

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

(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. The first excavation is that of the ruins of the ancient city of Taxâla 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 Taxâla, 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 Society¹ : 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 Parthenon² 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

The Account of the Temple of Jhandiala.

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

² I had the pleasure of seeing the Parthenon at Athens on 23rd November 1889.

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,¹ 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, *viz.*, 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.

¹ 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 Taxâla 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 Purnâ river and to say their Ardivisura Nyâish, and even the Khorshed and Meher Nyâishes. It was a place which gave them a more open look of the whole of the surrounding nature. The Taxâla temple tower may have been intended for a similar purpose."

III.

I. PÂTALIPUTRA—ITS HISTORY. THE IDENTIFICATION OF ITS SITE. ITS EXCAVATIONS.

It is the second group of excavations, *viz.*, that at Pâtaliputra, 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 Irânian Kings, of even further east.¹ Even the Vendidad 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 Pâtaliputra (Patna), as pointing to an actual dominion of ancient Irânians 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 Journal² 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,³ used on a somewhat similar occasion

¹ *i.e.* further than Punjab.

² Issues of January and July 1915.

³ 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,¹ 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.²

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."

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

¹ 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.

² 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 Tsiang¹ (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,)² 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 Pātaliputra³ (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.⁴ 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

¹ 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.

² " Explained in a note to mean Hiang-hu-kong-sh'ing—the city or royal precinct of the scented flower (kusuma).

³ " 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."

⁴ 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,¹ that, at the place, where, later on, there arose the city of Pātaliputra, stood a village of the name

2. Buddha's visit to the city and his prophecy about it.

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,

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.’¹ 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 Pātāligrama 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.”²

The Vāyu Purāna attributes the real foundation of Pātaliputra to Rājā Ajāta Satru’s grandson, Oudaya or Oudayaçva. 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.³

3. Its History in the time of Chandra-Gupta, as described on the authority of Megasthenes by (a) Strabo and (b) Arrian.

¹ 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 Irānian cities in the first chapter of the Vendidad, wherein, with each city, a mention is made of the accompanying evil or curse.

² “ Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra ” by Dr. L. A. Waddell (1903), p. 2.

³ 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,"¹ (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."²

Arrian speaks thus of Pâtaliputra 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,³ and that its breadth was fifteen stadia,⁴ and that a ditch encompassed it all round, which

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

² *Ibid.* Book. XV, Chapter 1, 36, Vol. III, p. 97.

³ i. e., 9.2 miles.

⁴ 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."¹

Pātaliputra seems to have risen to its zenith in the time of Chandragupta's grandson, the great Asoka (about B. C. 4. Pātaliputra in 250), "the greatest of Indian Emperors,"² the Asoka's time. 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."³

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

¹ The Indica of Arrian X (Ancient India, as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, Translation by J. W. McCrindle 1877, pp. 204-8).

² Dr. Waddell's Report of the Excavations at Pātaliputra, p. 6.

³ *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 Fa-Hien's time. "the town of Pātaliputra in the Kingdom of Magadha, the City where Asoka ruled": "The 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."¹ 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 gives the meaning of the name. This Chinese 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 hundreth year after the *Nirvāna* of Tathāgata, there was a king called Ashōka (O-shu-kia),² 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 Sanghārāmas³, Dēva temples and *stūpas* which lie in ruins may be counted by hundreds. There are only two or three remaining (entire)."⁴ 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.

¹ 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."

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

³ i.e., the monasteries.

⁴ 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 Shâh, 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. पतन) *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 PÂTALIPUTRA.

Pliny, among the ancients, was the first to point to a particular place as the site of Pâlibothra. He placed the city at 425 miles from the confluence of the river Jomanes (Jumna) and Ganges.¹ 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."² Thus we see, that Pliny placed Palibothra (Pâtaliputra) somewhere about 425 miles below the confluence of the Ganges and the Jamna.

European scholars began to attempt the identification of the site of Pâtaliputra in the latter half of the 18th century.³

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 (Pâtaliputra), with the Jamna, instead of with the river Son, placed Pâtaliputra somewhere near Helabas (Allahabad). He was misled to this mistaken identification also by the name Prasii, which, according to the Greek writers,

¹ Pliny's *Natural History*, Book VI, Chap. 21. Bostock and Riley's Translation (1855), Vol. II, p. 42.

² *Ibid.*, Chapter 22, p. 45.

³ 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 Prasii to be the same as Praye (Prayâg), which is another Indian name of Allahabad.¹ 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,² although called Erannobas.³ To this position corresponds that of Helabas,⁴ 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 Prasii occupied the city under consideration ; and the name of Praye,⁵ which we find applied to Helabas, seems to perpetuate that of the nation."⁶

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."⁷ Later on, he confirms this and says " Pliny's Palibothra, however, is clearly Patna."⁸

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

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

² Jamna.

³ The Greek form of Hira myabaha, *i.e.*, "The Golden-armed," the ancient name of, Son,

⁴ Allahabad,

⁵ Prayâg

⁶ D'Anville, p. 543.

⁷ Memoir of a Map of Hindoostan by James Rennell (1888), p. 50.

⁸ *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 " ¹ (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." ² 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." ³

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." ⁴

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 Hiuen Tsiang.

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

² Asiatic Researches (1798), Vol. V, p. 269.

³ Asiatic Researches (1822), Vol. XIV, p. 380.

⁴ " 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 Son¹ 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 Huien-Tsiang. Col. Waddell gives an interesting brief narrative of these identifications. ²

(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*³ (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

¹ 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.

² Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra.

³ *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,¹ 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 buildings². 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 Excavations³ 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. Waddell⁴ 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-Tsiang⁵ as the Nili⁶ 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. Spooner⁷ 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.

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

² Report on the Excavations at Pātaliputra (Patna), (1903).

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

⁴ "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.

⁵ "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).

⁶ *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, *viz.*, 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."¹

Dr. Spooner, at first, located eight rows of monolithic polished pillars. Subsequently, he found a ninth row and hopes to find a tenth 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 bays² 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

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

² *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.¹ 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 capitals² 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 Sarnath³ 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.

¹ 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.

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

³ 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, vedi, 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,¹ in his hand, he measured, he dug and

¹ 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."¹

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

Wooden architecture. A characteristic of Persia.

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 ".² It appears from this, that the builder of

¹ 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.

² 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 meaning of these excavations. 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."¹

I have spoken at greater length on this subject in my paper "Zoroastrianism. Its Puritans Influence on the Old World."²

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."³ 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

¹ "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.

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

³ 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".¹

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-Shapigân or Shaspigân (*i.e.*, the treasury of Shapigân) 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.² 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".³ 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

¹ "Chips from a German workshop," 2nd Ed. (1880), Vol. I, p. 162.

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

³ "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".¹

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."²

Dr. H. E. Cushman divides the time of Greek philosophy into three periods:³ 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"⁴

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-

¹ "The Great Persian War and its Preliminaries," by G. B. Grundy, p. 32.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

³ A Beginner's History of Philosophy, by Dr. Cushman, Vol. I, p. 13.

⁴ *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."¹ 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.²

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 says³ :
 "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.
 Darmesteter on the influence of Persia over Greece. Greece. It continued its influence on Greece, which it had begun in its previous wars with that

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

² Bury, History of Greece, p. 311.

³ I Translate from his "Histoire des Perses," Vol. II, p. 143.

country. Professor Darmesteter¹ 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." ²

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." ³

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

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

² " Il a persisé la Grèce, il n'a pas hellénisé la Perse " *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³ 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.¹ 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."²

IX.

THE SPECIAL QUESTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF IRÂN UPON INDIA.

The above short survey of the Influence of Irân upon Greece and Egypt, prepares us for the consideration of the present question of the Influence of Irân upon India. If, as said by Darmesteter, Irân, 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 Irân upon India. Dr. V. A. Smith on the influence of Iran upon India. 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.³ The Sassanians had also exerted great influence,⁴ 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

¹ "Greek and Eastern Churches by" Dr. Adeny, pp. 10-11.

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³ "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, 225. *Vide* also his article entitled "Persian Influence on Mauryan India" in the *Indian Antiquary* (1905), p. 201.

⁴ *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".¹

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 capitals² are more like the Persepolitan type than almost any others in India, and are each surmounted by horses and elephants, bearing men and women."³ 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."⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 136-7.

² *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.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁴ *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 Kârlé 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.¹ 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.”²
3. The Tâtvâ-gumphâ caves near the Khandgiri hill in Orissa, where, “the doors are flanked by pillasters with capitals of the Persepolitan type.”³

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 monoliths 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 monoliths, 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 bas-reliefs of Bharhut—unique alas! in Indian art—have their counterparts at Persepolis and Nineveh.

¹ *Ibid.* Vol. I, p. 178, Woodcut No. 97.

² *Ibid.* p. 215.

³ *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."¹

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.³ 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 Girnar.⁴

(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."⁵ Compare with these, the words of Asoka, introducing the different parts of his edict: "Thus saith His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King."⁶

(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

¹ Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1898, pp. 283-86.

² Herodotus, Book, IV, 87. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. III, p. 80.

³ *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.

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

⁵ "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.*

⁶ 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 Yajña.¹

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

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."⁴ 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-Shastra⁵ which was written by Chandragupta's Minister Chanakya, spoken of by Professor Jacobi as the Indian Bismark,⁶ 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.⁷

Dr. Vincent Smith⁸ 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 (Amestris, 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,

¹ 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.

² Vide the Mysore inscription, by Mr. Rice, p. 11.

³ Vide The catalogue of Indian Coins, by Professor Rapson, Introduction, p. 100.

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

⁵ Vide Law's Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity. Vide also the recently published books "Public Administration in Ancient India," by Pramathanath Banerjea.

⁶ *Ibid*, Introduction, p. XX.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. X.

⁸ 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."¹ 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."²

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."³ I think, that the word is some old Iranian form, from which comes the modern Persian تخت (*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*⁴ which itself comes from the Avesta root '*thwakhsh*,' Sans. *tvakhsh* (त्वक्ष),⁵ 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. (तक्), 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, *viz.*, a year." (b) Or the word may be derived from the same root (P. تاختن) which means to flow, to run, to hasten. Thus the word would mean "the period of life which has run," *viz.*, "a year." (c) Or perhaps it is some old Iranian word from which comes the Pahlavi word *takht*,⁶ Persian *takht* تخت throne; and it means a particular day in honour of the occupant of the throne, *i.e.*, of the King.

¹ Book IX, 110-11. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. IV, pp. 473-74.

² *Ibid.* Book I, 133, Vol. I, p. 273.

³ Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. IV, p. 473, n. 3.

⁴ *Vide* Mr. Steingass's Persian Dictionary, the word 'takht.'

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

⁶ 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 sacred 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 (*nân* 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,¹ when it refers to the sacred bath for purifying the body, says that the washing should begin from the head (*baresnu*). A particular sacred bath is, from that fact, still known as *Baresnum*. The place, where that bath is given, is known as *Baresnum-gâh*.

This above-mentioned custom is believed² 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 Ombrius (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."³

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."⁴ 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.⁵ 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-

¹ Chap. VIII, 40.

² Dr. Vincent Smith. Indian Antiquary of September 1905, Vol. XXXIV, p. 202.

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

⁴ Strabo Bk., XV, Chap. I, 71. Hamilton and Falconer's Translation, Vol. III, p. 118.

⁵ 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 ”¹

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 tanûmcha*)² 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 Pâtaliputra 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”³ ruled over India. That dynasty was the Mauryan dynasty, the founder of which, Chandragupta, “the first great Indian Emperor”⁴ was a Persian Aryan, a Parsi.⁵ He had Persepolis as his ancestral home. The

¹ Herodotus Book VI, Chap. 19.

² Vendidad, Chap. VIII, 11, Ś. B. E., Vol. IV.

³ Journal, Royal Asiatic Society of January 1915, p. 72.

⁴ *Ibid*, July Number, p. 416.

Ibid, July, p. 429.

Mauryan dynasty was Zoroastrian.¹ Not only that, but Dr. Spooner, further on, says,² that Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, was an Iranian sage and as such was Persian.³ 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,⁴ 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,⁵ Dr. Carl Schirmerstein "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)."⁶ 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."⁷

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

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 409.

² *Ibid.*, p. 406.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 453.

⁴ Journal, Royal Asiatic Society of 1898, p. 262.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Journal of 1910, p. 218.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

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."¹

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 Mobad. 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 Chānakya (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

Dr. Spooner's theory about the wave of Persian advance in India.

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 Orissa² 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

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

² Journal, Royal Asiatic Society, July 1915, p. 433.

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

Dr. Spooner adds Assam also to "the list of early Magian centres."³ 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 Nerbudda 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 Parsees",⁴ 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.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 434.

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

³ Journal R. A. S., July 1915, p. 434.

⁴ 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 Irân (Airyanâm dakhyunâm), Turân (Tuiryanâm dakhyunâm), Rum or Asia Minor and Eastern Europe (Sairimanâm dakhyunâm), China (Sâininâm dakhyunâm), and the country of the Dâhæ, a people of Central Asia (Dâhinâm Dakhyunâm).¹ Among these five, the first, Iran, the country of the Âryas or Âryas, included several places or countries. Out of these, the principal 16 are named, the first being Airyana-Vaeja or Irân Vej, the Irân 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).² 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.³ 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)⁴ 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 époque⁵). 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

¹ Farvârdin Yasht (Yt. XIII), p. 144.

² Le Zend Avesta, Vol. II, p. 1.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Le Zend Avesta, p. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*

writer says, that, besides these 16 places named, there were other beautiful prosperous places (henti anyāoschit asāoscha shoithrāoscha srīrāoscha),¹ 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. I) 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.”² Anyhow we can safely say that it was written long before the time of Buddha.

¹ Vendidad, Chapter I, p. 21.

² 9th edition, Vol. XVI, pp. 44, Col. I.

The general consensus 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.¹ 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 Persia²" 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."³ 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 (shiyâtîm) 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."⁴

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

¹ *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.

² S. B. E., Vol. IV, 2nd edition, p. LX.

³ S. B. E., Vol. IV, 2nd edition, Introduction, p. LXV.

⁴ *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

Origin of the
names, Hindustan
and India.

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 Rigveda¹ speaks of the Indus with its tributaries as Sapt-Sindhavas (*i.e.*, the country of the seven Sindhu rivers), not as Hapta-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.² We read in the Vendidad :

Panchadasêm asanghâmcha shôithranâmcha vahisstem frâthweresem, azem yô Ahurô Mazdâo, yô Hapta-Hindu, hacha ushastara Hindva ava daoshatarem Hindûm. Âat ahê paityârem frâkerentat angrô mainyush pouru-mahrkô arathwyâcha dakhshata arathwimcha garemâum.

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.

¹ Mandala (Book), IV, Hymn 28 अहिं अरिणात सवसिधुन. *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."

² "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 Âryan 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 Sindhustân, but by its Iranian or Zoroastrian name Hindustân. 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)."¹ 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,² 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.

¹ The book of Esther, Chap. I, 1. *Vide* also Chap. VIII, 9.

² *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,¹ and Nakhs-i-Rûstam,² Darius mentions, among his conquered countries, the name of India as Hidush³ or Hindush. The fact of this mention in his inscriptions suggests, that with its conquest, Persia must have exercised a great influence upon India.

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."⁴

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".⁵ 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

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

² *Ibid.*, pp. 79 and 146.

³ 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?

⁴ Book III, p. 94, Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. II, p. 485. ⁵ *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,¹ 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.

IV. Punch-marked coins.

Pandit Bhagvanlal Indraji 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."² 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.³ In connection with this matter, Mr. J. H. Decourdemanche, in his Paper on "The Ancient punch-marked coins of India"⁴ 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 India⁵ 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."

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

² Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XII, pp. 525-526.

³ Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of England of 1898. Article on "The Early Commerce of Babylon with India" pp. 277-82.

⁴ "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.

⁵ 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."¹ 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 Hvarekshaêta 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.²

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.³

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.

¹ J. R. A. S. of July 1915, p. 412.

² 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.

³ *Vide* my " Glimpse into the work of the B. B. R. A. Society during the last 100 years," pp. 88-90.

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

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 Jamyâd 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

¹ *Vide* Dr. Louis H. Gray's very interesting paper on "Mâongha Gâochithra" 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, Behrâm Varjâvand, as coming from India. In the Pahlavi *Mâdigan-i-Binâ-i-Farvardin Yum-i-Khordâd*,¹ this future apostle (*Vahrâm-i-Varzâvand*) is predicted to appear from among the Hindus (*min Hindukân*). The Pahlavi Bahman Yasht,² 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 :

“*Aûharmazd spoke thus : O Zarâtûsht, the Spîtâmân ! 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 Zarâtûsht, is born on lake Frazdân. It is when he comes to his conference with me, Aûharmazd, O Zarâtûsht, the Spîtâmân ! that in the direction of Chinistân, it is said—some have said among the Hindus—is born a prince (kai) ; it is his father, a prince of the Kayân race, approaches the women and a religious prince is born to him ; he calls his name Vahrâm the Varjâvand, 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-Aûharmazd who said that the month Âvân 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*

¹ 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 Kaikhushru.

² 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.”¹

The Persian Zarthosht-nameh² of Zarthosht Behram Pazdû also speaks of the future apostle (Behram Varzâvand) 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 Dinkard³ (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.⁴ There we read “Kai Spudakht Spendadad-u-Zargar (Zarir). Hindukân bê-keshwar pa din ravâinidâri 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.

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

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

³ S. B. E., Vol. XXXVII, Pahlavi Texts, Part IV, p. 414.

⁴ 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-nâmeh by Zarthusht Behram Pazdu. This treatise is believed to claim a Pahlavi source for its materials.¹ The tradition² says that Changragâch returned to India fully convinced, and, in his turn, converted about 80,000 Indians into Zoroastrianism.³

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=Changragu~~p~~ta=Changragach~~t~~a, 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

¹ Vide Professor Jackson's "Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran," p. 85.

² *Ibid*, p. 86.

³ 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 Bundeshesh¹ connects the event of the king's confinement in the fort of Padashkvârgar with king Minocheher, the Persian Shah-Nameh² 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,³ 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.⁴ The Brahmins even said, that their books said so.⁵ 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.

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

² Mohl, Vol. I, p. 424.

³ Zend Avesta Tome, I, Partie I, p. 392.

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

⁵ "Les Brahmes pretendent qu'il est écrit dans leurs Annales, que les excavations de Djegueseri 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, se qui leur paroit au-dessus des forces ordinaires de l'homme (Zend Avesta, Tome I, Partie I, 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-nameh. 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.¹ Take a specific instance. He says, that while all children wept on birth, Zoroaster laughed.² Now, that matter has been referred to, not only by the Pahlavi Dinkard³ and Zadsparam⁴ but also by other Persian writers like those of the Shahrastani, Dabistan,⁵ and Rauzat-us-safa.⁶ It has been also referred to by Pliny⁷ and Plato⁸ and also by the writer of the Scandinavian Eddas.⁹ These facts show, that one is not to disregard altogether the traditional statement of a writer like Zarathusht Behram Pazdu, simply because he was a comparatively much later writer.¹⁰

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,¹¹ 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

¹ *Vide* the S. B. E., Vol. XLVII.

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

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

⁴ Chap. XIV, 12, *Ibid* p. 142.

⁵ Shea and Troyer's Translation, 1843, Vol. I, p. 219.

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

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

⁸ Scholion on the first Aleibides.

⁹ *Vide* Jackson's *Zoroaster*, pp. 286-287.

¹⁰ The tradition about Changragacha is referred to in the Dabistan and the Desatur. 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.

¹¹ 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."¹ The Desatir² also refers to this matter.

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

Besides, Changraghâcha, there is another Indian sage, Biâs (Viâs) by name, who also is traditionally said to have been converted to Zoroastrianism. The Dabistan thus speaks of this sage :

"When the report of Jangranghâcha's having adopted the faith was published abroad, a sage, by name, Byâsa,³ came from India to Iran... ..Byasa listened to the words of God, and having made profession of the pure faith, returned to Hindustan".⁴

The Desatir thus speaks of the traditions of Changraghâcha and Bias : "Changragâch 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 Changragâch 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."⁵

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

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

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 Peshâddian Faridun. Faridun's

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

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

³ Troyer thinks that this name is Indian Vyasa.

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

⁵ 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, 2nd edition, (1902), pp. 87-88. *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 Peshadian dynasty, the author of the Jâvidân-i-Kherad (Eternal Wisdom), was the first Irânian monarch to come to India.¹ 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 Zaboulstan 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 Zaboulstan 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.² A nephew of this Maharaja Krishna had sought shelter with King Faridun. This Persian king sent his General Kersasp bin Atrud³ to India and compelled the Maharaja to give a portion of his territories to his nephew.⁴ After this time, Sam Nariman invaded Punjab at the direction of the

¹ Jarret's Translation, Vol. III, p. 325 *et seq.*

² "Paêvastê ba pâdshâhân-i-Irân-tarîkeh-i-mohbat va dâd maslûk midâsht" (Naval Kishore's Lithographed Text of Tarikh-i-Ferishta, p. 10, l. 26).

³ 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.

⁴ 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,¹ 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 Jallander² and helped him in subduing his tributary kings. Kesurai was succeeded by Firujrae.³ He turned ungrateful to Iran. Taking advantage of its weakness during the times following the death of its great general Sam Nariman,⁴ when Afrasiab invaded Iran, he rebelled against the suzerainty of Persia, and freed Punjab from its yoke. He took Jallander under his own sway⁵ 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.⁶ While there, I heard the tradition, that the fort was connected with

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

² *Ibid.*, p. 11, l. 14.

³ Briggs' Manuscript gives the name as Munirāe.

⁴ 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.

⁵ "Jalahunder rā qar mumalik khud sākht".

⁶ In a short account of my travels in Northern India in 1887, given by me in the "Jam-e-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.¹

XVIII.

Professor Satis Chundra Vidyabhusana, in his interesting Paper, entitled "Persian affinities of the Liechavis,"² 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 Pârsika (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 Kâlidasa, 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."³ 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." "It is possible that during the occupation of Sogdiana,⁴ 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)⁵ immigrated to Tibet into the Himalayan regions, where they established a monarchical system of Government on the model of the Government in Persia."⁶

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."⁷ This Nisibis is thought to be the Niçaya of the *Vendidad*,⁸ the curse of which city was scepticism (*vimano*, Pahl *gomân*, Persian *gumân*). The Professor adds: "The earliest reference to the people of Nisibis in Indian writings occurs

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

² Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXVII, March 1908, pp. 78-80.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁴ The Sogda of the Avesta, *Vendidad* I, p. 5.

⁵ The Haroyu of the Avesta, *Vendidad* I, p. 9.

⁶ The Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXVII, March 1908, p. 79.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁸ Chap. I, p. 8.

in the famous Brahmanic Sanskrit work, the *Manusamhitâ* (Chap. X, verse 12), in which they have been designated *Nicehibi*, which is, no doubt an Indian form of the Persian word *Nisibis*.¹ *Manu* describes the *Nicchibis* as *Vrâtya-ksatriyas*, or an outcaste royal race, and names them along with *Khasa*, *Karana* and others. In the *Bhavisya Purâna*, Chapter 139, verses 33-65, *Niksubhâ* is described as a daughter of the sage *Rijisvâ* of the *Gotra* or *Solar* clan, and under the name of *Hâvani* as married to *Surya*, the Sun-God. I imagine that *Niksubhâ* 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*,² which is only a softened form of *Nicchibi* or *Nisibis*, and have been mentioned as living in a large number in *Vaisâli* (in *Magadha*).³

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 *Bâmyân*⁴ (off *Nisibis*) which was visited by the Chinese traveller *Hiuen-Tsiang* 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*."⁵

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."⁶ We know that the *Haoma* plant, referred to in the *Avesta*⁷ had as its home, among other countries, the country of Western Tibet.⁸

¹ The original Avesta form of the name is *Niçaya*.

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

³ *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 79.

⁴ The *Bamikân* mountain of the Pahlavi *Bundehesh*, Chap. XX, p. 22.

⁵ *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXVII, March 1908, p. 80.

⁶ "Buddhist China" by Reginald F. Johnston, p. 15.

⁷ *Yasna*, Chaps. IX-XI.

⁸ *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,"¹ 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 Achæmenien 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 *Mahābhārata*² 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 (Airyavô Danghavô), 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

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

² Mahābhārata II, l. pp. 14-17.

refers to the Pâtaliputra buildings, and says, that they were built by Asura Maya (Ahura Mazda) for the Dânavas (the Airyavô Danghavô) 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. Spooner¹ lays aside as apocryphal and unsatisfactory, the Indian explanation of the derivation

(a) The name of the name Maurya from the name of a Sudra Maurya dynasty. woman Murâ, supposed to be the mother of Chandragupta. He connects the name with Mount Meru of the Purânas, 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 Irânian migration, where, one by one, Zoroastrianism flourished. In his theory of comparing the hundred-columned buildings of Chandragupta at Pâtaliputra 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.² But looking to the fact, that, in the Vendidad, Mouru (Merv) is mentioned together with other places like Irânvez, Sogd (Sogdiana near Samarkand), Haroyu (Hera), Bâkhdhi (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. Hutton'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.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of July 1913, p. 406.

² *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."¹ 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 Achæmenian 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 Pâtaliputra 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 Mahâbhârata 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 Mahâbhârata is the Ahura Mazda of the Iranians. Just as Darius the Great attributed his exploits and his works to Ahura Mazda, the Mahâbhârata 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

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

any serious difficulties."¹ 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."² 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 (هرمز). 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.³ The word *maza* is the positive degree form of the superlative *mazishta*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *mahishta*, which is often applied⁴ 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, *viz.*, "How can Ahura Mazda be taken as an Architect"? Dr. Spooner says :

¹ Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of January 1915, p. 78.

² *Ibid.*, p. 79.

³ 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.

⁴ 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,¹—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,² God is often spoken of as *tashan*, Sans. तश्न, तश्क, i.e., the Maker, Architect, Creator. The modern Free-masons, who connect their craft with ancient masonry,³ even now speak of God as the Great Architect.

Dr. Spooner says : "The Mahâbhârata assigns the evidently Mauryan palaces to certain foreign kings called Dânavas.

(c) The Indian Dânavas and the Iranian Danghavô. The Mauryas originated from Persepolis and were perhaps of Achæmenian descent. The Achæmenian kings speak of themselves in their inscription as Airyavô Danghavô." Dr. Spooner takes this fact as significant, and, with some diffidence, takes the Dânavas to be the same as Danghavô, 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 Airyavô Danghavô".⁴

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 "Airyanâm dakhyunâm narâm ashaonâm fravashayô yazamaidê"⁵ i.e., we invoke the spirits of the holy men (narâm नराम)

¹ Yt. I, p. 17, S.B. E., Vol. XXIII, p. 29.

² Yasna, XXIX, 2, Vide also Yasna, XXI, 9. XLVI, 9.

³ I'de my Paper on "The Legendary and the Actual History of Freemasonry" in my book of Masonic Papers.

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

⁵ Yt XIII, p. 143.

of the countries of Airyana (Iran). Again, we have the word often ¹ 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).² 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 Dânavā in the Mahābhārata, where the Mauryan palaces are referred to, with the word Danghavyō 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 Velāyet, 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 Velāyet," thereby meaning England.

¹ Atash Nyāish Yasna LXII, 5, Aiwīçruthrem gāh, 7.

² Yasna XXXI, 18. Vide "The Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsees," by Ervad Sheriarji D. Bharucha, Part II (1910), p. 60, 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

The Dânavas of the Mahâbhârata and the Dânu of the Avesta. 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.¹ The accusative plural of the word is Dânavô.² 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.³ Dr. Haug says: "The name Dânava 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."⁴ The Vedic Dânavas were "descendents from Danu by the sage Kashyapa. They were giants who warred against the gods."⁵ 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

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

² Yasht V., 73.

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

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

⁵ 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,¹ and in the Farvardin Yasht.² 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".³ This statement of Dr. Spooner suggests several thoughts from the Iranian or Zoroastrian point of view.

"The Great Ishtar," 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.⁴

¹ Yasht V, 73.

² Yasht, XIII, 37-38.

³ Journal Royal Asiatic Society, January 1915, p. 81.

⁴ 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.

⁵ *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 Ardvîçura Anâhita,¹ 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.² The districts of Wakhar, Sharikul and Kanjut are situated on the banks of the Oxus. According to Wood³ and Gordon,⁴ remnants of Zoroaster's creed were seen there till about 500 to 700 years ago. It is also in an account of the Ardvîçura Anahita, that we find a reference to the Iranian Dânu or Dânavas. There, the worshippers pray and implore Anâhita to subdue some leaders of the Turanian Dânu (Dânavô Tura-Vyâkhna)⁵. In the Farvardin Yasht also, the worshippers pray to overcome the Turanian Dânu (Dânunâm Turanâm)⁶.

Mr. E. W. Gosse, in his article on Denmark in the Encyclopædia Britannica,⁷ says: "The original form of the word Denmark is Dan mörk, the march⁸ 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 Dânu, the Vedic Dânava, 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 Dânu (Dânes)". Danube is "the river (Avesta âp., Sanskrit अर्प, Lat-aqua, Perian âb, *i.e.*, water) of the Dânu.

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 Irânian Anâhita, later Persian Nâhid (Venus). It is also significant to note that the word Dânu in the Avesta also means a river (*e.g.*, Danu-Drâjangha,⁹ *i.e.*, as long as a river).

¹ Aban Yasht, Yt. V. 101, S. B. E. Vol. XXIII, p. 77.

² Darmesteter translates the word fraskemb as "balconies."

³ 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.

⁴ 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).

⁵ Yasht V, 73.

⁶ Yasht XIII, 37-38.

⁷ 9th edition, Vol. VII, p. 84.

⁸ The word "march" is the same as Persian *marz*, country. The English word Marquis is similar to the Persian word, Marzbân.

⁹ Yasna LX, 4; Yt XIII (Farvardin), 32.

Hindu books speak very rarely and very little of the Maurya 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 Rājatarangini¹ refers to a King Mihir Cula, as a wicked monarch, in whose reign, the Mlech'has had an ascendancy². He founded the temple of Mihreshwara and the city of Mihirapur in which "the Gandhāra Brahmans, a low race. . . . were permitted to seize upon the endowments of the more respectable orders of the priesthood"³. These Gandhāra Brahmans (गान्धारा 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 Herodotus⁴ 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",⁵ 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),⁶ that these Gandhāra Brahmans had the next-of-kin marriages among them. This is an

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

² *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.

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

⁴ Herodotus *Ibid.*, Book III, 91.

⁵ *Ibid* Book VII, 66.

⁶ Shloka 308, Troyer's French Translation.

allusion to the so-called custom of the next-of-kin marriage among some ancient Persians,¹ a custom supposed to have been connected with the matriarchal custom which may be tribal with some Magi². (2) Secondly, the Rājatarangini speaks of a number of flesh-devouring birds following the army of the foreign king.³ 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 Rājatarangini'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 History⁴ and in the book of travels of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang⁵. The Chinese pilgrim⁶ speaks of him as having lived "some centuries ago." This confirms my above statement that one cannot depend upon the chronology of Kalhana's Rājatarangini, whose Mihiracula 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 Avesta⁷ to say, that some of the Hunnic leaders who fought against the Iranians, observed well nigh the same forms of ritual and worship.

¹ 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.

² 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.)

³ Shloaka, p. 291.

⁴ Mr. Vincent Smith's History of India, 2nd edition (1914), pp. 316-319.

⁵ Si-Yü-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.

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 168.

⁷ 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 (Paršis)."¹ This shows that some Parsee Kings had a Kingdom in the close neighbourhood of India. Lassen² 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.³

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

(f) Chânakya, supposed by Dr. Spooner to be a Persian. A few thoughts suggested by this fact.

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

¹ Journal B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. III, No. XIV, p. 154.

² 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).

³ 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. Chânakya, 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." ¹

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 two².

Now "the name of the Atharva-veda is a two-fold one—Atharvângirasas we find it called. Both elements in this compound name, it will be recognized, are equally good Persian".³ According to the Vishnu-purana, "Angirasa is one of the vedas in Shâka-divipa, i.e., it is a Persian scripture. The warrior-caste in Shâka-divipa, curiously enough, are known as Mâgatha. The Brahmins are called Magas, and the Kshatriyas Mâgadhas In the Atharva-veda itself, in a passage suggestive of that early friction the Mâgadhas 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 Keresâni, and an Iranian, Haoma. As to the foreigner, Keresâni, Dr. Mills compares him with "the Vedic Krishânû 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. Keresâni 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 apâm âthrava aiwishtish vêrêdhyê danghavê charât)." Taking the above two proper names as typical or as representatives of their class, what we find is this:

¹ Journal Royal Asiatic Society, July 1915, p. 421.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 421-22.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 421 (*vide* Haug's Essays on the Parsis, 2nd 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-
(g)References in the Chandragupta, Dr. Spooner refers to a passage
Bhavishaya Purana in the Bhavishaya-purâna, referred to by Wilson
to Zoroastrians. 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-dvîpa, as if the compiler had
adopted the Persian term *Mugh* and connected the fire-worshippers of
Iran with those of India".¹ 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."

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

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 Sâmba 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-purâna) to establish the identity of the Magas of the Purana with the followers of Zoroasters.'"¹

(a) According to the Bhavishya Purâna, 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 Mahârâj, the son of Krishna.² 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-purâna 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."³ 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.⁴ The Âbân Yasht enjoins that consecrated food shall not be given to persons suffering from leprosy.⁵ The Bhavishya-purâna refers to the

¹ *Ibid*, p. 425.

² Briggs's *Ferishta*, Vol. I, p. LXIV.

³ Herodotus, Book I, p. 139. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Vol. I, p. 278.

⁴ *The Vendidad*, Chapter II, p. 29.

⁵ *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" गौरा 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 सुवीश 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 Vacharcha, i.e., Sun-worshippers.
4. Their having four vedas, including the Angirasa.
5. The use of the Aavyāṅga 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 purṇaka 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.¹ (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.² (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.³ 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* of *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

The custom of among the Iranians, is very old. It arose during holding silence at the reign of Kaiomars. Kaiomars advised, that meals. 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.⁴

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

¹ Vandidad III, V, &c.

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

³ Vide my "Glimpse into the work of the B. B. R. A. Society."

⁴ 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."¹

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

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

¹ 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

(a) Yavana Bhagadatta. 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.¹

The Sâka-dwipa of the Indians is the Sekastan, Sagastan, Sagistan or Siestan of the Persians. The Sanskrit द्वीप 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.*,

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

"The Wonders and Mavels of Seistan" ¹, 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.² 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,³ 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" (Asârô aiwyâkhshayênti).⁴ Bearing in mind, that Sakastân 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.

¹ *Vide* for its translation my "Aiyâdgâr-i Zarirân," &c.

² Journal R. A. Society, July 1915, p. 438.

³ Yaçna XIX, p. 18.

⁴ Vendidad I, 20.