CHAPTER X

THE KURUS

KURUSRAVANA

Kurusraavana, the probable founder of the Kuru dynasty, was the son of Trasadasyu—an Aikśavāka (see Ch.XI Pp.149-150). Trasadasyu was known to be a king of the Purus. Oldenberg and Rapson believed that Purus got merged with the Bharatas to form the Kuru. We also support this view. According to the Mahabharata, Kuru, the son of Samvarana, cleared the forests 'Kuru jangal' and made the land inhabitable. In our view Bharatas were the rulers of this land so it is most probable that Kurusraavana, the founder of Kuru dynasty succeeded the Bharatas, most probably after Divodāsa. The conjecture is confirmed by the fact that Devabhāga Srautarṣa acted as priest of Śrījayas as well as kurus. Kavaṣa, the Purohita of Kurusraavana, was contemporary of Sudāsa, son of Divodāsa, and was killed in a battle fought against him at Paruṇi (See Ch. VIII Pp.118-20)

Kavaṣa7, the son of Iḷuṣa was appointed as priest of Kurusraavana. Kavaṣa praised the magnaminity of Kurusraavana, who

1 Puranās and Epics have splitted the name in 'Kuru' and 'Samvarana'. Kuru was son of Samvarana (Mbh. Adi Parva,94.48-50) In P.L.Bhargava's opinion Kuru could not have been the name of a king but people of Kuru land were known as Kurus (IIVA, P.1-5). P.V.Kane suggests that Kurusraavana may mean literally heard or famous in the land of Kurus (History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol IV. p.680 note). The authors of Vedic Index (VINS, 1.170) agree to the connection of Kurusraavana, son of Trasadasyu, with the Kurus.
2 Rg.,X.33.4; BD.,VII.35.36.
3 Rg.,IV.38.1.
5 CHOI.,Vol.1 P.74-75.
6 III.81.144. Kurukṣetra is named after Kuru, is illustrated in Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report,Vol XIV P.86.
7 seer of Rg.,X.30-34; Sam.,453.
gave him three bays with a thousand meeds⁶. Duḥṣāsu (probably Duḥṣāsana or Duryodhana of Mahābhārata) tried to obstruct his appointment but the devas protected and favoured him. There was a great hue and cry when the people saw Duḥṣāsu coming⁷. We further believe that probably there was a revolt against Kuruśravaṇa by his people, which was engineered by Duḥṣāsu¹⁰ but it was subdued by Indra (Arjuna¹¹) with the help of Brhaspati, when sri Kṛṣṇa was standing with 10,000 forces on the banks of Amsumati¹² (See Appendix I).

Though nothing can be said with certainty about the descendants of Kuruśravaṇa yet Vedic texts refer to some persons who appear to be related to Kuruśravaṇa. The following appear to be the sons of Kuruśravaṇa-

1. Upamaśravas.
2. Uccaśravas.
3. Pratiśravas.

UPAMAŚRAVAS

Kavaṣa was the priest of Upamaśravas’s father Mitrātithi on whose death Upamaśravas was mourning¹³. Mitrātithi has been identified by Vedic Index and V.G.Rāhurkar¹⁴ as father of Kuruśravaṇa. Kuruśravaṇa, therefore, might have adopted Upamaśravas, the son or grandson of Mitrātithi, as his own son¹⁵.

---

⁶ Rg., X.33.4-5.
⁷ Rg., X.33.1.
¹⁰ Rg., X.33.1. Ludwig (VINS, 1.371 cf., TR., 3, 165) also thinks on the same lines. According to him Duḥṣāsu was a hostile prince whose victory over Kuruśravaṇa has caused the distress, but he differs on the type of distress. According to him the distress caused by Duḥṣāsu is given in the next stanza which mentions about the stark poverty of Kavaṣa.
¹¹ Arjuna was another name of Indra. SB., V.4.3.7; JB., III.199.
¹² Rg., VII.96.13-15.
¹³ Rg., X.33.6-7.
¹⁴ VINS., 1.70; SR., P.233.
¹⁵ Mitrātithi appears to be belonging to the family of
UCCAISRAVAS

Uccaisras was a Kauravya\(^{16}\). He was the grandson of Kuru according to Mahabhārata\(^{17}\). This fact and the similarity of the name with Upamaśravas leads us to the inference that he was the son or brother of Upamasravas. It is said that he was efficient in rituals of yajña and the singing of Saman “aṣārīṃ sāman” which could make a person invisible\(^{18}\). His sister was married to Darbha, the Pañcāla king. Darbha’s son Kesin was the pupil of Uccaisravas\(^{19}\) (See Ch.IX P.124). He got his death through salvation\(^{20}\).

PRATISRAVAS

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa names a Kuru prince Pratīpa\(^{21}\). Atharva Veda names a king Pratīpa Prātisutavan. Prātisutvanā is possibly a prakṛtised version of Pratiśrutvan as suggested by Zimmer\(^{22}\). Prātisutvan means son of Pratiśravas. Name of Pratiśravas bears a striking similarity with that of Upamaśravas and Uccaisravas. So there is a possibility that Pratiśravas, father of Pratīpa, was their brother and another son of Kurusravana\(^{23}\). Bālhīka Kauravya was a son of Pratīpa\(^{24}\). Grandsons of Pratiśravas and sons of

17. Mbh/k.,Adi.1.94.
21. XII.9.3.3.
22. VINS.,2.33 cf., Altindisches Leben,131.
23. In the opinion of Rapson Prātisutvan and Pratīpa whose names are mentioned in the Atharvaveda were grandson and great grandson of Pariṅgit CHOI., P.107.
24. Though Kauravya may mean a descendant of Kuru yet it may mean a grandson also. According to the Epic genealogies (Mbh/k.,I.95.41-50) and Pargiter (JDRAS.,1910,52) Pratīpa’s father Pratiśravas was a grandson of Pariṅgit and son of Bhīmasena (brother of Janamejaya) but statements of Brāhmaṇas make it unbelievable and support our placement. For example Revottar Pāṭava Cakrasthapati was a contemporary of Bālhīka Pratīpya.
Pratīpa were—
1 Balḥika.
2 Devāpi.
3 Santanu.

BALHIKA

The territory of the Balhikas is identified as an area between Beas and Sutlej. Dusktarī Paumāyana, a descendant of Śrījaya (the Bharata king), tried to recover some area from the Kurus with the help of Revattar Pāṭava Cakra Sthapati an official of Śrījayas. Balhika opposed him but he was successful in regaining some part of the kingdom of his ancestors.

DEVĀPI AND SANTANU

Devāpi and Santanu were Kauravya. Devāpi is described as an Ārṣṭiśena i.e., a son of Ārṣṭiśena and Santanu as Āulanam (SB., XII.9.3.1-6, 13) and his grandson Uṣasti Cakrāyana was that of Janamejaya (PB., XXV.15.3). The statement is justified only when Balhika stands at a higher position in the genealogical table than Janamejaya (See Table P.138).

25 N.L.Dey GDAMI.
In Ath., (V.22.3.7.9) Balhikas are recalled with hatred along with Mūjavants and Mahavṛṣas. Bloomfield (VINS., 2.63 cf., Hymns of the Atharva Veda, 444, cf.,) suggests that the passage may contain a pun on Balhikas as suggesting outsiders (from Baliṣ, without) still in the opinion of Vedic Index (VINS., 2.63) the name was chosen from a northern tribe as Mūjavants are certainly a northern tribe which justifies the identification by N.L.Dey. Perhaps Balhika was not acceptable to the people of the region who were earlier ruled over by the Bharatas that is why he was known as outsider. Later Bharatas again snatched some part of the kingdom from him.

26 SB., XII.9.3.1-13.
27 A seer of Rg., X.98.
28 Rg., X.98.
29 Ni., II.10.15-20; ED., VII.159.
30 Rg., X.98.8 Ārṣtiśena is a patronymic of Devāpi according to Sarvanukrahaṇī, 'Griffith (HV., P.612 Col.1 Fn.6) and Sayana—'Ārṣṭiśenasya putreṇa Devāpi'. According to P.L.Bhargava (IIVA, P.170) Ārṣtiśenas were the descendants of Apanavāṅ, a son of Casyana Bhārgavā. Devāpi was adopted in to the Ārṣtiśena family. S.N.Pradhan (Chronology of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1927, Pp.74-75) on the basis of Vāyu Purāṇa (92.6) says that men who entered the gōtra or order of teachers established by Ārṣtiśenas were
i.e., a son of Ula probably adopted by the Kurus or born by the
Niyoga of Bhisa and Ula to the wife of Pratiṣṭha. And he
usurped the right of Devāpi to the throne of Kurus. As a result
there was a drought in the kingdom of Santanu. Santanu repented and
placated his brother Devāpi and asked him to perform a Yajña for
him. It is said that it rained and Devāpi relinquished all his
rights to the throne of Kurus in favour of Santanu. His
descendants also did not become kings and adopted the profession of
priesthood. Devāpi's son Indrota Diavāпа Saunaka, a Pupil of
Srutas, officiated at the horse sacrifice of Janamejaya.
Indrota's son Drīti, also a pupil of his father成为 a priest of
Abhiratārin - another Kuru king, a descendant of Parīṣit.
S.N. Pradhan identifies Santanu with Bhiṣak seer of Rgveda. We
do not agree with him (See Ch.IV Fn.222).

generally known as Ārṣṭiṣeṇas.
31 Rg.,X.98.11 Sāyana gives no interpretation of 'āulānas'
where as Griffith (HV.,P.612 Col.2 Fn.11) and Vedic Index
(VINS.,1.29) interpret it as a son of Ula or Uraṇa. There is
one 'Ula', seer of Sam.,184. Whether he was same
cannot be said with certainty.
32 As Mahābhārata I.7.91.15 calls them sons of Pratīpa. In
Pargiter's opinion as Pratīpa was a late figure (grandson of
Parīṣit) so to base chronological conclusions on them
would be misleading (JORAS.,1910, 92) But as discussed
above (See Fn 24) Pratīpa was not a late figure. Weber
(OST.,Vol 1,P.275) thinks it doubtful that the princes
who preceded the Pāṇḍavas could have been named in the
Rgveda. But we do not find any reference to 'Pāṇḍu' in the
Vedic Texts, therefore the question of anachronism
does not arise.
33 Rg.,X.98 : BD.,II.10.15-20.
34 In the opinion of Vedic Index (VINS.,1.79) Indrota
Daivāpa can not be connected in any way with Devāpi. No
reason is given to justify the statement. But in the
opinion of present writer it is not impossible because the
Saunakas belonged to Bhrigu (sarvā) and Ārṣṭiṣeṇas are
also stated to be descendants of Cyavana Bhrārqava
according to the Purāṇas. (IVVA.,P. 170) Drīti androta's
pupil was Arāda Dātreya Saunaka(VINS.,1.34).
36 S.B.,XIII.5.3; 4.1; S.S.S.,VII.7; 3.27.
37 Jüp. Br.,III.40.2.
38 PE.,XIV.1.12.18.
PARIKSIT

Parikṣit, a Kaurava king, was grandson of Kuru and a brother of Uccaiśravas. Roth and Bloomfield do not regard Parikṣit of the Atharvaveda as a human being but the authors of Vedic Index, Zimmer, Rapson and Oldenberg recognize Parikṣit as a real king because of the fact that in the later Vedic literature king Janamejaya bears the patronym Pariṣita.

Most of the scholars opine that there were two Parikṣits, first the ancestor of Kuru and the other a descendant of Kuru—the son of Abhimanyu, as given by the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. First Parikṣit was identical with the Vedic Parikṣit in the opinion of Pargiter, authors of Vedic Index and Dr. N. Dutta. In our view there was only one Parikṣit as also suggested by Ray Chaudhary. Parikṣit II represented a bardic duplication of the same original. Following are the reasons of our assumption—

1 Names of the most of the sons of both the Parikṣits are common and there is a strikingly similar story of quarrel of both the Parikṣitas with the Brāhmaṇas.

2 Drītī Aindrota, a son and pupil of Indrota Daivāpa (son of Devāpi) was a priest of Abhiprātārīn Kākṣaseni. Kākṣasena was son of Vaisvāparasya yo deve amartyan ati vaiśvāparasya suntimā suṇota pārikaśitah/ parachhinnah kṣemakarot tam āsatamācaran kulayan krovan kauravyah patiravadati jayaya'.

Ath., XX,127.7-8; Go Br., VI, 12.

39 ‘rājō viśvajaniemāsya yo deva amartyan ati vairavāparasya suntimā suṇota pārikaśitah/
parachhinnah kṣemakarot tam āsatamācaran
kulayan krovan kauravyah patiravadati jayaya’.

40 Mbh/k., I, 94, 50-57.
41 VINS., I, 493 cf., St. Peter.
42 Ibid., cf., Hymns of the Atharvaveda, 690, 691.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., cf., Altindisches leben, 131.
45 CHOL., P. 107.
46 Buddha., P. 396.
47 AIT., P. 114.
48 VINS., I, 494.
50 PHAL., P. 16.
51 Vi.P.IV. 20, 1; 21, 1; Va. P. 93, 22-25; Mat. P. 50, 65-64.
53 PB., XIV, 1, 12, 15.
of Parikṣit and brother of Janamejaya. Thus Pratīpa, grandfather of Indrota, cannot be a grandson of Bhīmasena another son of Parikṣit II (See table P.138).

Parikṣit in our opinion was a grand son of Kuru (Kuruśravana), son of Upamasravas or Uccaisravas as he is stated to be a Kauravya and confirmed by Mahābhārata. The authors of the Vedic index believe that Parikṣit belonged to the later Vedic period since the Atharvan passage in which his name occurs is late and none of the other Śaṁhitās know Parikṣit at all. But Other contemporaneous statements prove our contention. For Example—

Tura, son of Kavaṣa, acted as a priest of Janamejaya, son of Parikṣit. Kavaṣa was priest of Kuruśravana and a seer of the Rgveda so Parikṣit cannot belong to a later period.

Similarly Indrota (son of Devāpi) officiated at the horse sacrifice of Janamejaya. Devāpi, father of Indrota was one of the seers of the Rgveda. So Parikṣit cannot belong to a later period.

His kingdom, according to the Epic tradition and Ray Chudhari, was stretched from the Sarasvatī to the Ganges. In the Dīgavijaya Parvan it is stated that it extended from the border of the land of the Kulindas (the source of Sutlej, Jamunā and Gaṅgā) to that of Sūrasena and Matsyas. (Mathura and Bairit regions respectively) and from the frontiers of Rohitak (Rohtak) to that of Pañcālas (Rohilkhand). Atharvaveda states that there was prosperity in the domains of Parikṣit, the grandson of Kuru and people thrived merrily in the kingdom of king Parikṣit.

54 Mbh/k.I.94.50-57.
55 INS.,1.193.
57 SB.,XIII.5.4.1.
58 Rg.,X.98.
59 PHAI.,P.20.
60 Ath.,XX.127.8.
The sons of Parîkṣit were -
1. Janamejaya.
2. Ugrasena.
4. Srutasena.
5. Kâksasena.

JANAMEJAYA

Janamejaya was anointed king at Āsandivat (modern Āsandha near Kurukṣetra). Janamejaya performed a horse sacrifice with the help of Indrota Daivāp Saunaka and Tura Kāvaśeya as priests. He appears as a great conqueror in the Brāhmaṇas. The prosperity from the days of Parîkṣit continued upto the regime of Janamejaya.

According to the Epic tradition Janamejaya, performed a snake sacrifice to annihilate the race of snakes to avenge his father's death and that he also conquered Taxila. According to Majumdar and Von Buitenen perhaps Takṣaka was the Nāga king of Taxila who invaded Parîkṣit's kingdom and killed him. His defeat was avenged by his son Janamejaya by conquering Taxila. But Vedic texts do not}

---

61 Ait. Br., VII, 27.34; VIII, 11; SB., XIII, 5.4.1.3; 6.5.8., XVI, 9.7.
62 Mbh. k 1.94.54. Though not stated to be a son of Parîkṣit in the Vedic texts yet as his son Abhirājarin was stated to be a Kuru prince, we accepted him as such.
63 SB., XIII, 5.4.2; Ait. Br., VIII, 21.
64 Dr. Devendra Handa (The Tribune, June 8, 1986). Āsandha according to Raychaudhari (PHAI, P. 20) is Nāgasāhavya or Hastināpur. The identification appears to be wrong to Dr. Handa. In his opinion the mention of Āsandivat in Panini's Aṣṭādhyāyī and Mahābhārata reveals that it continued to be an important place for centuries. The antiquity of Āsandha is archaeologically attested by the discovery P. G. W.
65 SB., XIII, 5.4.1-3.
68 SB., XII, 5.3.13.
69 Mbh., I, 5.46-52.
70 Mbh., I, 3.20.
71 Vedic Age, P. 324; Mbh., P. 45.
confirm it. In the Sarpasatra mentioned by Pāñcavimśa Brahmaṇa27
Janamejaya, who participated in the Yajña was son of Intasta and
not son of Parikṣit. The aim of satra was the aquisition of
immortality for the Sarpas28 rather than annihilation29. Takṣaka
Vaiśāleya, a King of Khândava, was one of the participants. Thus
Janamejaya, son of Parikṣit, had no connection with the Sarpasa-
satra at all. Ray chaudhary30 also holds the same view.

Janamejaya had some dispute with the Brahmaṇas31. At one of
the sacrifices Janamejaya did not employ the Kāśyapas, but the
Bhūtavīras. There upon, a family of Kāśyapas called Asitaargas
forcibly took away the conduct of the offering from the Bhūtavīras.

Though the Mahabhārata and the Purāṇas give a long list of the
descendants of Janamejaya but Vedic texts do not confirm that.
Satānīka mentioned in the Atharvaveda and Aitareya Brahmaṇa
belonged to the Pāñcalas32. Descendants of other sons of Parikṣit
are given as following :-

UGRASENA

Ugrasena’s son Yudhāmsrauṣṭhi was coronated king by Parvata

72 XXV.15.3.
73 Sarpas were a tribe who dealt in poison of snakes - tad
viga sarpa upajīvannti upajīvanīye bhavati ya evamveda.
Ath.,VIII/10(5)/16. They also performed Yajñas as stated
above and worshipped Agni (Rg.X.80.3). They were protégés of
Ādityas (Vaj.S.,III.6-8). Their queen Kadru was a pīkā of the
Rgveda (Sarva). Kadru’s son Arbuda, grandson Īrdvagrāvā and
Airāvata, son of Jaratkarna, were the seers of the Rgveda
(Sarva). Airāvata’s son Dhṛtrāstra was a seer of the
Atharvaveda (VIII.10(5).15) Takṣaka Vaiśāleya realized Brahma
(Ath.,VIII/10(5)/15).
74 Baudh.S.S. XVII.18.
75 PHAI.,P.33.
77 There is a possibility that Satānīka Pāñcala inherited
the reign as he was a mighty conqueror but it is only a
conjecture in the absence of any other evidence. Two
more names Sunītha Saucadratha (Rg.,V.79.2) and Timirgha
Daureṣruta (PB.,XXV.15) have been given by Mahābhārata
and Purāṇas as the descendants of Janamejaya. But in the
absence of any other evidence anything about them cannot be
said.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE BHARATAS, KURUS AND PANCALAS

Aditi

Indra  Mitra-Varuna  Vivasat  Savitri/Vastra/visvarupa/Prajapati

Yama  Yama  Asvins  Manu  Trisiras Visvarupa/Manyama

Ilia  Ikshvaku  Devaki

Pururavas/Dhruanta/Sdyuana  Purukutsa  Devaki

Trasadasyu  Krishna (See app. II)

Bharata  Devavata  Devavravas  Asvamedha

Kurusravana  ~  Dushasna

Srijaya/Vadhryasva  Son  Upamavravas  Pratisravas

Upanaravas  Pratisravas

Pariksit  UccaiSravas  Pratipa

Sonata  Budasa/Pratardan/Trtsu Paruchepa  Ahinhas  Janamejaya Ugrasena Bhimasena Kratasena Nakhasena Balhika Devapi Saamanu

Satrajit  Ksatradri Bhalla  Armanata(SK)  Yudhamsrausti  Ahhipatraijn Indrota

Sataalkha-Dhrtarashtra (son of Vicitraya) [Dustartu Paunsayana, Pakasthamaan Kauryapa  Vrhadyasnah a Srijaya and a contemporary of Balhika Pratipya]

3. Darbha/Cikitano

Vaka Kesin Rathaviti Rathaptra Brahmadatta
APPENDIX I.

THE VEDIC SOURCE OF THE MAHABHARATA

The above mantra in the Rigveda bears reference to a Kṛṣṇa who is standing with ten thousand troops at the banks of Aṃśumati river. Unfortunately Sayana commenting upon this mantra says that Kṛṣṇa asura (a demon) was standing at the bank of river Aṃśumati with ten thousand forces. Indra seeing this came along with Brhaspati and killed him. Kṛṣṇa namā asura daśasahasra sankhyai asuraṁ parivṛtah san amśumatiḥ namadheya nadyastīre atisthat tatra tam Kṛṣṇam udaka madhye sāthitam Indro Brhaspatiṁ saha āgcchat. āgayya tam Kṛṣṇam tasya anucarāṁśca Brhaspatiḥ sahāyo jaghāna iti. Sayana added the epithet of 'Asura' with the name of Kṛṣṇa probably on the basis of other references of Kṛṣṇa in the Rigveda. For example, yah kṛṣṇa qarbha niraḥ R̄ṣiyanā has been interpreted by Sayana as Kṛṣṇa's wives Kṛṣṇo namā kaścid asuraṁ tena niṣiktagarbhā tadiyā bhāryāḥ niraḥ avadhīt. Kṛṣṇam asuram hatva putram api anutpatyartham garbhipiḥ tasya bhāryāḥ api avadhīt iti arthah. Now here 'Kṛṣṇa garbha' has nothing to do with Kṛṣṇa an asura, as interpreted by Sayana. 'kṛṣṇagarbhāḥ' simply means black wombed' probably a reference to a slave woman. This meaning is confirmed by the use of kṛṣṇayanīṁ dāśīṁ where Sayana

1 R̄g.,VIII.96.13.  
2 'Asura' in the Rigveda is generally used in the good sense and is equivalent of 'deva' but here in the commentary of Sayana it is used in the opposite sense, meaning thereby 'demon' as in classical Sanskrit. 
3 R̄g.,I.101.1.  
4 R̄g.,I.I.21.7.
himself interprets as 'krṣṇayonihat niṃkrṣṭajāṭhī dāśīh upa-
kṣapayitrīh āṣurīh senāḥ' as the army of demons or of low
castes. 'dāśīh' simply means 'slave women' or maid servant. 'krṣṇa' is interpreted as dark cloud by Sāyana. In Rg.VIII.85.3-4 the word 'krṣṇa' is obviously used for 'himself' by the poet Kṛṣṇa Āṅgirasa, the seer of these mantra. But here in the Rgveda VIII.96.13 the word is used in the sense of a proper noun and does not mean 'krṣṇa—the demon' as Sāyana puts it. From our point of view, the whole context i.e., the mantras Rg.VIII.96.13-15 requires a review. Sāyana in the above quoted mantra Rg.VIII.96.13 interpreted the word 'āvat' as 'prāṇapoti' (approached) and further adds that 'snehitih apa adhatta' means 'sarvasya himsitrīs tasya senāh apa adhatta. apadhānam hanañam avadhīt iti arthah' (killed the forces which were killing others) but if this mantra read together with mantra 14, then we come across the expression 'viṣo adevih abhyā carantir brhaspatina yujendraḥ sasah'. which means that accompanied by Brhaspati Indra brought to book the people behaving in most undivinely (fiendish) way. The word 'viṣah' does not mean the 'army'. It rather means 'the people', 'the subjects'. So the mantra Rg.VIII.96.13 will mean that Indra having seen Kṛṣṇa standing with ten thousand troops on the banks of Aṃsumatī approached him and put down with a heavy hand the violent people (who had risen against).

Now the question rises who were these violent people in the vicinity of Aṃsumatī river whom Indra subdued and Kṛṣṇa had to come with a force of ten thousand people to bring them under control. Aṃsumatī, according to Sāyana, flows in the territory of Kuru—'apa kramya tu devobhyah somo Vṛtra—bhavārditah, nādiṃ Aṃsumatīm

5 Rg.,V.17.14.
6 Aṃsumatī is Jamuna. R.,II.55.22.
nāmā, abhyatisthat Kurūn prati'. Thus it must be flowing in the land of Kurus or Kurukṣetra, the territory of Kurušravana. Kavasa Ailūṣa says that all the gods saved him when the outcry came that Duhsāsu had come -'viṣve devāsāt adhā māmarakṣan duhsāsuh āgat iti ghosa āsit'. Kavasa, bewailing his stark poverty and hunger also states that gods helped him in getting the priesthood of Kurušravana. 'Kurušravanam avrpi rājānam Trāṣadasyayam ṣmūḥistham vāghatāmsrij'.

Sayana, commenting upon these mantras has interpreted 'duhsāsu' as 'duḥsāsano ayam ṛṣi' some sage 'Duhsāsana' by name came. But the expression of Kavasa that gods protected him 'ārakṣan' shows that Duhsāsu instead of being a sage must have been a dreadful person. We, therefore believe that 'Duhsāsana' or 'Duhsāsu' must be the man behind the violent mob of people whom Kṛṣṇa and Indra (also known as Arjuna) subdued. So all these mantras read together give us the impression that some Duhsāsu—a fearful man, created unrest amongst the peoples of king Kurušravana. They rose in revolt against him. Kṛṣṇa came with a force of ten thousand contingent at the banks of Aṃśumati to help his friend and Indra (Arjuna) seeing this situation put down the revolt with a heavy hand.

The reference in the Satapatha Brahmaṇa that Satānīka, the son of Satrājīt, caught hold of sacrificial horse of Dhṛtrāṣṭra—son of Vicitravīrya, the king of Kāśi, further throws some light on the episode referred to in the Rg.VIII.96,13. Dhṛtarāṣṭra must have sided with Duhsāsu in the adventure against Kurušravana as Satānīka belonged to the family of Somakas and Śrṇjayaśas, frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata as the allies of the Pāṇḍavas. Pāṇḍu

7 Rg.,X.33.1.
8 Rg.,X.33.1-4.
9 SB.,V.4.3.7; JB.,II.199.
10 XIII.5.4.21.
or Pândava find no mention in the Vedas, Brâhmaṇas or Upaniṣads. So Kuruṣravana or Kuru might have been originally the adversary of Duhsāsu and Dhrtrāstra. Dhrtrāstra was not a Kuru king. The authors of Vedic Index also hold the same view. He was the king of Kāsi. Pratardana, the grandson of Śrīnāja and a Bharata also is given as ruler of Kāsi - Kaśira in the Sarvanukramani of Kātyāyana. It is probable that the kingdom of Kāsi might have been the bone of contention between the Dhrtrāstras and the Śrīnājas, which further led to a bigger conflict between Kuruṣravana and Duhsāsu.

Thus Kṛṣṇa in Rg.VIII.96,13 was not an 'asura' as Sayana has interpreted but must have been the son of Devakī, the lord of Gītā (See App.II).

***************

11 VINS., I, 403.
12 SB., III.5.4.22.
APPENDIX II

SRI KRISHNA

Sri Krishna, the son of Devaki, is also called ‘Vaikunthohari’ i.e., son of Vikuntha in the Mahabharata. Vikuntha, an Asura lady begot a son like Indra with his blessings. This Vikuntha thus most probably was the other name of Devaki who according to Puranas was the daughter of Devaka. Devaka was the son of Manyamana / Triśiras Visvarūpa (See Ch.V P.77). Savitr is described as ‘asura gracetah’—the sapient Asura. As Sri Krishna belongs to this family it is most plausible that the attribute was used with him too in the same sense but as Tvastṛ later did not command the same respect and Indra beheaded him so Sāyana used ‘asura’ in a contemptuous sense. Our supposition is confirmed by Brhaddēvata which calls Vikuntha as daughter of Prajāpati, though in our opinion she was the grand daughter of Prajāpati/Savitṛ.

Vikuntha while lauding Indra calls him by the epithets ‘śūra’, ‘Vasupati’, ‘Gopati’ and ‘Vṛṣṇam’—jagṛbhma te daksinām Indra hastam vaśyavah vasupate vaśnām vidmā hi tvā gopatiśūra gonaṁ asmabhyaṁ citram vṛṣṇam rayim dāh which are known epithets of Sri Krishna.

Krishna, son of Devaki, was a pupil of Ghora Āṅgirasa. He came to be known as Krishna Āṅgirasa too after the appellation of his preceptor. This view is based upon the fact that Krishna Āṅgirasa was the author of hymns in which he, introducing a warrior ‘astā’,

1 Chū. Up., III.17.6.
2 Mbh., Bṛīṣm.7.21.5.
3 Sayana commenting on Rg.,X.47.
5 Rg., IV.53.1.
6 VII.49.
7 Prajāpati was same as Savitr (See Ch.V Pp.73-74).
8 Rg., X.47.1.
10 Rg., XX.42-44; Ath., XX.17.9;94. (See Ch.XIII P.175,180).
condemned a 'śvaghni' - a gambler and describes the Palāśa tree prevalent in the region of Kurukṣetra. Tradition\(^1\) and several modern writers like Grierson, Garbe and Von Schroeder\(^2\), recognize in him the hero Kṛṣṇa, who later is deified. But to the authors of Vedic Index it seems to be doubtful\(^3\).

\(^{11}\) VINS., 1.184., Weber, Indian Literature, 169.
\(^{12}\) Ibid., cf., Vienna Oriental Journal, 19, 414, 415; Encyclopedia of Religions, article 'Bhakti'; Bhagavadgīta.
\(^{13}\) Ibid.