

VIII. NORTHWESTERN INDIA IN GREEK AND INDIAN SOURCES (2)

1. *Fabulous Peoples in Indian Sources*

The fabulous peoples of India as described in Greek ethnography and later literature on *mirabilia* (including the Alexander legend) do not have any exact parallel in Indian sources. There are some ethnic wonder stories, but more often curious habits were invented in mythological contexts. The *Rāmāyaṇa* and other books are full of demons (especially Rākṣasas) with marvellous features and properties, and different classes of semi-divine beings like Gandharvas, Apsarases, Yakṣas and Nāgas are another popular motif. But even if a legendary northern mountain with a population consisting of Gandharvas etc. may perhaps be taken as a kind of pseudo-ethnography, the difference between this and Greek wonder ethnography is notable.

The names and attributes of Indian demons have often been referred to in this connection, but these are not really useful. Too often they are taken as evidence,¹ but such comparisons are open to many kinds of criticism. These demons are more or less unique and do not propagate their physical peculiarities. The number of these peculiarities is so large that any parallel to fabulous peoples seems necessarily accidental.

We come a little nearer to the Greek type with the account of some tribal peoples like the Kirātas, the Niṣādas and the Puliṅḍas, but here the stress is on their cruelty and savagery, not on any marvellous features or customs. We simply cannot find ancient Indian tales about those fabulous peoples of India so often described in classical ethnography.

Yet the Indian sources are not wholly devoid of parallels. The lists of peoples we find in Indian epics contain several names which seem to be exact parallels for some fabulous peoples found in Classical sources. Here a striking, but somewhat neglected fact is that we really have only the names for the peoples. There are no *tales* of the fabulous properties which so greatly attracted early Greek authors on India. In vain do we consult such texts as the *Jātaka* or the *Pañcatantra* for them. They seem to have been no part of the folklore of Aryan India as far as it is reflected in the literature. They were mere vague rumours about countries situated well outside the Aryan sphere of culture, perhaps even more vague than their counterparts in Classical literature, where we find at least some kind of account of them.

The Indian evidence² is mostly found in four geographical lists, already mentioned

¹ Even Filliozat (1981, 103) referred to demons as a point of comparison for the fabulous peoples of Classical accounts.

in another context. In the *Sabhāparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* there is a long account of the conquests made by the Pāṇḍava brothers in order to conquer the "world" (*Digvijaya-parvan*). The four brothers of Yudhiṣṭhira divided the directions between them and the Southern direction conquered by Sahadeva includes several fabulous peoples.³ Somewhat later in the same book we find a long account of presents brought to Yudhiṣṭhira by many different peoples (*Dyūtaparvan*), and again some fabulous peoples are mentioned.⁴ Though these people are said to come from different directions (*nānādigbhyah samāgatān*), the general geographical context seems to be the Northwest.⁵ Later we again meet the Blanket-ears in the army of Duryodhana.⁶ In the *Rāmāyaṇa* the search for Sītā contains a long description of the various directions where the search was to be completed. Here the fabulous peoples are included in the eastern direction.⁷

² Among older discussions of this evidence Schwanbeck 1846, 61ff. and especially Stein 1927, *passim*, and 1932, 239ff. and 304ff. are most important.

³ Sahadeva's conquests are described in *Mbh* 2, 28, the fabulous peoples in verses 44ff.:

sāgaradvīpavāsāms ca ṛpatīn mleccchayonijān/
niṣādān puruṣādāms ca karṇaprāvaraṇān api//44//
ye ca kālāmukhā nāma narā rākṣasayonayaḥ/
kṛtsnam kollagirim caiva muracīpattanam tathā//45//
dvīpam tāmrāhvayam caiva parvatam rāmakam tathā/
timirṅgilam ca ṛpatīm vāse cakre mahāmatih//46//
ekapādāms ca puruṣān kevalān vanavāsinaḥ/
nagarīm samjayantīm ca picchaṇḍam karahāṭakam/
dūtair vāse cakre karam cainān adāpayat//47//.

⁴ *Mbh* 2, 47-48, fabulous peoples in 47, 15ff.:

dvyakṣāms trayakṣāṃḥ lalāṭākṣān nānādigbhyah samāgatān/
auṣṇīṣān anivāsāms ca bāhukān puruṣādakān//15//
ekapādāms ca tatrāham apasyam dvāri vāritān/
balyartham dadatas tasmai hiraṇyam rajatam bahu//16//
indragopakavarāṇbhān sukavarān manojavān/
tathaivendrāyudhanibhān samdhyābhrasādṛṣān api//17//
anekavarān āraṇyān gṛhītvāsvān manojavān/
jātarūpam anardhyam ca dadus tasyaikapādakāḥ//18//.

⁵ In verses 12ff. far Northwestern Yavanas are mentioned together with Prāgjyotiṣa, commonly belonging to the Northeast. But according to Rönnow 1936, 115ff. there may well have been another Prāgjyotiṣa in the Northwest (see also *Rājat* 4, 171). In 19 many northwestern (Chinese, Huns and Sakas) and one supposedly southeastern (Orissans) people are mentioned. But even the Oḍras are probably not the Orissans (as translated by Van Buitenen; this is also the only meaning given in Dey s.v.), for the word refers to Uḍḍiyāna/Swat (see Lévi 1915, 105ff. and Tucci 1963, 148).

⁶ *Mbh* 6, 47, 13 vidarbhair mekalais caiva karṇaprāvaraṇair api/ sahitāḥ sarvasainye-
na bhīṣmam āhavaśobhinam.

⁷ *R* 4, 39 contains the eastern direction, verses 24ff.:

mandarasya ca ye koṭīm samśritāḥ kecid āyatām/
karṇaprāvaraṇās caiva tathā cāpy oṣṭhakarṇakāḥ//24//
ghorā lohamukhās caiva javanās caikapādakāḥ/
akṣayā balavantaś ca puruṣāḥ puruṣādakāḥ//25//
kirātāḥ karṇacūḍās ca hemāṅgāḥ priyadarśanāḥ/
āmamināsanās tatra kirātā dvīpavāsinaḥ//26//
antarjalacarā ghorā naravyāghrā iti śrutāḥ/
eteṣām ālayāḥ sarve viceyāḥ kānanaukasah//27//.

The other two come from later sources. One is the Kūrmavibhāga division already mentioned (VII.8.). The oldest published version is found in adhyāya 14 of the *Bṛhatsamhitā* of Varāhamihira (the 6th century A.D.), but Kūrmavibhāga has apparently been included in the 23th aṅga of the unpublished *Gargasamhitā* (*Gārgīyajyotiṣa*, perhaps the 1st century A.D.).⁸ Other versions are found in Bhaṭṭotpala's commentary to the *Bṛhatsamhitā*, in al-Bīrūnī (closely following the *Bṛhatsamhitā*) and in the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* (very corrupt version). Fabulous peoples are mentioned in several directions,⁹ and the directions themselves are rather problematic as all except the south, southwest and east are located more or less in the Northwest.¹⁰

Some of our Indian sources are late, but there is nothing to indicate that these lists could have contained any influence from the West. It would be rather difficult to think that the names of fabulous peoples found in them could be due to any such influence. There are also such names (e.g. *vyāghramukha* 'the tiger-faced people') that are not found in Western sources.

The geographical distribution of these Indian names is wide, fabulous peoples are mentioned in the south, in the east and in the Northwest. But no source locates them in the central region, not even in the more remote parts of it. They always live in some distant place, well outside the Aryan sphere of culture. The exact location or even the direction is often difficult to say, as the lists are products of complicated text history. As we have them, their geography is for the most part anything but exact and reliable.

In one case we may perhaps somewhat limit this geographical variety. The geography of Sahadeva's conquests might be more complicated than has been supposed. The alleged southern location of the fabulous peoples here does not necessarily carry us to the Dravidian South as has been suggested.¹¹ Sahadeva himself made his conquests only in Gujarat and Northern Maharashtra,¹² all peoples that are interesting to us were conquered through envoys sent from there. The Dravidian South was conquered in a similar

See also Stein 1936b, 1032f., where this account is compared with Ptolemy. Lévi (1918, 16ff.) gives a translation of the geographical section of the *Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra* (preserved in Chinese and Tibetan) which follows our text rather closely. In the eastern direction we meet i.a. "les gens qui s'habillent de l'oreille" and cannibals (Lévi 1918, 17 and 19, discussed in p. 75), but "les hommes à un pied" are moved to distant southern islands (*ibid.* 31 and 101).

⁸ Mitchiner 1986, 107, on the date *ibid.* 5ff. and 81f.

⁹ *BS* 14, 5-7 in the East (*atha pūrvasyām añjanavṛṣabhadvajapadmamālyavadgirayaḥ/vyāghramukhasuhmakarvaṭacāndrapurāḥ sūrpakarṇās ca//5// khasamagadhasiviragiri-mithilasamataṭoḍrāsavadanadanturakāḥ/ prāgyjyotisālahityakṣīrodasamudrapuruṣā-dāḥ//6// udayagiribhadragauḍakapaṇḍrotkalakāsimekalāmbaṣṭhāḥ/ ekapadatāmralipta-kosalakā vardhamānās ca//7//*); 18 in the Southwest (*phēṇagiriyanamārgarakarṇaprāveya-pārasavasūdrāḥ/ barbarakirātakhaṇḍakravyādābhīracāñcukāḥ//*); 23 in the Northwest (*veṇu-matī phalgulukā guluhā marukucchacarmaraṅgākhyāḥ/ ekavilocanaśūlikadīrgha-gīrvāsyakesās ca//*); and 25 in the North (quoted above, in VII.8.).

¹⁰ The Southwest includes such well-known names as Sindhusauvra, Kāmboja and Yavana, the northeast such as Kāśmīra, Abhisāra and Darada. I have discussed this geographical orientation in a still unpublished paper read at the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference at Leiden in August 1987.

¹¹ Puskás 1983 and 1986, *passim*.

¹² Parpola 1984, 451 suggests a special relation of the Pāṇḍavas with this region. Cf. chapter VIII.3.

way, but somewhat later.¹³ Therefore, we cannot be sure where the fabulous peoples were supposed to live. From Gujarat, envoys can travel westward too.

It is more interesting to note that some of the fabulous peoples in Indian sources seem to belong together. While Sahadeva's envoys conquered the man-eating (*puruṣāda*) Niṣādas, the Kaṇapṛāvaraṇas and the one-footed people (*ekapādāḥ puruṣāḥ*) in the south, the apes searching for Sītā were to meet the Kaṇapṛāvaraṇas, the Ekapādakas and man-eating men (*puruṣāḥ puruṣādakāḥ*) in the east, where the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* refers to the basket-ears (*śūrpaakarṇāḥ*), man-eaters (*puruṣādāḥ*) and the one-footed people (*ekapādāḥ*). Among the peoples bearing presents to Yudhiṣṭhira the Kaṇapṛāvaraṇas are missing,¹⁴ but the Puruṣādakas and the Ekapādakas are present. Even in the (south)west the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* mentions not only the Kaṇapṛāveyas but the Kravyādas, whose dietary habits can be compared to the man-eaters.¹⁵

Thus it seems that the three more or less fabulous peoples mentioned above belong together, though they are located in different geographical contexts in different sources. When we remember that Sanskrit literature tells us nothing about these peoples, it seems likely that they come from somewhere else. Their appearance in early Greek sources¹⁶ points to Northwest India, but in Indian sources an origin to the east of the Aryan culture is perhaps more likely. An explanation could be that the stories about fabulous peoples were told by some people living in India before the Aryans. The remnants of these people now lived on both sides of the area occupied by the Aryans. They might be Dravidians, but they might equally well be descendants of an earlier Aryan wave. I shall come back to this later.

¹³ In 2, 28, 48. If we are to believe the conjecture suggested by Edgerton (1938), he conquered through envoys even Antioch and Rome.

¹⁴ They are found in some northern manuscripts after 2, 48, 17 (insertion 471).

¹⁵ In late sources there are similar accounts of fabulous peoples, but these accounts go back to those mentioned above. Thus for instance the *Jaimini-Aśvamedha* 22, describing the wanderings of Yudhiṣṭhira's Aśvamedha horse, lists after Strīrājya several fabulous peoples including those which are interesting to us: *tato deśān sa vīdhāms taramgeṇa samanvitaḥ/ kaṇapṛāvaraṇān ekavaktrān ekākṣapādakān//30// hayānanāms trinetrāms tān dirghanāsāms tripādakān/ saśṅgān ekasṅgāms ca kharavaktrān upāyayau//31// bhīṣaṇasya puram prāpto rākṣasasya turamgamah...* I would like to thank Mr. Petteri Koskikallio for pointing out this passage to me.

¹⁶ We might note that in Western sources some of the fabulous peoples (and often the same as those in India) tend to be grouped together. Among early authors they are found in the fragments of Scylax, Ctesias and Megasthenes. In Herodotus they are absent, though he is our main author on Indian cannibals (see VIII.2.).

2. Cannibals

Among the unorthodox practices followed by the Northwestern tribes (or some of them) cannibalism is mentioned in some Indian sources. In the lists of peoples arranged according to the points of compass the Northwestern direction¹⁷ includes such names as the Piśācas and the Rākṣasas, both well-known man-eaters in Indian lore.¹⁸ This leads us to think of the Herodotean account of the Indian tribes who ate their old and weak relatives.

There are two different accounts in Herodotus, one about the Καλλαταῖαι, another about the Παδαῖοι.¹⁹ The former comes probably from Hecataeus,²⁰ the second perhaps from some other (Persian?) source. The two passages contain a difference, which has led some scholars to suggest that two different peoples are meant.²¹ In the first passage it is not said that the relatives to be eaten are killed, whilst the second expressly says so.²² But the first passage is very short; how human flesh was supplied is left unmentioned. Consequently, we cannot rely on this difference.

The idea of a savage people eating their dead relatives (either killing them or waiting for a natural death) is connected with the larger ethnographical idea about food habits of remote peoples,²³ but even in this more defined form it early on became a τόπος in classical ethnography and was often used as an example of the relativity of morals.²⁴ Herodotus ascribed similar customs to Massagetes and Issedones,²⁵ Megasthenes to the

¹⁷ The direction may also be given as north or even northeast, but as was pointed out in the preceding chapter, in these lists the point of orientation is often a western one and even the Northeast includes such areas as Kashmir and Central Asia. The cannibals of Indian sources are yet not restricted to the Northwest. I have quoted passages locating the *puruṣāḥ puruṣādakāḥ* in the east or in the south.

¹⁸ We may perhaps add the Kirātas who in addition to the east are often located also in the northwest (see Rönnow 1936, 112ff. and especially 116f.) and sometimes described as cannibals (in addition to direct references, Rönnow 1936, 105 mentions the lexicographer's words *ambukirāta* 'crocodile' and *jalakirāta* 'shark').

¹⁹ Hdt 3, 38 and 99. The former are also mentioned in passing in 3, 97 (οὔτοι οἱ Αἰθίοπες καὶ οἱ πλησιόχωροι τούτοις σπέρματι μὲν χρέωνται τῷ αὐτῷ, τῷ καὶ οἱ Καλλανταῖαι Ἰνδοί, οἰκήματα δὲ ἔκτηνται κατάγαια), though some editors have deleted the sentence. The context here is not Indian but Ethiopian. It is not clear who are referred to as living underground, the Ethiopians or the Callatian Indians. An underground people was probably mentioned earlier by Scylax (F 6-7)

²⁰ Hecataeus F 298 (Jacoby) / 311 (Nenci) Καλαταῖαι γένος Ἰνδικόν. Ἐκαταῖος Ἀσία.

²¹ So e.g. Vofchuk 1982b, 92f.

²² Hdt 3, 38 Δαρειῶς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα καλέσας Ἰνδῶν τοὺς καλεομένους Καλλανταῖας, οἱ τοὺς γονέας κατέσθιουσι, εἴρετο κτλ.; 3, 99 (end) τὸν γὰρ δὴ ἐς γῆρας ἀπικόμενον θύσαντες κατευωχέονται. ἐς δὲ τούτου λόγον οὐ πολλοὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἀπικνέονται· πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ τὸν ἐς νοῦσον πίπτοντα πάντα κτείνουσι.

²³ See chapter V.1.

²⁴ As in Hdt 3, 38. See the discussion by Rankin (1969).

²⁵ Hdt 1, 216 and 4, 26. Here the difference suggested for the Indian accounts is actually stated. The

tribes which inhabit the Caucasus,²⁶ and Strabo's account of Irish customs is clearly related.²⁷ To Issedones is ascribed the additional custom of using the skull of the deceased as a drinking cup.

But as much as man-eating was a τόπος in classical literature, there were several peoples with anthropophagous customs in different parts of the ancient world. Although their existence in the most remote countries (as seen from Greece) was well in accordance with the ethnographical theory,²⁸ a conscientious author probably preferred cases where such peoples were somehow attested. A certain similarity of the accounts might then be ascribed to the theory as probably there was not a great deal of available information concerning, for instance, Indian cannibals. On the other hand, the kind of cannibalism described in these accounts may have had similar forms in different places. From the accounts it becomes clear that it was ritualistic²⁹ and was wholly regulated, though the Greek as well as the 18th and 19th century Western imagination tends to see it as wholly offensive.

That there were anthropophagous customs among some Iranian peoples does not seem to be a mere ethnological abstraction of Herodotus.³⁰ But Iranian parallels do not mean that there were no real Indian counterparts to Herodotean cannibals. Such have been suggested often enough, and confident identifications have been offered.

The starting-point has been that the Παδαῖοι lived in the east and that Herodotus' preceding chapter (3, 98) ends with a people living in the Indus Delta. Therefore, most have taken the southeastern direction from the delta for granted and suggested Bhils or Goṇḍs or, on account of the name, even the Pāṇḍyas of southernmost India.³¹ But when we read the text carefully, this is perhaps not so evident. In 3, 98 Herodotus speaks not only

Massagetæ kill and eat their old people, but do not touch the flesh of someone who has died of an illness (ἐπεὰν δὲ γέρων γένηται κάρτα, οἱ προσήκοντες οἱ πάντες συνελθόντες θύουσί μιν καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἅμα αὐτῷ, ἐψήσαντες δὲ τὰ κρέα κατευωχέονται. ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ὀλβιώτατά σφι νενόμισται, τὸν δὲ νοῦσῳ τελευτήσαντα οὐ κατασιτέονται ἀλλὰ γῆ κρύπτουσι, συμφορὴν ποιούμενοι ὅτι οὐκ ἔκετο ἐς τὸ τυθῆναι). The Issedones, however, seem to wait until the victim has died a natural death and only then prepare their feast (νόμοισι δὲ Ἴσσηδόνες τοιοσίδε λέγονται χρᾶσθαι· ἐπεὰν ἀνδρὶ ἀποθάνῃ πατήρ, οἱ προσήκοντες πάντες προσάγουσι πρόβατα καὶ ἔπειτα ταῦτα θύσαντες καὶ καταταμόντες τὰ κρέα κατατάμνουσι καὶ τὸν τοῦ δεκομένου τεθνεῶτα γονέα, ἀναμείξαντες δὲ πάντα τὰ κρέα δαῖτα προτίθενται).

²⁶ F 27b (from Strabo) φησὶ γὰρ τοὺς τὸν Καύκασον οἰκοῦντας ἐν τῷ φανερωῷ γυναξί μίσεσθαι, καὶ σαρκοφαγεῖν τὰ τῶν συγγενῶν σώματα. This can hardly be kept separate from Herodotus (see also Stein 1932, 238). By the Caucasus, Hindukush is probably meant.

²⁷ Strabo 4, 5, 4 mentioned above (chapter V.2.).

²⁸ See Rossellini & Saïd 1978, 955f. and chapter V.1.

²⁹ This has been emphasized in the case of the Indian cannibals of Herodotus by Fremkian (1958, 233). See also Bolton 1962, 76ff. (on Issedones).

³⁰ Falk 1986, 16 and 39 (quoting Widengren). See also Parpola 1988, 257f.

³¹ Bhils e.g. by Charpentier 1918, 478, Goṇḍs by Lassen 1852, 635 (cf. Lassen 1847, 375), Pāṇḍyas by Puskás 1983, 205 and 1986, 258f. On the other hand, there were also Pāṇḍyas/Pāṇḍavas in the Northwest (see VIII.3.).

of the Delta people. He established the desert as the eastern boundary of India and stated that among Indians there are many tribes who speak different languages and have different customs.³² Then he gives an account of several Indian tribes: some (οἱ δὲ) live in the Indus Delta, others (3, 99 ἄλλοι) live in the east and eat human flesh,³³ still others (3, 100 ἑτέρων δὲ Ἰνδῶν) do not kill anything. It is possible that the Παδαῖοι do not belong east of the delta people, but just to the eastern part of the India known to Herodotus.³⁴ In any case, a knowledge of what is now Central or South India is hardly likely in Herodotus.

The actual form of cannibalism – eating old and sick relatives – seems to be unattested in Indian literature, but separately we find both the abandoning of old people and cannibalism. The first custom was noticed by Winternitz in connection with the *Mahābhārata* story of Dīrghatamas, whose wicked sons tied their blind old father to a raft and threw him into the water.³⁵ Winternitz saw in this a survival of an ancient custom and compared it with Herodotean cannibals eating their old relatives. There are more curious and interesting elements in the story of Dīrghatamas. As was noticed by Winternitz, too, his family was apparently polyandrous, as his father's younger brother had intercourse with his mother. Datta has pointed out that when Mamatā (and the foetus himself) opposes her brother-in-law's advances it happens not because of any moral scruples concerning such a relation, but because of the waste of his semen in a woman who is already pregnant.³⁶ In the part not included in the critical edition it is reported that Dīrghatamas learned the *godharma*, practised it and enraged the other munis by such excessive behaviour. According to Nīlakaṇṭha this *godharma* means *prakāśamaithuna*, which can be compared with Herodotus.³⁷

³² Hdt 3, 98 Ἰνδῶν γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ ἐρημίη ἐστὶ διὰ τὴν ψάμμον. ἔστι δὲ πολλὰ ἔθνηα Ἰνδῶν καὶ οὐκ ὁμόφωνα σφίσι, καὶ οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν νομάδες εἰσὶ, οἱ δὲ οὐ, οἱ δὲ ἐν τοῖσι ἔλεσι οἰκέουσι τοῦ ποταμοῦ κτλ.

³³ Hdt 3, 99 ἄλλοι δὲ τῶν Ἰνδῶν πρὸς ἠῶ οἰκέοντες τούτων. The question is, are these "other Indians living to the east of these (the delta people)" or is the meaning "others of those Indians living in the east"?

³⁴ The southeastern direction is actually mentioned in 3, 101 (quoted in chapter II.5.), but it is not certain that the Παδαῖοι are included here. As to the Καλλατῖαι, if they are not the same people, we have no idea about their location. Puskás (1986, 259) identifies them tentatively with the Kālamukhas mentioned among Sahadeva's conquests (*Mbh* 2, 28, 45), but this depends only on the similarity of the names.

³⁵ Winternitz 1897, 723 referring to *Mbh* (crit. ed.) 1, 98, 18f. *lobhamohābhībūtās te putrās taṁ gautamādayaḥ/ kāṣṭhe samudre prakṣipya gaṅgāyāmsamavāsṛjan// na syād andhas ca vṛddhas ca bhartavyo 'yam iti sma te/ cintayitvā tataḥ krūrāḥ pratijagmur atho gṛhān*. The legend is already referred to in *RS* 1, 158. See also Datta 1979, 84ff.

³⁶ Datta 1979, 10ff., especially 17 and 27.

³⁷ *Mbh* insertion 1038* after 1, 98, 17 or 18ab found in northern recensions: *dharmātmā ca mahātmā vedavedāṅgaparāgāḥ/ godharmam saurabheyāc ca so 'dhītya nikhilam sunaḥ/ prāvartata tathā kartum śraddhāvāms tam aśānkayā/ tato vitathamaryādam taṁ dṛṣtvā munisattamāḥ/ kruddhā mohābhībūtās te sarve tatrāśramaukaṣaḥ/ aho 'yam bhinnamaryādo nāśrame vastum arhatī/ tasmād enam vayam sarve pāpātmanam tyajāmahe/ ity anyonyam samābhāṣya te dīrghatamasam munim/ Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary is quoted by Sørensen s.v. *Dīrghatamas*. This version is also found in several Purāṇas, and casting into the*

Another well-known case of the abandoning of old people is the Vedic legend of Cyavana. Here a nomadic clan (the Bhṛḡus) abandons their old man Cyavana, who is simply left behind.³⁸ In the *Mahābhārata* the same clan, the Bhārgavas, are described with many fierce and curious, often remarkably un-Aryan habits.³⁹ The famous Bhārgava hero Rāma Jāmadagnya (Paraśurāma) is said to have killed his own mother, and the whole history of the Bhārgavas as collected by Goldman is full of violent episodes. The Bhārgavas are also drunkards among the Brahmans. Intoxication itself was created by Cyavana in the form of a demon called Mada, who was later put into drink, women, dice and hunting.⁴⁰ Śukra (Uśanas) is described as habitually drinking surā until after a bad joke made at his expense by the Asuras he introduced the prohibition of drinking.⁴¹ But the Bhārgavas are not connected with the Northwest. As to the abandoning of the old, in a way we might say that the entire orthodox system of four āśramas means that old people are expected to leave the community and will not be supported by the next generation.

A long time ago Charpentier connected the Herodotean Παδαῖοι with the Vrātyas and the origins of the Śaiva religion.⁴² Among the Vrātyas and the Śaivas, human sacrifice and even cannibalism have been attested.⁴³ Charpentier's idea contains good points, but as such it cannot be accepted. The common geographical context of the Vrātyas is far in the east, in Magadha,⁴⁴ and it is extremely unlikely that Herodotus could have any knowledge of them. And when Charpentier saw in Παδαῖοι a somewhat erroneous account of eastern Śaivas given to Scylax by western non-Śaivas, he was hardly correct. Indian religious chronology does not really allow us to speak of Śaivas in the fifth century B.C., and it is not so clear that proto-Śaivism belongs to Magadha. Later Charpentier himself connected this proto-Śaiva religion with the Indus country, and located Παδαῖοι somewhere east of the mouth of the Indus. Thus he found them among the Bhils, the Puliṅḍas, the Śabarās and other primitive Vindhya tribes, among whom human sacrifice is reported until the 19th century.⁴⁵ But they are not known to have been cannibals.

There are more Indian cannibals in classical literature. According to Pliny, Indian (but living in the Northwest, near Central Asia) *Casiri* eat human flesh.⁴⁶ They may be the

river is there explained as punishment for Dīrghatamas' promiscuous behaviour (Datta 1979, 85). Hdt 3, 101 μεῖλις δὲ τούτων τῶν Ἰνδῶν τῶν κατέλεξα πάντων ἐμφανῆς (*prakāśamaithuna*) ἔστι κατὰ περ τῶν προβάτων (*godharma*).

³⁸ *SB* 4, 1, 5 and *JB* 3, 120, see also Witzel 1987b. For a similar legend indicated in *RV* see *ibid.* 387.

³⁹ Goldman 1977, *passim*. Goldman (p. 145) concludes that they were perhaps a caste or clan, masters of martial activities and followers of customs prohibited to orthodox Brahmans. We may also note that Śukra, the sacrificial priest of the Asuras was a Bhārgava (*ibid.* 124ff.).

⁴⁰ *Mbh* 3, 124, 18 – 125, 8.

⁴¹ *Mbh* 1, 71, 32ff. See also Goldman 1977, 127 and 144.

⁴² Charpentier 1909, 158.

⁴³ Falk 1986, 38ff.

⁴⁴ But see what I say about them at the end of chapter VII.8.

⁴⁵ Charpentier 1918, 475f. and 478.

⁴⁶ *N. H.* 6, 20, 55 *Indorum Casiri introrsus ad Scythas versi humanis corporibus vescuntur*. In the same passage such peoples as *Attacori* (Uttarakuru) and *Tochari* are mentioned.

same as the *Cosiri* mentioned a little later among the peoples living in Himalaya.⁴⁷ There have been several attempts to give them an Indian name. They have thus been connected with Ptolemy's (7, 1, 47) Κασπιραῖοι and Kashmir as well as with Kaśyapapura/ Multan.⁴⁸ Beside *kāśmīra*, the form *khaśīra* has been often quoted from the *Mahābhārata*,⁴⁹ but has to be abandoned with the critical edition. Kauśika/Kauśila has been quoted from the Vedas.⁵⁰ Eggermont has the important observation that in spite of geographical difference the cannibal Gamerae (Γαμηραῖ) of Ptolemy may represent the same people as our Casiri. But he fails to convince one that "these Gamerae or Casiri are the shadows of the ancient Śaka people of the Gimirri, who in the VIIIth-VIIth centuries B.C. had passed the Caucasus, invaded northern Persia, fought with Assyrians and had conquered Asia Minor" but had nothing at all to do with India.⁵¹ Grierson's idea is rather interesting that the Khaśas (or Khaśīras) are meant, who at an early period lived in Kashmir.⁵²

The problem here is that we do not know enough to make any reliable identification concerning the *Casiri/Cosiri*. To be useful, such an explanation should somehow include cannibalism,⁵³ the only piece of information we have about them. In any case, it is a rather dubious method to try and find out names in Indian sources by looking at some superficial resemblance to the names given in classical accounts in a geographical context which is not wholly different. It is more interesting, in my opinion, to investigate the appearance of cannibalism in the Northwest and especially in Kashmir.

Stories about anthropophagous customs are cited from the Dards of Gilgit⁵⁴ and from the Pashais of Nuristan.⁵⁵ We are told that the Dards of Gilgit had a reputation for cannibalism amongst the Kashmiris as late as 1866, and that one Dardic tribe would accuse another of the practice, whilst the Dards themselves confess to the custom of drinking the blood of a slain enemy.⁵⁶ Among the Nuristani and Dardic peoples many

⁴⁷ N. H. 6, 21, 64 *gentes, quas memorare non pigeat, a montibus Hemodis, quorum promunturium Imaus vocatur incolarum lingua nivosum <sic> significante, Isari, Cosiri, Izi et per iuga Chirotosagi...* This has sometimes been ascribed with slight grounds to Megasthenes (as F 56 in Schwanbeck).

⁴⁸ Kashmir first suggested by Troyer in 1840, then e.g. Tomaschek 1899, Multan by Foucher 1947, 198 (for Ptolemy, not Pliny). See André & Filliozat 1980, 80f. (on *Casiri*, favouring Multan).

⁴⁹ McCrindle 1877, 132 citing St. Martin.

⁵⁰ André & Filliozat 1980, 92. (on *Cosiri*).

⁵¹ Ptolemy 7, 2, 16, discussed in Eggermont 1984a, 210f. (see also 222f.) To the parallels discussed by him we may add that the neighbouring country in Ptolemy, Κιρραδία, corresponds to the *Chirotosagi* of Pliny's account on *Cosiri*. It is not clear that the *Casiri* account comes from Amometus as thought by Eggermont, *ibid.*

⁵² Grierson 1916, 3, supported with additional evidence by Rönnow (1936, 123ff.), who refers to Pliny's (6, 23, 73) *Gentes montanae inter eum [Indum] et Iomanem Caesi, Caetriboni...* and Ptolemy's Κασία in Scythia (6, 15, 2 and 3) and Serica (6, 16, 2 and 3). See also Tucci 1977, 20 and 82. We may note that the Khaśas were among those peoples who in *Mahābhārata* brought the ant gold.

⁵³ A reference to the Issedones having cannibal customs and the supposition that they live in neighbouring Tibet (Tomaschek 1899) is not sufficient.

⁵⁴ About a cannibal king, quoted by Grierson (1905, 285f.) from Leitner. In 286, note 2, Grierson compares it with the *Mahāsutasomajātaka* (*Jātaka* V, n. 537).

⁵⁵ A princess who attempts to eat her brother, quoted by Grierson (1905, 287f.) from Leitner.

stories of cannibal demons are told.⁵⁷

According to the Kashmirian tradition preserved in the *Rājatarāṅginī* and the *Nīlamata-Purāṇa* the original inhabitants of Kashmir were the Nāgas and the Piśācas, mentioned among the Northwestern "peoples" as early as in the epics.⁵⁸ This has been interpreted as referring to a population consisting of snake-worshippers and cannibals,⁵⁹ and certainly the Piśācas were cannibals. This does not make all the Piśācas of Indian literature a Northwestern cannibal people, often the word has been used for a kind of goblin, but even then it seems that it also denoted a Northwestern people.⁶⁰ In a more general way we can also note the general unorthodox character of the Northwesterners, who practise an orgiastic religion, are barbarians with no Brahmans among them and are originally thought to be degraded Kṣatriyas.⁶¹

3. Pāṇḍava

In chapter VI.3. I pointed to the difficulty of reaching the original core of the *Mahā-bhārata* and the different ways – historical and mythical – attempted to interpret of the origins of the great epic of India. Even here I do not claim any preference for one particular interpretation, yet I have taken one as a hypothesis compatible with the classical evidence. Without thinking it to be a conclusive solution I shall proceed to discuss the Pāṇḍavas in the light of this hypothesis and the classical evidence.

The "pale" King Pāṇḍu and his five sons with such remarkably unorthodox customs as polyandry⁶² and the violation all the accustomed rules of chivalrous warfare have

⁵⁶ Grierson 1905, 286.

⁵⁷ See e.g. Jetmar 1975, 64, 139, 222, 224, 272ff. and 436.

⁵⁸ *Rājat* 1, 28ff. on the Nāgas, 1, 184 on the Yakṣas apparently corresponding to the Piśācas (see note in Stein's translation), *NīlP* 66ff. on the Nāgas, 200ff. on the Piśācas. For *Mbh* see Grierson 1912, for the legendary history of Kashmir Vogel 1926, 220ff.

⁵⁹ Rönnow 1936, 126ff. The references to the Piśācas in Kashmir and in the Northwest are so numerous that the complicated question of the home of the *Paiśācī Prākṛit* (see e.g. Hinüber 1981) makes little difference. Cf. Van Nooten 1971, 62: "The Piśācas were probably originally a tribe of cannibals living in Northwest India."

⁶⁰ Cf. Macdonell & Keith s.v. *Piśāca*.

⁶¹ Summarized in Grierson 1916, 3ff. with a special reference to Khaśas. His references are to *Mbh*, *Manu* and, for Northwesterners having no Brahmans, to the late *BhāgP* (9, 20, 30 *kirātaḥūṇān yavanān andhrān kaṅkān khaśān chakān/ abrahmanyān nṛpāmś cāhan mlecchān digvijaye 'khilān/*). So late a source is not very useful in the context of classical sources as there have been so many changes in the Northwest.

⁶² In addition to the polyandry of his sons, Pāṇḍu himself seems to have had rather unorthodox sexual habits (see *Mbh* 1, 113 and Datta 1979, 65ff. and 108f.).

caused many headaches for ancient as well as modern commentators of the great epic. Many explanations have been offered, sometimes with much ingeniousness and imagination, but rarely anything really worth mentioning has been offered. Often their peculiarities have been simply put aside as "un-Aryan", but as Winternitz noticed long ago, "what right have we to describe everything we do not like as 'un-Aryan'?"⁶³ Another possibility is that they were Aryans, but perhaps did not belong to the orthodox Vedic circles. This hypothesis is presented by Parpola who states: "The Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍavas may therefore represent a new wave of marauding Aryans coming from Central Asia to northern and western India around the eighth or ninth century B.C."⁶⁴

There are several arguments for such a hypothesis. When the Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍavas seem to be wholly absent in the Veda, the Kurus are mentioned.⁶⁵ The Buddhist sources describe the Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍavas as "a marauding hill tribe which infested eastern as well as western regions including Kosala, Ujjayinī and probably also Takṣaśilā".⁶⁶ Their fraternal polyandry was an entirely un-Vedic and shocking custom for Indo-Aryan contemporaries, but corresponds to some extent to the Massagetan custom described by Herodotus.⁶⁷

Further, the very name *pāṇḍu* as well as the related *pāṇḍura/pāṇḍara*⁶⁸ means 'white, whitish, yellow, pale'. Pāṇḍu himself is stated in the *Mahābhārata* to be the "pale" king (with various more or less clumsy explanations for his paleness) and one of his sons is *Arjuna* 'shining, whitish'. According to Parpola this paleness originally means the lighter skin of the newcomers in the hot sun of India, where older Vedic Aryans had already become tanned enough. The word *pāṇḍu* has no satisfactory etymology, and Parpola suggests a Dravidian one, which gives some reason to think they must have come through the southern way (via Sind, Gujarat and Malwa).⁶⁹

⁶³ Winternitz 1897, 756. A non-Aryan origin of the Pāṇḍavas has been suggested e.g. by Meyer (1971, 108). As far as the rules of chivalrous warfare as found in the great epic are concerned, they are not particularly Aryan. There was a rather similar set of rules followed in the Tamil South in the Cankam period (see e.g. Kanakasabhai 1904, 65ff.). Of course breaking these rules is not so strange if one consults the *Arthaśāstra* instead of the *Dharmaśāstra* and the epics; in the latter the rules often seem to be rather idealistic in comparison with the hard reality of warfare.

⁶⁴ Parpola 1984, 455.

⁶⁵ Parpola 1984, 453f. This has been used earlier for Holtzmann's old hypothesis of the original *Mbh* being a Kuru epic, afterwards rewritten to put the intruding Pāṇḍavas in a favourable light (Winternitz 1908, 394). Another explanation makes Kuru/Pāṇḍava a late substitute for the original Kuru/Pañcāla (see Vekardi 1974, 261).

⁶⁶ Parpola 1984, 454.

⁶⁷ Parpola 1984, 454f. In the Veda, polyandry is never mentioned (Macdonell & Keith s.v. *pati*, p. 479 and Kane 1941, 554). For Indo-Aryan reaction to Pāṇḍava polyandry, see *Mbh* 1, chapters 187–189, for Massagetae, *Hdt* 1, 216 νόμοισι δὲ χρέωνται τοιοῖσίδε: γυναῖκα μὲν γαμέει ἕκαστος, ταύτησι δὲ ἐπίκοινα χρέωνται. τὸ γὰρ Σκύθας φασὶ Ἕλληνας ποιεῖν, οὐ Σκύθαι εἰσὶ οἱ ποιεόντες ἀλλὰ Μασσαγῆται: τῆς γὰρ ἐπιθυμῆση γυναικὸς Μασσαγῆτης ἀνὴρ, τὸν φαρετρεῶνα ἀποκρεμάσας πρὸ τῆς ἀμάξης μίσγεται ἀδεῶς.

⁶⁸ According to *PW* and Mayrhofer (s.v.), *pāṇḍura* is found in classical Sanskrit sources only (*R. Śakuntalā*, *AK*, *BS* et al.), but *pāṇḍu/pāṇḍara* is already Vedic (*SB*).

⁶⁹ Parpola 1984, 455.

All this can be neatly connected with archaeological evidence connecting the Pāṇḍavas and the Yādavas (a connection between them is prominent in the epic) with the Black and Red Ware found in several north Indian sites together (and often slightly later) with the Painted Grey Ware now commonly connected with the Vedic culture.⁷⁰ Combining literary and archaeological evidence Parpola suggests that they were in the north from the 8th to 5th century and then moved to the south through Gujarat.⁷¹ This southern immigration he connects with the beginnings of the Megalithic culture of the south, as the early "megalith people" seem to have been marauding pastoral nomads with both horses and Black and Red Ware.⁷²

There is also literary evidence from the South. The Sinhala kingdom of Sri Lanka was founded by immigrants from the north, and among them the Paṇḍus seem to have had a prominent role. Probably they also had some relation with the Pāṇḍya kingdom of southernmost India, where also Megasthenes' Πανδαίη,⁷³ the daughter of the Indian Heracles, perhaps lived. Parpola has also pointed out several links which connect the Pāṇḍavas and the Yādavas of the *Mahābhārata*, the Yādava country around Mathurā, Gujarat, South Indian Pāṇḍya (with Madurai) and the Paṇḍus of Sri Lanka.⁷⁴

Here I must make one reservation. The discussion so far is designed to show that there are good reasons to see the Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍavas as an ethnic group intruding into India. But even if it is easy and not wholly unlikely to make them a later wave of Indo-Aryans, here we cannot be very sure. Herodotus' account mentioned above represents the idea common in early Greek ethnography about the sexual behaviour of distant peoples, and the account itself does not fit very well with polyandry proper.⁷⁵ A Dravidian

⁷⁰ On the other hand, in chapter VI.3 we saw that there is also a connection between the *Mahābhārata* and Painted Grey Ware sites. Vasil'kov (1982, 58f.) considers also the possibility that the great epic reflects a conflict between cultures represented by Painted Grey Ware and Northern Black Polished Ware.

⁷¹ Parpola 1984, 457f.

⁷² Parpola 1984, 458f. In a much later age the megaliths have been assigned to the Pāṇḍavas of folk tradition.

⁷³ It has been pointed out by Hinüber (1985, 1110 on Arrianus, *Ind.* 8, 7) that the name might well represent Indian *Pāṇḍeyā 'daughter of Pāṇḍu'. According to Patañjali (on Vārttika 3 on P 4, 1, 168 *pāṇḍor dyaṇ vyaktaḥ/ pāṇḍyaḥ*) and *Kāś* (on P 4, 1, 171 *pāṇḍor janapadasabdāt kṣatriyād dyaṇ vaktavyaḥ/ pāṇḍyaḥ*) Pāṇḍya is an irregular patronymic formation from Pāṇḍu (cf. Parpola 1984, 451). In Tamil sources (quoted in André & Filliozat 1980, 157) a similar legend as that of the daughter of Heracles (otherwise unattested in India) is told about queen Paṇṭi (Paṇḍi) of Paṇṭiyār (Pāṇḍya). See also VIII.5.

⁷⁴ Parpola 1984, 451ff. (see also Law 1973, 190ff. and André & Filliozat 1980, 155ff.).

⁷⁵ Of course, just because the theory supposed promiscuity in a distant people, a Greek author could instinctively turn a real account of polyandry into what was expected. Even the original account might not have been too exact about the real customs followed by the Massagetae. In the same way I suppose that curious accounts of sexual transgression in the *Mahābhārata* simply refer to a different set of rules of sexual behaviour, though they might have been interpreted as reminiscences of ancient promiscuity at an early date (as they certainly are by some modern scholars, see Datta 1979, 111f.). With such verses as *Mbh* 1, 113, 4 (*anāvṛtāḥ kila purā striya āsan varānane/ kāmācāravihāriṇyaḥ svatantrās cārulocane//*) and the following verses it is indeed easy to think of promiscuity, but then it is also stated in verse 6 that *purānadṛṣṭo dharmo 'yaṁ pūjyate ca maharṣibhiḥ*. It is the greater sexual freedom of women which has so easily been interpreted as promiscuity by Indians and Westerners alike.

etymology says nothing about their ethnic origin, and in the first millennium the horse was no longer solely used by Indo-Europeans, as it was earlier.⁷⁶

In any case, this Pāṇḍava hypothesis suits very well with our Northwestern viewpoint. Actually, both parties in the great war had strong ties with the Northwest. The mother of the Kauravas, Gāndhārī, was born in the Northwest, as her name indicates. According to the Buddhist *Kunāla-jātaka*, the five sons of Paṇḍu came to the svayaṃvara of their would-be bride from Takkaśilā (Taxila), where they had studied under world famous teachers.⁷⁷ In the *Mahābhārata* we find the Pāṇḍyas (and the Colas, which reduces the worth of the passage) mentioned among Northwestern peoples.⁷⁸ According to Mārkaṇḍeya and Lakṣmīdhara, Pāṇḍya is one of the eleven Paiśācī countries⁷⁹ and the *Nīlamata-Purāṇa* refers to a tīrtha called Pāṇḍavatīrtha in Kashmir (present Pāṇḍ Chak 5 miles southeast of Srinagar).⁸⁰ Another late source (the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa*) lists Pāṇḍyas among the southwestern peoples, but the better version does not mention them.⁸¹

As to the polyandry practised by Pāṇḍavas,⁸² the same practice has been found in the far South, among the Bhils of Gujarat/Maharashtra and in the Western Himalaya,⁸³ the last location being near enough to the Pāṇḍavas and to the peoples mentioned in the classical sources I shall soon discuss. Of the two types of polyandry, the southern practice is characterized as matriarchal, the northwestern as well as the case of the Pāṇḍava brothers as fraternal.⁸⁴ The custom is now disappearing, but a hundred years ago it was stated "that in Kumaun between the Tons and Jumna river about Kalsi,

⁷⁶ See Parpola 1988, 196f.

⁷⁷ *Jātaka* V, n. 536, p. 426 tadā Paṇḍurājagottato Ajjuṇo Nakulo Bhīmaseno Yuddhi-ṭṭhilo Sahadevo ti ime pañca Paṇḍurājaputtā Takkaśilāya disāpāmoḁkṁhassa ācariyassa santike sippam gaheṭvā desacārittam jānissāmā 'ti vicarantā Bārāṇasim pattā.

⁷⁸ *Mbh* 6, 46, 49f. piśācā daradās caiva puṇḍrāḥ kuṇḍīviṣaiḥ saha/ maḍakā laṭakās caiva taṅgaṇāḥ parataṅgaṇāḥ// bāhlikās tittirās caiva colāḥ pāṇḍyās ca bhārata/ ete janapadā rājan dakṣiṇam pakṣam āśritāḥ// According to Dey (ss. vv.), with the exception of the eastern Puṇḍras and the two last-mentioned names, all these peoples either belong to the Northwest or are unknown.

⁷⁹ Both quoted in Pischel 1981, 33f. Mārkaṇḍeya's list includes southern names like Dakṣiṇātya and Drāviḍa, but in Lakṣmīdhara the perspective is clearly northwestern, including such names as Kekaya, Bāhlikā, Nepāla, Gāndhāra and Bhoṭa.

⁸⁰ *NīlP* 1322.

⁸¹ *MārkaP* 55 (Pargiter 58), 31 drāvaṇāḥ sārgikāḥ sūdrāḥ karṇaprādheyabarbarāḥ/ kirātāḥ pāradāḥ pāṇḍyās tathā pārasavāḥ kalāḥ, but see *BS* 14, 18 quoted above in VIII.1. In both texts the southwest is centred in Sind.

⁸² The history of polyandry in India is discussed in Jolly 1896, 47f., Meyer 1871, 108ff. and Kane 1941, 554ff.

⁸³ Ghirshman 1948, 125f. presents some evidence, mostly from the first millennium A.D., suggesting that it has existed even further in the west. But he seems to err in saying that the Basgali Kafirs are polyandrous (*ibid.* 125). The Basgalis are the eastern branch of the Katis of Nuristan, and their marriage is matrilinear, but not polyandrous (Jettmar 1975, 44f.). According to Jettmar, among the Nuristani and Dard peoples polyandry is customary only among some Shina speaking Dards living in the neighbourhood of (polyandrous and Tibetan) Ladakh (*ibid.* 228).

⁸⁴ Kane 1941, 555f.

Rajputs, brāhmaṇas, Śudras all practice polyandry and the children are all attributed to the eldest brother who is alive".⁸⁵ It is true that Draupadī's children did not all belong to Yudhiṣṭhira, but then polyandry with the division of the children is reported to have existed in the Pañjab.⁸⁶

In ancient Indian literature polyandry is rarely mentioned in contexts other than the case of Draupadī. Āpastamba seems to mention it as an obsolete habit,⁸⁷ and a quotation from the lost *Bṛhaspatismṛti* ascribes the custom to another country.⁸⁸ Instead of proper fraternal polyandry these may also point to the extended form of niyoga, which allows relations between a wife and her husband's younger brothers. This custom has been mentioned in VIII.2. in connection with the birth of Dīrghatamas, and the same is told still in the 19th century of the Jats of the Pañjab.⁸⁹

In classical sources we find some references which seem to be related to the Pāñḍus/Pāñḍavas. Ctesias knew of a mountain people called *Pandarae*, who were white-haired (OIA *pāñḍara* 'white') in their youth but darkened later.⁹⁰ As Ctesias belongs to a much earlier period than Megasthenes, we cannot connect this with the Megasthenian account of the daughter of Heracles and his people, who had a life span of forty years, whereas Ctesias' *Pandarae* lived two hundred.⁹¹ The fragment of Ctesias does not mention polyandry, but this could well be connected with Heracles' daughter and people, *sola Indorum regnata feminis*.

Ptolemy knew of the country of the "Pandovoi" situated east of the Bidaspes (Jhelam) with towns well-known from the history of Alexander and the Indo-Greek kingdoms: Labaca, Sagala, Bucephala and Iomusa.⁹² Pandovoi has been commonly (and with good grounds) connected with Pāñḍavas.

It is possible that our supposed migration is reflected in one further Buddhist source,

⁸⁵ Kane 1941, 556 quoting Bh. Indrajī (*IA* 8, p. 88).

⁸⁶ Jolly 1896, 48. It is also interesting to see that the way the princes in the *Mbh* arranged their lives in their common marriage corresponds very well to what has been told about Northwestern (Kulu) and Southern (Nayar) polyandry (Winternitz 1897, 758).

⁸⁷ *ĀpDh* 2, 10, 27, 3f. *kuḷāya hi strī pradīyata ity upadisanti/ tad indriyadaurbalyād vipratipannam*.

⁸⁸ *Smṛticandrikā* 1, 10 quoted by Kane (1941, 555) *kuḷe kanyāpradānam ca deśeṣv anyeṣu dṛṣyate*. Kane shows that this does not necessarily point to the South (as supposed by Jolly 1896, 47).

⁸⁹ Jolly 1896, 48.

⁹⁰ Ctesias F 52 (Pliny 7, 2, 28) ...*Macrobios. Ctesias gentem ex his, quae appelleretur Pandarae, in convallibus sitam annos ducentos vivere, in iuventa candido capillo qui in senectute nigrescat*.

⁹¹ They were connected by Pliny himself, whose account is rather confused. Fragments from Cleitarchus (F 23) and Megasthenes (F 13d) about *Mandi* (probably *Pandae* was meant, at least by Megasthenes) giving birth at seven and being old at forty. But this is not from Ctesias and we must drop the emendation of Mayhoff (accepted by Rackham without mentioning it in his apparatus) who on account of Pliny 6, 23, 76 (*gens Pandae, sola Indorum regnata feminis*, Jacoby's F 13b of Megasthenes) corrected *Pandarae* to *Pandae*. See also Markwart 1913, CCXff. though he tries to read too much into our fragments.

⁹² Ptolemy 7, 1, 46 (quoted without the latitudes and longitudes) *παρὰ δὲ τὸν Βιδάσπην ἡ Πανδοοῦων χώρα ἐν οἷς πόλεις αἴδε· Λαβάκα· Σαγάλα ἢ καὶ Εὐθυδομία· Βουκεφάλαι· Ἰώμουσα*. Cf. the discussion in McCrindle 1885, 121ff. (somewhat antiquated) and Eggermont 1982, 61f. The latter author would like to draw upon all these accounts (Cleitarchus, Megasthenes and Ptolemy) originally from Ctesias, but at least the towns of Ptolemy are not from him.

in the *Udrāyaṇa-Avadāna* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* and the *Divyāvadāna*.⁹³ It is a māhātmya style legend about the introduction of Buddhism into Udrāyaṇa (Swat), supposedly carried out by Mahākātyāyana,⁹⁴ who was himself described as a North-westermer born in Vokkāṇa (Wakhan). Here the two pious ministers of Udrāyaṇa, Heruka and Bhiruka, are said to have sailed down the Indus and then founded two cities, Herukaccha and Bhirukaccha, which are identified with Barbarice at the mouth of the Indus and Barygaza in Gujarat, both mentioned in *Periplus* and other classical sources.⁹⁵

4. Wine

In a chapter abridged by Photius to one sentence, Ctesias mentioned Indian cheese and wine.⁹⁶ He had himself tasted them and found them very good. When Alexander and his companions arrived at what is now eastern Afghanistan they probably found vine growing there and local people preparing wine.⁹⁷ At least they found wine in the Indus country. Strabo praises the wines of Arachosia, which are said to keep good for three generations in vessels not smeared with pitch.⁹⁸ In the Northwest, this has been a local peculiarity ever since, wines are still prepared from local grapes in the 20th century, although modern visitors have not always found them as good as the ancient.⁹⁹ In

⁹³ Summarized in Eggermont 1975, 149ff. and Tucci 1977, 61ff.

⁹⁴ In Pāli sources Kaccāyana is said to be born in Ujjenī (Tucci 1977, 63, note 87).

⁹⁵ Eggermont 1975, 159f. Yet Eggermont fails to notice that Barbarice is also known in Indian sources as Varvara/Barbara (Sircar 1965, 344). Tucci (1977, 63) identifies Herukaccha with Bamhore in Sind, where an ancient harbour has been excavated.

⁹⁶ Ctesias F 45, 48 ὅτι τὸν τυρὸν καὶ τὸν οἶνον πάντων φησὶ γλυκύτετον, ὡς αὐτὸς φησι φαγῶν διὰ πείρας ἔμαθεν. Cf. F 50 Κτησίας δὲ παρ' Ἰνδοῖς φησιν οὐκ εἶναι τῷ βασιλεῖ μεθυσθῆναι (and this with Megasthenes F 32).

⁹⁷ This is somewhat conjectural. The existence of Nysa and the supposed cult of Dionysus there also suggests wine, but the extant accounts are curiously reticent about it. Strabo (15, 1, 8) mentions vines on Mount Meros, but claims that the grapes do not ripen. Curtius (8, 10), too, mentions ivy and vines on Meros (*multa hederā uitisque toto gignitur monte*) and describes the orgies Alexander's soldiers had there in honour of Dionysus. Theophrastus (*H. pl.* 4, 4, 11) stated that in India vines grow in the mountains (ἡ γὰρ ὄρεινῇ καὶ ἄμπελον ἔχει). Arrianus (*Anab.* 5, 2, 6) mentions in connection with Nysa that vines are also found elsewhere in (Northwest) India (οὐ γὰρ εἶναι ἐν τῇ Ἰνδῶν χώρα κισσόν, οὐδὲ ἴναπερ αὐτοῖς ἄμπελοι ἦσαν). Onesicritus (F 22; not Aristobulus) mentions that wine is produced in the country of Musicanus. Philostratus (*V. Ap.* 2, 8) refers to Nysan wine. See also Laufer 1919, 239f. and Edelberg 1965, 179f./194f. According to Edelberg, all plants mentioned by Curtius and Arrianus as growing on Meros are found in Nuristan and some (ivy and cedar) nowhere else in Afghanistan. See also Bretzl 1903, 239ff.

⁹⁸ Strabo 11, 10, 1, c. 516 εὐοῖνεῖ δὲ σφόδρα ἡ γῆ· καὶ γὰρ εἰς τριγωνίαν παραμένει ἐν ἀπιτώτοις ἄγχεσι. The next chapter (11, 10, 2) mentions the exceptional size of the vines and grapes of Margiana.

Nuristan the tradition stopped with Islam, but the splendid silver cups (*urei*) previously used for wine-drinking remain.¹⁰⁰ Wine has an important place in the rituals of many Northwestern peoples (especially the Dards and Nuristanis, and even in Kashmir).¹⁰¹

We may add one curious piece of information. In a passage preserved by Athenaeus Chares tells us how Alexander honoured the death of Calanus. "Because of the Indians' love of wine he also organized a competition in the drinking of unmixed wine." The game turned out to be dangerous, forty-one of the contestants died. The winner was not Indian as he has a Greek name, Promachus.¹⁰² In another fragment of Chares an Indian wine god called Sorodeios is mentioned.¹⁰³

In addition to classical sources, the antiquity of the Nuristani vintages is confirmed in Indian and Chinese literature.¹⁰⁴ In the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* it is reported how the Buddha was travelling in the Northwest with his disciples when they were given a present which included grapes. The monks had never seen such fruits and the Buddha explained that they are edible when purified and that one can press them and make a juice out of them; this juice can be preserved in a storeroom and can be used by the Saṅgha as a syrup.¹⁰⁵

In the first millennium A.D. the wines of Kapiśa (Begram) were famous in India, though it may be that they acquired their fame only after the Indo-Greek period, when wine was certainly popular there.¹⁰⁶ Kapiśa was already known to Pāṇini, who taught the

⁹⁹ On this Northwestern wine in general see e.g. Edelberg 1965 (about Nuristan) and Jettmar 1973 (about Dardistan), on its taste Jettmar 1973, 196. Bajoi (1986) informs us that vine is cultivated even in Baluchistan.

¹⁰⁰ "Men den ældgamle vin-kultus i Hindu-kush tålte ikke Islams lys", states Edelberg (1965, 190). Wine was still found in Dardistan some 20 years ago, but was strongly objected to by orthodox Muslims (Jettmar 1973, 204). That the tradition is still in existence among the Ismaelite population of Hunza, is reported orally by Dr. Bertil Tikkanen, who visited the region in summer 1989. I am grateful to him for this information. In Swat the vine was still cultivated when the Tibetan pilgrim O rgyan pa visited the country (Stacul 1987, 8), but the 19th century reports quoted by Stacul (1987, 9ff.) do not mention it. For *urei* see Edelberg 1965, 155ff./193 and 181ff./196 and Jones 1974, 239ff./253ff. According to Jones (1974, 239/253), there were probably also golden cups earlier. Perhaps they are related to the κρατήρες ἀργυροὶ τε καὶ χρυσοῖ, δέκα συμπόταις ἀποχρῶν mentioned by Philostratus (*V. Ap.* 2, 28) as used in the Taxilan court.

¹⁰¹ See Jettmar 1975, Index s.v. *Wein*, and Edelberg 1965, 166ff./193f. and 185/197. Kashmir will be discussed soon.

¹⁰² Chares F 19a, translated and discussed in Pearson 1960, 54f. Aelianus, *V. H.* 2, 41, mentions the same and says that drinking contests were an established Indian custom.

¹⁰³ F 17. For various attempts of explanation, see e.g. Goossens 1953.

¹⁰⁴ The Chinese evidence is discussed very fully in Laufer 1919, 220ff. Later, Nuristani wine is mentioned by Bābar in the early 16th century and by Mountstuart Elphinstone in 1815 (both quoted in Edelberg 1965, 153/193). Marco Polo, too, knew the drinking habits of the Northwesterners (Foucher 1947, 256).

¹⁰⁵ Przulski 1914, 506f. and Tucci 1977, 34.

¹⁰⁶ *Ragh* 4, 61 refers to drunken Yavana women (*yavanīmukhapadyānām seha madhumadam na sah*). But though Raghu could not bear this sight, his own soldiers knew how to refresh themselves with wine (4, 65 *vinayante sma tadyodhā madhubhir vijayaśramam/ āstīrñājinaratnāsu drākṣāvalayabhūmiṣu//*). Marshall (1951, 205 and 406ff.) reports wine vessels, drinking scenes etc. from Bhir Mound (Taxila). See also Dar 1984, 118.

derivation of the adjective *kāpīśāyana*,¹⁰⁷ but we cannot be certain that he had the local wine in mind. Thus it was at least interpreted by the authors of the *Kāśikā*, whose example for this was the wine of Kapiśa.¹⁰⁸ The same is also mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*, where the Northwest is specified as the origin of wine.¹⁰⁹ Drinking vessels found in the tombs of Swat and grape seeds found in the excavations at Aligrāma (Swat) give some archaeological confirmation of the antiquity (first millennium B.C.) of local wines. Later excavations have unearthed similar remains at prehistoric levels at Loebanr (Swat) and at Mehrgarh and Pirak (Baluchistan).¹¹⁰

In India proper the vine (*drākṣā*) and its product were introduced rather late, and especially the orthodox Brahman opinion of it tended to be very negative.¹¹¹ Megasthenes, too, was aware of this.¹¹² The *Arthaśāstra* (2, 25) and popular literature, like the *Pañcatantra* and Mahendravikramavarman's *Mattavilāsa*, show that among other classes drinking was by no means unknown. Physicians prescribed wine and other drinks as medicines, took measures against alcoholism and praised the virtues of moderate drinking.¹¹³ But a drinking Brahman like Bhārgava Śukra is very unorthodox indeed.¹¹⁴ In most parts of India the climate is not particularly suitable for viticulture and its significance has mostly been rather small.¹¹⁵ Intoxicating drinks have been made of other ingredients, like palmyra and coconut toddy, sugar cane and rice. The only place where

¹⁰⁷ P 4, 2, 99 *kāpīśyāḥ ṣphak*.

¹⁰⁸ *Kāś* ad l. gives as examples *kāpīśāyanam madhu* and *kāpīśāyanī drākṣā*. In Sanskrit lexicography *kapiśa/kapiśika/kapiśarī/kapiśāyanam* are explained as intoxicating drink. These examples have been quoted in Thomas 1906, 460f.

¹⁰⁹ *KA* 2, 25, 24f. *mṛdvikāraso madhu/ tasya svadeso vyākhyānam kāpīśāyanam hārahūrakam iti*, see also Scharfe 1968, 320, who follows Bailey identifying *hārahūraka* with *hārahūra*, 'red Huns'.

¹¹⁰ For Aligrāma see Tucci 1977, 32f., for other sites L. Costantini in Stacul 1987, 160 (with further references).

¹¹¹ See Aalto 1955 and 1963. In early *GautDh* drinking is listed in second place immediately after the murder of a Brahman and before violating a guru's bed in the list of major sins (21, 1 *brahmahā surāpa gurutalpaga ... patitāḥ*). The punishment is loss of caste (23, 1ff.). It is probably a mark of the antiquity of this text that cow killers (21, 11 *gohanṭṛ*) are included among those who commit a minor sin (*upapātaka*). In 22, 18 killing a cow is said to be an equivalent to killing a Vaiśya.

¹¹² F 32 οἶνόν τε γὰρ οὐ πίνειν ἀλλ' ἐν θυσίαις μόνον, πίνειν δ' ἀπ' ὀρύζης ἀντὶ κριθῶν συντιθέντας and later on μεθύοντα δὲ κτείνασα γυνὴ βασιλέα γέρας ἔχει συνείναι τῷ ἐκεῖνον διαδεξαμένῳ. These partly idealized accounts are discussed by Stein (1922, 90ff.) and Timmer (1930, 259ff.). On the other hand, in connection with the Indian Dionysus, Megasthenes describes the viticulture and wine drinking of Indians, but as will be seen this belongs more or less to the Northwest.

¹¹³ *Suśruta* Cikitsāsth. 10, 8 describes medicated surās, *Sūtrasth.* 45, 170–216 contains a systematic *Madyavarga*, and *Sūtrasth.* 46, 419ff. an *Anupānavarga* with many alcoholic drinks used as medicines. Symptoms and treatment of alcoholism (*pānātyaya*) are discussed in *Uttarasth.* 47, where verses 7–8 contain the praise of moderation (8cd *vidhivat sevyaṃāne tu madye saṃnihitā guṇāḥ*).

¹¹⁴ See Goldman 1977, 30ff. and chapter VIII.2. According to Goldman (1977, 144) this is "perhaps a real reminiscence of an alteration in the practices of the group" (i.e. Bhārgavas).

¹¹⁵ Among the works on gardening Varāhamihira, *BS* 55, 4, knows that the vine can be grafted, while Surapāla, *Vṛkṣāyurveda* 122, advises how to fertilize it.

grapewine has been common is Kashmir.

Kashmir has both a climate that is very suitable for viticulture and a location near the wine-drinking Dards. It is probable that the vine was introduced there from the west, but it has a very long local tradition. Kalhaṇa mentions that the vine is common in Kashmir but rare elsewhere,¹¹⁶ but King Lalitāditya during his digvijaya did not tolerate the continual wine-drinking of the Dards.¹¹⁷

The *Nilamata-Purāṇa*, the late and orthodox local authority of Kashmir, still honours wine traditions. In the festival of first snow (*navahimapātotsava*) fresh wine is said to be drunk "by those used to drinking".¹¹⁸ According to Kumari, the *irāpuṣpasamāyuktam pānam* mentioned in verse 675 in connection with the Irāmañjarīpūjā refers to the "wine distilled from Irā flowers".¹¹⁹ The vine creeper itself is personified as the goddess Śyāmā, whose Śyāmādevīpūjā is celebrated when the grapes are ripened. But wine is not mentioned in this connection.¹²⁰

5. Heracles and Dionysus

Many authors have preserved fragments of Megasthenes dealing with two legendary conquerors and rulers of India, who were said to be subsequently worshipped by Indians as major gods. They were connected with Greek legendary history by identifying them with Heracles and Dionysus.¹²¹ They seem to represent two Indian gods and their identifica-

¹¹⁶ *Rājat* 1, 42 *vidyāvesmāni tuṅgāni kuṅkumaṁ sahimam payaḥ/ drākṣeti yatra sāmānyam asti tridivadurlabham//*. Vine is mentioned also in 7, 498.

¹¹⁷ *Rājat* 4, 169 *tasya pratāpo daradām na seche nārataṁ madhu/ dariṇām oṣadhijyotiḥ pratyūṣārka ivoditaḥ//*.

¹¹⁸ *NilIP* 461ff., especially 465cd *navo madyas ca pītavyo madyapaiḥ patite hime*. On the festival see Kumari 1968, 193f. As to the madyapas, Vreese quotes an interesting MS gloss: *hime patite sati navam madhyam [sic] nūtanāsurasudhāpair eva sūdrādibhir vāmācāraniratais ca pātavyam peyam na tu brāhmaṇādibhiḥ suddhācārapālakaiḥ tais tu pānakarasah peyaḥ yad vakṣyaty agre Mahīmānavidhivārṇane Nilamunir eva "madyam tu madyapaiḥ peyam brāhmaṇaiḥ pānakāḥ subhā" iti/ anyathā śrutismṛtīvirodhaḥ syāt brāhmaṇena na surā peyeti tasmād brāhmaṇarājanyau vaiśyaś ca na surām pibed iti ca śrutismṛti iti*. The verse cited is *NilIP* 523ab. In Punyal at the Gilgit, wine matures during the autumn and most of it is drunk during the winter (Jettmar 1973, 199).

¹¹⁹ Kumari 1968, 122 and 201f. on *NilIP* 668ff. Both *PW* and *pw* (cf. also Mayrhofer [New] s.v.) give 'ein berauschendes Getränk' as one of the meanings of Sanskrit *irā*, but do not mention it as a name of a plant. It might be *Viburnum stellulatum* Wall., a shrub of the northwestern Himalayas, called in Pañjabi *ira* or *eri* (Watt s.v. *Viburnum stellulatum*).

¹²⁰ *NilIP* 797ff. and Kumari 1968, 208. Perhaps no wine is available when the grapes have just ripened. Cf. Edelberg's (1965, 166ff./193f. and 185/197) account of a wine harvest in Nuristan.

¹²¹ See Megasthenes F 4, 11, 12, 13 and 14. The relevant texts are easily found in Breloer & Bömer 1939 (Index s.v. Hercules and Liber) and Dahlquist 1962, 46ff.

tion has been attempted by scholars for more than two hundred years. A variety of Indian gods and other kinds of solutions have been suggested without any really satisfying answer. It is this vexing question we must now discuss and try to clarify.

Part of the problem depends on the fact that the two gods are precisely Heracles and Dionysus, Greek gods with their Greek attributes and only occasional Indian embellishment. We may quote Weber's early opinion about Heracles: "Nach meiner Ansicht ist indess dieser Bericht ... in so hohem Grade von der griechischen Vorstellung des Herakles influenzirt, dass wir die indische Grundlage nicht mit völliger Sicherheit herstellen können."¹²² With Dionysus we find still fewer Indian features, so that according to Lassen: "Wir können ihn einfach beseitigen, als willkürliche Verknüpfung der indischen mit der griechischen Mythengeschichte."¹²³

Yet many scholars have attempted an identification, and far-reaching theories have been built on these identifications concerning the history of Indian religion.¹²⁴ Most theories can be criticized both methodologically and in relation to their individual arguments. Every identification demands that only parts of the features are emphasized, parts of them ignored. As these things have often been discussed, I shall give just a short survey of the various theories and their history and then proceed to attempt to find a somewhat more satisfactory approach.

If we leave aside early speculations¹²⁵ the first who seems to have attempted an explanation of the classical references to Indian gods was Sir William Jones. But with him it is not always clear whether he really meant to explain Megasthenes and others or whether he speculated about an original (we would say Indo-European) connection. Sometimes he himself does not seem to have kept the two separate.

For **Heracles** the oldest and most likely identification is *Kṛṣṇa*. As an etymological guess it was proposed by Wilford in the late 18th century,¹²⁶ but it seems to have become a real theory with Lassen, who has been followed by many.¹²⁷ As main arguments for the identity of Indian Heracles with *Kṛṣṇa*, their common role as monster-killers, their many wives and mistresses, and especially the connection of Heracles with Mathurā are mentioned. The last argument is the most important, although it is not without problems.¹²⁸ If it is true, we have here apparently the first mention of *Kṛṣṇa*, and this should make one careful. Yet the chronological gap is not too wide and some early form of *Kṛṣṇa* worship, perhaps a local hero cult in Mathurā,¹²⁹ is by no means excluded.

¹²² Weber 1853, 409.

¹²³ Lassen 1847, 509.

¹²⁴ These are discussed by Dahlquist (1962), often with good criticism, but his own attempt is no better.

¹²⁵ Thus e.g. Gerhard Vossius identified Dionysus (Greek and Indian) with Noah, because both started up viticulture (Vossius 1700, 69).

¹²⁶ *Heracles = Heri*, i. e. Hari (Wilford 1799, 190).

¹²⁷ Lassen 1827, 91 on the basis of Mathurā, 1844, 252 with more grounds. Later followed by e.g. Schwanbeck 1846, 44, McCrindle 1877, 111f. and 1901, 108 (but cf. McCrindle 1896, 70), Stein 1932, 303f., Goossens 1953, 44 and Eggermont 1966a, 286ff. (but see Eggermont 1986).

¹²⁸ See Dahlquist 1962, 79ff. Some were already pointed out by Weber (1853, 409f.).

¹²⁹ Hinüber 1985, 1107ff. An early form of Vāsudeva as a Kṣatriya hero was also suggested by

With other theories we can be rather brief. Referring to the *Sibae* as special worshippers of Heracles and to Heracles being a club-bearer dressed in skins, Cunningham identified him with Śiva.¹³⁰ Without mentioning his source McCrindle mentioned that Heracles has also been identified with Balarāma.¹³¹ Dahlquist has aptly criticized older theories, but his own Indra hypothesis has also met with very severe criticism.¹³² While Skurzak saw in the Indian Heracles a pre-Aryan hero-god, the "Proto-Siva" of Harappa, Eggermont has recently suggested that he might have been a Yakṣa, an earth-spirit.¹³³

There is also the possibility that Megasthenes has confused several Indian gods or cults in his account of the Indian Heracles. As a South Indian legend from Madurai comes close to the Megasthenian account of the daughter of Heracles but has Śiva as the god, Filliozat suggested a confusion of Kṛṣṇa and Śiva.¹³⁴

In the same way there are many competing theories about the identity of the Indian **Dionysus**. He has been variously connected at least with Rāma, Sūrya, Holi festival, Kṛṣṇa, Manu, Soma and Skanda, a king, Śiva, a culture hero of the Muṇḍas, Balarāma and a combination of several gods.¹³⁵

Now it is time to try our Northwestern perspective with these supposed Indian gods. Here it must be stressed that while the identification of foreign gods with Greek ones was a common habit in Greek ethnography, it was not Megasthenes who decided that Heracles

Bongard-Levin (1973, 9f.). That Kṛṣṇa was not always honoured by everybody is nicely shown in the criticism he is given in *Mbh* 2, chapters 34, 38f. and 41f. Śiṣupāla's words in 2, 42, 4 are a good example of this: *ye tvām dāsam arājanam bālyād arcanti durmatim/ anarham arhavat kṛṣṇa vadhyās ta iti me matiḥ//*.

¹³⁰ Cunningham 1891, VII. It was accepted by Kennedy (1907, 967) and Rawlinson (1926, 61), who also pointed to some common attributes found in Kushan coins. For criticism, see Dahlquist 1962, 72ff. The club has been discussed again by Mariottini Spagnoli (1967 and 1970), who compares it with the club depicted as a royal weapon in Kushan art. This she connects both with Heracles (who is important in Indo-Greek coins) and with Śiva, but she rejects the idea that Megasthenes' Heracles would be Śiva (Mariottini Spagnoli 1967, 248ff., 257ff. and 260f.).

¹³¹ McCrindle 1896, 70f. This unmentioned source seems to be Tod 1835, but his discussion is now wholly antiquated.

¹³² Dahlquist 1962, 88ff. and especially 94ff. The same idea was proposed earlier by L. von Schroeder in 1915. Dahlquist's theory has been accepted by Mariottini Spagnoli (1967, 260) and Derrett (1975, 1152), criticized by Buddruss (1965, 719f.), Hartmann (1965), Kuiper (1969, 142ff.) and Goyal (1985, 114f.).

¹³³ Skurzak 1979, 72f., apparently followed by Sachse 1981, 49ff.; Eggermont 1986, 165.

¹³⁴ Filliozat 1945, see also André & Filliozat 1980, 156ff. The confusion theory has also been proposed by Goyal (1985, 114ff. Śiva, Kṛṣṇa and Manu) and Vofchuk (1985, 19f. several gods or cults including Kṛṣṇa and Śiva). I have perhaps rejected it somewhat too rashly in Karttunen 1986a, 85f.

¹³⁵ Rāma in 1784 by Sir William Jones (Jones 1798, 256f., for other early views see Wilson 1832, 607ff.), Sūrya by Cunningham (1891, VIII), Holi by Growse in 1880 (see Dahlquist 1962, 180f.), Kṛṣṇa by Kennedy in 1907 (see Dahlquist 1962, 181f.), Manu by Stein (1932, 309ff.), Soma and Skanda by Kerbaker (1905, Soma also by K. Chattopadhyaya, cf. Stein 1932, 303), the King by Hartmann (1965, 63), Śiva apparently already by Sir William Jones, at least by Schwanbeck (1846, 45, also McCrindle 1877, 111f.), a Muṇḍa hero by Dahlquist (1962, 190ff.), Balarāma by Chaudhary (1983) and a combination of several gods by Goukowsky (1981, 25ff. and 32f. Indra in the form worshipped by the ancestors of the Nuristanis and Śiva) Goyal (1985, 107ff. Indra, Saṅkarṣaṇa-Balarāma and Śiva) and Vofchuk (1985, 19f.). Hinüber (1985, 1105f.) too considers a combined origin but wisely leaves the question open.

and Dionysus were the gods worshipped in India. They were in fact "inventions of the flatterers of Alexander".¹³⁶ When Megasthenes went to India he "knew" that the Indians worshipped these two gods and tried to find their cults there (or at least something even slightly similar).¹³⁷ Therefore, it is quite possible that he combined several cults into one. At the same time it is also possible were different identifications had already been made in the Northwest, when Alexander's companions were searching for traces of the supposed Indian campaigns of Heracles and Dionysus.

Let us consider first the Greek side. Both gods were great travellers who had visited many countries even before Alexander's campaign, and both can be characterized as culture-heroes.¹³⁸ Dionysus had been as near to India as Bactria.¹³⁹ But it seems that there is one important difference. With Heracles, who was an ancestor of Alexander, the Greek side was always dominant and the "Indian" features secondary and few, at least until Megasthenes found his "Heracles" worshipped in Mathurā. His most important Northwestern element, the inability to conquer the rock Aornus, can perhaps be connected with a local myth,¹⁴⁰ but a single episode does not allow further conclusions.

I doubt whether we can infer much from the fact that both Heracles and Dionysus seem to have important cults in the Northwest in the Indo-Greek period and later,¹⁴¹ when they were again identified with several Indian gods. Such identifications were not always permanent and it might well be that there was a fresh start with them when the Greek cults were established for a while in the Northwest.¹⁴² The importance of Heracles and Dionysus followed from the importance of Alexander and from the supposed eastern campaigns of these two gods. Therefore, it is not relevant here that we find Heracles' club apparently in connection with Śiva,¹⁴³ a Heracleian motif in the iconography of Κῆρυξ,¹⁴⁴

¹³⁶ Strabo 15, 1, 9 ὅτι δ' ἐστὶ πλάσματα ταῦτα τῶν κολακευόντων Ἀλέξανδρου.

¹³⁷ Cf. Zambrini 1985, 783ff.

¹³⁸ On Heracles see Lacroix 1974 (36ff. on travels, 41ff. on the culture hero aspect), on Dionysus e.g. Graef 1886, Long 1971 and Dihle 1987. See also Noiville 1929, 245ff., Hartmann 1965, 58ff. and Schachermeyr 1973, 408ff.

¹³⁹ Euripides, *Ba.* 13–15

λιπῶν δὲ Λυδῶν τοὺς πολυχρύσους γύας
φρυγῶν τε, Περσῶν θ' ἠλιοβλήτους πλάκας
βάκτριά τε τεῖχη τήν τε δύσχιμον χθόνα.

This has been quoted by Strabo (15, 1, 7) as an argument against the Indian campaign of Dionysus. Dihle (1987, 49) suspects that the verses in the *Bacchae* are an interpolation.

¹⁴⁰ Tucci 1963, 171ff. connects him with Žun(a)/Sun(a), who is mentioned in Chinese sources as a god of Zabulistan in Central Afghanistan. Like the Indian Heracles he came from afar and could not conquer the mountain of another god.

¹⁴¹ For Heracles see Mariottini Spagnoli 1967, 257f. and Pugačenkova 1977, for Dionysus Pugačenkova 1967, Carter 1968 and Chaudhary 1983, 119f.

¹⁴² Cf. Mariottini Spagnoli 1967, 260: "The attention of the Greeks is usually drawn by exterior characteristics, which lead them to assimilate foreign gods with those of their own pantheon. Nor do such identifications have, on the other hand, a fixed and constant nature once they are established, especially in a period like that of the Κῆρυξ, which sees in the religious field the flowering of eclectic and syncretistic tendencies, particularly favourable to the fusion of elements belonging to the mythical cycle and to the philosophical speculations relative to various divinities."

¹⁴³ Mariottini Spagnoli 1967, 248ff.

an apparent identity of Dionysus and Balarāma in Indo-Greek coins¹⁴⁵ etc. On the other hand, it may be important that there seem to be some traditions of a cult resembling that of Dionysus in Bactria and adjoining countries.¹⁴⁶

However, Dionysus does seem to have been familiar with the Northwestern mountains.¹⁴⁷ It has already been stated how the Macedonians found a place (probably in Nuristan) they readily identified as Nysa, because the vine and ivy were growing there and people seemed to worship Dionysus. As one scholar stated it: "Although the Greeks had certain traditions of Dionysus having penetrated through Asia and conquered the Indians this can, of course, only mean that in the Northwest of India they had found cults which strangely reminded them of those of their own wine-god. Such cults could only have been those of Śiva, in which the use of intoxicating drinks have [*sic*] nearly always taken a prominent place."¹⁴⁸ This brings us back to the old identification with Śiva, but here an important modification must be made. Śiva as we know him in classical Hinduism is a composite figure and we have no need to believe in his existence as such in the mountains of the Northwest in the fourth century B.C. The Northwestern god represents one of the forms which were later united as Śiva. Nevertheless, he does seem to be related to the Vedic Rudra.

This is no new theory. It has been discussed most exhaustively by Tucci,¹⁴⁹ but there is much to add. The structural comparison made by Long offers further similarities,¹⁵⁰ but here I shall restrict the discussion to the Northwestern aspect. For the same reason, older attempts to connect Śiva and Dionysus are left out.

One general point must yet be noted. There are clear orgiastic characteristics in both cults. Śiva just as much as Dionysus is the god of music and dance. If the drinking is not as central as it is with Dionysus this is only natural in India, where drinking was strictly condemned. Śiva had to give up wine in order to become a respectable god in orthodox Indian society. In the Northwest, where wine was commonly honoured, there were no such problems. And yet even in India proper there were wine-drinking Śaiva sects like the Kāpālikas. Human sacrifice and anthropophagous tendencies were also found in connection with wine drinking.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁴ Fighting the horses of Diomedes/slaying of the horse-demon Keśin (Harle 1985).

¹⁴⁵ Chaudhary 1983, 125ff. (see also Narain 1973). Chaudhary's other arguments for identifying Megasthenes' Dionysus with Balarāma are quite far-fetched. It is true that as a son of Zeus, Dionysus is Heracles' elder brother, like Balarāma is Kṛṣṇa's, but the Greek relationship is quite insignificant. Then he combines Nonnus' Βλέμυς with Balarāma and supposes that he will find in *Dionysiaca* very early traditions about Egyptian origins of the cult of Dionysus and about Indo-Egyptian contacts. But it has been known for a long time even to Indologists that *Dionysiaca* is a late poem which contains very little authentic information (see e.g. Wilson 1832).

¹⁴⁶ Pugačenkova 1967, but her examples (mostly from art) are so late that a Hellenistic influence cannot be excluded. Yet it was those gods who had some resemblance with local tradition who were most easily accepted.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Strabo's (15, 1, 58) statement that Dionysus is worshipped in the mountains, Heracles on the plains.

¹⁴⁸ Charpentier 1934, 41f.

¹⁴⁹ Tucci 1963, 157ff., earlier Foucher 1947, 256ff. (especially 260f.).

¹⁵⁰ Long 1971.

In the *Mahābhārata* Śiva is called Gāndhāra. The same name is given as a gloss by Hesychius and explained by Tucci as a Northwestern god later identified with Śiva.¹⁵² Śiva is also otherwise connected with the Northwest. His Vedic form Rudra comes from the north.¹⁵³ In Kashmir Śiva is traditionally a very prominent god.¹⁵⁴ Śiva's abode, the Kailāśa, is situated in the Northwest and near Peshawar there is a Śivapura.¹⁵⁵ In the religions of the Northwest known from Nuristani and Dardic traditions the Indian Śiva often derives his name from *Mahādeva* (Mahandeu, Mānde etc.).¹⁵⁶ But it is quite possible that he is originally a local god later identified with Śiva, a process common everywhere in India.

It is the Northwestern mountain god, "le grand Seigneur de la montagne", whom Foucher and Tucci offer as the Northwestern form of Śiva and identify with the Indian Dionysus.¹⁵⁷ They point out that Śiva as Girīśa/Giriśad is a mountain-god himself, sitting on the Kailāśa, but also on other mountains.¹⁵⁸ In Chinese sources (Xuanzang) we meet a Northwestern mountain god called Žun(a)/Sun(a), whom Tucci compares both with Śiva and with evidence of a mountain god formerly worshipped in the Chakar Valley.¹⁵⁹

There are also strong reasons to think that the orgiastic, Dionysiac element was very strong in the Northwestern cult. It was shown in chapter VIII.4. how viticulture and wine-drinking has been common until recent times, and it has been suggested that the local wine feast may sometimes have been no more than an orgy.¹⁶⁰ Greek sources often talk about the Dionysiac feasts of (Northwest) India, and in Northwestern (Gandhāra and Mathurā) art we find many Bacchanalian scenes often connected with Śiva and his people, like Kubera and the Yakṣas, later also Gaṇapati.¹⁶¹ According to Carter, grape-

¹⁵¹ Tucci 1963, 159 and especially Long 1971, 192ff. and 204ff., for similar aspects of Rudra see Dandekar 1953, 101f. and 117ff. Many points are also noted by Bongard-Levin (1973, 12).

¹⁵² Tucci 1963, 159f.; Hesychius s.v. Γάνδαρος: ὁ ταυροκράτης παρ' Ἰνδοῖς. See also Charpentier 1913, 92f.

¹⁵³ Dandekar 1953, 114f.

¹⁵⁴ Kumari 1968, 158f.

¹⁵⁵ Tucci 1963, 162f.

¹⁵⁶ Jettmar 1975, Index ss. vv.

¹⁵⁷ Fouchert 1947, 258ff. and Tucci 1963, 163ff.

¹⁵⁸ Tucci 1963, 162f.; Rudra as the northern mountain god is stressed already by Charpentier (1934, 42). On Rudra see also Dandekar 1953, 113ff.

¹⁵⁹ Tucci 1963, 163ff., the Chakar mountain god discussed in 167ff. A curious point in Žun(a)/Sun(a) is the importance of fish in his cult, compared by Tucci (1963, 166ff.) with Matsyendra Śiva, with Northwestern inscriptional Makara names and with Matsyendranātha of the Krama school of Swat. As there is also an astral element in Žun(a)/Sun(a) as well as in Śiva, this may reflect some very ancient Northwestern religious tradition (cf. Parpola's ideas about the religion of the Indus civilization e.g. in Parpola 1980, 24ff. and 1984b, 187ff.).

¹⁶⁰ Jettmar 1973, 200f.

¹⁶¹ See especially Carter 1968, 121ff. In Mathurā Archaeological Museum I have personally noted a relief depicting a Śiva liṅga, some worshippers and a vine creeper with a large bunch of grapes. For Gaṇapati we may notice his Unmattagaṇapati form. The cult of the Yakṣas is also important as they are offered surā and meat (Carter 1968, 141 lists several Indian sources). This might be compared with the offerings given to the Piśācas according to *NiIP* 555ff. But Balarāma, the great drunkard of the Indian

vine and Dionysiac motives related to the Yakṣas disappear in India after the 5th century A.D., but continue for some time in Central Asian and Iranian silver vessels.¹⁶² We meet these Northwestern orgies in Indian literature, too.

The Northwest is the country of various semi-divine and demonic fabulous peoples. According to the *Mahābhārata*, the diverse kinds of the Piśācas live beyond the Himalaya and are fond of music and dancing.¹⁶³ And their god is Śiva, here called Śarva.¹⁶⁴ The divine musicians or Gandharvas belong to the Northwest. We must also remember that the Northwest (not only Kashmir) was the country of the Nāgas. Several Northwestern dynasties have claimed descent from famous Nāgas and Takṣaśilā was supposedly founded by the Nāga king Takṣaka. Classical authors tell of enormous serpents bred by local rulers.¹⁶⁵ Both Śiva and Dionysus are connected with serpents.¹⁶⁶

An exceptionally important account of Northwestern religious habits is preserved in the *Mahābhārata* as chapter 30 of the Kaṇṇaparvan. It was first made known more than 150 years ago, but in spite of its clear orgiastic character it has not often been connected with Indian Dionysus.¹⁶⁷ Even in the critical edition the passage is too long (82 śloka) to be quoted here in its entirety, but I shall take up some central points. The passage is given as Kaṇṇa's rebuke to Śalya, the king of the Madras, and occasionally it is emphasized with the refrain **uta śalya vijānihi hanta brūyo bravīmi te.**

The geographical location offers little difficulty. Although the critical edition reads *Bāhlika* (Bactrians) our account can hardly be moved as far as to Bactria. Instead, these people live between the five rivers and the Indus.¹⁶⁸ Their other name is given as Madras,

pantheon, seems to be absent in these Bacchanalian scenes.

¹⁶² Carter 1968, 146. Her latest example is from the 7th century (in Pyandjikent).

¹⁶³ *Mbh* 13, 19, 16ff. (referred to by Grierson 1912, 139f.):

dhanadam samatikramya himavantam tathaiva ca/
rudrasya yatanam dṛṣṭvā siddhacāraṇasevitam//16//
prahṛṣṭaiḥ pārṣadair juṣṭam nṛtyadbhir vividhānanaiḥ/
divyāṅgarāgaiḥ paiśācair vanyair nānāvidhais tathā//17//
pāṇitālasatālais ca samyātālaiḥ samais tathā/
samprahṛṣṭaiḥ pranṛtyadbhiḥ śarvas tatra niṣevyate//18//.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. also *NiP* 553 (and Kumari 1968, 162), where Śiva is worshipped by piśācādhipati Nikumbha and his people (*tasyām vipra caturdaśyām nikumbhaḥ saṁkaram tadā/ saṁpūjayati dharmātmā sānuyātro mahābalaḥ//*).

¹⁶⁵ These and several further examples are listed by Rönnow (1936, 137f., note 1).

¹⁶⁶ See e.g. Long 1971, 198f. and 201.

¹⁶⁷ Editio princeps by Lassen (1827, 63ff., with Latin translation). It has been connected with Dionysus only by Hauer (1927, 240), Goossens (1953, 47) and Parpola (1980, 67). Tucci (1963, 162) mentions it in his discussion about the Northwestern mountain god and Hauer (1927, 232ff.) in connection with the Vṛātya cult. According to Van Nooten (1971, 108) our passage would refer to Indo-Greek customs and a similar idea was also suggested by Ray (1922, 260ff.). See also Vasil'kov 1982, 58f.

¹⁶⁸ *Mbh* 8, 30, 9ff.

tatra vṛddhaḥ purāvṛttāḥ kathāḥ kāścid dvijottamaḥ/
bāhlikadeśam madraś ca kutsayan vākyam abravīt//9//
bahīṣṭā himavatā gaṅgayā ca tiraskṛtāḥ/
sarasvatyā yamunayā kurukṣetreṇa cāpi ye//10//
pañcānām sindhuṣaṣṭhānām nadīnām ye 'ntarāśritāḥ/
tān dharmabāhyān asucin bāhlikān parivarjayet//11//.

a people of the Pañjab, and in fact *Bāhika*, another Pañjabi people, instead of *Bāhlika*, in the Vulgate is a respectable variant.¹⁶⁹ In addition, the town of Śākala and the River Āpa-ga are also mentioned, both in the Pañjab.¹⁷⁰ Later the Āraṭas (verse 36) and the Sindhu-sauvīras (verse 47) are added, and in one instance the Pañjab too is mentioned.¹⁷¹

All those peoples are said to be devoid of dharma (*dharmabāhya*). They drink alcoholic drinks, eat beef with garlic and other improper food, they laugh and sing and dance naked and drunk with women in and outside of the town, and are anointed and wear garlands. Their songs resemble the noises of asses and camels.¹⁷² The words given represent, according to Hauer, a primitive cult song of a fertility god called Svāmin and, as husband of his female worshippers, Bhatṛ.¹⁷³ Soon there follows another passage partly given as a quotation of a song sung by Madra women. Again drinks, meat-eating and music are stressed as local customs.¹⁷⁴ This time the song is not of cultic nature. It ends in praise of mutton, a fitting theme in Northwestern sheep-breeding areas (cf. VIII.8.).

There are further similar verses and especially the impure food of the Northwesterners is greatly stressed. Thus, for instance, they eat from impure vessels and drink all kinds of milk.¹⁷⁵ These impious customs are explained by claiming that the *Bāhlikas* are not

¹⁶⁹ Tucci 1963, 162 accepts it and adds that the same *Bāhikas* are in *ŚB* said to worship Rudra as Bhava. In our *Mbh* passage *Bāhlika/Bāhika* is again mentioned in verses 13f., 19f. etc. Nevertheless, it is probably not necessary to alter the text, as *Bāhlikas* and *Bāhikas* were often confounded. In *Mbh* *Mādrī* is called *Bāhlikī* (1, 116, 21, noted by Przyluski 1926, 11f.). On *Bāhlika/Bāhika* see also Witzel 1980, 88ff.

¹⁷⁰ *Mbh* 8, 30, 14ab *sākalam nāma nagaram āpagā nāma nimnagā*. See Dey ss. vv.

¹⁷¹ *Mbh* 3, 30, 65f. (and the similar account in 74cd):

pūjyamāne purā dharme sarvadeśeṣu śāsvate/
dharmam pāñcanadam dṛṣṭvā dhig ity āha pitāmahaḥ//65//
vrātyānām dāsamiyānām kṛte 'py aśubhakarmaṇām/
iti pāñcanadam dharmam avamene pitāmahaḥ//66//.

¹⁷² *Mbh* 8, 30, 15ff.

dhānāgauḍāsave pītvā gomāmsam laṣunaiḥ saha/
apūpamāmsavātyānām āśinaḥ śilavarjitāḥ//15//
hasanti gānti nṛtyanti sribhir mattā vivāsasaḥ/
nagarāgāravapreṣu bahir mālyānulepanāḥ//16//
mattāvagītaiḥ vividhaiḥ kharoṣṭraninadopamaiḥ/
āhur anyonyam uktāni prabruvāṇā madotkaṭāḥ//17//
hā hate hā hatety eva svāmi bhartṛ hateti ca/
ākrośantyāḥ pranṛtyanti mandāḥ parvasv asamyatāḥ//18//.

¹⁷³ Hauer 1927, 236.

¹⁷⁴ *Mbh* 8, 30, 30ff.

kadā vā ghoṣikā gāthāḥ punar gāsyanti śākale/
gavyasya tṛptā māmsasya pītvā gauḍam mahāsavam//30//
gaurībhiḥ saha nārībhir bṛhatībhiḥ svalamkṛtāḥ/
palāṇḍugaṇḍūṣayutān khādante caiḍakān bahūn//31//
vārāham kaukkuṭam māmsam gavyam gārdabham auṣtrakam/
aiḍam ca ye na khādanti teṣām janma nirarthakam//32//
iti gāyanti ye mattāḥ śidhunā śākalāvataḥ/
sabālavṛddhāḥ kūrđantas teṣu vṛttam katham bhavet//33//.

¹⁷⁵ *Mbh* 8, 30, 38f.

created by Prajāpati, but descend from the Piśācas.¹⁷⁶ In their country the four varṇas are known but one is not bound to one of them and can move even from the lowest status to the highest.¹⁷⁷ The Bāhlikas are the dirt of the earth and Madra women the dirt of their sex.¹⁷⁸ But here Karṇa seems to forget that the latter were also famous for their beauty and eagerly sought as matches among the North Indian princes.¹⁷⁹ The most famous was perhaps Mādri, the second wife of Pāṇḍu.

With these kinds of bad habits our Northwesterners seem to be related to the Vrātyas. They are actually called Vrātyas in our text (verses 36 and 66). They have been accepted as Vrātyas by Hauer¹⁸⁰ and they seem to have the same relation to our Northwestern Proto-Siva/Dionysus as the Vrātyas have to Rudra. We must also keep in mind that the name *Madra*, if not actually derived, could very easily be thought to be derived from *mad-*.

There is always the problem of how ancient a particular passage of the *Mahābhārata* is. Here the mention of the matrimonial inheritance, which probably refers to the Sakas, is not included in the critical edition.¹⁸¹ However, we do meet the "omniscient Yavanas" before the end,¹⁸² and the Yavanas became omniscient in India only after their astronomy (and astrology) became famous, i.e. in the first centuries A.D. On the other hand, (and this seems to rule out the possibility suggested by Van Nooten), the Yavanas appear only in a list of peoples, and the bad Northwestern habits are ascribed to peoples who are Indo-Aryan. It has often been noted that the Greek rule in Northwest India did not leave many traces in the traditions and customs of local people. The Greeks (or Iranians who were sufficiently Hellenized) were always a thin upper layer in Northwestern society. A far-reaching influence in the sphere of religion is hardly thinkable. Therefore, I think that we have here again another account of the orgiastic Northwestern cult we have met in connection with the Indian Dionysus.

It is perhaps not out of place to note here a danger in my Northwestern viewpoint. We

kāṣṭhakunḍeṣu bāhlikā mṛṇmāyeṣu ca bhūñjante/
saktuvātyāvalipteṣu svādiliḍheṣu nirghṛṇāḥ//38//
āvikaṃ cauṣṭrikaṃ caiva kṣīraṃ gārdabham eva ca/
tadvikārāṃs ca bāhlikāḥ khādanti ca pibanti ca//39//.

¹⁷⁶ *Mbh* 3, 30, 44:

bahiś ca nāma hlikaś ca vipāsāyām piśācakau/
tayor apatyam bāhlikā naiṣā sṛṣṭiḥ prajāpateḥ//44//.

¹⁷⁷ *Mbh* 3, 30, 53ff.:

tatraiva brāhmaṇo bhūtvā tato bhavati kṣatriyaḥ/
vaiśyaḥ sūdraś ca bāhlikas tato bhavati nāpitaḥ//53//
nāpitaś ca tato bhūtvā punar bhavati brāhmaṇaḥ/
dviḥ bhūtvā ca tatraiva punar dāso 'pi jāyate//54//
bhavaty ekaḥ kule vipraḥ siṣṭānye kāmācāriṇaḥ/
gāndhārā madrakās caiva bāhlikāḥ ke 'py acetasaḥ//55//.

¹⁷⁸ *Mbh* 8, 30, 68cd: malam pṛthivyā bāhlikāḥ striṇām madrastriyo malam.

¹⁷⁹ Ray 1922, 258f. with many references.

¹⁸⁰ Hauer 1927, 237.

¹⁸¹ *Mbh* insertion 392* after 8, 30, 59 tasmāt teṣāṃ bhāgaharā bhāgineyā na sūnavāḥ.

¹⁸² *Mbh* 8, 30, 80a sarvajñā yavanāḥ.

may easily see differences in the various parts of India, but the Northwest – and the capital N adds to the danger – is too easily treated as a uniform whole, while in fact it is a vast area with different peoples and cultures. In these chapters I have often combined evidence from the different corners of this area, from Nuristan to Kashmir, from Sind to Central Asia. Nevertheless, local cultures there often influenced each other; they also borrowed both from the east (India) and the west (Iran), and perhaps shared ancient local features. I think that orgiastic cults combined with viticulture and a male god were probably such a feature. It is mostly found among the Indo-Iranian peoples (we have little evidence of others, though their presence cannot be denied) but its roots are probably deep in the pre-Aryan period.

6. The Sun Cult

The origin of the sun cult in India is rather problematic. The sun has always been a god, in the *Rigveda* there are already many hymns to the sun in his different aspects, but there is not much evidence of any specific cult of Sūrya or some other solar deity of the Veda. The sun cult as it is met in the first millennium A.D. is clearly of Iranian origin,¹⁸³ but the question is, did it come into India only during the period of Iranian (Pahlava/Saka/Kushan) dominion of Northwestern India or was there also some earlier cult without many traces left.

Both opinions have found supporters. If we leave out some scholars who with weak arguments try and deny any foreign impulses in Indian culture and consequently find all forms of sun cult indigenous,¹⁸⁴ the most important theory about an early origin has been proposed by Srivastava. According to him, "it appears that for the first time the Maga priests entered into India in the wake of the Achaemenian invasion of the 5th century B.C. They remained confined to the northwestern portions of India in the beginning... The second wave of the Maga's immigration into India came in the wake of the Śaka-Kuṣāṇa invaders in the 2nd cent. B.C. – 1st cent. A.D. This appears to have been a much more powerful wave than the previous one."¹⁸⁵

It has been shown by Gail that Srivastava's arguments for the early existence of a Saura sect and for the Achaemenian immigration of Magas are rather weak. The passages he quotes from the *Mahābhārata* are mostly late, are found only in a limited number of

¹⁸³ Testified by such features as the boots in Sūrya/Mihira iconography beginning in the Kushan period, by the name *Mihira* itself (< Middle Iranian *Mihir*), by the fact that his cult was conducted by *Maga Brāhmaṇas*, who came to India from *Śakadvīpa*, and by their use of the *avyaṅga* girdle (Avestan *aiwyanhana*) etc. See also Stietencron 1966, 231ff. and 248ff.

¹⁸⁴ For instance Pandey in a book published 1972. See the criticism in Gail 1978, 335ff.

¹⁸⁵ Srivastava 1972, 350 (also 252).

manuscripts or recensions, and consequently are not included in the text of the critical edition.¹⁸⁶ Pāṇini and Patañjali probably refer to the Vedic Sūrya, not to the highest god of a Saura sect.¹⁸⁷ Although there are some pre-Kushan representations of the sun god, he is never the central figure and seems to be inspired by the Greek Helios.¹⁸⁸ The possible evidence from Taxila will be taken up soon.

It follows that Srivastava failed to give adequate proof for his hypothesis, not that it is necessarily wrong. As he saw himself, a recent Iranian influence is necessary to explain the sudden blossoming of Mihira worship beginning in the half Iranian Kushan empire and spreading in a few centuries throughout northern India. There is no need for the existence of a pre-Kushan Saura sect or Magas in India in order to explain this. However, I still think that it was quite possible that there was a sun cult in Northwest India even earlier, though it probably never had any influence further in the east.

The principal testimony is Ctesias, who wrote about a holy place of the sun and the moon in the Indian desert.¹⁸⁹ If there is any geographical meaning in the Indian desert of early Greek authors, it seems to denote the Thar desert. This brings us very near to Multan (Mūlasthāna), which was later a famous centre of the sun cult and is often mentioned as the original home of the cult in India.¹⁹⁰ It was flourishing when Xuanzang and al-Bīrūnī visited there, but unfortunately there is very little evidence for extending its history beyond the early centuries A.D.¹⁹¹

Indian sources do not help us much here. The sun cult is commonly given north-western origin, but all sources are too late. They refer to the situation in the Kushan period and later. Earlier references are very scanty. We may perhaps notice that a Vedic text says that the Bāhīkas worship Agni under a special name, Bhava.¹⁹² The *Ārṣeya-Upaniṣad* mentions two Northwestern peoples (Darada and Barbara) in a list of sun-worshipping tribes.¹⁹³ On the other hand, we may note some archaeological evidence. The so-called fire altars of Dashly-3 (Bactria) and Kalibangan (Pañjab) seem to belong to

¹⁸⁶ Srivastava 1972, 177ff. and Gail 1978, 345.

¹⁸⁷ Gail 1978, 346 (on P 3, 1, 114).

¹⁸⁸ Srivastava 1972, 182f. and 291ff. and Gail 1978, 335ff. and 341.

¹⁸⁹ F 45, 17 περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ χωρίου τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀοικήτῳ, ὃ ἐπ' ὀνόματι τιμῶσιν ἠλίου καὶ Σελήνης· ἐν ᾧ διὰ ἑ' ἡμερῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους τῆς Σαρδοῦς τις παραγίνεται. καὶ ὅτι λε' ἡμέραις ὁ ἥλιος ψύχει ἐκεῖσε τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐορτήν, ἵνα ἀφλεκτοὶ αὐτὴν τελέσωσι καὶ ὑποστρέψωσιν. The same seems to be the source for the account in *Alexander's Letter to Aristoteles*, see Gunderson 1980, 111f.

¹⁹⁰ See Stietencron 1966, 226ff. and Srivastava 1972, 267f. and 322f.

¹⁹¹ At least we can point to Vogelsang's (1985, 78ff.) attempt to find a special connection between Multan and Arachosia in the Achaemenian period.

¹⁹² SB 1, 7, 3, 8.

¹⁹³ Srivastava 1972, 250f. quoted it from Belvalkar's and Ranade's *History of Indian Philosophy* II, 298, and Gail (1978, 344) failed to find it in the text translated by Deussen. In *Un-Published Upanishads* the passage is found on page 8: *ya ime puṇḍrāḥ suhmāḥ kulumbhā daradā barbarā iti*. It has been noticed elsewhere that *Barbara/Varvara* belongs to the mouth of the Indus and have of course nothing to do with the Babylonians (as supposed by Srivastava). While Puṇḍra and Suhma seem to belong only to the east (Dey ss. vv.), Kulumbha could be related to Kulūta, the people of the Kulu valley in the Western Himalayas.

the late third millennium B.C.¹⁹⁴ Tucci's evidence for a sun cult in Swat (early first millennium B.C.) is rather scanty.¹⁹⁵ But excavations at Balambat, west of the Panjkora in Pakistan, have unearthed fire altars and a sun disc from the Achaemenian level. Dani compares the altars to the "altar-ovens" found at Dahan-i Ghulaman (Seistan, Iran).¹⁹⁶

If there was a sun cult in the Northwest, it may well have been of Iranian origin.¹⁹⁷ There were probably Iranians very early on in the country west of the Indus, and the Achaemenian dominion certainly added to their number. A fragment of Aristobulus (see next chapter) seems to ascribe Zoroastrian customs to Taxila at the time when Alexander visited the place. A later source ascribes sun worship to its citizens, although this might also be explained as a later cult of the Greek Helios or the Iranian Mihir.

It was John Marshall, the excavator of Taxila, who noticed that the account written by Flavius Philostratus in the early third century A.D. about the supposed visit of Apollonius of Tyana to Taxila contained so much authentic material that it must be founded on an eye-witness account.¹⁹⁸ When Marshall proceeded to explain the Janḍiāl temple (Janḍiāl C of Dar) as a Zoroastrian fire temple and identified it with the temple mentioned by Philostratus as situated outside the city wall – characterized often as a sun temple – everything seemed to be favourable for my hypothesis.¹⁹⁹ Unfortunately, it is not so clear at all.

The temple seen by Damis and Apollonius (or whoever was Philostratus' source here) was not said to be a temple of the sun.²⁰⁰ And it also seems that Marshall was somewhat too confident with his case. The excavated temples of Taxila have been examined again by Dar. As to the Janḍiāl C, he stresses its unmistakable Greek style, compares it with the Heroon of Kineas at Ai Khanum and confirms Marshall's date in the second century B.C.²⁰¹ But as to Marshall's theory of the temple being a fire temple he has good

¹⁹⁴ On Dashly-3 see Parpola 1985b, 76f., on Kalibangan, Allchin & Allchin 1982, 183 and 303, Parpola 1985b, 115f. and 1988, 238.

¹⁹⁵ Tucci 1977, 31f.

¹⁹⁶ Dani 1967, 244f. (quoted also by Srivastava 1972, 17 and 251f.). The finds belong to period IV, dated in the 6th to 4th centuries B.C. (*ibid.* 240) on account of the clearly Achaemenian pottery found there (*ibid.* 268ff.). On Dahan-i Ghulaman see Scerrato 1966 and Tucci 1977, 13f.

¹⁹⁷ Although Ctesias' account has nothing Iranian in it, neither Vedic Sūrya and other solar gods nor a sun cult of some Central Dravidian peoples help us much to explain it (these ideas have been suggested in Vofchuk 1982a, 66f.). A tribal sun cult of the Vindhya was suggested by Lassen (1852, 648).

¹⁹⁸ See e.g. Charpentier 1934, 48ff. and Marshall 1951, 64f., 139, 175f., 201 and 227. The Taxila episode is found in *V. Ap.* 2, 20–42.

¹⁹⁹ Marshall 1951, 222ff., followed e.g. by Srivastava (1972, 251 and 323). Philostratus' account is *V. Ap.* 2, 20 νεῶν δὲ πρὸ τοῦ τείχους ἰδεῖν φασιν οὐ παρὰ πολὺ τῶν ἑκατομ- πόδων λίθου κογχυλιάτου, καὶ κατεσκευάσθαι τι ἱερὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἦττον μὲν ἢ κατὰ τὸν νεῶν τοσοῦτόν τε ὄντα καὶ περικίονα, θαυμάσαι δὲ ἄξιον· χαλκοὶ γὰρ πίνακες ἐγκεκρότηνται τοίχῳ ἐκάστῳ, γεγραμμένοι τὰ Πώρου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα κτλ. It is pity that those pictures have not been found in excavations, though Dar (1984, 62) suggests that perhaps they were only some Buddhist reliefs misinterpreted as representing Porus and Alexander.

²⁰⁰ This has been noticed by Gail (1978, 344). It is still possible as this temple and the real temple of the sun were both claimed by Philostratus to contain representations of Alexander and Porus.

²⁰¹ Dar 1984, 45ff. Marshall gave his final date in a postscript in Marshall 1951, 229.

grounds to dismiss it and suggests that it was what the ruins seem to suggest – a Hellenistic temple dedicated to some Greek god. And after a fresh comparison with Philostratus he finds some discrepancies in the description and adds the fact that the temple seems to have collapsed in the earthquake in 20/30 A.D., while Apollonius' supposed visit seems to have taken place in 44 A.D.²⁰²

There are more temples at Taxila. Janḍiāl D is also rejected by Dar, but in the small Ionic temple of Mohra Maliaran (the first century B.C.) he thinks he has the exact counterpart of Philostratus' temple.²⁰³ However, there was also the temple of the sun, according to Philostratus,²⁰⁴ situated inside the wall, though unfortunately the excavators do not seem to have found it. It must be added that Philostratus mentions the cult of the sun again several times in his account.²⁰⁵

Aelianus tells us that Calanus prayed to the sun when he was dying.²⁰⁶ Clemens Alexandrinus notes that Indians worship the sun.²⁰⁷ A late tradition represents Porus as a sun-worshipper.²⁰⁸ Gundaphar demanded of the apostle Thomas that he would give a sacrifice to the sun.²⁰⁹ All these sources are late, but contribute perhaps to the idea of a sun cult in the Northwest which is perhaps earlier than the dominion of the Sakas and the Kushans.

We must conclude that the evidence for an early sun cult is disappointingly scarce. And even if Iranian fire worship could be shown, it could hardly explain Ctesias, whose informants were probably familiar with Zoroastrian religion. Ctesias actually mentioned a

²⁰² Dar 1984, 47ff. It seems that archaeology leaves us with fire-temples only from the Kushan period, like those in Surkh Kotal (Afghanistan) and Old Termez (U.S.S.R.), if their identification is correct.

²⁰³ Dar 1984, 60ff., on Janḍiāl D also 53ff. It must be emphasized that all these temples are definitely Greek ones (as Philostratus too says of his temples) and cannot go to the early period.

²⁰⁴ V. Ap. 2, 24 ἱερὸν δὲ ἰδεῖν Ἥλιου φασίν, ᾧ ἀνεῖτο Αἴας ἐλέφας, καὶ ἀγάλματα Ἀλεξάνδρου χρυσᾶ καὶ Πῶρου ἕτερα, χαλκοῦ δ' ἦν ταῦτα μέλανος οἱ δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῖχοι, πυρσαῖς λίθοις ὑπαστράπτει χρυσὸς αὐγὴν ἐκδιδούς ἐοικυῖαν ἀκτίνι. τὸ δὲ ἔδος αὐτὸ μαργαρίτιδος σύγκειται ξυμβολικὸν τρόπον, ᾧ βάρβαροι πάντες ἐς τὰ ἱερὰ χρῶνται.

²⁰⁵ V. Ap. 2, 32 καὶ προσελθόντα ταῖς πύλαις οὕτω τι ἄσμενοι ἐδέξαντο οἱ ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ βώμου τοῦ Ἥλιου δᾶδας ἀψάμενοι πρὸ πυλῶν τε ἤκειν καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι δεῦρο; 2, 43 citing the dedications on the altar supposedly built by Alexander by the Hyphasis Πατρὶ Ἀμμωνι καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ ἀδελφῶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ Προνοίᾳ καὶ Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳ καὶ Σαμοθρᾶξι Καβεῖροις καὶ Ἰνδοῦ ᾧ Ἥλιῳ καὶ Δελφῶ Ἀπόλλωνι.

²⁰⁶ V. H. 5, 6 καὶ ὁ μὲν ἥλιος αὐτὸν προσέβαλλεν, ὃ δὲ αὐτὸν προσεκύνη.

²⁰⁷ Protrept. 2, 26, 1 (quoted in Breloer & Bomer 1939, 105) καὶ προσκύνησαν ἥλιον, ὡς Ἰνδοί.

²⁰⁸ The letter of Porus quoted in Breloer & Bomer 1939, 169 from *Epitome Mettensis* 57: *et cognosces me Indorum regem esse, mihi autem dominum neminem nisi Iovem. et perignem magnum rectorem caeli Porus iurat.*

²⁰⁹ *Passio Thomae* quoted in Breloer & Bomer 1939, 198f. *Tunc Caritius dicit regi: "fac illum sacrificare deo Soli, et iram incurrit dei sui qui illum liberat ab his quae inferuntur ei." cumque urgueretur in templo simulacro Solis sacrificium inferre, ridens in faciem regis dixit: "dic mihi, rex, quis est melior inter te et imaginem tuam. non dubito quod praestantior tu sis quam pictura tua; et quomodo vos dimittitis deum vestrum et picturam eius excolitis?" erat autem statua Solis facta ex auro habens quadrigam equorum auream et currum, et habens effusus quasi cursu rapido agebatur ad caelos... Here at least the quadriga Solis clearly refers to Iranian Mithra, cf. Gail 1978, 335f.*

combined cult of the sun and the moon, but I cannot find any parallel evidence for such a cult.²¹⁰

7. The Customs of Taxila

In a fragment preserved by Strabo, Aristobulus describes several curious customs he had noticed at Taxila.²¹¹ The unmarried girls of poor families were shown in the market-place in order to find a husband for them. This has sometimes been thought to be a case of selling the girls and therefore identical with the custom condemned in Indian law books as *asuravivāha*.²¹² In Indian sources it is strongly censured and generally forbidden, yet it seems to have been customary somewhere as there was the need to grant a wife's status to women married this way.²¹³ In fact, the custom is not unknown in the Northwest. Among the matrilineal Katis of Nuristan a price is paid for a bride.²¹⁴ According to Marshall, "a somewhat similar custom [as in Taxila] still prevails in parts of the Himālayas, where girls without dowries offer themselves at the annual fairs to the highest bidders".²¹⁵

Unfortunately, Aristobulus did not say whether the brides are purchased, though this is quite possible. There are two further passages in literature about Alexander mentioning Northwestern marriage customs. In them it is expressly stated that the beauty and other

²¹⁰ It does not help us much that in Nuristani and Dardic mythology the sun and the moon are often mentioned together (see Jettmar 1975, Index s.v. *Sonne*) as there are no parallels with the account of Ctesias.

²¹¹ Aristobulus F 42 τῶν δ' ἐν Ταξίλοις νομίμων καινὰ καὶ ἀήθη λέγει· τό τε τοὺς μὴ δυναμένους ἐκδιδόναι τὰς παῖδας ὑπὸ πενίας προάγειν εἰς ἀγορὰν ἐν ἀκμῇ τῆς ὥρας, κόλῳ τε καὶ τυμπάνοις, οἷσπερ καὶ τὸ πολεμικὸν σημαίνουσιν, ὄχλου προσκληθέντος. τῷ δὲ προσελθόντι τὰ ὀπίσθια πρῶτον ἀνασύρεσθαι μέχρι τῶν ὤμων, εἶτα τὰ πρόσθεν· ἀρέσσασαν δὲ καὶ συμπεισθεῖσαν, ἐφ' οἷς ἂν δοκῇ σθνοικεῖν. καὶ τὸ γυνὴ ρίπτεσθαι τὸν τετελευτηκότα. τὸ δὲ πλείους ἔχειν γυναῖκας κοινὸν καὶ ἄλλων. παρά τισι δ' ἀκούειν φησὶ καὶ συγκατακατομένας τὰς γυναῖκας τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀσμένας, τὰς δὲ μὴ ὑπομενούσας ἀδοξεῖν. εἴρηται καὶ ἄλλοις ταῦτα.

²¹² Arora 1982b, 477. Pearson (1960, 176), too, thinks that the girls were sold. For a better approach see McCrindle 1901, 69 and Vofchuk 1988, 147f.

²¹³ See e.g. Manu 3, 31. The custom has not always been disapproved of, cf. Jolly 1896, 51, Meyer 1971, 100ff. and Kane 1941, 521f. Manu, for instance, forbids it (9, 98) but on another occasion (3, 23) allows it for a Sūdra. Cf. also *BaudhDh* 2, 1, 2, 27 *pitṛn vā eṣa vikrīṇīte yas tilān vikrīṇīte, prāṇān vā eṣa vikrīṇīte yas taṇḍulān vikrīṇīte, sukṛtāmsān va eṣa vikrīṇīte yah paṇamāno duhitaram dadāti.*

²¹⁴ Jettmar 1975, 44f.

²¹⁵ Marshall 1951, 19, note 3.

characteristics of the bride are the only qualifications for marriage, noble birth is not valued and no dowry (and probably no bride price either) is required.²¹⁶ In Aristobulus we may also notice that a dowry was apparently not unknown at all, as only poor girls without any dowry went to the market place. But the custom of purchasing brides in the market place comes from an older source and another geographical context. In his account of Babylonia, Herodotus described such a custom.²¹⁷

One cannot deny a certain similarity between the accounts of Aristobulus and Herodotus and it has been duly noted by scholars. Yet I find it rather absurd to construct on this sole point a Babylonian colony at Taxila²¹⁸ and even connecting this with better attested Western influences in India is rather far-fetched.²¹⁹ If the two accounts are really linked, it probably means that Aristobulus was using his predecessor and either distorted or interpreted his account of Taxila accordingly.

Other Taxilan customs mentioned by Aristobulus give an interesting picture of the actual situation in the Northwest.²²⁰ A mixture of Indian and Iranian customs is described. Leaving the dead to be devoured by vultures is of course a good Iranian custom²²¹ and as such is rather repulsive to Indians, though the exposure of the dead, who were consequently devoured by dogs, birds and other animals is not unknown among unorthodox circles in India.²²² In this connection we may also note that burials of bones without flesh are found in some of the tombs of Swat. It is quite possible that here, too, the corpse was left to decompose before the burial.²²³ In Taxila itself apparently no burials of any kind are found in levels connected with our study (Hathial and Bhir Mound).²²⁴ But otherwise Hathial seems to be rather close to the culture of late Swat graves.²²⁵

²¹⁶ Curtius 9, 1, 5 (*nuptiis coeunt non genere ac nobilitate coniunctis, sed electa corporum specie, quin eadem aestimatur in liberis*) and Diodorus 17, 91 (ἀκολούθως δὲ τούτοις καὶ τοὺς γάμους ποιοῦνται προικὸς μὲν καὶ τῆς ἄλλης πολυτελείας ἀφροντιστοῦντες, κάλλους δὲ καὶ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ὑπεροχῆς φροντίζοντες); both mentioned by McCrindle (1901, 69). These accounts refer to the country of Sopeithes, not to Taxila.

²¹⁷ Hdt 1, 196.

²¹⁸ Suggested by Rawlinson 1913, 221.

²¹⁹ Suggested by Saletore 1975, 405ff., who seems to believe that Aristobulus actually said that the girls were put on sale. For Mesopotamian elements in India see chapter II.4.

²²⁰ Consequently, I cannot see why Majumdar (1960a, XXIV) calls our passage "absurd". See also Il'in 1958, 11.

²²¹ It was common in Bactria and in Northeast Iran in general during the first millennium B.C., though we cannot be certain that birds were allowed to help the decomposition (Jettmar 1967, 62ff.).

²²² See e.g. Basham 1954, 177. On different views about decomposing flesh see also Tucci 1977, 25f.

²²³ Tucci 1977, 23ff. Similar burials were used further in the north (Gilgit) until recent times, but at least there the corpse was not left to be devoured but placed for decomposition in a closed burial chamber (Jettmar 1967, 67ff.). Aristobulus' account is connected with Swat graves and the older Gandhāran Grave Culture, and these together with some similar finds in Soviet Middle Asia are seen as a proto-form of later Zoroastrian burial by Vasil'kov (1982, 59).

²²⁴ On Bhir Mound see Marshall 1951, *passim* and Il'in 1958, 11, on Hathial I know only the short account in Allchin & Allchin 1982, 314f., Dar 1984 and Dani 1986 (in both see Index s.v. Hathial).

²²⁵ Allchin & Allchin 1982, 314.

Kane quotes from Aniruddha a late account of Northwestern funerary customs: "The Hāralatā quotes a passage from the Ādipurāṇa to the effect that Magas are buried underground and that Daradas and Luptrakas (?) go away after placing their dead relatives on trees."²²⁶

Our passage is important as it is one of the few literary accounts which testify to an Iranian presence in Northwest India. In Indian sources there is hardly anything about it before the Maga Brahmans (see VIII.6.). I have already noted (in II.9.) that there are curiously few testimonies about the Achaemenian dominion. But then most of our Indian sources are later than that, and for a great majority of them our Northwestern country is a more or less distant periphery. In early literature the most famous case is that of the Kambojas, the famous Northwestern horsemen of ancient India. They seem to speak an Iranian language, but one word is hardly sufficient for any conclusions. There is also a Jātaka verse ascribing to them customs which are more or less identical with those attested in Zoroastrianism, but both can still be explained as mere Iranian influences.²²⁷

The third custom, the suicides of Indian widows (and philosophers), was often noted by Greek authors and was a popular theme in classical literature.²²⁸ From the Indian perspective we have here, of course, a case of the well-known custom of a widow becoming a satī by entering the funeral pyre of her deceased husband. The historians of Alexander prove that the custom had a remarkable antiquity²²⁹ and at least in this respect the orthodox customs seem to have been held in honour in the Northwest, too. Though the Northwest has never really been an orthodox country the custom occurred until quite recent times. Only now has a thorough Islamization rooted it up.²³⁰

8. The Bad Habits of the Northerners

In addition to the *Mahābhārata* passage discussed above there is another account of the bad customs prevailing in the Northern (Northwestern) country.²³¹ As it has no bearing

²²⁶ Kane 1973, 234. The text is quoted in a footnote: *magā bhūmau nikhanyante daradāms ca mṛtān sadā/ āsadya (jya?) vṛkṣe gacchanti luptrakās ca svabāndhavam//*.

²²⁷ Essential points were stated by Kuhn (1904), who also concluded that the Kambojas are Iranians (followed by many scholars, e.g. Charpentier 1923 and Scialpi 1984, 66). On their language see *Nirukta* 2, 2 *athāpi prakṛtaya evaikeṣu bhāṣante vikṛtaya ekeṣu/ savatir gatikarmā kambojeṣu eva bhāṣante (kambojāḥ kambalabhojāḥ kamanīyabhojā vā kambalaḥ kamanīyo bhavati)/ vikāram asya āryeṣu bhāṣante śava iti*.

²²⁸ Vofchuk 1988, 143ff. quotes six accounts in addition to Aristobulus.

²²⁹ In Indian sources the first certain references to it are found in the Dharmaśāstra (e.g. *ViDh* and *YDh*), see Vofchuk 1988, 146 and especially the general discussion in Kane 1941, 624ff.

²³⁰ Tucci 1977, 31f. mentions a possible case from a grave in Swat and remarks that some 19th and even some 20th century travellers have still encountered the custom although it is now extirpated (note 35).

²³¹ As always in Indian sources the north (*uttara*) means in actuality the northwest and becomes the

on the question of Northwestern religious peculiarities, I have left it until now to give it a separate chapter. The account is found in the Deśanirṇaya section of the *Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra*, where both southern and northern customs are mentioned and condemned as inappropriate. The passage in question in Bühler's translation runs: "Now (the customs peculiar) to the north are, to deal in wool, to drink rum, to sell animals that have teeth in the upper and in lower jaws, to follow the trade of arms, to go to sea."²³² According to some authorities every country has its own rules and one should always follow the habits of the country where one lives,²³³ but according to the sūtrakara "one should not take heed of either (set of practices) because they are opposed to the tradition of the Śiṣṭas."²³⁴ The following²³⁵ discussion shows clearly that the southern and northern habits meant are those which are prevalent beyond the borders of Āryāvarta. Therefore, the areas where the northern habits may be found are Kashmir, the Pañjab and the Indus country.

We thus have five (bad) habits peculiar to the Northwestern country. The first is dealing in wool (*ūrṇāvīkṛaya*). This is somewhat more difficult to explain than the other four. Of course, long before the coming of the Aryans, sheep and wool had an important place in the Northwestern economy.²³⁶ In the *Rigveda* the sheep of Gandhāra²³⁷ and the wool of the Paruṣṇī,²³⁸ identified with the modern Ravi,²³⁹ are specially mentioned. The woollen blankets of the Kambojas are mentioned in the *Nirukta* passage quoted above (VIII.7.). According to the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṅghikas, Vaiśālī, Puṣkalāvati, Takṣa-silā and Nandivardhana are the four kingdoms which yield the best wool.²⁴⁰ The Greek authors knew about the sheep of the Northwest²⁴¹ and there is plenty of archaeological evidence about sheep-breeding. It always seems to have been as important a part of the rural economy of Pakistan and Afghanistan as it is now.

The Sanskrit sources do not represent wool as a particularly despised substance, but in India proper sheep are rare, because the climate is too hot. What is unfamiliar is often looked on with suspicion. Later, in caste hierarchy, the shepherd has a place much below the cowherd and the peasant. A natural explanation for the reference to the wool trade in our passage would be that it was the Brahmans who dealt in wool, but generally wool is not mentioned among the trades forbidden to the Brahmans in the Dharmasūtras. Instead, several kinds of other cloth are mentioned in these lists, such as hempen and linen cloth,

north only (if even then) when observed from the westernmost part of the Āryāvarta.

²³² *BaudhDh* 1, 1, 2, 4 athottarata ūrṇāvīkṛayaḥ sidhupānam ubhayatodadbhir vyavahāra āyudhīyakam samudrasamīyanam iti.

²³³ *Ibid.* 5-6.

²³⁴ *Ibid.* 8 ubhayam caiva nādrīyeta śiṣṭasmṛtīvirodhadarśanāt.

²³⁵ *Ibid.* 9ff.

²³⁶ Allchin & Allchin 1982, 97, 103 and 190.

²³⁷ *RV* 1, 126, 7 sārṇvāhām asmi romasā gandhārīnām ivāvīkā.

²³⁸ *RV* 4, 22, 2 śrīyē páruṣṇīm uśāmāṇa ūrṇam; 5, 52, 9 utá sma té páruṣṇyām ūrṇā vasata sundhyávaḥ. See also Macdonell & Keith s.v. ūrṇā.

²³⁹ Macdonell & Keith s.v. parūṣṇī.

²⁴⁰ Lévi 1915, 78. According to Lévi, Nandivardhana is situated between Peshawar and Lamghan. For further sources about Northwestern wool see Przyluski 1926, 20ff.

²⁴¹ E.g. Ctesias F 45, 22, 27, 35, 40, 44 and 46.

silk and dyed cloth, but not woollen cloth.²⁴² Fortunately, there is one account of trades not allowed to a Brahman which includes both trade in wool and trade in horses.²⁴³

The rest of the bad habits are more easy to explain. The fact that any alcoholic drink was severely condemned, especially by orthodox Brahmans, is well-known and it has already been mentioned (chapter VIII.4.) that in South Asia wine was prepared and drunk especially in the Northwest, the only region where grapes grew. How much more shocked must an ordinary Brahman have been if this really meant that even Brahmans drank there. And yet it seems that this is exactly what is meant. The *Mahābhārata* passage discussed earlier mentions drinking as a part of the established religion led by the Brahmans, and even the late *Nīlamata-Purāṇa* prescribes its use in a ritual context.²⁴⁴ We have seen that the Northwestern drinking habits are well attested in Greek sources too.

“Animals with teeth in both jaws” (*ubhayatodant-*) is the Vedic name for hoofed animals (in addition to *ekasapha*) such as the horse and the ass as distinct from cattle, sheep and goats which are *anyatodant-*.²⁴⁵ Northwestern horses have been famous through the history of India.²⁴⁶ Their various breeds were much appreciated everywhere²⁴⁷ and without doubt the Northwestern horse dealer was familiar in many places. Our passage shows that even a Brahman could take this lucrative trade, that is if he had become addicted to the unorthodox Northwestern habits. But by doing this he sinned in the eyes of the more orthodox. Even a Brahman could resort to trade if necessary, but there was a set of articles he was strictly forbidden to sell. Among them “domestic animals with uncloven hoofs” are clearly mentioned.²⁴⁸

We can perhaps also notice that according to the classical historians the more eastern Indian kings had more elephants, the more western more horses (especially cavalry) in their armies.²⁴⁹

In the Northwest, it seems, it was also lawful for a Brahman to become a soldier.

²⁴² *GautDh* 7, 9–10 *°śāṅakṣaumājināni/ raktanikte vāsasi; VāsDh* 2, 24–25 (29) *sāna-kauseyakṣaumājināni ca tāntavam raktam sarvam ca.*

²⁴³ *GautDh* 7, 15 *bhūmivrihiyavājāvyasvarṣabhadhenvanaḍuhas caike* (*eke* — as some say) are defined in 7, 8 as *tasyāpaṇyam*. The “vicious ram” quoted above from *SB* 12, 4, 1, 4, can hardly help us here.

²⁴⁴ See VIII.4.

²⁴⁵ Macdonell & Keith s.v. *ubhayādant*.

²⁴⁶ See e.g. Saletore 1975, 178ff. (with references). An early example is the Saindhava horses of *SB* 11, 5, 5, 12.

²⁴⁷ A classification is found in *KA* 2, 30, 29 *prayogyānām* (scil. *asvānām*) *uttamāḥ kāmboja-saindhavāraṭṭajavānāyujāḥ, madhyamā bāhlikapāpeyakasauvīrakataitalāḥ, seṣāḥ pratyavarāḥ.*

²⁴⁸ *VāsDh* 2, 28 (32) *grāmyapaśūnām ekasaphāḥ*. The same is indicated in the śloka *BaudhDh* 2, 1, 2, 29 where only “animals with teeth in one jaw only” are allowed to be sold by Brahmans (*paśavaś caikatodantā asmā ca lavaṇoddhṛtaḥ/ etad brāhmaṇa te paṇyam tantuś cārajani-kṛtaḥ*). Later the same restriction is found e.g. in *Manu* 10, 89.

²⁴⁹ Pliny, *N. H.* 6, 22, 66ff. Noticed by Smith (1957, 193). The same is seen also in Indian sources like *Mbh*, see Vasil'kov 1982, 56.

From the Indian point of view this is rather unusual, though not unheard of.²⁵⁰ Baudhāyana mentions the possibility that a Brahman follows the Kṣatriya dharma, but adds that this is forbidden altogether by Gautama and that other authorities allow arms to Brahmans (and Vaiśyas) only in order to protect cows or Brahmans, or to prevent a confusion of the castes.²⁵¹ Vasiṣṭha allows arms to Brahmans and Vaiśyas in self-defence and in order to prevent a confusion of the castes.²⁵² The rules already show that there were Brahmans who bore arms as it was necessary to control their use, and the rules always reflected the ideals of the orthodoxy. Āpastamba plainly states that "the son of a Brahman, who follows the profession of a Kṣatriya" defiles a śrāddha.²⁵³ In any case, it was impossible that the large armies of Mauryas and other early monarchs consisted solely of Kṣatriyas.²⁵⁴

In the Northwest we have some additional evidence for professional Brahman warriors. Alexander met them and had to fight hard to subdue them.²⁵⁵ Although we can perhaps say that Alexander's campaign actually threatened to confuse the castes (though we do not know how rigid the system was in the Indus country), these Northwestern Brahmans are called a tribe²⁵⁶ and they were apparently well used to fighting even before. Probably they are related to those mentioned in our passage and – as the evidence does not tell us much about them – we can only regret with Smith that we do not have their Dharmasūtra.²⁵⁷ Moreover, they are not wholly unknown in Indian literature. Pāṇini mentioned Brāhmaṇaka, defined by Patañjali as a janapada and explained in the *Kāśikā* as the country of the warrior Brahmans.²⁵⁸

The last of the Northwestern bad habits brings us necessarily to the lower Indus, perhaps the delta and its harbours. In another passage the same text mentions *samudrasamīyāna* as the first (worst?) of crimes that are punished by loss of caste.²⁵⁹ Govinda's commentary confirms that "going to sea" means "voyaging by means of ships to another continent (*dvīpa*)".²⁶⁰ As the whole passage we are discussing refers to the Northwest,

²⁵⁰ There are several Brahman warriors like Paraśurāma and Droṇa in the *Mahābhārata*. The Bhārgavas, also otherwise known for their unorthodox habits (see VII.12.), are often described as warriors (see Goldman 1977, 99ff.).

²⁵¹ *BaudhDh* 2, 2, 4, 16–18 *adhyāpanayājanapratigrahair asaktaḥ kṣatradharmaṇa jivet pratyantarātāt// neti gautamaḥ/ atyugro hi kṣatradharmo brāhmaṇasya// athāpy udāharanti/ gavārthe brāhmaṇārthe vā varṇānām vāpi samskāre/ gṛhṇīyātām vipraivisau sastram dharmavyapekṣayā//*

²⁵² *VasDh* 3, 24 (26) *ātmatrāṇe varṇasamskāre vā brāhmaṇavaiśyau sastram ādāyātām*.

²⁵³ *ĀpDh* 2, 7, 17, 21 *āyudhiyaputraḥ ... ityete śrāddhe bhūjānāḥ panktiduṣaṇā bhavanti*.

²⁵⁴ A remark by Smith (1957, 192).

²⁵⁵ See Eggermont 1975, 6ff. and 107ff. and Narain 1965.

²⁵⁶ It is curious that all the four varṇas seem to be represented as tribes in the Northwest.

²⁵⁷ Smith 1957, 192.

²⁵⁸ P 5, 2, 71 *brāhmaṇakoṣṇike samjñāyām, Kāś* on same *brāhmaṇako desaḥ ... yatrāyudhajivino brāhmaṇāḥ santi*. See also Agrawala 1963, 51f. Without giving a full reference Agrawala mentions that Rājasekhara names *Brāhmaṇavaha* as a western janapada.

²⁵⁹ *BaudhDh* 2, 1, 2, 2. (*atha patanīyāni//1// samudrasamīyānam//2//*).

²⁶⁰ Bühler's note in his *BaudhDh* translation.

the only possible starting point for a sea voyage seems to be in the Indus Delta. The voyages starting there could have been directed to Mesopotamia, South Arabia and/or South India.

Despite orthodox opposition, seafaring seems to have been quite common in our period. Our text suggests it for the Indus Delta and slightly older Western evidence (Old Persian inscriptions and Herodotus) confirms this. *Bāverujātaka* probably points to the western Indian ports, whose flourishing sea trade is alluded to in several other Jātakas, too.²⁶¹ Probably there were already ports and seafarers in South India as well. There is no direct evidence from the South in this period, but soon the Tamils were sailing long distances. I cannot find any good reason for the opinion of Bühler and Smith that only the Northerners were sailors, and that they gained dominance even in southern trade as the southerners were prejudiced against seafaring.²⁶² Baudhāyana's southernness is very relative, he belongs only to the south of Āryāvarta, the Dravidian South was for him as suspicious and unorthodox as the North(west). And when he speaks of seafaring in the North, he means north of Āryāvarta, which excludes the harbours of the Western coast.

It was only the orthodox Brahmans of Āryāvarta, living far from the sea and always worried about their ritual purity, who were strictly against seafaring; but in the end it was their opinion which prevailed.²⁶³ This took a long time, however, and before it happened sea trade gained its widest extension in the early centuries A.D. At the same time the Aryan culture became everywhere more and more assimilated into South Asia. A passage in Manu perhaps has some significance in this respect. There the *samudrayāyin* is banned from a śrāddha,²⁶⁴ but though exclusion from a śrāddha certainly indicates impurity, it is still much less than a total loss of caste, and is roughly comparable to the sin of travelling in the Northwest. In any case, traders (even Brahmans) always seem to have been much less afraid of pollution than priests.²⁶⁵ Manu belongs to the period extending from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D., and at that time seafaring was less strange even to the Aryan community. Even the seafaring Tamils were already more or less absorbed into Aryan culture and the Western trade was in full blossom. Little by little trade passed into foreign hands, but it is difficult to say if the growing orthodox disapproval was the reason for this or the result.

To come back to our text, it seems that in the Northwest even the Brahmans sailed merchantmen. In the light of their other unorthodox habits this is not surprising. In spite of Dandamis' refusal to come before Alexander, Calanus may thus have followed good Northwestern custom when he accompanied Alexander to Iran.²⁶⁶ If Megasthenes heard

²⁶¹ E.g. in *Sussondijātaka* (J. 360), *Catuvārajātaka* (J. 439) and *Suppārakajātaka* (J. 463).

²⁶² Bühler 1895, 81 and Smith 1957, 202. But even the earliest Tamil sources (perhaps in the first centuries A.D.) testify to substantial naval activity (Parpola 1984a, 460).

²⁶³ The first traces of this can be seen in Buddhist sources where sea trade is deprecated as a vain and dangerous business. This is somewhat curious when we think how much Buddhism was the religion of merchants. There were many Buddhist monks who were great travellers, like those whom Aśoka sent to the Hellenistic kingdoms and to Ceylon.

²⁶⁴ Manu 3, 158.

²⁶⁵ Thapar 1971, 425.

²⁶⁶ Onesicritus F 17, Arrianus, *Anab.* 7, 2, 2-4.

him criticized in India,²⁶⁷ this may well have been by his more orthodox (though not in the Northwestern sense) colleagues. Later we meet several travelling Brahmans in the West, though their place of origin is not mentioned.²⁶⁸

We have seen that Baudhāyana's passage about bad North(west)ern habits presents an exceptionally good case in which Northwestern information can be interpreted by comparing Classical and Indian sources.

²⁶⁷ Megasthenes F 34.

²⁶⁸ See Karttunen 1986b, 194.