Goths and the Vandals, Mithraism suffered a great blow, which paved the way for Christianity, because, with the fall of Dacia, people began to look more towards the Christian Constantinople than the Pagan Rome as the seat of the Roman empire. The Mithræa or the temples of Mithras began to be wrecked and plundered. The masses began to turn from Mithraism to Christianity. The adherents of Mithra, popularly known as the "Capped One" from the fact of their priest putting on a particular cap (the mitre) grew less and less. Thus, the invasions of Attila, which gave a great

---

was, if not indigenous, yet of very early growth. Moreover the wars of the Romans against the Persians kept them constantly in the border provinces of the two empires, where the native populations not infrequently changed masters. The enemy's town that the legions besieged one year might therefore give them a friendly reception the next; and there was thus abundant opportunity for the acquaintance of both sides with each other's customs. When the Roman troops marched back to Europe, as was constantly the case during the civil wars which broke out on the downfall of the Julian house, they took back with them the worship of the new god whom they had adopted, and he thus became known through almost the whole of the Roman Empire. 'From the shores of the Euxine to the north of Brittany and to the fringe of the Sahara,' as M. Cumont says, its monuments abound, and, he might have added, they have been met with also in the Egyptian Delta, in Babylon, and on the northern frontiers of India. In our own barbarous country we have found them not only in London and York, but as far west as Gloucester and Chester and as far north as Carlisle and Newcastle. The Balkan countries, like Italy, Germany, Southern France, and Spain, are full of them; but there was one part of the Roman Empire into which they did not penetrate freely. This was Greece, where the memories of the Persian Wars long survived the independence of the country, and where the descendants of those who fought at Salamis, Marathon and Thermopylæ would have nothing to do with a god coming from the invaders' fatherland. It is only very lately that the remains of Mithras-worship have been discovered at the Piræus and at Patras, in circumstances which show pretty clearly that it was there practised only by foreigners." (Fore-runners and Rivals of Christianity, being Studies in Religious History from 330 B. C. to 330 A. D., by F. Legge (1915, pp. 228-30).

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid*, Vol. II, p. 270.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. 271.

blow to the power of Rome, also gave a great blow to Mithraism and a great impetus to Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

In connection with this subject of the spread of Zoroastrian Mithraism in Europe, it may be said that Sir George Birdwood seems to think that some Zoroastrians even served in the Roman army. They had entered in the service of the Roman empire in Western Asia where Rome had many possessions. With the advent of the Roman army into England as the army of occupation, these Zoroastrian soldiers had gone to England, and when there, they may have had a direct hand in the spread of Mithraism. Zoroastrian Mithraism paved the way for Christianity, in so far, as it first shook and then broke to a certain extent the ancient paganism.<sup>2</sup>

(a) The food of the ordinary Huns in the very early period of their history was of roots of some trees and half-raw flesh of all animals. (b) Horses were their inseparable companions. They lived as it were, on the back of horses, because in marches they ate on their back and even slept over them. (c) They were a wandering tribe and as such did not live in houses. (d) Their clothing was made partly of linen and partly of the skin of field mice. (e) Their implements of war for fighting from a little distance were javelins pointed with bones, and for fighting from close quarters swords and lassos. (f) In attacks, they did not advance in lines or ranks but rather in loose array.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 273. For a succinct account of the spread of Mithraism, *vide* also "The Religious Life of Ancient Rome" by Jesse Benedict Carter (1912), pp. 87-94.

<sup>2</sup> Sir George Birdwood thus speaks on the subject: "Europe owes the establishment and endowment of Christianity as a State religion to the fact that Constantine the great was attracted to it by the religion of the Zoroastrians, who had served in the Roman legions under his command. Zoroastrians, with the neo-Platonists and Christians were the three principal spiritualizing influences closely inter-related, and equally free from dogmatic theology that at last broke down the whole structure of paganism west of the Indus right on to Great Britain; and on the ruins of the temples of Greece and Rome appeared the domes and towers and spires of the Catholic Roman Schismatic Greek Churches. In Great Britain, there are, I believe, 40 contemporary monuments of ancient Persians, Zoroastrians of the Roman army of occupation in these islands; and the remains of several of them are to be found along the wall of Hadrian within a cycle sweep of Edinburgh. At St. Ives in Huntingdonshire, the abbot of Ramsay in the 11th century, dedicated a chapel to Ivo, a Zoroastrian, who came to England and died here in the 7th century—possibly as a refugee from Iran when first invaded by the Arabs. Our Western code of social etiquette reaches us from the ancient Persian Court, through the Court of the Cæsars of Constantinople and thence through the courts of the Mediæval Christendom that sprang up out of the dust of fallen Rome. It was this 'Persian apparatus' of social etiquette that taught the barbarians who overthrew Rome good manners and made us 'gentlemen' gentlemen." (Sir George Birdwood's letter to the Edinburgh: Paræce Union—The Parsi of 30th August 1908.)

Priscus, one of the ambassadors from the Roman Empire to the Court of Attila, has left us some account of the manners and customs of the later Huns, based on what he saw during his stay in Attila's Camp. From this, we learn the following<sup>1</sup> :—

(b) The manners and customs of the Huns in Attila's time.

1. Attila's quarters in his camp were in a "palace of logs and planks, enclosed by palisades and dignified by turrets."
2. His many wives had separate lodges, where they worked at preparing showy dresses for the soldiers.
3. Some of the Romans, who were taken prisoners, married Hunnic women in Attila's Camp.
4. Their dinner time was at three in the afternoon, which they called "the 9th hour," counting the hours from six in the morning.
5. The first thing offered before dinner was a cup of wine, which the guests drank in honour and for the health of their host. It was after drinking this health that they took their seats for dinner.
6. At dinner, the king sat on a coach, his eldest son sitting by his side in reverential awe for his father.
7. The king had a simple clean dress but the nobles had their arms, bridles, and even the shoes of their horses decorated with jewels. The king drank and ate in wooden cups and plates, but the nobles ate in silver and gold ones.
8. They ate at separate tables in parties of three or four.
9. The king's fare was mostly flesh, while the others had meat, bread, relishes and wine.
10. The king sent his cup to an honoured guest who stood up and drank it standing. Each guest had a separate cupbearer.
11. In the evening, minstrels sang at the Court. This singing was accompanied by or followed by some musical performances. In connection with this matter, Mr. Moncrieff adds: "This is the type of a Tartar, and the description of his rude Court is not unlike what may be seen to-day in a Mongol Chief's *Yurt*; nor indeed were his revels more barbarous than those of the Germans and Gothic kings he turned into vassals. In quite modern days we read of Hungarian feasts as graced by the like rude minstrelsy."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Leaders and Landmarks in European History, by Moncrieff, Vol. I, pp. 151 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p. 152.

12. They took special care to hide the tombs of their kings. They buried them in much sequestered places and then killed the diggers of the graves, so that they may not tell anybody where the king was buried, lest somebody may remove his body. At times, they diverted waters of rivers from their natural beds, and then, burying their kings in those beds, let the water flow in again.

**Claudian on the Huns of the 5th century A. D.** Claudian the poet, who has written on the Fall of the Roman Empire, has thus given a picture of the Huns of the 5th century:

“ There is a race on Scythia’s verge extreme  
 Eastward beyond the Taurus’ chilly stream.  
 The Northern Bear looks on no uglier crew ;  
 Bare is their garb, their bodies foul to view.  
 Their souls are ne’er subdued to steady toil,  
 Or Cere’s webs. Their sustenance is spoil.  
 With horried wounds they gast their brutal brows  
 And o’ver their murdered parents bind their vows.”

On the death of Attila in 453, his Hunnic empire fell into pieces. His sons quarrelled among themselves. Ardaric, the King of the Gapidæ, rose in revolt against Attila’s sons. In a battle near the river Netad in Pannonia, 30,000 Huns and their confederates were killed, among whom also was Ellak, the eldest son of Attila. The Huns were broken as a nation and they dispersed. Some of their hordes began to live under the Romans in modern Servia and Bulgaria. The main part of the Huns returned to, and lived in, the plains of the river Ural, which were their home till about a century ago. About thirty years after this, their two tribes—the Kulurguri and Utarguri, reappeared under the name of Bulgari. They again invaded the Eastern Empire of the Romans and continued harassing it for 72 years (485-557). The Avars, who were, up to now, a tribe under them, got ascendancy over them for some time. But the Huns under Krobat or Kubrat again regained their independence in 630, made a treaty with Emperor Heraclius. On the death of Krobat, his dominions were divided among his five sons. The Huns under the first son, Batbaia, remained in their own country, but those under the third son, Asperuch, crossed the Danube. The Huns under Batbaia afterwards came into contact with the Khazars on the river Volga. Their dominion was then known as the Great Bulgaria, whose people were spoken of as the Danubian or White Bulgarians. Thus, according to this account, the Bulgarians were the descendents of the Western Huns.

In or about the 5th century after Christ, the Huns began to lose or lost their original name of Hiong-nou or Huns.

Huns began to be known as Turks, and, later on, as Mongols or Moguls.

One of their hordes or tribes, which was known as the Turks becoming very powerful, gave its name to the whole Hun nation. So, the Huns began then to be known among the neighbouring nations by the name of Turks. Later on, when Chengiz Khan, the chief of the horde or tribe of the Mongols or Moguls became very powerful, his tribe gave its name to the whole nation. The whole Tartar nation then began to be spoken of as the Mongols or Moguls. Just as one and the same river receives different names in the different parts of the country, through which it runs from its source to its mouth, so, the one and the same nation, the Hiong-nou or Huns received different names during its progress from the time of its origin up to now, and from its original home to different countries. The horde or the tribe of the Turks who gave its name to the Huns later on, was called Tou-Kioue by the Chinese and Turks by the other adjoining nations.

The German confederation of groups before the invasion of the Huns, and the effect of the invasion upon the confederation.

Their wars with the Romans had taught the Germans, that it was to their advantage, that the different tribes should unite into groups. So, before Attila's invasion, the numerous German tribes had united into the following four :—

1. The Allemanni, meaning *all men*. They were so called, because their custom was to hold land in common among *all men*. This tribe had given its French name Allmagne to Germany. They lived in the south of Germany, in German Switzerland, the Black Forest and near the lake Constance.
2. The Franks, who gave their name to France, and who have given us the name Firangi for all Europeans, because the Franks, the French, were the first Europeans to come into contact with the Mahomedans (Saracens, Arabs) in the Crusades. The Portuguese were the first Europeans to come to India. So, the Indian Mogul (Mahomedan) rulers, taking them to be like the Franks, called them Firangis. After the Moguls and following them, other Mahomedans, and following them, all the Indians called all Europeans, Firangis.
3. The Saxons, who lived in North Germany and who gave to the ancient Englishmen the name of Anglo-Saxons.
4. The Goths, who were divided into the Eastern Goths (Ostrogoths) and the Western Goths (Visigoths). They were the

most cultured of all the Germans and were first converted to Christianity by Ulphilas who translated the Bible for them into Gothic. They lived on the banks of the Dneiper. They had formed a great Kingdom in the 4th century A.D. extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea. They included the Vandals and the Burgundians.

The invasion of the Huns dispersed these Germans. According to Mr. Gould<sup>1</sup>, the invasion was like that of a wasp in a beehive when all the bees immediately disperse. After the invasion of the Huns, the German groups or confederacies left their countries and began to disperse. The Huns, crossing the Volga for the first time in 375, invaded that part of Germany where lived the Goths. The Ostrogoths, being unable to stand against them, crossed the Danube and entered into the dominions of the Roman Empire, asking for protection. They stayed there, and, after a time, led by their King Theodoric conquered Italy. The Visigoths or Western Goths, not being able to stand against the Huns, ran towards Southern Gaul and made Toulouse their centre. They, under their King Alaric, at one time, took Rome. The Vandals and the Suevi ran towards Spain and from thence went to Africa, forming Carthage as their centre. The Suevi being driven by the Huns, also occupied modern Portugal. The Angles and the Saxons crossed over to Britain in 449 and conquered it. The Lengobards or Lombards descended into North Italy. The Burgundians descended into the country between the Rhone and the Saone and founded the Burgundian Kingdom. The cold German soil of North Germany being deserted by the Germans, it was latterly occupied by the Sclavs who came from the North-East and who occupied Ponerina and Molenburg.

The whole of the dispersion of the German tribes was not bad in itself. Some tribes or groups became very powerful. Among such were the Franks, who, at times, fought on behalf of the Romans against the German tribe of Allemanni and against the Western Goths. They established a good strong kingdom and their kings established their authority in a better way.

The final result of the dispersion of the Germans was this: Some of them, escaping into adjoining countries more civilized than theirs, took up their habits and customs. They gradually disappeared as German tribes and were absorbed among the people among whom they lived. Thus, the old German tribes of the Vandals, Burgundians, Goths and Lombards disappeared. The Franks going into Gaul gave

The final result.  
Some German  
tribes disappeared.

---

<sup>1</sup> The story of the Nations. Germany, p. 29.

it the name of France and ceased to be Germans. The Franks were the most important of the groups. Thus the final result of the invasion and depredations of the Huns was this : Those German tribes, which left the country on being driven away by the Huns, were, later on, gradually absorbed into the people of the other countries where they went. They gradually acquired new languages and even new customs. They gradually disappeared as German tribes.

We will conclude our account of the wars of the Huns with the Romans with accounts given by two well-known Arab writers, Maçoudi and Tabari, who refer to the Romans.

According to Maçoudi, near the territories of the Khazars and the Alans near the Caucasus, in the direction of the west, there inhabited in about 932 A.D., four Turkish tribes which had come down from the same stock. Some led the life of nomads, and some led a sedantary life. Each of these tribes was powerful, was ruled by a chief, and had its country at the distance of several days' march from that of another. The country of one of them extended up to the Black Sea (la mer Nitas). They carried their excursions up to the country of the Romans and even up to Spain.<sup>1</sup> These four tribes were the following :—

Maçoudi's references to the Turks (Huns) who invaded Rome and the adjoining countries.

1. The Yadjni (بیجینی)
2. The Bedjgards. (بجگرد)
3. The Bedjn&ks. (بجناک)
4. The Nowkardehs. (نوکرده)

In about Hijri 320 (932 A.D.), or a little after, they fought with the Romans. There was a Greek city named Walendar (ولندر), which, being on a site between the mountains and the sea, was very difficult of access. It came in the way of their excursions upon the territories of the Romans. When the four tribes were quarreling among themselves about a certain Mahomedan merchant, a native of Ardebil, who, belonging to one of the tribes, was maltreated by another tribe, the Greek garrison of Walendar, taking advantage of the internal quarrels, attacked their country, and carried away their women and cattle. The Turks, thereupon, united, and with an army of 60,000 horsemen invaded the country of their common enemies, the Romans (Hijri 332 A. D. 944). Armanus was then the King of Rome (ارمنوس ملك الروم) (Romanus I. the Emperor of the East,

<sup>1</sup> Maçoudi, traduit par Barbier de Meynard, Vol. II., p. 58, et seq. Chapter XVII.



919-944 A. D.). He sent to the help of his subjects of Walendar, an army made up of 2,000 cavalry-men, raised from the newly converted Christians of the district and 50,000 Romans. After a long and heavy fight, the Turks were successful and they marched against Constantinople. They then marched successfully towards France and Spain. The route followed by the armies of these Turks served, later on, as roads of communication with Constantinople.

According to Maçoudi, "they have pliant articulation, curved legs and a bony frame-work, so soft, that they can draw the bow above their shoulders by turning themselves; and

Maçoudi on the physical constitution of the Huns known as the Turks.

thanks to the softness of the vertebra of their back, their body appears to be entirely turned back. . . . Under the action of rigorous cold, the heat carries itself and concentrates in the superior part of their body—this is what gives a strongly coloured taint".<sup>1</sup> "The Turcs are fat and soft. Their character offers much analogy to that of women. Thanks to their cold temperament and to the humid principles which prevail in them, they show little aptitude for cohabitation and have consequently a small number of children. Again, continuous horse-exercise weakens amorous desires among them. Among the women, plumpness and humidity prevent the absorption of the seed from the organs of generation. It is the cold which gives to their race a reddish taint . . . because the effect of persistent cold is to colour red what is white."

According to Tabari, in the time of the Roman Emperor Eliânus (Julien), some tribes of the Huns, known as Khazars, and their territories were under the sway of the Romans. When this Emperor invaded Persia, ruled over by Shapour Zulaktâf, the Khazars, together with the Arabs, formed a part of his army. After some desultory fight, Julien was killed by an arrow from the Persian army and was succeeded by Jovianus who soon concluded peace.

## VI.

### III. THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.

We saw above, that the Huns had, at first, their home in the steppes of Central Asia. They moved eastward towards China. They moved westward and divided themselves into two branches, one towards the valley of the Oxus and the other to that of the Volga. The

Their Inroads in Asia.

<sup>1</sup> I give my translation, *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 9.

division, which went towards the valley of the Volga, invaded, in about 375 A.D., Eastern Europe and drove before them the Goths (who also were an offshoot of some early Hun stock), who thus driven, invaded the dominions of the Roman emperors, fighting with them, in what is known as the Gothic War, in which Emperor Valens lost his life in 378 A.D. The Huns, with Attila at their head, harassed the Roman Empire, both, the Western at Ravenna and the Eastern at Constantinople. Attila died in 453 A.D. His Hunnic Empire was broken by another branch of their original stock in the North. The invasion and ravages of this Hunnic division in Europe were quick in their result, and did not continue long; but in the case of the inroads of the other division, that in Asia itself, they were slow and lasted long.

The branches or offshoots of the division which had moved to the valley of the Oxus were known under different names. Those, who invaded Persia, were known as Ephthalites or White Huns. Firoz, the grandfather of Noshirwan, was killed in fighting with them (484 A.D.). The frontier kingdoms of India like Kabul and the adjoining territories were then governed by the Kushans. The Huns attacked them and occupied these territories. They then invaded India proper. This was at the time when the Gupta King Skandagupta was reigning. We now come to this part of their history. We will first speak of their relations with Persia.

Among the above-named four great kingdoms, Persia was one, with whom the Huns had frequent quarrels and fights. Under their different names of Huns, Turks, Haetalites, Khazars, &c., they were in frequent wars, one may say in continuous wars, with the Persians. The reason is simple, *viz.*, their co-terminous boundaries. In a certain way, the war between these two countries may be said to be, not only boundary-wars, but also blood-wars. I have spoken, at some length, elsewhere on their relations with the very early Persians on the authority of the Avesta and Pahlavi books.<sup>1</sup> According to the ancient Iranian tradition, the founders of both, the Iranian and the Turanian kingdoms, were brothers. Jealousy and rivalry led to fight and murder, which now and then continued. The history of Persia of the very early dynasties, the Peshâdâdians and the Kayânians—of times preceding those of what may be termed authentic history,—was the history of the war of Iran with Turan, the latter being the cradle of the early Huns. The history of the Achæmenian times was mostly the history of Iran's war with the Greeks. But the Achæmenians had also to fight with the Huns. The Massagetæ, against whom Cyrus fought, and the Sakas or

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Sir Ramcrishna G. Bhandarkar's Memorial Volume.

Scythians, against whom Darius fought, were Hunnic tribes. The history of the Parthians and the Sassanians was the history of Iran's wars with the Romans. But, these last two periods also were interspersed with frequent wars with the Huns or Turks.

Maçoudi, with some difference, derives the origin of the Turks from the same source as the Pahlavi Bundelesh. He says, that one Turk was the ancestor of all the Turks (Ce Turk, qui est le pere de tous les Turks).<sup>1</sup> He gives as follows the genealogy of Firasiâb, the Frâsiâb of the Pahlavi Bundelesh, the Afrâsiâb of Firdousi: Firasiab-Bouchenk (the Pashang of the Bundelesh)-Nabet-Nachmir (the Zaeshm of the Bundelesh)—Turk-Yaceb (the Spaenyash of the Bundelesh.)—Tour (the Tuj or Tur of the Bundelesh.)—Aferidoun (the Fredun of the Bundelesh.) Maçoudi places the country of the Turks together with that of the Khazars, Dilemians and the Slavs in the sixth clime between Syria, Asia Minor and Mesopotamia on the one hand, and China on the other<sup>2</sup>. One of the tribes of the Turks being the Khazars, who lived on the shores of the Caspian, the Caspian sea was called Behr-al Khazer, *i.e.*, the sea of the Khazars<sup>3</sup>.

The Tagazgez (طغرغز) with whom Zadsparam, the brother of Manuscheher, the author of the Pahlavi Nâmakihâ-i-Mânuschihar<sup>4</sup> seems to have come into contact, and from whom he had taken some heretical views,<sup>5</sup> formed the bravest, most powerful and the best governed tribe, (la plus valeureuse, la plus puissante et la mieux gouvernée) of the Turks.<sup>6</sup> These Tagazgez latterly adopted Manichæism<sup>7</sup>.

The chief ruler of these Turks was known as the Khakân of the Khakâns (خاقان الخوقان). They formed an empire and ruled over all smaller kings of the various tribes or divisions. Afrasiab

<sup>1</sup> Maçoudi, *Tradit par Barbier de Meynard*, Vol. 11, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII, Vol. I., p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 263.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide* Ervad Bomanji N. Dhabhar's edition of the Text (1912).

<sup>5</sup> *Vide* my Paper on "References to China in the ancient books of the Parsees," read before the International Congress held at Hanoi in December 1902.—(*Journal*, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXI, pp. 525-536). *Vide* my *Asiatic Papers*, Pt. I, pp. 251-252.

<sup>6</sup> Maçoudi par B. de Meynard, Vol. I, p. 288

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 299-300

*Ibid.*, p. 288.

himself, the above referred to inveterate enemy of the Irânians, has been considered to be one of such Khâkâns.

An account of the relations of the Huns with the Sassanian Persians is somewhat important from the point of view of the history of India. The Hunnic invasion of India, had, as we will see later on, some connection with the relations and wars of the Huns with the Sassanian Persians. These Hunnic-Persian, or to speak more particularly Hætalite-Sassanian wars lasted for about 100 years.<sup>1</sup>

We have, as it were, a labyrinth of various versions or accounts of the wars of the Sassanians with the Huns. On the one hand, we have Eastern writers like Firdousi, Maçoudi, Tabari, and Aboulfedâ, who differ among themselves. On the other hand, we have a number of Byzantine writers, who also differ among themselves in the matter of the details of these wars. We find excellent epitomes of the versions of these Western writers in the History of M. Deguignes and in the recent Mémoire of M. Drouin. Among the Sassanian kings, Kobad is one, for whose wars with the Huns we have the most different versions. As M. Deguignes says, the Huns had very long wars with Kobad of which the details are not known<sup>2</sup>.

The second stock of the ancient Huns, when stopped in China, had remained temporarily settled in Central Asia at places like Aksu, Kashgar, &c. The ancient Huns, who had knocked at the gates of China, had also knocked at the gates of Persia. The history of Persia of the Peshdadian and Kianian times was, as said above, the history of the wars of the Irânians with the Turanians, the ancestors of the early Huns. The Avesta and the Pahlavi books of the Parsees speak of them. I will not speak of these here. In later times also, in the times of the Achænenians and the Parthians, they had frequent wars with the Persians. I will not speak here of these wars also. But I will speak of their wars during the Sassanian times, because it was at this time that the Huns came into more prominence both in Asia and in Europe. It was during these times that they made their presence and their force felt to the Roman, Persian and Indian Empires. They were the descendants of the above second branch who had temporarily settled in Central Asia.

<sup>1</sup> The late M. E. Drouin speaks of them as Ephthalites, and gives us an excellent paper on the subject, under the title of "Mémoire Sur les Huns Ephthalites dans leur Rapports avec les Rois Perse Sassanides." (Extrait du Muséeon, 1895).

<sup>2</sup> Histoire des Huns, T. I., P. II, p. 332.

At the time when the black or sun-burnt Huns of the North were devastating the countries of Europe, the Huns of the above other Hunnic branch, known generally as the white Huns, were committing inroads into Persia. They were known under different names, such as Euthalites, Ephthalites, Hailalites, Nephthalites, Atelites, Abtelites, Cidarites.

The origin of the different names under which they came into contact with the Persians.

Oriental writers speak of them generally as Turcs. The Huns, who, as said above, had settled at Kashgar and Aksu, and had, thence, spread towards the Caspian and the frontiers of Persia, were called Te-le or Til-le. As they lived on the waters (آب تیل) *i.e.*, the shores of the Oxus, they were called Ab-tele. The name Abtelite in the above list of their names comes from this origin. It is the corruption of their name 'Abtelites,' that has given the people their other names such as Euthalites and Nephthalites.<sup>1</sup> It is this last corrupted name Nephthalite, that has led some to believe that they were the descendants of the Jews of the Nephthali tribe. According to Tabari, the word Hailalite comes from the word 'Hailal,' which in the Bokharian language, means "a strong man."<sup>2</sup>

The different Sassanian monarchs with whom the Huns came into contact. Behramgour, 420-438.

The Persians fought with the Huns during the reigns of the following Sassanian monarchs :—

1. Behramgour (Behram V) 420-438 A. D.
2. Yazdagard II, 438-457.
3. Hormuzd (Hormazd III), 457.
4. Pirouze, 457-484.
5. Balâsh, 484-488.
6. Kobâd, 488-497 (Kobad dethroned).
7. Jâmbâsp, 497-499.
8. Kobâd (restored to throne), 499-531.
9. Naushirwan the just (Chosrø I), 531-579.

We will speak of the relations and wars of the Huns with these Sassanian kings.

According to Firdousi, Behramgour was a very brave king, but he was of a 'jolly good fellow' type. Reports having spread round about, that he was an easy going man, the Khakân of Chin thought of

<sup>1</sup> Histoire des Huns, by M. Deguignes, Tome I. Partie II, pp. 325-26.  
 Tabari par Zotenberg II., p. 128.

taking the opportunity of the Persian king's easy going life to invade his dominions. The people, whose leader is spoken of as the Khakan of Chin, were Hætalites or, Epthalites, otherwise known as the White Huns. Behram's courtiers grew restless over the news, but he assured them to depend upon God for the safety of the country. He apparently seemed to take the matter lightly, but really was anxious about it. He appointed his brother Narsi to rule for him and to remain at the capital, and marched with a large army to a direction other than that from which the enemy was coming. His people thought, that he shirked the coming war, but it seems, that his object was to entice the enemy to advance further and then to fall upon him in an unexpected way. Behramgour first went to the great Iranian Fire-temple of Adargoushp in Azarâbadgân and prayed for victory. The king could not disclose all his plans ; so, the courtiers in spite of the remonstrances of Narsi, sent one Homai (همای) as an envoy to the camp of the coming invader and offering a tribute sued for peace. The Khakan accepted their offer and promised not to advance further than Merv. He asked the envoy to meet him at Merv with the offered presents and tribute. He then advanced upto Merv where he waited for the offered presents and tribute. Behramgour was all along kept informed by his spies of what was happening and of the movements of the Khakan. By an unfrequented road, he secretly marched towards Merv and fell upon the Khakan and his army. A great battle was fought at Kashmihan (کشمیہن) near Merv. The Khakan was defeated and fell a prisoner in the hand of Khazravân (خزروان), a general of Behram. Behram then invaded the territories of the Turcs (Haitalites), who all submitted to him and offered to give tributes. He then ordered a stone column to be built on the frontiers to mark the spot<sup>1</sup> which no Turk or Khalaj<sup>2</sup> may cross and enter into the land of Irân<sup>3</sup>. The Jehun or the Oxus was fixed as

<sup>1</sup> M. Deguignes names the place as Pherbar, but does not give his authority (*Histoire des Huns*, T. I. P. II, p. 327).

<sup>2</sup> The modern Khiljis of Afghanistan are believed to be these Khalaj.

بر آورد میلی ز سنگی و ز گج  
 که کس را ز ایران ز ترک و خلیج  
 نبودی گزر جز بفرمان شاه  
 ہما نیز حیہون میانجی براہ

(Firdousi. Mecan's Calcutta Edition, Vol. III, p. 1546.)

the boundary between these countries. He appointed one Shohreh<sup>1</sup>, in command of the frontier district. It appears that the long circuitous way which Behramgour had taken was purposely intended by him as a ruse to take the Huns by surprise and to give them a crushing blow.<sup>2</sup>

The religion of the Huns, at least in early times, was, Mazdayaçnian and if not purely Zoroastrian, somewhat akin to Zoroastrian. At least, there lived many Zoroastrians in their country. A statement of Firdousi, in connection with this victory of Behramgour over the Haetalites, seems to show this. He says, that in the Haetalite centres like Chagan, Khatal, Balakh, Bokhara and Gurzastân<sup>3</sup>, there lived Mobads who went to fire-temples and prayed there with Bâz and Barsam.<sup>4</sup>

Behramgour then went to the great fire-temple of Âdargushasp in Âzarâbâdgân and offered thanks to the Almighty for his victory. He presented to the temple, for its decoration, the jewels of the crown of the Khakan which he had taken with him. According to Tabari,<sup>5</sup> in his war with the Huns, Behram had also taken prisoner the wife of the Khakan, the great Khatun. He took her as a state prisoner to the above great fire-temple and made her serve the temple.<sup>6</sup> This fact of sending a Hun lady to serve in a Fire-temple also shows that some Huns were Mazdayaçnâns. This great victory in the battle of Kashmihan had far-reaching effects in Central Asia. The various chiefs and rulers sought the friendship of the king of Iran, and the spread of Sassanian coins in Central Asia is believed to be the result. Behramgour's coins seem to have served as a type for the coinage of some surrounding people, even of India. That also seems to be the result of this great victory.

According to Firdousi, Behram, some time after this, came to India and married Sepinud, the daughter of the king of Kanouj. The

<sup>1</sup> شهر لا Some MSS. give the name as Shamr.

<sup>2</sup> M. Deguignes, Histoire des Huns, T. I. P. II, p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> Some MSS. have the name as Gharchakân.

<sup>4</sup> Mecan's Ed. Vol. III, p. 1548 چغانی و ختلی و بلخی ردان

بخاری و از غرچکان موبدان

برفتند با باژو و برسم بدست

نیاش کفان پیش آتش پرست

<sup>5</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg, Vol. II, p. 121.

<sup>6</sup> آن خانون که زن خاقان بود بخد مت آتشکده کردن فرستاد

(Munshi Naval Kishore's Text of 1874, p. 301.)

name of the Indian king, as given by Firdousi, is Shangal (شنگول)<sup>1</sup> and as given by Maçoudi is Shabarmeh<sup>2</sup> (شبرمه). M. Drouin thinks that they do not sound as Hindu names.<sup>3</sup> I think, the first name is a Hindu name corresponding to the modern name Shankar, a form of which we see in Shankarâchârya. It is more the name of a family than of an individual king. According to Firdousi, Behram on his return to Persia took his Indian queen to the great fire-temple of Adargushasp<sup>4</sup> and got her admitted into the fold of Zoroastrianism. M. Drouin thinks that these events, *viz.*, Behram's visit to India, and his marriage with the Indian Princess Sepihnoud, are no poetical fancies of Firdousi, but real facts. The Persian kings had, ere this, commenced to have closer relations with India. Hormuzd II (A.D. 305) had come to Kaboul and had married a daughter of its Kushan (Yuetchi) king. A copper coin of this king bears the figure of Siva with the Nandi symbols. This coin then illustrates Persia's closer relations with India.

According to Firdousi, Behramgour sent for 10,000 singers, male and female, of the class of Luri (لوریان)<sup>5</sup> and distributed them in Persia to provide Indian music to his people who asked for it. It is these Luris, who seem to have given to Persia, Western Asia and Europe, the various classes of singing gypsies. It is said, that the use of Pahlavi alphabet for writing purposes in the country of the Haetalites began after this time of the victory of Behramgour. The Armenian alphabet had gone in there before this time, in the times of the Parthians.

Behramgour was succeeded by his son Yazdagard, known familiarly as the Sipah-dost, *i.e.*, the friend of the soldiers. He was also spoken of as Kadi, *i.e.*, the great. On his coins, he is spoken of as Kadi Yazdagardi or Mazdayaçna Kadi Yazdagardi. Firdousi, Tabari and Maçoudi, while speaking of this king's reign, do not refer to his wars with the Haetalites. It is the Armenian writers, who give us a glimpse of these wars.<sup>6</sup> He carried invasions over the country of the Ephthalite or Haetalite Huns, spoken of as the country of the Kushans, every year from 442 to 450. The king issues a proclamation and appeals to his subjects.—Ariks and Anariks (*i.e.*, Iranian and un-Iranian)—to

<sup>1</sup> Mecan's Ed. III, p. 1558.

<sup>2</sup> Maçoudi, traduit par B. de Meynard II, p. 191.

<sup>3</sup> Aucun de ces noms n'a une tournure Sanscrite. Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites (1895), p. 28, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Adar Gushasp is one of the great Fire-temples, which are still mentioned by the Parsees in their Atash nyaish. For its History, *vide* my Iranian Essays, Part I.

<sup>5</sup> Mecan's Text, Vol III, p. 1585.

<sup>6</sup> M. Drouin's Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites (1895), p. 30.



unite and help him against the Huns. Even his Christian subjects in Armenia helped him in these wars against the Huns or Kushans. He carried his invasions over their country for seven successive years but without effect. He succeeded a little in 450 A. D., and taking a part of their territories, founded therein a city and named it Shehrastān-i-Yazdagard, *i.e.*, the city of Yazdagard. Yazdagard, flushed at this victory, aimed at Zoroastrianising Armenia. But, it is said that Kushan, the country of the Haetalite Huns, once being opened to other people, opened also to Christianity.

The Haetalite Huns were off and on carrying on their depredations in Persia. So, Yazdagard carried another invasion in 454 A. D., but, falling in an ambushade had to beat a sudden retreat. He died in 457 A.D., leaving two sons, Hormuz and Phirouz, by his queen Dinaki. The name of this queen has recently come into light by means of an intaglio or a cut gem discovered in 1868 by a Russian savant M. Boutkowski. M. Dorn, in 1881, discovered the name from a Pahlavi inscription on it.<sup>1</sup>

Firouz was, according to Firdousi, the elder son of Yazdagard. But Yazdagard, had, from his dying bed, declared his son Hormuzd as his successor. Firouz was at the time of his father's death at Seistan. So, Hormuzd, being on the spot, easily occupied the throne. This brought in a civil war. Firouz asked for help from the Haetalite king, whom Firdousi calls Shah Haital (شاه هیتال)<sup>2</sup> Firdousi calls him Chagāni Shahi (چغانی شاهی)<sup>3</sup> and gives his name as Faganish (فغانیش).<sup>4</sup> I think, that, as we will see later on, it was this Hunnic king or a prince of his clan or tribe, who is known in Indian inscriptions as Toramana the Shahi.

This Haetalite king offered to help Firouz to gain his father's throne, on condition, that he (Firouz) surrendered to him the countries of Tarmud (ترمذ) and Visehgard (ویسه گرد).<sup>5</sup> Firouz accepted that condition, and with the help of this Hunnic king Faganish, defeated his brother Hormuzd and won the throne of Persia. According to

<sup>1</sup> M. Drouin's *Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites*, p. 32, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Mecan's Calcutta ed.* Vol III, p. 1589. M. Mohl's small ed. Translation, Vol. VI, p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The name of this town seems to have some connection with the Vaésaka clan of the Huns (Hūnavo Vasačkaya), who according to the *Ābān Yasht* (Yt. V. 54) were, as it were, the hereditary Hunnic foes of the Iranians (*Vide* my paper on the Iranian Huns in the *Bhandarkar Memorial Volume*.)

Firdousi<sup>1</sup> and Mirkhond,<sup>2</sup> Firouz pardoned his brother, but, according to Aboulfeda<sup>3</sup> he was imprisoned, and according to Tabari,<sup>4</sup> he was killed. According to this last author, the Hunnic king, at first, kept Firouz at his Court, giving him the command over the country of Talekan, and sent him to Persia later on, when the people there appealed to Firouz to relieve them from the oppression of Hormuzd.

M. Deguignes<sup>5</sup> and M. Drouin<sup>6</sup> name this Hunnic king as Khushnawâz. They seem to follow Tabari, but, I think Tabari<sup>7</sup> is wrong and Firdousi's version is correct. Firdousi, later on, speaks of a Hunnic king Khushnawâz as fighting with Firouz, and says, that he was the son of Khâkân<sup>8</sup> (فرزند خاگان).<sup>9</sup> By 'Khakan:' perhaps, he meant, as said by Drouin,<sup>10</sup> the Khakan previously referred to, *vis.*, Faghanish. I think Faghanish the Khakan, who first aided Firouz, and of whom he specially speaks as the Shâhi and Chaghani, must have gone to India to make an inroad there. I think, he is the Toramana of the Indian inscription. But more of this later on.

In the matter of the wars of the Huns with the Sassanian kings, we find a great difference, not only in the statements of Western and Eastern writers, but also between the statements of different Oriental writers like Firdousi, Tabari, Maçoudi, &c. This difference is especially very great in the case of the reign of Firouz. One cannot even say with certainty, whether this Sassanian king had only one war with the Hunnic king or more than one; and, if the latter, whether it was with the same Hunnic tribe or different tribes. However, we will try to string up the various statements.

An year after Firouz's accession to the throne, Persia was visited by a great famine which lasted for seven years. His Famine policy. Firouz helped his people with grain and did his best to prevent mortality, both among men and cattle. He threatened with loss of life, those, who thought of

<sup>1</sup> Mecan's Text III, p. 1389.

<sup>2</sup> M. Drouin's Memoire sur les Huns, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 128.

<sup>5</sup> Histoire des Huns, T. I., P. II, p. 328.

<sup>6</sup> Memoire sur les Huns, p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 127.

<sup>8</sup> Mohl, Vol. VI, p. 74.

<sup>9</sup> Mecan's Text III, p. 1392.

<sup>10</sup> Memoire sur les Huns, p. 33.

taking an undue advantage over the poor. He wrote to the heads of all villages : " Give food to the poor. Do not remove them from one village to another. If in any village any single poor man will die for want of food I will put to death one rich man for that."<sup>1</sup> Firouz remitted all land collections. He sent for grain from the countries of the Roman Empire, India, Turkestan and Abyssinia. Tabari says, that owing to an extraordinary care on the part of the king, only one person died of hunger during all the seven years of the famine, and the king, in order to atone as it were for this one death, distributed 100,000 dinars among the poor. He appointed a day for general public prayers to the Almighty for the relief of the distress. When the famine ended and plenty began to return, he commemorated that event by founding a new city which he named Firouza. Firouz's famine administration, as described by Firdousi and Tabari, would do credit to any modern king.

According to Priscus, a Roman writer, Firouz, after defeating his brother Hormuzd and winning the Persian throne with the help of the Hunnic king (Faganish, according to Firdousi), seems to have made a treaty with the Hunnic king. Therein he agreed to give his sister in marriage to a Hunnic prince, who is named Coucha<sup>2</sup> (or Koukhas),<sup>3</sup> and whom M. Drouin identifies with Khoushnâvâz.<sup>4</sup> But Firouz did not act according to the agreement, because, perhaps, as said by M. Deguignes, he was ashamed, that his royal sister should marry a Hunnic king. It is said, that Firouz got another Persian lady dressed as a royal queen and passed her off as his sister before the Hunnic king. But this pretended princess, afraid lest the fraud may be known and she be put to death, gently divulged the secret to the Hunnic king, who, though displeased with the fraudulent ruse of Firouz, was pleased with the loyalty and sincerity of the Persian lady, and so, in recognition of that, married her and made her his queen. The Hunnic king then thought of revenging himself upon the Persian king. He asked him to send him 300 of his best Persian soldiers to train his Hunnic army. Firouz sent them. The Hunnic king killed some and mutilated others. The latter were then sent to the Persian king. It is worth noting in this connection, that the Huns of this Hunnic king are spoken of as Kidarites<sup>5</sup>. These events brought about a breach of peace, and war was declared in which the Persians were successful. According to some writers, the

---

Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 128.

<sup>1</sup> Histoire des Huns by M. Deguignes T. I., Partie II, p. 328.

<sup>2</sup> Mémoire sur les Huns, by M. Drouin, p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Drouin, Mémoire sur les Huns, p. 34. M. Drouin thinks that these Kidarites were a Hunnic tribe, different from the Ephthalites (*Ibid.*, p. 35, n. 2.)

Hunnic king had asked the hand of a daughter of Firouz in marriage. This being refused, the refusal served as a cause of war.

It is said, that in this war, Firouz asked the help of Emperor Leon I, but was refused. Leon only sent an ambassador, named Constantius, to the court of Firouz. In the war that ensued, Firouz was entrapped in a defile from which there was no escape and he had to surrender. It is said, that the Hunnic king offered to set him free on condition that he prostrated before him, and swore, that he would not invade his territories again. Firouz's Zoroastrian Mobads being consulted, said, that a Zoroastrian king could prostrate before none but the sun. To meet the difficulty, it was arranged, that the Hunnic king may be asked to receive the prostration, the next morning with the rise of the sun. Accordingly, the next morning, when the sun rose, Firouz prostrated before the king, but giving the prostration, at least in his mind and in the mind of his Persians, a look of a prostration before the sun.

There is another version, which is based on that of Joshu the Sliglite, a Syrian monk-historian, who lived in the beginning of the 6th Century, and who is known as a good historian of the war between the Sassanian king Kobad and the Byzantine Emperor Anastalius (502-506). According to this version, the Hunnic king made peace on condition that Firouz paid 10 mule loads of ecus.<sup>1</sup> Firouz could pay then only two-thirds, and so, his son Kobad was kept as a hostage.<sup>2</sup> Firouz, later on, paid the balance and Kobad was set free.

According to Tabari, a Hunnic officer had once to resort to a ruse<sup>3</sup> to secure victory for his master. It is not clear in which of the several wars that Firouz fought with the Huns this patriotic ruse was resorted to.

**A Hunnic officer's ruse for victory over Firouz.**

The ruse described by Tabari was this : When Khushnavâz had to retire before the large Persian army, then a devoted patriotic chief officer of his court came to his help and saved him by means of a stratagem. Taking Khoushnavâz into his confidence, he got some of his limbs cut off. Thus mutilated, he got himself placed in a position, where he could be seen by the Persians. Some Persians, passing by the place saw him, had compassion upon him, and took him to Firouz who inquired after his case. The Haetalite chief said, that as he had remonstrated with Khoushnavâz for his tyrannical government and for his war against the Persians, he was thus mutilated for his liberty of speech and freedom of views. He then offered to lead

<sup>1</sup> An ecus about half a crown.

<sup>2</sup> Drouin's *Mémoire sur les Huns*, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> We read in Herodotus of a similar ruse during the siege of Babylon by Darius (Bk. III 150-160).

the Persian army by a particular route against the Haetalites, whereby he could be sure of victory. Firouz was deceived and was led into a trap, where he was surrounded and defeated by the Hunnic army.

According to Tabari, the Hunnic king got a great stone column erected to mark the boundary of his country. **A Boundary column.** So grand was the structure that it took six months to erect it. It was made out of one stone. It was then covered over with metal. Firouz was made to swear before it that he would never cross it and invade Hunnic territories. Tabari, after describing the erection of this column at some length, says, that according to some, it was built by Behramgour. I think this latter version is correct and Tabari's previous version does not seem to be probable. The very life-history of the Huns makes it improbable, that they should bind themselves to a particular boundary. Firouz was burning with revenge for the humiliation, he was put to by then Hunnic king in the previous war, and he sought for an opportunity to invade the Hunnic country again. It is said that the Hunnic king became a little oppressive and his oppression drove some of his people to seek the protection and help of Firouz. He accorded these. Firouz ordered an invasion of the Hunnic country ruled over by Khoushnávâz. His son Kobad accompanied him in the invasion. His other son Palâs was left at the capital to rule as a regent. According to Tabari, the cause of the war was the oppression of Khoushnávâz over his people. He was a man of unnatural lust.

As said above, Behramgour had raised a column on the frontiers to mark the boundary between his country and that of the Turanian Hunnic king. According to some, it was the Hunnic king who had raised it. The latter protested against Firouz crossing the boundary. Firouz, according to Tabari, retorted<sup>1</sup>: "I have obligation towards thee, but I have greater obligations towards God." He said: "a number of your Haetalites, tired of your oppression, have entered into my Persian territories and have appealed to me for help." It is said, that, to avoid the apparent guilt of crossing the above boundary stone, Firouz resorted to a ruse. He ordered the column to be brought down and placed it on a large chariot drawn by a number of elephants. He then let the chariot always proceed in the front and he marched behind it with his army.

In the war that ensued, the Hunnic king Khoushnávâz prepared extensive deep trenches and covered them with grass and dry rubbish, and then, under the pretext of retreat, drew the Persian army over the

---

<sup>1</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 131.

trenches. Firouz and a number of his army fell in them. In the battle that ensued, Firouz was completely defeated and killed. His daughter Firouzdokht was taken prisoner. According to some, even his son Kobad was taken prisoner. Some say that the Hunnic king married Firouzdokht. Others say, that the Hunnic king sent her away to Persia with all due honours. Thus ended the war or wars of Firouz with the Haetalite or Eupthalite Huns.

On the death of Firouz, the Persian nobles wanted to give the throne to his minister Sufrai, but he refused, and Balâsh, the Valens of the Western writers, a son of Firouz, was given the throne. Sufrai was a Persian minister in whose charge Firouz had left the country when he went to fight against the Haetalites. When he heard of the death of his Royal master being killed in the war with the Haetalites, he declared war with them and gave them a partial defeat, but soon concluded peace, on condition that Khushnavaz was to set at liberty Kobad, the son of Firouz, and Ardeshir, a minister of Firouz, who were taken prisoners in the final war when Firouz was killed. Khousnawaz set Kobâd and Ardeshir free. According to a Western writer, Lazarus of Pharbia, Zareh, a brother of Balâsh, had raised a revolt to gain the throne, but it was suppressed and he was put to death<sup>1</sup>. But this is doubtful. Some writers do not speak of Kobâd having been a prisoner in the hands of the Hunnic king.

Kobâd sought the aid of the Hunnic king to depose Balâsh and gain the Persian throne for himself. Khushnavaz promised him help but did not soon fulfil the promise. When help was actually given and he marched with the help of the Hunnic army to Ctesiphon,<sup>2</sup> the capital of the Persian empire, he heard on the way, that Balâsh was dethroned by the Persian Mobads. The reason for this dethronement, as given by Josua, the Slylite,<sup>3</sup> was, that he introduced into Persia, the customs and manners of the Byzantine emperors. Among these, one was that of the institution of public baths. It seems, that these public baths were places where large reservoirs or tanks were built in which all people dipped. This was held to be insanitary, and so, sinful from the point of view of the Iranians, who held water in reverence and enjoined, that it should not be so spoilt as to do harm to those who used it. If an unhealthy or infected man dipped into the reservoir of a public bath, the water, that was spoilt and contaminated, was likely to do harm

Drouin's Mémoire, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> According to Hamazah, this town was, at first, named **طوسفون**, I think, it was named after Tug of Siftâna. *Vide* my text and translation of the Pahlavi Shatroiha-i-Airân, pp.72-73

<sup>3</sup> Drouin's Mémoire sur les Huns, p. 41, n. 2.

to subsequent bathers or swimmers. According to the Pahlavi *Ardâi Viraf Nameh*<sup>1</sup>, this was sinful.

There are different versions about the relations between Balâsh and Kobâd. Some writers say, that Balâsh voluntarily resigned in favour of Kobâd. Others say that Balâsh's natural death paved Kobâd's way to the throne. Others related, as said above, that he was dethroned and that the dethronement made matters easy for Kobâd, who then seized the throne of Persia. According to Firdousi, Kobâd was only 16 years of age when he came to the throne, and it was Sufrai who asked Balâsh to retire and set Kobâd on the throne. Anyhow, it seems, that for some time, Sufrai was the real ruler and Kobâd a nominal king. Some time after Kobad came to the throne, some of his courtiers prejudiced him against Sufrai, who was his father's confidential minister and who had released him from the hands of the Haetalite king Khoushnawaz. He was told, that Sufrai was ambitious and looked for royal power, etc. He, thereupon, got Sufrai murdered. The Persians therefore rose in rebellion against him for this unjust conduct, and handed him over as a prisoner to Zarmeher, the son of Sufrai. They then placed his brother Jamasp on the throne. Zarmeher however treated Kobâd well and set him free. Kobâd, in company with Zarmeher, fled to the country of the Haetalites. On his way there, he fell in love with the beautiful daughter of a village headman, who traced his descent from Feridun and married her. Noshirwan was born of this wife who was named Baboudokht.<sup>2</sup>

Both western and eastern writers differ on the subject of Kobâd's marriage or marriages. Some say, that he went to the court of Khoushnawaz, the Hunnic king, for the second time to seek help against his brother Jamasp, who was placed on the throne of Persia by his people when they dethroned him for his Mazdakaism or such other fault. When there, he married a daughter of the Hunnic king, and that it was from this Hunnic wife that Noshirwan was born. Some say this queen was not the daughter of Khoushnawaz himself, but was a royal lady of the court of Firouz, who, having fallen a prisoner in the hands of the Hunnic king, was adopted by him as his daughter.

As to his deposition also, there are differences. Some say that his inclination towards the socialistic views of Mazdak was the cause of

<sup>1</sup> The Book of Arda Viraf by Hoshang-Haug-West. Chap. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Drouin's *Mémoire*, p. 44.

dethronement. Others place the fact of his relation with Mazdak<sup>1</sup> a little later on. Some say, that anticipating what was going to take place, he himself retired. Anyhow, this much was certain, that Kobád had made himself unpopular and was therefore dethroned by his people or had to leave the throne.

Jamasp had a short reign of about 3 years (497-499 A. D.). Kobád soon sought the help of the Hunnic king and regained his throne. According to Tabari<sup>2</sup>, he had the help of 30,000 soldiers from the Hunnic king.

Kobad promised a tribute to the Hunnic king in return of the assistance he received from him. He had a number of Huns in his Persian army serving as auxiliaries. The tribute not being paid regularly, the Hunnic king pressed for it. So, Kobad turned to the Roman Emperor Anastasius and asked for help of money from him. This help being refused, he besieged Theodosopolis, the modern Erzeroum, which formed a part of Roman Armenia. When he was in Mesopotamia, busy with the Romans, the Huns invaded his dominions and so he had to return. He then had long wars with these Ephthalite Huns, commencing from 503 A. D. According to the Byzantine writers, Kobad soon made peace with his enemies in the West and concentrated all his efforts for the war with the Huns which lasted for about 10 years (503 to 513 A. D.). During these years, he had also to fight against a famine in his country. Again, besides the Ephthalite Huns, there arose against him the Huns of the Caucasus and the Kidarite Huns. According to Tabari<sup>3</sup>, he fought also with the Khazars who also were a Hunnic tribe.

According to Tabari<sup>4</sup>, it was during the reign of this sovereign, that Shamar, a son of Tobba, the king of the Arabs, founded the city of Samarkand which, upto then, forming a part of the Empire of China, was known as Shin or Chin. Shamar took the city by a ruse in concert with a princess of the city who was duped by the invader.

Again, according to the same author<sup>5</sup>, it was during this reign that the Persian kings turned from payment in kind to payment in coin in the matter of the land revenue. It is said, that at one time, when Kobad was in a village, he heard the wife of a villager rebuking her child for plucking a grape from a vine-plant. Kobad inquired, why she would

<sup>1</sup> For particulars about his teachings, *vide* my paper on "Mazdak, the Iranian socialist" in Dastur Hoshang Memorial Volume.

<sup>2</sup> Zotenburg II, p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Zotenburg II, p. 156.

<sup>4</sup> Zotenburg II, p. 148.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 152, Chap. XXX



not let her own child eat a grape. This honest woman said, that until the officers of the king took an inspection of the crop, she was not justified in letting the grapes to be eaten by the child, because the king was to be paid a share of the crop. The king was touched by the honesty of the woman and saw the harshness of the system, whereby a farmer could not make any use of his crop till the State officers measured the crop; so, consulting with his officers, Kobad introduced the system of levying some fixed revenue from land, whereby the farmers could be at liberty to make any use they liked of their produce.

The ancient Persians under the Sassanides had come into contact with the Chinese<sup>1</sup>. Moses of Chorene, a known Armenian writer of the 5th century, who wrote in about 440 A.D., speaks of China as Jenasdan (*i.e.* Chinistân) and of its emperor as Jenpagur (*i.e.*, Chin Phagfur). He refers to some relations between the emperor of China and Ardeshir Bebegan, the founder of the Sassanian dynasty.<sup>2</sup> But the first notice of Persia in the Chinese Annals is that of about 461 A.D. Col. Yule, thus speaks of the subject: "Their first notice of Persia is the record of an embassy to the Court of the Wei in 461; succeeded by a second in 466. In the year 518-519, an ambassador came from Kinhoto (Kobad), king of that country, with presents and a letter to the emperor. The Chinese annalists profess to give the literal terms of the letter which uses a tone of improbable humility."

Kobad was in war with Justin, the king of Rome. The latter sent ambassadors to the king of the Huns, asking for help against Kobad. These Huns are spoken of as Hongres and their country as Hungrie, by the writer whom M. Deguigne<sup>3</sup> follows. Herein, we see the origin of the name of modern Hungary. The king, whose help Justin sought, was named Zilidges. He is also spoken of as Zeliobes, Zilgbi, and Ziagbir.<sup>4</sup> His capital was on the North of Derbend.<sup>5</sup> He

<sup>1</sup> For references to China in Parsee books, *vide* my Paper before the B. B. R. A. Society entitled "References to China in the Ancient books of the Parsees." Journal of the B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXI, pp. 525-36. *Vide* my Asiatic Papers, Pt. I., pp. 241-54.

<sup>2</sup> "Cathay and the Way thither," being a Collection of Mediæval Notices of China by Col. Yule. New edition, revised by Dr. Henri Cordier (1915), Vol. I, Preliminary Essay, pp. 93 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Histoire des Huns, &c.*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 319 note, d.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, note e.

<sup>5</sup> Derbend is situated in the state of Hissar in Central Asia. Between it and Khuzur lie the celebrated defile of Kohlugu (a Mongolian word, meaning a barrier) and the iron-gate, and now known as Buzghal Khana, *i. e.*, Goat's House. It is said to be very narrow, in some places only about 5 ft. wide, and affords the only outlet from the valley.

was paid for the promised help. He entered at the same time into a treaty with Kobâd, binding himself to help him against Justin. Kobâd, learning this fact from Justin, was enraged at this treachery and put to death the Hunnic king, who had joined his army with about 80,000 men. This was in about 521 A. D.

At one time in the reign of Kobâd, two different tribes or branches of the Huns took two different sides. A division of the Huns known as the Salai Huns, under the leadership of their queen Barez, who had succeeded to the leadership on the death of her husband Malak, helped Justinian, the Roman Emperor, against the Persians. Another tribe of the same Huns, led by Styra and Gloves, helped Kobâd with 20,000 men. In the subsequent fight that took place between these rival parties of the Huns, the adherents of Kobâd were defeated.

According to Firdousi, Naoshirwan succeeded his father Kobâd.

One of his first acts was to sign the treaty of Ctesiphon in 533 A.D. whereby the long war between the Persians and Romans in Mesopotamia was ended. One of his great works was to build large fortified walls across those parts of his frontiers, from which some Turkish tribes of the Hunnic stock now and then committed inroads into his territories. He then went against the Alans who soon surrendered. He then subdued the Baluchis and received homage from Indian princes on the banks of the Indus. He then crushed the power of the Ephthalites. Once upon a time, the Khakan of China thought it advisable to seek the friendship of Naoshirwan. So, he sent an embassy to him with many rich presents. The embassy had to pass through the country of the Haetalites or Ephthalites who were then ruled over by Gatcre (غاتقر). The Haetalian king did not like any closer alliance between the Khakan of China and the Shah of Persia. So, he impeded the way of the Embassy. The Khakan, whose people, according to Firdousi, were the descendents of the tribes of Afrâsiab and Arjâsp, thereupon declared war against the Haetalites of Gatcre. His army, under a general named Fanj, marched towards the river Gulzaryun (گلزریون). His army consisted of the Kâchârbashis (کاجارباشی) and the people of Chach (چاچ). The army of the Haetalian king Gatcre collected war materials from the countries of Balkh, Shignan, Amur, and Zam. The soldiers were from the country of Khallan, Tarmud and Viseh. Bokhara was the principal seat of the Haetalian army. The Haetalians were in the end defeated completely. The people thereupon met in an

assembly and elected Fagâni (فغانی) of the tribe of Chagâni (چغانی) as their leader and king, and thought it advisable to seek, under the circumstances, an alliance with Naoshirwan.

On the other hand, Naoshirwan, when he heard of the war between the Haetalian king Gatcre and the Khakan of China, the tribes of both of whom belonged to the same original stock, was well inclined towards the fallen Haetalites, because he found, that one day, the victorious Khakan may get overpowerful and overbearing. He made preparations to march against the Khakan. The latter, hearing of this, sent ambassadors offering friendship and submission, and returned to his country, no longer molesting the Haetalites. The alliance was further completed by Naoshirwan, marrying a daughter of the Khakan. Naoshirwan's successor Hormuzd was the fruit of this marriage.

A year after the marriage, Naoshirwan arranged with the Khakan to invade the territories of the Haetalites with a view to completely avenge the death of his grandfather Firouz who was killed in a war with them. The Haetalites under their king Faghani were completely defeated and their empire was divided between Naoshirwan and the Khakan. This event took place in about 557 A.D. This was a great crushing defeat which the Haetalites or Ephthalites received at the hands of Naoshirwan. They then retired to other countries. Thus ended the long war, the one-hundred years' war of the Haetalites with the Persians. M. Drouin gives the following dates about the principal events of this hundred years' war :—

Arrival of the Haetalites or Ephthalites in Transoxania ...	420-25
The First War of the Persians under Behramgour: ...	427
The Second War... Yazdagard II ... ..	442-49
The Third War ... ..	450-51
The Fourth War .. ...	454
Firouz seeks the aid of the Haetalites against his brother Hormuzd III ... ..	458
Firouz's First War with the Haetalites ... ..	474-76
Firouz's Second War ... ..	482-84
The War of Safrai with the Haetalites ... ..	484-85
Kobâd at the Court of the Haetalites to ask for help ...	486
Kobâd at their Court for the second time ... ..	497-99
Kobâd's War with them ... ..	503-13
Naoshirwan's War with them when they were finally destroyed and driven away ... ..	556-57

## VII.

## IV.—THE INDIAN EMPIRE. THE HUNNIC INROADS INTO IT.

We find a mention of the Hunas in two places in the Vishnu Purana, both, in the third chapter of the 2nd book<sup>1</sup>.  
 (a) In the first mention the writer gives a description of the Bharata-Varsha (India). After a mention of its extent, its mountains, divisions, and rivers, its principal nations are mentioned, and among these, in the list of those living "in the extreme west," we find the Hunas. Wilson, while speaking of these people in his Vishnu Purana says: "By the Hunas we are to understand the white Huns or Indo-Scythians, who were established in the Punjab and along the Indus at the commencement of our era, as we know from Arrian, Strabo, and Ptolemy, confirmed by recent discoveries of their coins.

(b) The second mention is in the detailed list of the different people. In this list, among what are called "ferocious and uncivilized races," are included "Sakridgrahas, Kulatthas, Hunas, and Pârsikas."<sup>2</sup> As to the last people, the Pârsikas (the Parsees), Wilson says that they are known both as Pârsikas or Pârtakas. "The first is not a common form in the Pûranas, although it is in poetical writings, denoting, no doubt, the Persians or people of Pars or Fars: the latter, also read Pâradas, may imply the same as beyond (Pâra) the Indus."<sup>3</sup> It may be noted in this connection, that the Pahlavas, or Pallavas or Pahnava<sup>4</sup> (the Parthians) are spoken of separately in the Vishnu Purana.<sup>5</sup> Wilson speaks of them as "a northern or north-western nation, often mentioned in Hindu writings, in Manu, the Râmâyana, the Purânas, &c. They were not a Hindu people and may have been some of the tribes between India and Persia<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The Vishnu Purana, a system of Hindu Mythology and Tradition, translated from the original Sanscrit, by H. H. Wilson (1840) pp. 177 and 194.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 177, n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 149.

*Ibid.* pp. 189 and 195.

<sup>5</sup> According to Wilson, this form 'Pahnava<sup>4</sup>' is more usual in the text. *Ibid.*, p. 195, n. 158.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 189 n. 61

The Hunas are also referred to in the Raghuvan̄a (Canto IV, 68)<sup>1</sup> of Kalidas. The date of this celebrated poet of India is not certain. But "the balance of evidence is in favour of the view that the poet flourished in the sixth century A. D."<sup>2</sup>

The Hunas in the Raghuvan̄a of Kalidas. We read the reference to the Huns in the following lines of his poem :—

" His mighty acts,  
Wrought on their husbands, Hūna dames proclaimed,  
Recorded on their cheeks in angry scars,"<sup>3</sup>

Professor P. B. Pathak, thus translates the three couplets referring to Raghu's march towards the country of the Hunas :

" Thence Raghu marched against the regions of Kubera, subjugating the northern kings with arrows as the sun drinks up the water with his rays.

" His horses relieved of the fatigue of the journey by rolling on the banks of the Indus shook their bodies which had saffron flowers clinging to their manes.

" There the redness on the cheeks of the Hūna queens testified to Raghu's achievements in which his prowess was displayed against their husbands ".<sup>4</sup>

According to Mallinātha, the commentator of the Raghuvan̄a, Kālidāsa, meant, that Raghu marched against the countries of the Hūnas, and that the Hūna princes being killed, their wives mourned over the loss of their husbands.<sup>5</sup>

It seems that the Huns had some relations with India from early times, just as the Persians had. But, just as their relations with Persia in the Sassanian times above referred to, may be said to have been more authentic, so, their relations with the later Guptas may be said to be more authentic.

<sup>1</sup> The Raghuvamsa of Kalidasa with the commentary of Mallinatha by Kashinath Pandurang Paraba, 2nd edition (1882), p. 80.

<sup>2</sup> " The date of Kalidasa " by Mr. K. B. Pathak (Journal, B. B. R. A. S. Vol. XIX, p. 35).

<sup>3</sup> The Raghuvan̄a, translated by P. De Lucy Johnstone (1902) p. 34, ll. 179-81.

<sup>4</sup> Paper on " The Date of Kalidasa," Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XIX, p. 36.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

A. D. 330 to 455, a period of about a century and a half, was the golden age of the Guptas.<sup>1</sup> The death of Kumargupta in 455 brought that age to an end. Authentic History. The first invasion of the Huns A.D. 455- Skandagupta<sup>2</sup> came to the throne after him. An irruption of the Huns from the steppes of Central Asia through the North-Western passes was one of the causes that brought about the end of this golden age. Skandagupta saved India for a time by defeating these Huns. To commemorate that event, he erected at Bhitari "a pillar of victory" with a statue of Vishnu at the top.

Bhitari is a village about five miles from Sayidpur in the Ghazipur district of the North-Western provinces. The inscription<sup>3</sup> is on a red sand-stone column, and in the Sanskrit language. The object of the inscription is "to record the installation of an image of the god Vishnu . . . . and the allotment to the idol, of the village . . . . in which the column stands."<sup>4</sup> In this inscription, Skandagupta speaks of himself as one "by whose two arms the earth was shaken, when, he, the creator (of a disturbance like that) of a terrible whirlpool joined in close contact with the Hūnas."<sup>5</sup> This inscription, as said by Dr. Fleet, is not dated. But as pointed out by Dr. Smith, "this great victory over the Huns must have been gained at the very beginning of the new reign"<sup>6</sup> (about 455 A.D.). This is inferred from another inscription of Skandagupta at Junāgadh. The inscription is on a large granite boulder at the foot of Mount Girnar. The boulder has three inscriptions on it of three different periods. (a) The first is that containing 14 edicts of Asoka. (b) The second, which is later, is that of the Satrap Mahākhshatra Rudradāman<sup>7</sup> who had built the lake Sudarshana. (c) The third inscription, much latterly added, is the inscription in question of Skandagupta.

Skandagupta's inscription on the boulder is dated 138th year<sup>8</sup> of the Guptas, *i. e.*, A.D. 457-58. It takes a note of his work of repairing the

<sup>1</sup> These Guptas were known as the 'Early Guptas' and were distinguished from the 'Later Guptas of Magadha.'

<sup>2</sup> Kumargupta I was succeeded by Skandagupta (455-80), who, in turn, was succeeded by his brother Purargupta (480-485). Purargupta was succeeded by his son Narsimhagupta Baladitya, who was succeeded by his son Kumargupta II.

<sup>3</sup> For this inscription, *vide* "Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum Early Gupta Kings and their successors," by Dr. J. F. Fleet (1888), pp. 52-56.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* p. 56.

<sup>6</sup> The Early History of India, 3rd edition, 1914, p. 309.

<sup>7</sup> Rudradaman's inscription speaks of the city as "Girinagara," *i. e.*, the City of the hill. This name seems to have given to the mountain, on the side of which it is supposed to have stood at first, its modern name Girnar, its old name being Urjayat,

<sup>8</sup> Dr. Fleet's Inscriptions of the Early Guptas, p. 58.

embankment of the above lake<sup>1</sup>. Now, in this inscription, Skandagupta's victory over the Huns mentioned in the previous inscription, is referred to, in words of allusion, but not in name. The words used in this second description, *viz.* "verily the victory has been achieved by him" (Skandagupta),<sup>2</sup> in reference to his victory over the Mlechchas (foreigners of alien religion) are a repetition of similar words in the previous inscription<sup>3</sup> used in connection with the king's victory over the Huns. This fact shows that it is the victory over the Huns that is referred to in this second inscription, bearing the date of about 458. So, the victory of Skandagupta over the Huns must have taken place before this time.

In or about 465 A.D., there was another great inroad of the Huns into India. We have the authority of the Chinese traveller Sung-yun or Sing-yun to say so. He travelled in India in 520 A.D. He thus speaks of the Ye-thas, who were a tribe of the Huns: "This is the country which the Ye-thas destroyed, and afterwards set up Laelih to be king over the country; since which event two generations have passed. The disposition of this king (or dynasty) was cruel and vindictive, and he practised the most barbarous atrocities. He did not believe the law of Budha, but loved to worship demons . . . . The king continuously abode with his troops on the frontier, and never returned to his kingdom in consequence of which the old men had to labour and the common people were oppressed."<sup>4</sup>

We learn from this statement of the Chinese traveller, that the Huns occupied the country of Gandhāra (near Peshāwar) or the North-Western Punjab, which was then ruled over by the Kushans. The Chinese traveller speaks harshly of their atrocities.

Of the tribe of Ye-tha (Ephthalites), Mr. Beal says:<sup>5</sup> "The Ye-tha were a rude horde of Turks who had followed in the steps of the Huing-nu; they were in fact the Ephthalites or Huns of the Byzantine writers." According to the above Chinese writer, these Ye-tha Huns set up a king of their own named Lae-lih. Cunningham thinks that the Hunnic King Lae-lih was the father of Toramāna. They settled there and advanced further into the interior of India in 470 A.D., and invaded Skandagupta's territories in the heart of his country. Owing to the repeated attacks of these Huns, whose hordes seem to have followed one after another into India, Skandagupta was in the end

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid* p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid* p. 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid* p. 55.

<sup>4</sup> "Si-Yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World," by Samuel Beal, Vol I, (1884) Introduction, pp. 99—100.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, Introduction, p. XVI.

defeated. The Hunnic war brought great financial distress to Skandagupta's reign. Consequently, coinage degraded both, in the purity of its gold and "in the design and execution of the dies."<sup>1</sup> Skandagupta died in or about 480 A. D.

The Huns, before they invaded India this time, had tried their luck elsewhere. When checked there, they came to India. We saw above, that they were now and then driven to extensive inroads and migrations by want of food in the country where they settled, whether provisionally or permanently. Their inroads were, as said above, in accordance with the Bread and Butter Theory of Huttington.<sup>2</sup> They were driven towards the West, towards Europe from their steppes in Asia by want of food. We saw, that in the 4th century A.D. they went to Eastern Europe and invaded the country of the Goths, who themselves were the descendants of some of their own previous Turkish tribes, similarly driven to the West in some earlier times. The Goths thus driven invaded the countries of the Romans whose Gothic War cost them the life of their Emperor Valens in 378. The Huns then spread into other parts of Europe, but, being divided into a number of groups or tribes which fought against one another, they could not unite. At last, some of the powerful tribes united under Attila, who caused terror among the people of the Roman Empire. He died in 453 and his Hunnic Empire broke for a time. During this period, some of their tribes had been trying their strength with the Persians who kept them under certain check. We saw above, that they had long continuous wars with the Persians even in the Peshdadian and Kyanian times. In the Sassanian times, Behramgour had a long war with them. His son Firouz had to continue that war and in the end he lost his life falling into a concealed trench dug by them (484 A. D.). Kobād, Naoshirwan, Hormuzd, Khushru Purviz all had to fight, with more or less success, against their different tribes, the Haetalites, Khazars and others, known generally as the Turcs of the Khākān.

On the defeat and death of the Persian king Firouz, the Huns must have grown stronger. About 500 A.D., they, led by Toramāna, brought stronger attacks on India. Toramāna settled himself in Malwa in Central India, at some time before 500. He assumed the Indian title of Maharajadhiraja, *i.e.*, the Raja of the Maharajas. He established his power so strongly, that besides taking this Indian title, he struck coins in his name and engraved inscriptions.

<sup>1</sup> Smith's Early History of India, 3rd edition (1914), p. 311.

<sup>2</sup> The Pulse of Asia.



Three inscriptions are known, wherein his name occurs. (a) The first is an inscription of his own reign and is that at Eran in the Khurā sub-division of the Sāgar district in the Central Provinces. It is inscribed on "the chest of a colossal red sand-stone statue of a Boar, about 11 feet high representing the God Vishnu in his incarnation as such<sup>1</sup>." The object of the inscription "is to record the building of a temple in which the Boar stands, by Dhanyuvishnu, the younger brother of the deceased Mahārāja Mātrivishnu<sup>2</sup>." In this inscription, engraved in the first year of Toramāna's reign, he (Toramāna) is spoken of as "the glorious Torāmana of great fame (and) of great lustre<sup>3</sup>." It gives no era, but its reference to Matrivishnu helps scholars to determine its approximate date. This Mātrivishnu is referred to as a feudatory of the king Budhagupta in an inscription of the latter's reign,<sup>4</sup> which is dated completely in words in the year 165, *i.e.*, 484-85<sup>5</sup>. This date in Budhagupta's inscription leads us to say, that the date of this inscription and the date of Toramāna referred to therein must be some date about 484-85 A. D.

(b) The second inscription of Toramāna is that at Kura in the Salt Range. The inscription is, at present, in the Lahore Museum. We find the following account of this inscription in the *Epigraphia Indica*, from the pen of the late Dr. E. Bühler<sup>6</sup>:—"The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a Buddhist monastery by one Siddhavṛiddhi, the son of Roṭṭa-Jayavṛiddhi, for the teachers of the Mahiśasaka school. . . . The inscription was incised during the reign of the king of kings, the great king Toramāna Shāha or Shāhi, Jaūvla, to whom and to whose family the donor wishes to make over a share of the merit gained by his pious gift. The date is unfortunately not readable. On palaeographical grounds, it may be assigned to the fourth or the fifth century."

The inscription refers to Toramāna in the following words: "In the prosperous reign of the king of kings, the great king Toramāni Shāhi Jaū. . . . (राजा—राजमहाराज तोरमानी शाहि ब्रह्म)."<sup>8</sup>

(c) The third inscription is that of the time of Toramāna's son Mihircula inscribed in his (Mihircula's) 15th year of reign. It was "found

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fleet's *Inscriptions of the Early Guptas*, p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Fleet's *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings*, No. 36, p. 160.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 19, Plate XIII., pp. 88-90.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89.

<sup>6</sup> *Epigraphia Indica*, a Collection of Inscriptions supplementary to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, edited by Dr. J. Burgess (1892), p. 239.

<sup>7</sup> The article is entitled "The new Inscription of Toramana Shaha."

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 239-40.

built into the wall in the porch of a temple of the sun in the fortress at Gwalior in Central India." It is now in the Imperial Museum at Calcutta. The inscription<sup>1</sup> refers to solar worship and records the building of a temple dedicated to the Sun, and built by one Mātrichêta in the reign of Mihircula "for the purpose of increasing the religious merit of (his) parents and of himself."<sup>2</sup> Mihircula is referred to in this inscription as being the son of Toramāna who is spoken of as "a ruler of great merit<sup>3</sup>." The inscription begins with the praise of the sun. Mihircula himself is spoken of as a person "of unequalled prowess, the lord of the earth."<sup>4</sup>

From an account of the relations of the Hunnic kings with the Sassanians, as given by Firdousi, and as referred to by us above, we find that there was a Hunnic or Haetalite king, who had helped Firouz or Pirouze. This Persian king reigned from 457 to 484 A.D. He was the son of Yazdagard II (438-457). Yazdagard had, on his death bed, directed that the throne may be given to his son Hormuzd (Hormazd or Hormrisdas III, 457 A.D.). The throne having thus passed to his brother Hormazd, Pirouz disputed it and with the help of the Hunnic king, invaded Persia and won the throne which was occupied by Hormuzd for hardly a year. Now this Hunnic or Haetalite king, who helped Pirouz, was, according to Firdousi, Faghānish (فغانیش).<sup>5</sup> He is spoken of as the Shāhi of Haital (شاه هیتال)<sup>6</sup> and also as Chagāni Shāhi (چغانی شاهی).<sup>7</sup>

I think the title "Shāhi" of the Indian inscription of Toramāna is the same as the above Shāhi of Firdousi. I also think, that the title "Jaû..." in the Indian inscription of Toramāna is the same as that of Chagani in Firdousi's Shah-Nameh. In the Indian inscription, the portion of the title which is quite legible is "Jaû...". The other letters are, says Dr. Buhler, very faint and partly doubtful."<sup>8</sup> On the suggestion of Dr. Fleet, he reads them as 'vla' and thus takes the whole word to be Jaûla. I think the faint and doubtful letters are 'gan' and so the whole word is Jagan or Jaugani, which is another form of Firdousi's Chagani. 'Ch' and 'J' being letters of the same class, the words Chagani and Jagan are the same.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fleet's *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings*, p. 163, No. 3

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Mecan's Calcutta Edition, Vol. III, p. 1589.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Epigraphia Indica*, edited by Dr. Burgess, p. 239, 2, 1.

<sup>9</sup> According to M. B. Drouin, Chagan was also written "Djagan" (*Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites*, p. 21).

This Hunnic king was called Chagani from the fact of his Huns being specially connected with Chagan. Chagān seems to have been their favourite place. They were very eager to retain Chagan in their hands. Later on, when Kobād sought the aid of the Hunnic king Khoushnāz, the latter asked the Persian king to agree, that he would never claim Chagan, and the Persian king agreed.<sup>1</sup>

The identification of the above two words Shāhi and Jau (gani) of the Indian inscription of the Hunnic king Toramāna with the titular words Shāhi and Chagani of Firdousi's Hunnic king Faghana brings us to, or helps us in, the identification of the name of the king himself. I think, that the Hunnic king Toramāna of the Indian inscription may be the same as the Hunnic Fagāna of Firdousi's Shahnameh. The identification of the titles is pretty certain. So, anyhow, this Toramāna, known as the Shahi and Jau (la) or Jaugani was, if not the same king as Firdousi's Hunnic king known as the Shahi and Chaghani, at least a member of the same family or stock.

These identifications lead us to say, that the time of the Hunnic king Toramāna of the Indian inscription is some time during the reign (457 to 484 A. D.) of king Firouz of Persia. So, I think, it was after this event, *vis.*, the accession of Firouz to the throne of Persia with the help of the Hunnic king (A. D. 457), that the Huns may have turned towards India for the second invasion and made an inroad into it. Firouz had further wars with the Haetalite Huns, but they were with another king, *vis.*, Khoushnāz. I think, Tabari is wrong in naming the Hunnic king who helped Firouz to gain the throne of Persia as Khoushnāz, and that Firdousi is right in naming one as Fagani, and the other as Khoushnāz.

---

اگر باز یابی تو گنج و کلاه  
چغانی مرا باشد و گنج و گاه  
مرا باشد آن مرز و فرمان من  
نگهداری این عهد و پیمان من  
زبردست را گفت خندان قباد  
کزان بوم هرگز نگیرم یاد  
چو خوابی فرست مت بی مر سپاه  
چغانی چه باشد که دازم نگاه

In 510 A. D., Mihiragula (Mihirkula) succeeded, Toramāna. Sakala (Siālkot) in Punjab was his capital. He had struck his coins also. The Hunnic rule was in the ascendancy in India in his time. It had spread far and wide beyond India. Bāmyān near Herat and Balkh were two of the principal centres of these Huns ruled over by Hun kings. One of the two kings of these two centres was so powerful, that he levied tribute from forty countries, between the frontiers of Persia in the West, to Khotan on the frontiers of China in the east.<sup>1</sup> A Chinese pilgrim-envoy, Sung-Yun, from the king of China, visited his Court in about 519 or 520 A. D.<sup>2</sup> It is believed that Mihirkula ruled also over the country of Gandhara. It is the same Mihirkula who is referred to in the Rajatarangini, the History of Kashmir, by Kalhana, as a wicked king who was opposed to the local Brahmins and who imported Gandhara Brahmins into Kashmir and India. The practices and customs attributed to him and to his Brahmins show that these imported Brahmins were Zoroastrian in their belief to some extent.

I suspect that the Mātrichata, the builder of the sun-temple, referred to in the above inscription, wherein Mihircula, the Hunnic king is mentioned, was himself a foreigner, one of the same stock of Huns to which Mihircula belonged. He was an Iranian Hun, who, it is very likely, believed in some forms of Zoroastrianism. His special reference to the true religion (Sad-Dharma, <sup>3</sup> Cf. Behdin) and to the classes of the twice-born (Dvija-gana<sup>4</sup>) leads us to that inference.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, the monk-writer, who wrote in 547 A. D., refers to a king of the White Huns, named Gollas, as ruling oppressively in India and drawing large tributes. This *Gollas* is thought to be the same as this Mihira *gula*, "the Attila of India."<sup>5</sup>

In the end, Mihircula was defeated in about 528 A. D. by an Indian king. He was taken prisoner and was sent away with all honour, due to a captive king, to his capital at Sakala (Siālkot). Taking advantage of the defeat of Mihircula in the south, his brother usurped his throne. So Mihircula went to Kashmir whose king extended to

<sup>1</sup> Vide S. Beal's Si-Yu-ki, Buddhist records of the Western World (1884), Vol. I, Introduction pp. LXXXIV *et seq.* for the Mission of this traveller.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the court customs of the Hunnic king of the country of Yētha (Ephthalites), remind us of our present court customs. For example, (a) on entering the assembly, one man announces your name and title; then each stranger advances and retires..... (b) The royal ladies of the Ye-tha country also wear state robes, which trail on the ground three feet and more; they have special train-bearers for carrying these lengthy robes." (*Ibid.*, p. XCI).

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Fleet's inscriptions of the Early Gupta kings, No. 37, p. 162.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Smith's "History of India," 2nd edition, p. 307.

him his hospitality, which he abused by raising a revolt against him and seizing his throne. Mihircula died in or about 548 A. D.

The invasion of India by the Huns is said to have "changed the face of Northern India."<sup>1</sup> Had their power not been broken, they would have still further changed the face of the country.

### VIII.

#### WHO BROKE THE POWER OF THE HUNS IN INDIA.

Now, the question among Indian scholars is: Who broke the power of the Huns in India? Mr. Vincent Smith and Báláditya. Mr. Vincent Smith gives the credit to Báláditya (Narasimhagupta), the King of Magadha. He associates with him Yashodharman, a Raja of Central India,<sup>2</sup> as one playing the second fiddle. He says that both these Rajas "appear to have formed a confederacy against the foreign tyrant." He takes the Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsang for his authority. Hiuen Tsang says as follows: "We came to the old Town of Shákala (She-kie-lo)..... Some centuries ago, there was a king called Mo-hi-lo-kin-lo (Mihiracula) who established his authority in this town and ruled over India. He was of quick talent, and naturally brave. He subdued all the neighbouring provinces without exception. In his intervals of leisure he desired to examine the law of Buddha, and he commanded that one among the priests of superior talent should wait on him. Now it happened that none of the priests dared to attend to his command."<sup>3</sup> Hiuen Tsang then says, that as no good respectable priest offered his services, to explain to the king the law of Buddha, an old servant in King's household who had long worn the religious garment was put forward for the purpose. Mihiracula resented this want of respect towards him and ordered a general massacre of the Buddhist priests. "Báláditya-*raya*, King of Magadha, profoundly honoured the law of Buddha and tenderly nourished his people. When he heard of the cruel persecution and atrocities of Mihiracula, he strictly guarded the frontiers of his kingdom and refused to pay tribute. Then Mihiracula raised an army to punish his rebellion." In the war that issued, Báláditya retired at first on some "islands of the sea," but subsequently defeated Mihiracula and took him a captive. Báláditya ordered Mihiracula to be killed, but his mother interceded and persuaded her son to forgive him. Mihiracula's

<sup>1</sup> Kennedy, *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, 1908, p. 879.

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *History of India*, 3rd edition (1914), p. 318.

<sup>3</sup> *Buddhist Records of the Western World* (Bk. IV), translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsang (A.D. 629) by Samuel Beal, Vol. I, p. 167.

brother ascended his brother's throne at Shakala (Sialkot), and Mihiracula retired to Kashmir, where he was welcomed by the king of the country. But he proved ungrateful and after a short time usurped the throne of Kashmir.<sup>1</sup>

According to Hiuen Tsang, who travelled from 629 to 645 A.D., the Mihiracula mentioned by him lived some centuries before his time. Mr. Vincent Smith says: "It is not easy to explain why the pilgrim alleges (p. 167, *Beal Records*, Vol. I) that Mihiracula lived 'some centuries' before his time."<sup>2</sup> According to Mr. Smith, "Watters is inclined to think that the tale told by Hiuen Tsang refers to a Mihiracula of much earlier date. Dr. Fleet suggests that there may be an error in the Chinese text."<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Rundolph Hoernle differs from Mr. Vincent Smith and gives the sole credit of the Indian victory over the Huns to Yashodharman (Vishnuvardhman), a Raja of Central India. He admits no confederacy and rests the claim of his hero on three inscriptions of Yashodharman, which Mr. Smith sets aside as a piece of false boasting on the part of the king. As to this epigraphical evidence, Dr. Hoernle particularly refers to two inscriptions of Yashodharman at Mandasor, known as rana-stambhas, *i.e.*, "Columns of Victory in War."<sup>4</sup> There are two columns at short distances, but the inscription on both is the same. One may be said to be, as it were, the duplicate of the other, built, perhaps with a view, that if one was destroyed, another may continue to proclaim the work and the victory of the king. The inscription on one (No. 33) is well-nigh entire, but much of that on the other (No. 34) is destroyed. Yashodharman thus speaks in column 33 of his victory over the Huns of Mihiracula. "He who, spurning (the confinement of) the boundaries of his own house, enjoys those countries—thickly covered over with deserts and mountains and trees and thickets and rivers and strong-armed heroes (and) having (their) kings assaulted by (his) prowess—which were not enjoyed (even) by the lords of the Guptas whose prowess was displayed by invading the whole (remainder of the) earth (and) which the command of the chiefs of the Hunas, that established itself on the tiaras of (many) kings failed to penetrate.....he to whose two feet respect was paid with

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 168-171.

<sup>2</sup> *History of India*, 3rd edition, p. 319, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, 1903, p. 549, *et seq.* *Vide also Ibid* of 1909, p. 89, *et seq.*

complementary presents of the flowers from the lock of hair on the top of (his) head by even that (famous) King Mihiracula."<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Vincent Smith<sup>2</sup> says, that Yashodharman, in this inscription of his, took to himself false credit and that Hiuen Tsang, the great Chinese traveller very properly gave the credit to Bâlâditya. Dr. Hoernle doubts the authority of Hiuen Tsang in this matter, saying that his account is romantic, though based on some truth. He says, that the authority of a contemporary inscription of King Yashodharman is far greater than that of Hiuen Tsang, who came to India much later, and who bases his version on what he had heard. That being the case, Yashodharman was properly the person who broke the power of the Huns.

The Vikrama era began in 57 B. C. It is now generally believed, that there existed no King Vikramaditya at that time, and that the era latterly known by his name, was then, in those early times, known as the Malwa era. Dr. Fleet thus sums up the explanation of the change of the name: "The word *vikrama*, from which the idea of the King Vikrama or Vikramaditya was evolved, most properly came to be connected with the era by the poets, because the year of reckoning originally began in the autumn, and the autumn was the season of commencing campaigns, and was, in short, the *vikrama-kala* or war-time."<sup>3</sup> Dr. Hoernle differs from this explanation, and thinks, that there did exist a king of the name of Vikrama. Who was that King? Dr. Hoernle says, that Vikramâditya (*i.e.*, the Sun of prowess) seemed to be the popular title of the kings of Malwa during the later times of the Gupta Emperors, who lived and ruled in turbulent times, requiring great power in war matters, just as Sâlâditya (*i.e.*, the Sun of goodness or peace) was the title of Harshavardhana of Kanouj. He thinks, that it was the above King Yashodharma of Malwa, that was known by the popular title of Vikramaditya.

The Rajatarangini of Kashmir by Kalhana says (Bk. III), that there reigned "at Ujaina, King Vikramaditya called Hersha as the sole sovereign of the world". It includes Kashmir in the territories of that king. It also speaks of a foreign King Mihiracula being defeated.

<sup>1</sup> Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum Vol. III. Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their successors by John Faithfull Fleet (1888) pp. 147-48. Inscription No. 33. Stone pillar inscription of Yashodharman at Mandasor in the Mandasor district of Scindia's dominions in the Western Malwa division of Central India.

<sup>2</sup> Early History of India end. Edition p. 301.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of 1909, p. 99.

The Mandasor inscription, above referred to, of Yashodharma also refers to Kashmir as one of his dominions, under the words "the tablelands of the Himalaya," and it also refers to the overthrow of Mihiracula by Yashodharma. So, it appears, that the Vikramaditya referred to by the Kashmir history as ruling in Ujjain and defeating Mihiracula, is King Yashodharma who is associated by his inscription with Kashmir and Mihiracula.

Dr. Hoernle further adduces (a) numismatic and (b) literary evidence to support Yashodharma's (Vikramaditya's) connection with Kashmir and his claim to be the successful opponent of the Huns.

(a) There are some coins known as the coins of Yashovarman, and they are believed to belong to the series of Kashmir coins. But, there has been no king of Kanauj of the name of Yashovarman who held Kashmir. So, Dr. Hoernle says, that this Yashovarman of the coins belonging to the Kashmir series, is the same as the Yashodharma of the Mandasor inscription and of the Kashmir History, the Rajatarangini of Kalhana.

(b) Tradition says, that there were "nine gems" nava-ratna, *i.e.*, nine learned men in the Court of Vikramaditya. Kalidasa is believed to be one of these best learned men of the time, who lived in the Court of Yashodharman. Another learned man was Varaha Mihira. This fact of some learned men (ratna) living in the Court of Yashodharma and also in the Court of Vikramaditya according to the tradition, points to the probability of Vikramaditya and Yashodharman being the same sovereign.

The literary evidence of Yashodharman's connection with the conquest of Kashmir is further supplied by Professor Pathak who discovers it in Kalidas's Raghuvamsa. Kalidasa seems to have drawn his picture of the description of the conquest of his hero Raghu from an account of the conquest of a contemporary king in whose court he lived. Professor Pathak<sup>1</sup> concludes, that this contemporary King was Yashodharman, who took a note of his *digvijaya* in his Mandasor inscription on the "Column of Victory". The Kunkuma mentioned in Kalidas's poem is the well-known saffron of Kashmir.

Dr. Hoernle adds to Professor Pathak's evidence, a further evidence supplied by the landmarks given in the Mandasor inscription and in Kalidas's Raghuvamsa<sup>2</sup> to show, that the above referred to king, the contemporary of Kalidas, was Yashodharma (about 499-550 A. D.).

<sup>1</sup> Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XIX, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> One of the landmarks in Kalidas's Raghuvamsa is the Western Country where ruled the Párasika and other tribes from the West. This refers to the rule of the Persians over the Western part of India, over Gujarat, Kathiawad, Cutch, Sind, &c.



Mr. Monmohan Chakravati differs from Professor Pathak, and thinks, that the contemporary king from whose series of conquests Kalidas drew his picture of the *digvijaya* of his hero Raghu, was Skandagupta and Yashodharma. One of his arguments for his conclusion thus refers to an event in the history of Persia : Kalidas, in his Raghuvamsa, refers to the defeat of the Persians (Parasika) on the frontiers of India. Mr. Chakravati identifies this event with an event in the reign of the Persian King Piruz (Firuz) (457-484), the son of Yazdagird II. As we saw above, Firuz had come into great contact with the Ephthalites who are otherwise spoken as the White Huns, Khazars, &c. These Ephthalites had helped him against his brother in securing the throne of Persia, but latterly he fell out with them. He alternately won and lost, but was at last killed in a battle with them in 484 A. D. The Ephthalites or the White Huns overran Persia. Their further fight was brought off by an annual subsidy by Persia. In this war, the Persians are believed to have lost a portion of their eastern territories on the frontiers of India.

Mr. Chakravati thinks, that Kalidas in his Raghuvamsa refers to this defeat of the Persians and to their loss of their eastern dominions. As this happened in about 484 A. D., when Skandagupta was ruling, he thinks that the contemporary of Kalidasa was Skandagupta and not Yashodharman. But Dr. Hoernle says, that it is not this event that is alluded to in the Raghuvamsa, because Piruz had lost in this war only Gandhara, and not the country on the direct frontiers. So, it is a later event. It is the event of Kavâdh (Kobâd) fighting on the side of his brother-in-law, the Hunnic King. With the help of the Huns, he removed his brother Jamasp from the throne (499 A. D.). He died in 531 A. D. Thus the Persian Kavâdh (488 or 489-531) was a contemporary of the Indian Yashodharman (490-550). The Huns had warred against Yashodharman; and in this war, they may have been helped by Kavâdh who had married a daughter of the Hunnic king. In this war, wherein he fought on the side of the Huns as their ally, he lost some of his eastern provinces, especially the province of Sindh. It is this loss that Kalidas refers to as the defeat of the Persians (Parasikas).

We do not learn from Firdousi's Shahnamah anything about the loss of any territories on the frontiers of India either by Firouz or by Kobâd. Tabari and Maçoudi also do not speak directly of any loss of Persian territories on the frontiers of India. Tabari indirectly refers to such a loss. While speaking of the conquests of Naoshirwan, he says : " Then

Naoshirwan desired to possess equally a certain portion of Hindustan. He made a large army, with a distinguished general at its head march against Hindustan (and) against Serandib where lived its king. . . . This (Indian) king surrendered to him all the countries in the neighbourhood of Oman which had already been ceded to Persia in the time of Behramgour<sup>1</sup>. ”

What we learn from this passage is this : A part of India on its frontiers belonged at one time to Persia under Behramgour. Between the time of that monarch and that of Naoshirwan, it had passed back from the hands of the Persians into the hands of the Indian king. We do not know in whose reign it so passed. But, looking to the history of the reigns of two of the several intervening kings, we find that it may be either in the reign of Firouz who was killed in the war with the Hætalite Huns, or in that of Kobâd, who also had friendly and unfriendly relations with them. Of these two, the reign of Kobâd was much weaker. He had to meet the brunt, both, of a kind of civil war and a foreign war. So, possibly it was during his reign, that a part of India which belonged to Persia in the reign of Behramgour, passed into the hands of the Indian king. Maçoudi also does not throw any light on the question. What we learn from him is simply this : “ The kings of Hind and of Sind and of all the countries on the north and south concluded peace with the king of Persia (Naoshirwan).” The Indian king writes a letter “ to his brother, the king of Persia, master of the crown and the banner, Kesr Anaoushirawan.”

( الي اخيه ملك پازس صاحب التاج والرايت  
كسري آنوشيروان )<sup>2</sup>

On weighing the arguments on both sides, including the appeals to the relations of the Huns to the Sassanide Persians, I am inclined to say, that the credit of crushing the power of the Huns in India belongs to Yashodharman. The authority of the Chinese traveller is a later authority and a second-hand authority. Again, there is one statement of this traveller, which leads us to pause before taking his statements as authentic. He places the Hunnic king Mihircula some centuries ago.<sup>3</sup> If that be true, the date of Baladitya and also that of Yashodharma are carried some centuries ago. This is contrary to facts.

<sup>1</sup> Translated from Zotenberg's French Translation, Vol. II, p. 221, Chap. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Maçoudi par B. DeMeynard. Vol. II, p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> Beal's Buddhist Records. Vo I, p. 169.

Now, as opposed to this doubtful authority of the Chinese pilgrim-traveller, who speaks (*a*) some time after the event, and (*b*) that on second-hand information, and (*c*) upsetting the chronological order of time, we have (*a*) the contemporary authority and (*b*) that the first hand authority, (*c*) supported by a proper chronological order of dates of Yashodharma's own inscriptions.

It is suggested that the court-poet of Yashodharman may have given false credit to his royal patron on his inscriptions. But we must bear in mind, that kings have some reputation to uphold. If Yashodharman had not been the real victor, he would not have dared to get a wrong inscription put up. He ran the risk of being taken for a braggart or boaster by his contemporaries, by both, the princes and the peasants. The court-poet may be allowed to praise his royal master and even to deify him, if he liked ; but he would not be allowed to subject his master to public ridicule by attributing to him a feat or exploit which he did not do. To exaggerate in praise is one thing, but to state an untruth and to attribute a feat to the king which he did not do is another thing. The latter, instead of raising the king in the estimation of his contemporaries, his own subjects, would lower him. From all these considerations, I think that the real credit of breaking the power of the Huns belonged to king Yashodharman.

As said above, the History of the Sassanian kings of Persia has been appealed to, in determining the question of destroying the power of the Huns in India. In this connection, there is one point which seems to me to be important. If Kalidas refers to a defeat of the Persians, it is more likely that he refers to a defeat at the hands of his own people, the Indians, and at the hands of a king of his own country, and not to a defeat at the hand of others,— the Huns—who were also hostile to his people and his country. So, it is more likely that the event referred to the later event of Kavadh's reign as pointed out by Dr. Hoernle. From all this rather long review of events, we find that it was king Yashodharma, who broke the power of the Huns and it was he who was known as Vikramaditya.

ART. XIX—*Yasna XLVIII in its Indian Equivalents.*

BY

PROFESSOR MILLS.

(Contributed.)

1. Yadi(-y) (ebhih(-r))<sup>o</sup> adhah(-r), adhanah(-r, (?) rtena (-a-) asmakam adhikah(-s) sena-patih(-r) druham<sup>o</sup> vaṅsate (-sate) ).

(b) yat(-d) asit<sup>oo</sup> (-d), <sup>o</sup>asan(-n) asmakam (aṅsah(-a) iva tattvena (-a-) achyutani, akṛtani, (kila, yat(-d) imani pravartyante yani dambhanani (-i) iva purvyam asmakam dhvaradbhih(-r) dveshibhih(-r) pra (-o)uktani(-y) asuh (asan<sup>oo</sup>(?)), pra(-o)ucire<sup>oo</sup>.

(c) (achyutani, akṛtani(-y) ), amṛtatve, pravartani, nirvodhani, devai(-r), -deva-pujakaih(-s)<sup>oo</sup> ca, (-a-) anyatah(-o) -martyaih(-s) ca ((-ar-) rtavabhih(-r) anyatah(-s), -sarvaih, pṛthak, pṛthak svacyautnaih) ;

(d) at (sah) (sa) te (tava) savaih(-s) suasti-kṛdbhih(-s) stutivahanam vakinyam aukshat(-d), ukhshayat(-d),<sup>o</sup> -ishyati (-y), asura.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE CRISIS. HE PRAYS FOR INSPIRATION  
AND FOR RE-ASSURANCE.

2. Vocha me yani tvam vidvañ (asah(-o) ), yani vedah(-a), asura.

(b) tasmāt pura, purastat(-d), yat(-d) mām (u-gaman)<sup>o</sup> yani mama manah-pṛtah<sup>oo</sup> ((-o's-) asan), kila, mama kshanon,<sup>o</sup> karyanirvahanan ihamutra(-e)<sup>o</sup> ihaloke va paraloke va, chinvatāh(-o) vichaya-setau va, tasmāt pura, purastat(-d) yat(-d)<sup>o</sup> imani tattvena(-o-) upagachchhan(-antai)—

(c) Kat(-d) rtava ((-a-) asmakam adhikah(-s) senapati(-s) (-s), sumedhah, pravaṅsat, pravaṅshyati dhvarantam pupam asmakam dharmadveshinam ;—

(d) sa hi(-y) asoh(-r) visvasya jivanasya), vasvi (-y-evam) vitta, vidita, akṛti(-s), (kila, (-e) idṛk tasya dveshinah parajayah(-o) vasuh(-r) evam vidyate, vetsyate).

OUR SYSTEM FIRST OF ALL OTHERS TO THE ENLIGHTENED—ALTOGETHER  
PARAMOUNT OVER THE D(A)EVA-SYSTEM OF OUR FOES.

3. At(-d) vedamanaya, (visva-vichakasate,) vasishtha(-a) asti sasanam, (asmakam dharmadhih) (vishatah(-o) dhyanyoh paraspareṇa (-ai) etavat pratvadinoh(-r) asmakam dhyanam vasishtham asti).

(b) yam dhyam sudhah(-s) sasti (-y) rtena (-a-) asurah(-s)

(c) svantah(-o) vidvañ, (asti, kila, tan veda) ye chid <sup>o</sup>gudharthasansasah(-o'san), (ye tan(t)sasan dharayan),

(d) tvavan(-t),<sup>o</sup> sumedhah(-o) vasoh kratva<sup>o</sup> manasah.

1. If through (his action in) the offering of gifts in accordance with Asha, Our Holy Order, (Thy Saint who stands so signally for us) shall smite the Druj-Lie-Demon (of our foes); (*b*) when those things in very truth shall be (our portion) which have been (and still are) proclaimed as fallacious (by our foes, but in vain); (*c*) (when they shall have actually appeared) in the Immortal Deathlessness as regards both the Dæva-demon (worshippers on the one side to afflict them) and our (holy) men (upon the other); (*d*) then shall he (Thy Saint Our leader) increase thereby the celebration of Thy praise, O Lord, and with it great blessings (for Thy folk).

---

\* 1 Owing to the distance at which this article is printed, the simplest possible transliteration—that of Max Muller's Grammar—has been adopted. Even the long vowels may be left undistinguished from the short ones, or italicised as *a* for long *a*, *e* for long *e*, *i* for long *i*.

See the Dictionary throughout, with the Gatha texts. As usual I vary my suggestions a little as time passes. Some writers seem almost to exaggerate their neglect of their own previous renderings. One accuses the other of 'three entirely different renderings of the same passage'; but it is best to offer many alternatives in the case of the Gathas as our religious-philosophical interest here is paramount over all consideration of minute literary distinctions. The last minute pointing of the literary meaning is almost universally uncertain in all such ancient writings. (As in my other studies of this kind I have here applied sandhi redundantly; see Roth's Festgruss, 1893, ZDMG, 1911, —12, —14, Museon 1912, —14, JRAS, April, 1915, etc.

2. Tell me then, Lord, (the end), for Thou dost know it. (*b*) (Tell me to grant me strength and courage) before those crisis of the conflict come (which shall encounter) me (as leader of Thy tribes in their armed struggle),—(*c*) shall the (champion of Thy holy Order indeed, O Ahura), smite down the enemy,—and when? (*d*) (I ask Thee this); for this, (if it be gained, is) known to be the (one) good consummation of (our) life,—(and of the world. All hangs in balance on this issue).

---

Notice the Gathic *para hyat*; see it also in the later Av. It occurs to me to be a question whether the *a* of *para* is not one of the many results of the confusion which is everywhere apparent in the spelling of Av. words, and which was owing to the omission of the short vowels in the ancient Pahl.—Av. writing, they having been regarded as being inherent in the consonants as all the short vowels are in Pahlavi.

3. (For there can be no hesitating doubt at all);—the best of the (two daena-)-revelations (is our own and not the rival Lore of Angra Mainyu, and best of all which can be uttered anywhere)—(*b*) that one which the Beneficent Ahura doth proclaim through Asha (the Law of Our Holy Order)—(*c*) bounteous-in-holiness as He is—and wise (with His great<sup>o</sup> scheme),—as well as those who declare to us all deepest sayings in His name. (*d*) Thine Own, and worthy of Thyself (that chieftain is), O Mazda, endowed with Thy Good Mind's planning skill.

---

\* *Khrathva*, Av. *Khratu*-(thu), like *Senhaenho*, *avao*, and other words, has an especial sense in the Gatha. It seems to mean 'that sacred political sagacity' which was so essential to the existence of the holy State. I ask especial consideration as regards transliteration here.

THE CHARACTER OF THE NEEDED MAN MUST BE BEYOND ALL COMPROMISE. HE MUST SELECT THE BETTER OF THE TWO URGENT SYSTEMS WITH IMMOVEABLE CONSISTENCY.

4. *Yah*(-o) *dhat*(-d) *manah*(-o) *vasyah* (-asi), *vasiyah* (-si) (*asmakam dhyane*) *aghatare cha*, ( -a-) *adharmye* (*deva-pujakanam*) )

(b) *svah* (*sah*, *sa*) *ubayoh* (-r) *dhyana-yoh*(-r) *asmakam dharma-dhyam chya*utnena *vachasa cha* (*vrnite* *sapishyati cha*) ;—

(c) *asya joshan*, (*kila sva-dharma-varan hrdaya-bhakti-jushtan*, *asmabhih* °*pramanavat*(-ch) (*cha*) *pra*(-o)-*uktan*, -*tan sva*(-e)-*ishthih* (-s)°° *sva*(-e) *ishthih*(-s) *sachate*, (*kila*, *sva-nischitam samkalpam avasthitam sva*(-e)-*ishthih*(-s) *sachate*) ;

(d) *tvadiye kratau*(-a(-v)) *apamam nana* (-a-) *asat* ; (*kila*, *tava sevakah*(-o) *hrdaya-bhaktah* *punya-dharma-sthitau*, *tatpratikshah*(-s), *sampurnam vichakasan*° *bhavishyati*(-i) ; *idrk*(-g) *iva cha sevakah*(-o) *vratyah*(-s) *tvaya prati-j Napyishyate*).

NO COMPROMISE WITH THE OPPOSED DESTRUCTIVE POLITICS. SACRED WORK MUST BE REVIVED IN THE INTERESTS OF OUR AGRICULTURAL STATE.

5. *Sukshatrah* *kshayantam*, *ma nah*(-o) *dushkshatrah* *kshayanta*,

(b) *vasvyah*(-s) *chitteh*(-s) *chya*utnaih(-r) (*haye*) *aramate*,

(c) *yoh*°(-r)-*dhah*(-a) *martyaya* (-a-) *api-jantum*°<sup>1</sup> (*haye*) (*tvam*) *vasishthe* (*Aramate*) ;

(d) *gave avrjyatham*°<sup>2</sup>, *krshi-karma kriyatam* (*avarja va, krnu*(-v)iti) ; *tam nah* (-a) *aharaya*°<sup>3</sup> *pasuvid* ( (-t) *poshayah*) *kila tam, gam, gavam, sarvatha* (-o) *ukshayah*(-saphali *krnavah* *poshtrvat*).

ĀR(A)MAITI, ARCHANGEL OF THE SACRED FIELD WORK, ALONE CAN GIVE PROSPERITY. SHE ALONE EFFECTS THE FOOD SUPPLY, THEN AS EVER THE VITAL QUESTION.

6. *Ssa hi* (-y) (*aramatih*(-r) *nah*(-s) °*su-kshetram, sukshe mam*, (*dat*) ; *sa nah* ( (-a)°° *uta-yutim*)

(b) *dat tavishim vason*(-r) *manasah*(-o) *bhadra-bhraj*asvati ;

(c) *at*(-d) *asyai* (*a*(-y)) *rtena* (*tat*(-d) *anugunatvena*) *sumedhah* (-a) *urvarah*(-a) *oshadhih*(-r) *vakshayat* (-d)

(d) *asurah* (-o's-) *asoh*(-r) *jantau, janman, purvyasya*.

4. (Yea, tell me the issue of the future struggle ; for the man so by Thee enlightened must follow close the holy Faith for which that struggle has had its toil and effort). Yea, O Mazda, he who would bend his mind on that which is (both) the better and the worse (of the two rival causes), (*b*) must pursue the Daena which he chooses (that proclaimed by us) close in word and action. (*c*) His will and wish must be consistent in every way with his chosen creed and fealty, (*d*) and in Thine Understanding (which discerning teacheth all) shall he in many ways be (versed) at last;—(by Thee he will be recognised as faithful to Thy scheme—the plan of Thy Salvation—here in our hamlets now and there beyond).

5. (But while I as yet know not that future, I can still hope and pray). Let the good kings obtain (our) throne. Let not the evil foe-monarchs govern us, (but let Our Sainted Monarch gain well the day and rule us), (*b*) with deeds done in a sane sagacity (the true spirit of our party), O thou (Holy) Aramaiti, (*c*) sanctifying to men('s minds) O Thou Best One, the best of blessings for (their) offspring, or since their birth, (*d*) Yea, for the (Sacred) Kine, (O Aramaiti Blest Angel of the Herdsman's toil,) let (Thy Tiller's) toil be given, and may'st Thou cause her to prosper for our life. (The salvation of our cause).

---

\*1 *aiþiñathem*,—hardly = 'the future life'. We should keep our ideas to this present life as far as this may be possible. The future life is elsewhere amply provided for in the Gatha. It may mean the 'entire life, from birth', or possibly 'posterity',—'offspring'.

\*2 *veresyatam*. We are indeed tempted to read *veresya*,—this especially in view of the caesura—which would be a good reason, and *veresya* = ad. sg. imperv. would harmonise with *fshuyo* ad sg. conj. so read as alternative or indeed as preferred text. But it is impossible to deny that the form in *-tam* rings familiar to the ear—see *dyatam* in a following verse to which this *veresyatam* might be in antithesis. 'Let one be cast down—let the other be served'; then see the caesura apparently violated in *hu-shoithma* in 6.

\*3 Is it to *suar, svar*,—one would have thought that the Cow's meat was forbidden to be eaten;—yet we must not push such analogies too far.

6. (*a, b*) For she (dear product of that Holy Toil) will give us happy homes and the long enduring strength of the Good Mind(ed One, Our Pasture-Tiller), (*c*) and so for her Mazda in His Justice caused the meadow grass to flourish, (*d*) He, Ahura, in the birth of the primaeval life.

---

\* The sign for final *é* in the supposed word *berckhde* is one of those cases where that sign simply equals *y+a*; see Gathas and Dictionary.

THE ACCURSED RAIDER EVER THREATENS WITH HIS DAEVA-WORSHIPPING ALLIES. THE SONS OF AIRAN, OUR HOLY STATE, MUST HEW THEM WITH THE SHARPENED SABRE. THE HOLY SYSTEM MUST PREVAIL AND BE IMMOVEABLY ESTABLISHED.

7. Ni(-y) esha-hedah(-o) dhiyatam, asyatam prati(-y) upa-ramam(?)<sup>21</sup> prati(-y) irshyam ati-syadhvam<sup>22</sup> (yuyam).

(b) ye(-a) a vasoh(-r) manasah(-o) didhrshadhve <sup>o</sup> 3, didrnhishadhve va, (-ar)

(c) rtena samasrayam<sup>o</sup>, yasya setoh<sup>oo</sup>(-s), sambandhasya, na svantah(-o'sa-) asat(-d) ;

(d) atse((?)'sm-), asmai, tasya hetoh(-r) imam samasrayam, imam va—?, dhaman<sup>o</sup>,(-s) tvdiye (-a) adham, asura.

AN EFFECTIVE PRAYER SOUGHT FOR. BY WHAT RELIGIOUS ACTION SHALL THE FAITHFUL LEADERS BE RALLIED TO THE WORK ?

8. Ka te vasoh(-r), (haye) sumedhah, kshatrasya (-e) ishtih, (prarthana, satyena (-a) artha-siddhi-bhrt ?) ;

(b) ka te (-a) rteh <sup>oo</sup> (-r) iti, kila, ka tvadiyasya phalasya, -tat-sam-prapti-niyukta (-e) ishtih, prarthana, mahyam, asura ;—ka mama hetoh (-s) tat-phala-samprapti-nirupita, niyukta, bhavishyati ? ;—

(c) kena prarthana-yaj/vena, tava (-ar) rtena tvadiyan<sup>o</sup> rtena, vyakti-gaman ardhayitrn ishyami ; kena (-a) asmañ avah(-o'r-) artham pratichah(-o) mama janebhayah(-s) sarma(-n), utim datave(-a) ahvyami (hvayishyami),

(d) vasoh(-r)manyoh(-s) cyautnanam javanah.

WHEN SHALL OUR DOUBTS BE RELIEVED ? REVEAL A FRESH POINT IN DOCTRINE—THE NEEDED POLICY ; HOW TO GAIN OUR OBJECT.

9. Kada vedā (vedishyami) yadi kasya-cit kshayatha (-yatha)

(b) (haye) sumedhah (-a) rta, yasya ma, mama(-ai-), etih(-r)<sup>21</sup> dvayavini (-y) asat(-d)

(c) rju me manah(-a)-okah(-o)<sup>22</sup> (vavachat(-d)<sup>o</sup> va) vasoh(-r) vapuh(-r) manasah(-o) ;

(d) vidyat(-chchh<sup>oo</sup>-) svayayishyan(-n), asmakam dharma(-a)-adhipatih (-s) savah(-o)-bhrt(-d) yatha se(?)sm-asmai(-a(y)-rtih(-r), iti (-y) evam, phalam punyam<sup>o</sup>, asat.



7. Down then let (her first mortal foe) be cast, Aeshma (of the bloody Raid who leads her captive with her Herdsmen). Against this envious<sup>o</sup> Fury<sup>o</sup> (death-dealing as it is) smite ye, (*b*, *c*) O ye who desire to hold fast the sacred Refuge of Our Good Mind(-ed One the Central stronghold of Thy Cause) to whose Bond<sup>o</sup> the bounteous holy man belongs-(*d*) and therefore, O Ahura, (to save Thy struggling saint who toils with changing lot). will I establish (that refuge) for him in Thy State.

\* 1 Remem. ?—perhaps not here to *Rama+uša* = 'cease', 'stillness of death'—*ušarama*, see *ramam* in str. 11;—cp. New Persian *ramidan*. The Pahl., Per. and Skt. have 'envy'. See *Gothas*.

\* 2 *syodum* to ind. *sa, si* = 'sharpen', etc.; cp. *syati* with *ati* = 'to strike at'.

\* 3 Desid. of *dhr* or *dṛh*, *dṛnh*-, *didharishadhvacm*.

\* 4 *vyaṃ* to *vya* = 'to envelop', so here preferred. Alternative otherwise in the Dictionary.

\* 5 Loc. sg. nt. See Dictionary throughout.

\* 6 Notice *thvahmi* (= *-min*) again, why not a corresponding Ind. form after *tasmin*?; see *tua* = 'thy.'

8. (And how shall I beseech Thee for this victory and gain?) What is the (potent) prayer<sup>o</sup> to bring on that Thy good Reign with Thy chosen ruler at its head, Our Sovereign;? (*b*) What for Thy sacred reward and blessing for myself (the success of all my labours)? (*c*) How shall I successfully (with Asha) seek after Thy conspicuous (princely) coadjutors (in our cause). (*d*) While I myself help pressing on in Thy Good Spirit's deeds?

\* *Thvoi*, dat. or loc. of *tvem* (??); but *thvoi* may equal *thve* = *thvaya*,—see Y. 44, 11, where the *thvoi* may = *thve*; and where the *e* may equal *y+a* = *ya* in a *thvaya* = 'Thy', as nom. sg. f. *thvaya dājena*;—it seems to me not impossible that *thvoi* may here as ideogram represent a *thvaya(n)* acc. pl. masc.; recall ved. *tva*, possessive.

9. (Aye, when shall faith and prayer be changed to sight); and when shall I in verity discern if Ye indeed have power over aught, (*b*) O Lord, (in this Chief effort of Our life), and through the Holy Order of Thy Law, (O Thou) within whose (power lie) my griefs and doubts? (*c*) Let then Thy Saving Prophet find and declare aright (for) my delight Thy Good Mind's wonder-working grace; (*d*) yea, let Thy Soshyant see how gifts of blest recompense may be his own.

\* 1 See Y. 32, 16.

\* 2 *ucham*, some have suggested 3d sg. imperv. perf. to *vach* = 'let him declare' or 'let it be declared aright'; see Dict.; fo-am as 3d sg.; see *nicham* for *dugdham*. Otherwise 'the delighting' acc. sg. f. to *uc*.

HOW LONG ! WHEN SHALL THE EFFICIENT MEN ARISE ? AND WHEN  
SHALL THE FOUL TYRANTS BE REPELLED ?

10. *Kada*, *sumedhah(-o)*, *manishayah(-a)* *narah(-a)* *visante* ;  
(b) *kada (-a)* *apa (-a)* *ajan(-n)*, *ajishyanti*, *mutram asya madasya*,  
(c) *yena (-a)* *anhasa (-e)* *iNgayata*, *(-a)* *anhurana*, *(-a)* *aNgayata*,  
(*vikrah*) *Kalpakah(-o)* *rupyanti*, *(-yan)*, *ropishyanti*,  
(d) *yena cha (vikrtena)* *kratuna dush-kshatrah (-o)* *ropishyanti dasy*  
*unam*\*\*\* (*asmakam janma-bhumi-desanam*) *kshayan*.

AYE, WHEN SHALL THE SACRED FIELD LABOUR BE RE-ESTABLISHED ?  
WHAT PRIEST-WAR-CHIEFTAIN SHALL GIVE THE SETTLING  
BLOW TO THE DEVASTATORS ?

11. *Kada*, (*haye*) *sumedhah(-a)*, *rtena smad*, *aramatih(-r)* *gamat*  
(*ishyati sukshiti*) ;  
(b) *kada*, *gamat kshatrena sukshiti (-s)* *trna-vasita*, *ksetra-yavasa-*  
*vasini* ?  
(c) *ke dhvaradbhih(-r)* *dveshibhih kruraih (-s)*, *tebhayah(-s)*, *tesham*  
*prati*, *tan pratikshah(-a)*, *uparamam dhuh*, *dhante*,<sup>oo</sup> (?) ;  
(d) *kan a vasoh (-or)* *gamat (-d)* *manasah(-s)* *chitih* ?

WE HAVE THE ANSWER—THE MEN ARE HERE. OUR SOSHYANTS WILL DO  
THE WORK FOR THEM.

12. *At te (tava satyena (-a) ) asan svayayishantah (-o)* *dasyunam*  
(*asmakam janma-bhumi-desanam*)  
(b) *ye kshnutam<sup>1</sup> nama*, *(-s)* *samtosham tubhyam dadatah (-s)*, *tvam*  
(*-s*) *joshayantah(-s)*, *samtoshayantah (-o)* *vasuna manasa sachantai*.  
(c) *chyautnaih (-r)*<sup>oo</sup> *rtena tava (tvadiyasya)* *sasasya*,  
(d) *te hi hitah, (-a)* *dhitah, (-a iva)* *adhiyanta*<sup>oo</sup> *sammethitarah (-o)* <sup>o2</sup>  
*mithati-krtah*<sup>o2</sup> (*-kartarah*), *(-a)* <sup>oo</sup> *eshmasya*, *iti*, *kila (-ai)*, *esha-*  
*hedasya (-a)* *asman prati (-y)* *akramatah*.

10. When, Mazda, shall the men of active judgment come? (*b*) when shall they drive from hence, the soil of this (polluted) drunken joy, (*c*) whereby the Karpans with (their) fierce zeal would crush us, (*d*) and by whose planning inspiration the tyrants of our Provinces (hold on) their evil sway?

\* *Manroish*, 'of enlightenment,' to *man*.—for the suffix *ri* recall *sahu ri*; cp. also *anghri*.  
*A Ngraya*, to the foot of *anhah*, 'through whose torturing fury; see *Anghri* = 'foot', 'root', but Wh. seems to think that it may belong here;—possibly having some reference to the 'twisted limb' at the end of the leg, and the 'twisting roots' 'at the foot of the tree.'  
*ANraya* has possibly some allusion to the Soma-juice used as a stimulant by the Priestly Warriors of the enemy before battle in the preparatory sacrifices.

11. Aye, when shall our Aramaiti, (High Angel of Our true Herdsman's Zeal) appear with Asha, Archangel of Thy Law, and with Khshathra (Thine established government)? (*b*) When shall she come, as having the amenities of home for us, and provided (like our land) with pastures (for the sacred Herds)? (*c*) (And) who shall give us rest from the bloody foes of evil deeds and faith? (*d*) To whom (to what Ardra-princes) shall Thy Good Mind(-ed One)'s wise plan) of strategy and policy) come near (to guide them in their toil to rescue and defend us).

12. (To whom?) The answer lieth near; the men are here). Such (needed) ones shall be the princely Saviours of the Provinces, (*b*) they who through Ihy Good-Mind(-ed Chief) follow up a keen mental scheme of satisfaction (to thy Will) (*c*) through great deeds done with Asha's law, the Law of Thy Revealed Commandment, O Mazda, (*d*) for these Prince Saviours are set for us as the (deadly) foes of Aeshma (Foul Demon of the bloody Raid—Arch Foe of all our Country's Life—Yea, they are set for us, and shall be once more and firmly established in their offices).

\* 1 *khshnum* = 'sharpening' in the sense of 'animating satisfaction.'

\* 2 Formed for *ham(a)estaro*—recall *mithati*.

It is impossible that this and the other Gathas could have been composed without a pointed reference to the particulars of a religious-political crisis in time of war.