CHAPTER II

GENESIS OF THE REPUBLICS

INTRODUCTION

The early sacred texts of the Buddhists and the Jains give us definite evidence of the existence of a large number of republics flourishing in North-Eastern India in the 6th century B.C. These republics covered the area between Gorakhpur and Darbhanga and the Himalaya and the Ganga, or the land to the east of the kingdom of Kosala and Kauśāmbī and to the west of Sāga, from the district of Gorakhpur and Ballia to the district of Bhagalpur, to the north of Magadha and the south of Himalayas. The republics were those of the Sakyas, the Bhaggas, the Bulis, the Kālāmas, the Koliyas, the Vālas,


"... the earliest Buddhist Records reveal the survival, side by side with more or less powerful monarchies, of republics with either complete or modified independence."  

2. Homage to Vaiśālī (Compiled), p.69.

3. HP., p.42.
the Moriyas, the Videhas and the Lichchhavis. How did these republics come into being? This poses a difficult and at the same time very interesting problem before the students of the early Indian Socio-political organism.

It is proposed to discuss this problem in the following text and find a convincing solution to it.

IN VEDIC ARISTOCRACIES:

Mr. J.P. Sharma in his recently published research work suggests the genesis of the North-Eastern republics in the Vedic aristocracies. He says that the aristocracies of the Samhitās period ceased to exist in the Brāhmaṇa period, and the monarchies of the Vedic time also changed to become autocratic having the power of life and death on the subjects and claiming to be divine. The republican tribes which resented such oppression migrated eastward and to preserve their identity, they might have joined other marchers to the east led by Videha. In other words, it is most likely that the republican peoples of the Buddhist period had their origin in the Vedic aristocracies of the North-West and their republican constitutions were adaptations or developments of the non-monarchical Vedic political communities. Mr. Sharma's theory is purely conjectural as he fails to advance sufficient evidence for it. However, while we may accept his view that the

4. Vide the list of the recorded Buddhist Republics given by Prof. Rhys Davids in Buddhist India, pp.11-12:
Cf. Jayaswal : EP., pp.42-43, and R.C. Majumder:
Corporate ... p.224 and f.n.2.
5. Republics in Ancient India, p.52.
north-eastern republics were not a "bolt from the blue, but rather was the result of a gradual progress with a long history behind it going back at least to the days when the earliest hymns of the Rigveda were chanted (op.cit., p.68), it will be as fantastic to describe these republicans as "off-shoots of the early Vedic aristocrats" (op.cit., p.236) as to describe the present Indians having Western style republic as "off-shoots" of the republics of ancient Greece or Rome, or of the English or the American or the French peoples who were pioneers in modern democracy. Instead of resorting to such far-fetched conjectures and romantic sentimentalism one should try to find the genesis of these republics in the antecedent and existing historical circumstances of the time.

**ECONOMIC ORIGIN:**

The origin of the ancient Indian republics has been discussed in a general way by D.R. Bhandarkar. On the basis of a passage of Brahadaranyaka Upanisad along with the commentary of Sayana, referred to him by K. Majumdar, he opines that since "the crucial passage speaks of Gana only in the case of the Vaiśyas and not of the Brāhmaṇas or the Kṣatriyas or the Śūdras, it appears that we had Commercial Ganas (Śrenis) first among the Vaiśyas before there were political Ganas among the Kṣatriyas." He argues further that just as the political Ganas were divided into kulas or families, so also the commercial

6. Brahadaranyaka Upanisad, 1.4.11-3.

Qanas were divided into Aulas (Gana), as is known from the seals discovered at Bhita and Basarh. We may concede that sometimes economic organisation has inspired the growth of a corresponding political organisation. A very typical example of this fact may be noticed in the history of Germany wherein the Zolleverein (custom union) inspired political unity of the country in the 19th century. But the hypothesis of Bhadarkar regarding the origin of the Gana (Republic) is quite untenable. For, as we have seen earlier in this work, Gana was well known in its political and social aspects as early as the Vedic period, when there was not even the faintest idea of its commercial character. Moreover, in the beginning only the functions of agriculture (krishi) and rearing of cattle (pasupalan) were assigned to the Vaiśyas; commerce (vānijya) was a later development. Thus the general theory that the political Gana was derived from the commercial Gana is quite inapplicable in the case of both the Vedic and also post-Vedic republics.

8. ibid., p.170.
10. Supra, Ch.I.
TRIBAL ORIGIN:

Most of the writers have tried to find the origin of the ancient Indian republics in the constitution of a clan or a tribe. Here the observation made by Dr. Altekar on this issue merits serious consideration. He observes as follows:

"Most of the republics had a clan origin and the members of the privileged aristocracy believed themselves to be the members of one stock or descended from the eponymous hero. Membership of the Central Assembly seems to have been confined to them. In the City councils or village assemblies, however, all the leading classes and interests had their proper representations and voice. There is no sufficient evidence to suggest that there was any serious clash of interests between the members of the privileged orders and the rest. Here we should not forget that the inter-marriages were fairly common down to the 5th century A.D. and so the Ksatriyas could not have formed a watertight privileged order. Members of the Vaiśya and the Śudra classes, who entered into army and rose to high position in it, could hardly have been denied the privileges of the Ksatriya status. A sūtra of Pāṇini (V.3.114) suggests that the status of the Brāhmaṇas was the same as that of the Ksatriyas.
The consciousness of a clan origin seems to have played a great part in the formation of republics. Where it did not exist, such a state did not usually come into existence."

This observation of the learned scholar may be true of the Vedic Genas, but certainly not of the territorial and class-ridden and politically conscious Sanandas of the time of the Buddha. The Indian political system in the age of the Buddha had outgrown the stage of clanish or tribal constitution. As Jayaswal has very ably argued that the stage, when state is felt to be based on contract and the ruler is regarded to be a servant of the ruled and when political loyalty is open even to strangers, is a high water-mark of constitutional development. Voting and ballot-voting, motion and legislation, legalism and formalism in procedure of deliberation, are other indicia of that stage. Constitutions gave distinctive marks to individual political community and converted it, so to say, into artificial tribes. We may note here that all these

12. Altekar : SCAI., p.136; Cf. Rhys Davids, who referring to the Sixteen Great Countries, observes: "It is interesting to notice that the names are names, not of the countries, but of peoples, as we might say Italians or Turks. This shows the main idea in the mind of those who drew up or used this old list was still tribal and not geographical." (EI., p.12).

elements of a political system were fully present in the constitution of the political Samgha of the time of the Buddha. We may here take note of the contention of Prof. Rhys Davids. Referring to the names of the Solasa Mahājanapadas (the Sixteen Great Countries), he says that the names are names, not of countries, but of peoples, and this shows that the main idea in the minds of those who drew up or used this list was still tribal and not geographical. Jayaswal has ably demolished this contention. He has successfully proved the existence in ancient India of the system of naming a corporate association after its founder or president, under which village corporation was named after the Grāmanī, Vedic charanas were named after their founders, religious bodies took the names, of their first organisers and so did many of our republics. In this context, the names of these North-Eastern republics should be taken to indicate political nationality, and certainly not tribal nationality as suggested by the learned Buddhist scholar, Prof. Rhys Davids. And thus the theory of the tribal origin of the republics in question is untenable.

Reaction Against Later Vedic Life:

Dr. R. S. Sharma opines that the real causes of the origin of the territorial, class divided Gana of the post-Vedic period have to be sought in the Universal

15. BL., p. 12.
reaction against the pattern of life as evolved in the later Vedic period. While on the social plane the new movement sought to do away with the growing class and sex distinction, as well as expensive and superstitious religious practices involving the destruction of cattle wealth on a large scale, on the political plane it wanted to do away with the hereditary kingship based on Brahmanical ideology and denial of all rights to the masses of the people. For lack of a new programme, the leader of the new movement modelled their ideals on the basis of the past where there were no Varna distinction, no domination of the Brāhmaṇas and Ksatriyas over the masses and no coercive authority of the king depriving the overwhelming majority of the people of their rights. We may note here that the universal reaction referred to by Dr. Sharma was initiated and spearheaded by the Buddha and Mahāvīra and other unorthodox religious leaders in the 6th century B.C. This new movement was primarily socio-religious, and it was decidedly not political at all. The Buddha and Mahāvīra and others were socio-religious teachers and not political leaders. There was nothing like a political revolution which was directed against the hereditary and despotic kingship of the later Vedic period as the learned scholar would like us to believe. Further, his contention that the egalitarian tribal association of an age before Brāhmaṇa ideology consolidated society on the basis of Varna distinctions, hereditary kingship and costly sacrifice was the inspiration of the Post-Vedic Gana, is equally

17. Annasta....pp.92-93; Cf. Mrs.Stevenson : The Heart
lacking in the evidence. The new movement referred to by Dr. Sharma did not have the leadership of an Indian counterpart of Rousseau whose call 'Back to the Nature' provided the main inspiration for the French Revolutionary Movement of the Eighteenth Century and the new political order which followed on the destruction of the ancient Regime. On the other hand, we find the Buddha, Mahāvīra, and other religious leaders vying with one another in gaining the friendship and patronage of the reigning monarchs of Kosala and Magadha, which clearly shows that they were not against the monarchical order as asserted by Dr. Sharma. Thus Dr. Sharma's thesis on the origin of the post-Vedic republics suffers from overstatement and is far-fetched. Finally, we should note here that the Buddha and Mahāvīra were born in the republics of the Śākyas and the Lichākhavis respectively, and the other neighbouring republics along with these two were in a full flourishing condition before the advent of these two great personalities as the leaders of the new movement.

18. Cf. D.D. Kosambi who observes, "In the political field, the new religion was the exact parallel, for the same economic reasons, of the move towards Universal Monarchy, the absolute despotism of one as against the endlessly varied tyranny of the many."

(An Introduction to ..., p. 160.)
Cyclic Political Evolution:

The political Sanghas or republics of the North-Eastern India had sprung out from the ruins of the ancient monarchies which existed since long before them. Political evolution in India resembles closely the political evolution in the ancient cities of Greece where also the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by aristocratic republics. The statement of Megasthenes that the republican form of government was thrice established and thrice changed into monarchy suggests this very fact. In the later Epic period of the ancient Indian history, there was a decentralisation of political power in the Northern India. This led to the break-up of the ancient kingdoms of Kosala, Videha or Mithilā and Visāla. and on the ruins of these centralised monarchies a number of small republics grew up which we know from the Pāli texts. The working out of this political tendency causing the rise of the Buddhist Republics is well illustrated by the following review of the history of the decline and dis-integration of these once so powerful monarchies.

Kosala is first mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmana which relates the story of the spread of the Aryan Culture. The early Vedic Literature does not refer

21. SB., I.4.3.1.
to it. Ayodhya was the earlier name of Kosala. Manu's eldest son Ikshvaku inaugurated the Solar Dynasty in the Madhyadesa with Ayodhya as the capital city. The kingdom of Ayodhya rose to a great power in the time of king Māṇḍhātṛ, who was called Samrāt or emperor. The imperialism of the Haihayas destroyed Ayodhya which was again revived under Sagara whose great grand-son Bhagiratha made it a great power. Ayodhya had another spell of power under a succession of kings like Bhagiratha, Dilīpa, Rāghu, Aja and Daśaratha by whose time it was known as Kosala. Rāghu virtually established Kosala as an imperial power by his extensive conquests. He set out on Dīgovijaya in whose course he conquered Suhamdeśa (Eastern Bihar and Western Bengal) and Vaṅga (rest of Bengal) in the East, Utkala (Orissa), Kalinga, Pāṇḍya, Kerala, Mural and Aparānte (Kathiyavad and Gujarāt) in the South, Persia or the Parās in the West, the Rūṇas and Kāmbojas in the North-East and Himalaya region and Kāmarūpa. Afterwards he performed the sacrifice of world conquest (viśvajīta) and adopted the title of Samrāt or Emperor. His world

22. AIHT., p.84. Cf. R.C.Majumdar: Ancient India, p.68. See also History of Kosala, p.116 f.n. 2, wherein all the Prānic evidences are cited.

oonquest is immortalised in the celebrated Sanskrit work
Raghuvamsa. The greatness of Kosala continued in the
time of his successors Aja, Dasaratha and Rama. Rama's
important conquest was that of Lankë, and, after return
from his exile, he performed the Aevamedha Yajña, as a
result of which all the kings of India accepted his
overlordship or imperial authority. After this he
divided his empire among his nephews and sons. Gandhïræ
was given to the sons of Bharata, and Takṣa and Puskala
(Puskara) founded Taxila and Puskalavati (Puskaravati)
respectively and made them the seats of their rule. The
famous kingdom of Mathurâ conquered by Śatrughna was
given to his sons Subâhu and Sūrasena who ruled in
this region which, after the latter's name, became known
as the kingdom of Sūrasena. And the Kārupatha territory
was given to Lakshamanâ's sons Aṅgad and Chandraketu.
Kārupatha has been identified with the area presently
covered by the eastern part of Basti and the western part
of the Gorakhpur District. In this region two capital
cities were founded which were called Aṅgadiyâ and
Chandrakântâ (Chandrachakrâ) after the names of Aṅgada
and Chandraketu who were coronated in these capital cities
respectively. The traditional account of the Śākyas
speaks of their being Sūryavamsi and as settled in the
western Kārupatha, and this indicates that most probably
they were descendants of Aṅgada.

25. Lankå has been variously identified.
According to the Rāmāyana, Malladesa was situated in the eastern part of Kārupatha. This nomenclature was probably given after the title 'Malla' borne by Chandraketu, which literally means skill in shooting in the eye of a fish, a super marksman. According to Dr. Pandey, Kārupatha, since beginning, was an integral part of Madhyadesa and a part of the kingdom of Ayodhyā, and that Chandraketu was the founder of the Madhyadesa and also of the descendants of the Malla Kṣatriyas. Lava and Kuśa were given Śrāvasti and Kuśāvatī respectively. Kuśāvatī has been generally identified with Kusinārā or the present Kasivā in Gorakhpur District. Kuśa succeeded Rāma to the kingdom of Kosala but continued to rule from Kuśāvatī, and after his return to Ayodhyā, the eastern part of Kosala kingdom came to be ruled by Laksūmanā's son Chandraketu who shifted the capital from Chandrakānta to Kuśāvatī or Kusinārā, whence it remained the capital of Malladesa till the Buddhist time.

Kosala, after Rāma, recedes into the background, and the subsequent period was dominated by the Yādavas and the Pauravas. In the Mahābhārata war Kosala was on the side of the Kauravas. After the Great War, which is approximately dated 1000 year B.C. by R.C. Majumdar, twenty-four kings of the Ikṣvāku line ruled, but our detailed knowledge begins only from the time of king Prasenajit. This clearly suggests that the big Kosala

27. ibid., p.76; Cf. Pre-Buddhist India, p.55 and PHAL..p.127.
28. ibid., p.76.
29. Ancient India, p.7E.
Empire of the early Epic age had disintegrated and therefrom a number of small states had sprung up, of which Malla kingdom was the most important as it finds mention in the Buddhist and the Jaina lists of the important states existing just before the rise of the Buddhism and Jainism. And some of these small states which thus emerged adopted a Republican Constitution like the Mallas and the Śākyas etc.

Vaiśāla was the name of a kingdom as well as its ruling dynasty. The history of Vaiśāla goes back to a hoary antiquity. We have no mention of it in the Vedic Literature.

According to the Rāmāyana, the Videha and Vaiśāla monarchies existed side by side. The kingdom of Vaiśāla was probably a later establishment. The Mahābhārata also refers to this kingdom. The Puranic tradition records that one of the sons of Manu named Nābhānīdishta founded a line of kings that reigned in the country which afterward

30. The list is given in the Anguttara Nikāya, (R.T.S.), I, p.213; IV, 252, 256, 260; Mahāvastu., I. 34; Vinaya Texts; SBE., XVII, p.146 n.; Bhagawati Sūtra, Sāva, XV; Uddessa I.; Cf. PHAI., pp.95 f.

31. AIHT., p.97.

32. The Rāmāyana, I. 47-48 (Vālmīki : Tr. by Griffith).


34. AIHT., p.97.
was known as kingdom of Vaisālī. After the rule of a number of generations of this line of kings, a new ruling dynasty was founded by Karnadhana who inaugurated the age of Vaisalian Imperialism, which reached its climax in the time of king Merutta the Great. The Pauranic-Epic account describes him as a Chakravartin, meaning a sovereign who conquered the surrounding kingdoms or brought them under his authority and established a paramountcy over more or less extensive regions around his own kingdom. Rājyavardhana was the last king of this line. The successors of Rājyavardhana are shadowy figures except for Trinabindu, Viśāla and Sumati. The reign of Trinabindu saw a further increase in the imperialistic power and the wide sphere of influence of Vaisāla, and as a result the need of a second enlargement of the existing capital was felt which was accomplished by king Viśāla, his son and successor. According to the Epic-Pauranic account, king Viśāla founded the City of Viśālā or Vaisālī as his capital and thenceforward the kingdom was that of Vaisālī and the kings were

36. Mbh. (Poona Critical Ed.). XIV.4.23; Vishnu-Purāṇa, IV.1.34; Ed., III.61.7; Bhag., IX.2.25; Va., 85.9, 12; and Mark., 129.3.
37. Mark., 129.6; 131.49. Here the term 'Chakravartin' is explained with reference to Marutta.
38. Bhag., IX.2.33.
The great power and influence wielded by this king is indicated by his memory being cherished long after him, and even today his name is kept alive by 'Rājā Viśāla Kā Garh', a big mound at Basār in Muzaffarpur District. The king Viśāla appears to be the last great king of Vaiśāli, and after him the kingdom gradually declined and finally came to an end with Sumati who is indicated by the Purāṇas to be the last Vaiśālakṣa king. After him, we do not have any mention of Vaiśāli for several centuries. A pretty long period of about six centuries intervene between the end of king Sumati's reign and the foundation of the Vajjian Republic (725 B.C.). And this period constitutes the Dark Age of the Vaiśāli history. A number of suggestions have been offered by eminent scholars about the fate of Vaiśāli in this period.

The fact that, while there is no mention of Vaiśāli after Sumati for a long period, the Puranic-Epic account makes frequent references to Videha or the kingdom of Mithilā, may provide the basis for the most probable conclusion that Vaiśāli was merged with the Mithilā Kingdom. And the fall of the Mithilā monarchy and establishment of republics

39. AIHT., p.97; Cf. Yogendra Mishra : op. cit., p.64. The author has argued that king Viśāla did not found a new capital City of Vaiśāli, but enlarged the already existing one and gave his name to it, as Hastin had done with regard to Hastināpur a few years before.

40. See for details Cunningham : Ancient Geography of India, pp.373 ff.

41. For the summary of the suggestions collected and
there caused the growth of an independent republic of the Lichhavvis in Vaiśālī which later became a part of the Vaijjan confederacy.

The kingdom of Videha over which the Great Janaka ruled seems to be mentioned for the first time in the Yajur-Veda-Samhitās. According to the Pargiter "Videha comprised the country from Gorakhpur on the Rāpti to Darbhanga, with Kosala on the west and Anga on the east. On the north it approached the hills, and on the south it was bounded by the small kingdom of Vaiśālī. But recent researches have led to the seizing up of the ancient Videha kingdom as corresponding roughly to the modern Tirhut in North Bihar. According to the Jātaka, it extended over three hundred leagues and comprised 16000 villages, and was situated in Majjhima-desa or Middle country. Mithilā,

critically appraised, refer to the Early History of Vaiśālī, Bk.II, Ch.IX, pp.87-94.

44. Taittiriya Samhitā, II.1.4.5; Cf. Vedic Index, II, p.296.
45. JASB., 1897, p.89.
46. Raychaudhuri : PHAI., p.52.
47. Suruchi and Gandhāra Jātakas; Cf. Pre-Buddhist India, p.46.
which was the capital city of Videha, covered seven leagues, and has been identified with the small town of Janakpur just within the Nepal border, north of the place where Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga districts meet.

Māthava Videgha of the Sātapatha brāhmaṇa or Makhādeva or Maghādeva of the Majjhima Nikāya and the Bharhut Inscriptions, may be taken to be the earliest known king of Videha. The Jātakas also know of more than one Janaka reigning at Mithilā, thus agreeing with the Puranic statements about the 'Janakavamsa' or the Janaka Dynasty of Videha. The Videha kingdom rose to eminence through their Philosopher king Janaka who was a leading patron of Upanisadic doctrines. This Great Philosopher king of Mithilā has been identified with Mahājanaka 11 of the Jātaka and with the Vedic and the Epic Janaka. Kalaraṅga Janaka is said to have brought to an end the line of Videha.

48. ibid.
49. PHAl., p.52. See also Cunningham : op.cit., p.375.
50. SB., I.4.1.
51. MN., II.74-83.
54. For example, Nimi Jātaka; Cf. Pargiter : AIHT., p.96: Pre-Buddhist India, p.47.
55. Vedic Index, II, p.298.
56. ibid., p.48.
Dynasty. He made a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa's daughter which appears to have caused an uprising against him, and he was attacked and killed by his subjects. A number of other reasons like the jealousy of the Nāsi ruler Ajātaśatrū with the great power of Videha leading to frequent wars between those two kingdoms, hostilities from other neighbouring powers like Uttara Pañcālā and frequent foreign invasions, have been suggested as contributing to the fall of Videha. However, Kalāra's episode brought about a popular revolution which inaugurated a new age in the history of Northern India. It destroyed the monarchy and established a republic in Videha. The founding of the Vajjian confederacy after the fall of the Videha monarchy is indicated by the text of a Pāli

57. For controversy regarding the identification of Kalāra Janaka, see Pre-Buddhist India, pp.50-51; PHAI., pp.82-83 and History of Mithilā, pp.60 ff.

58. Cf. Aśvaghoṣa: Buddhacarita, IV.80; Arthaśāstra, Eng.Tr. p. II; 'Bhoja, known also by the name Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a brahmin maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relation, so also Kalāra, the Videha'. Cf. AIHT., p.96.

59. See History of Mithilā, p.61; PHAI., p.83 and Vedic Age, p.327.

Commentary which speaks of the Lichchhavis succeeding Janaka Dynasty as the strongest political power in the North Bihar. The Kalāra's episode and the revolution following it clearly manifest the republican spirit of the time and of the people. As it has been very aptly observed by Raychaudhuri: "The downfall of the Videha reminds us of the fate of the Tarquins who were expelled from Rome for a similar crime. As in Rome, so in Videha, the overthrow of the monarchy was followed by the rise of a republic - the Vajjian Confederacy.

As regards the possible date of this event, Rhys Davids suggests a very late date in his observation that the Great Janaka ruled a little while before the rise of the Buddhism. It is obviously unacceptable. For, it must have taken at least a century for the new confederacy to have been firmly established as a great power which we find it in the 6th century B.C. Hence, this event may be very reasonably placed between 750 B.C. to 650 B.C.

CONCLUSION:

From the preceding account of Kosala, Vaiśāla and Videha we have noticed that these kingdoms, which

---

62. PHAI., p.83. Cf. BL., p.13; HP., p.108. "It is very interesting to notice that while tradition makes Videha a kingdom in earlier times, it describes it in the Buddha's time as a republic."
occupied an imperial position in the later Vedic and early Epic periods, were in the process of disintegration during the century preceding the rise of Buddhism. There was a decentralisation of political power in the North India. It was on the fall of Kosala that the western republics, of which the most important ones were the republics of the Śākyas and the Mallas, had arisen. And further it was after the disestablishment of the Mithilā monarchy that the whole region from the Himalayas to the Ganga broke up into a number of republics, amongst whom were also the Lichchhavis or the Simhas of Vaiśāli. The political evolution in India resembles closely the developments in the ancient cities of Greece where also the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by republics.

But it will be a mistake to consider the process of political evolution as the sole cause of the genesis of these republics. For, political evolution itself is a complex phenomenon, having its propelling force in a vortex of social forces. Hence socio-economic and religious and intellectual factors, each one of which held to be the sole cause of the growth of the republics by eminent scholars discussed above, should be considered as various contributory forces to the historical circumstance which caused the birth of these republics. In another word, it was a combination of the political and various social forces thoroughly treated above which was responsible for the genesis of the North-Eastern republics.

63. Cf. Homage ... p.62 and Pre-Buddhist India, p.51.
64. History of Mithilā, p.109; N.N. Ghosh: Early History of India, pp.70-71.
65. Cf. FHAII., p.121.
ETHNOLOGY:

It was Vincent Smith who first raised the question of ethnology or the racial origin of the ancient Indian republics by suggesting them to be of Mongolian origin like the Tibetans. Since then no writers on the subject have failed to take note of it. The evidences advanced by Smith for his conclusion were the existence of an old form of government in the Chumbi Valley pointed out by 66 E.H. Walch, the snub-nosed Tibetan features of the human figures in the Shāhrūt and Sānchī sculptures and the Mongolian basis of the Indian population till the early centuries of the Christian Era. In this the Liochhāvias and the Sākyas have figured most. Smith considered the former to be of the Mongolian origin on grounds of great similarity in the manner of disposal of human dead bodies by exposure and in their judicial systems. Satish Chandra 67 Vidyabhusan held them to be of Persian origin on the basis of verbal coincidence between Nisbi and Nicchhavi.

68. IA., 1902; pp. 143 ff.; 1908, pp. 78 ff.
69. Name of the Persian City.
70. Manu. X. 22.
Samuel Beal equated them with Yue-chis. All the above propositions asserting the non-Indian origin of the ancient Indian republics (Ganas) have been most ably refuted by Jayaswal, and the subsequent writers have added in his support. Moreover, we have plentiful evidences to prove that the Buddhist republicans were the sons of the soil, and we may briefly note some of them as follows:—

1. The Satapatha Brahmana records the colonisation of the Northern Bihar by the Vedic people known as Videhas. And as the Videhas were pure Hindus, the Licheshavas, who share a common nationality with the Videhas as both being 'Vrijis', could not have been non-Aryans or foreign barbarians.

2. The Epic-Puranic account represents the Vaisalaka rulers as Ikshvakuids.


73. SB., I. 4. 1. 10 ff.; Vedic Index, II, p. 293.

74. Cf. HP., PP. 176 f.
3. The Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta of the Dīgha-Nikāya represents them as Kṣatriyas.

4. The Lichshhavis most probably belonged to the Vaśīṣṭha Gotra, for the Buddha always addressed them as Vaśīṣṭhas or 'man of Vaśīṣṭha race.'

5. Buddhaghosa in his Pāli Commentary Paramatthajotikā traces their origin in Kāśi or Banaras.

6. The Buddha's comparison of the Lichshhavis with the 'Tāvatīṃsa Gods' hardly accords with the theory that represents them as kinsmen of the snub-nosed peoples who lived beyond the Himalayas.

7. Manu describes the Lichshhavis together with the Videhas as Vṛtyas. But from his statement, it is clear that he conurs in the view that they were Rājanyas.

75. See History of Vaiśāli, p.74, where all the references are cited in foot-notes. Cf. ALHT., pp. 96-97.
77. Mahāvastu, I, p.283; SBE., XVI, p.235; SBE., XIII, p.xii, 193; Rockhill : The Life of the Buddha, p.97 ff.
79. Mahāparinibbāna Sutta (Buddhacaryā, p.498); Dialogues, II, p.103, n.2.
or Kṣatriyas. Manu explains Vṛtyas as meaning ‘those (sons) whom the twice-born beget on wives of equal caste, but, who not fulfilling their sacred duties, are excluded from the Sāvitrīs’. The obvious conclusion appears to be that the Līchāhavas were indigenous Kṣatriyas, but when they championed the cause of non-Brahmanical faiths and joined the reactionary movements (Buddhism and Jainism) against the Brahmanism, they fell off from the strict observance of the Brahmanic regulations in the eyes of the exponents of Brahmanism, and as a result they came to be designated as Vṛtyas by Manu and his followers.


“From a Vṛtya of the Kṣatriya caste, the Jhalla, the Malla, the Līchāhavi, the Nāṭa, the Karana, the Ahasa, the Dravida” (SBE., XXV, p.406).

“The Sūta, the Vaidehaka, the Chandāla, the lowest of mortals, the Magadha, be of the Kṣatri caste (Jāti) and the Ayogava.” (ibid., p.407).

Cf. Hara Prasad Sastri : Annual Address, JASB., XVII, No.2 (M.S.) and Aśvaghosa : Buddhacarita, Bk.1.9: SBE., XLIX, p.2.

81. JASB., 1933, p.233; PHAI., p.123.
8. The *Arthasastra* also describes the Lichhñhívikas (Lichchhivikas) as of equal rank and position with the great Kṣatriya peoples of the Northern India like the Madraka, Kuru, Pañchála, Kukura, Vrijika, Mallaka and others who lived by the title of a Rājā.

1. The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta of the Dīgha-Nikāya describes the Mallas as 'Vāsiṣṭha' belonging to the Vāsiṣṭha Gotra which is a famous Aryan Gotra name. We may note here that Vāsiṣṭha figures in the Rāmāyana as the Purohita of the Ikshvākuśas.

2. The name of the Malla king Okkāka (Ikshvāku) mentioned in Kusa Jātaka suggests that they belonged to the Ikshvāku family.

3. The *Arthasastra* mentions the Mallas (Mallakas) along with the other Kṣatriya peoples of the Northern India suggesting their equal rank and position with the latter.

4. The Mallas claimed a share of the last remains of the Buddha and built a stūpa over it along with the

---

83. Mahāparinibbāna Sutta; Buddhacaryā, p.502.
84. Rāmāyana (Vālmīki), VII.102.9; Raghuvamsa, XIV.90:
   Vāyu Purāṇa, 83. 17-18.
85. Pre-Buddhist India, p.55.
other Kṣatriya peoples of the North-Eastern India on
the ground that they belonged to the same Kṣatriya class
37
to which the Buddha belonged.

5. Manu has bracketed together the Lichshhavvis
38
and the Mallas as Vrātya Kṣatriyas.

The ethnology of the Sakyas has raised a contro­
versy. Mr. Vincent Smith considered them to be non-Aryan
"Sturdy Hillmen" from Nepal. This
is quite erroneous, as the term

C. Sākyas:

'Aryan' had already come to mean a
way of living which the Śākyas
followed, while their language was certainly Aryan.

Next, the tradition of an ancient and obsolete custom
of sister-marriage amongst the Sakyas referred to in the
Buddhist Literature was made the basis for such a view.

But as Jayaswal has pointed out, such ancient and once
living custom or law is accepted by the Vedic literature
to have existed in the orthodox race. Buddhist tradition
does not limit it to the Sakyas. It extends it to the
Ikshvāku royal dynasty and the Ikshvākus were not newcomers;
they were never desacramented. They were as ancient as
the Vedas. If Ikshvākus were Aryan, their offshoot, the
Śākyas, cannot be otherwise. Further, D.D.Kosambi suggests
the possibility of their affiliation with the Saka of the
Persian Empire. He argues that the Pāli form of the

name (Sākya) is Sākka; this occurs at the time of the Buddha in the Elamite version of the inscriptions of Darius, the Persian being Saka, the Babylonian Gimirri (Gimir). We may note here that the Sākyas were already a powerful people prior to the time of the extension of the Achaemenian rule in India which took place in the reign of Darius (522-486 B.C.), and as such this suggestion of the learned scholar is unacceptable. On the other hand, the Buddhist tradition represents the Sākyas as belonging to the Gotama gotra which is a very celebrated Aryan Gotra name. Both the Pāli authorities and the Brahmanic tradition place the Buddha, his father and his son in the Ikshvāku house. The Buddha's contemporaries, like the Magadhan king Ajātasatru, claimed him to be a Ksatriya. Finally, the Sākyas of Kapilavastu made a demand for a share of the last remains of the Buddha, along with the other Kṣatriya peoples of the time, on the ground that the Exalted One was their very kith and kin.

90. ibid., p.14.
93. Mahāvastu. II, p.303 (Here Sākyas are styled as 'Ādityabandhu' - kins men of the sun, indicating that they belonged to the Kṣatriyas of the Solar race). Cf. Suṃangalevilāsini, I, pp.258 ff ; Mahāvaṃsa, Ch.II, vrs. 1-24; III, 246-47; Vis., Pt.IV, 22.3; Va., 37, 283-84; Mat., 270-12; Of.HP., pp.177-78.
94. Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, Buddhacaryā, p.308.
The Videshas who were closely related to the Lichhavvis were indigenous Kṣatriyas as they are classed with the Lichhavvis as Vṛtyas by Manu. The Koliyas of Rāmagāma are represented by the Pāli text as the kith and kin of the Buddha. They have also been described in the Buddhist tradition as a branch of the Śākyas. The Koliyas claimed to have been the cadets from the royal house of Banaras. There appears to have been a very close affinity between the Lichchhavis, the Mallas and the Śākyas. The Buddhist tradition describes the Moriyas as an offshoot of the Śākyas of Kapilavastu. The Baggas or the Bhaggas also appear to have been the very ancient people of our country, for they find mention in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which speaks of a Bhērgayana prince named Kairiśi Sutvan, and also by Pāṇini. And finally, we may note that the Koliyas, the Bulis, the Moriyas, along with the Lichchhavis, the Śākyas and Magadhan king Ajātashatru made a claim to a share of the Buddha’s relics.

96. Manu., X. 86.
99. ibid., Cf. PHAI., p. 192.
100. B. O. Law : Kṣatriya Clans in Buddhist India, vo. 16-17.
on the ground that "the Exalted One was a Ksatriya and so we are."

CONCLUSION:

From the preceding discussions on the question of their race-origin, we may safely conclude that the Republican Communities of the Buddha's time were indigenous peoples, belonging to the Ksatriya class or the ruling order of the Indo-Aryans. In the face of an abundance of very positive evidences adduced above in the favour of their being ancient peoples of this land and also belonging to the Aryan stock, it is impossible to take them to be Mongols, related to the peoples of Tibet, or Hinduised foreigners, as contended by some eminent scholars like Mr. Vincent Smith and others discussed above. We should also note here the controversy on the exact meaning of the term 'Ksatriya' occurring in the Pāli Literature raised by Richard Fick who contended that it did not have the same meaning as in the ancient Brahmanical Literature. Fick's contention was very ably rebutted by Professor H. Oldenberg who saw no

103. Astādhyāyī, IV.I.176.
difference in the meaning of the word 'Kṣatriya' in the Pall and the Brahmanical texts. And thus, we may finally conclude that the republican communities and the republican polity (Gana or Samgha) of North-Eastern India were definitely not outlandish, but were 'Indian and Orthodox Indian.'


"When it is admitted that the families of the Gautama and Bharadwaja were all grouped together in the caste of Brāhmaṇa as being pervaded all of them by the mystic potency of the 'Brahma', I cannot see why just in the same way and answering the similar mode of expression in these texts, it should not be held that families like the Sākyas, the Lichāhāvis etc., all of whom felt in themselves the potency of the Kṣatras Nobility, all of whom said 'Mayampi Khattiya' are to be reckoned as belonging to the single caste of the Kṣatriya."

107. Cf. HP., p.179.