

Historicity of Brahmanism In India

Sanjay Chaudhari

(Department of History, Culture & Archaeology, Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad, Sate of Uttar Pradesh, India)

Abstract : *Indian history writing has witnessed biased writings from the beginning by modern writers. Mauryas, Guptas etc has been tried to be part of the Brahmin social order exclusively known as the Varnashram system. The historians intended to prove that Brahmin ideology and traditions were prevalent from the earliest time possible. They took advantage of the weak historical evidences and eventually made efforts to disfigure the History. They refused all evidences deliberately that supported the cause of the non-Brahmin traditions. They tried to place the period of Vedic evidences far earlier than it could be. They accepted or refuted the very evidences of Puranas according to their suitability. They calculated the reigning years of pre-Brahmin dynasties less to keep non-Brahmanic era shorter. They tried to establish that Kshatriyas were people evolved accordingly to the Purushshukta. They tried to establish that Buddhism was evolved after Brahmanism. They keep silence over the fact that if Brahmanism was ideology existed from time much before Buddhism then why Sanskrit was not used by the masses. All of the ancient historical records favoured Pali-Prakrit. Sanskrit has been used first time after second century of Christian era. Most of the modern historians blame the imperial historians for distorting Indian history but are themselves responsible for doing the same biased historical writing.*

Keywords : *Bias in Historical writings, Brahmin traditions, Kshatriya traditions, Puranas, Varnashrama system, weak evidences.*

I. Introduction

It is known fact that Indian history was compiled by special efforts of colonial government. After independence many scholars started to blame them for distortions in writing Indian history. Even after 66 or more years of independence none of the historians ever tried to correct it. Most of them have shown criminal leaning towards writings in favour of own prejudices. Most of the historians continued the tendency of biased writing. Most of the scholars tried to establish that Brahmin traditions are much older than the facts. They tried to conclude a number of theories that support that Brahmin traditions were oldest in Indian subcontinent. By doing so they created conditions which deny any existence of the indigenous people that resided before the advent of Aryans. The present work enlightens the problem and evidences that support the view.

II. Historicity Of Brahmanism In India

It has been found that many historians who begin the writings on Indian History unnecessarily went on imposing Varna on the kingly families of ancient times. The Varnashram system was hypothesized and established by Brahmin literatures. Some earlier dynasties of ancient India did not favoured the political traditions mentioned in the Brahmin literatures. Even after the fact, Indian historians tried to prove that they belonged to one of the four Varnas. Let us take one example of Mauryan kings. They had been described as Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas or Sudras.¹ It appears that these historians were adamantly intended to establish that all political activities were followed according to the Brahmin directives. It is established fact that the antiquity of Vedas could not be proved. Even though, majority of the Indian historians try to put their time around 2000 years before Christ.² Indus civilization acted as limit to the antiquity of the Vedas. Historians, who wanted to put the period of the Veda much before 2000 B.C., started to discourage the further historical recreation for the people of Indus Valley Civilisation. Most of them started to believe that the people of Indus could not survive. They started to harass any attempt to recreate the future history of the people of the Indus. In between contradictory assertions by the historian few started to state that the people of Indus, migrated towards peninsular India. They got mixed up with the inhabitant of Indian subcontinent.³ North-west frontier has been entrance gate for Indian subcontinent. Most of the tribes entered into Punjab through this area only and after some controversial mishap, the people of Indus civilization also believed to have entered deep in Indian subcontinent. They are now believed to be mixed with the people of south India or peninsular India.⁴ Each and every time when new invaders arrived on the gate, previous tribe was forced to enter deep into India. Some scholars have established that Indian peninsula was humaneless⁵ before Aryans came and entered India. They tried to negate the probability presented by A.L.Basham. The theory was presented to counter various researches that targeted Aryans for degradations. If their theory was accepted and India is presumed to be people less, what

happened to the people of Indus civilization. Indus civilization was highly developed and urban in nature. Development has always been achieved historically. It is achieved in stages. The evidences that proved facts about the civilization are archaeological not literary. They could not be denied. People with such an achievement could not be considered to have gone extinct. The developments in the sites show the developed mental status of the people. Prof. A.L. Basham and his supporters have stated four major human groups resided in India before Aryans entered into the subcontinent.⁶ Prof. Basham and his supporters do not believe the theory mentioned above. The assertion made by Prof. Basham is scientific, logical and unbiased. Humans are developed in historical steps and scientific way. To state that Indian peninsula did not witness any such development is illogical.

Vedic literature has made mention of the people, physically and ideologically different⁷ from the authors of Vedas. They offered stiff resistance to eastern expansion of the authors of Vedas. The Vedic evidences contradicted the theory presented by the scholar. Moreover, none of the Brahmin literary source ever said that the people living in India, entered subcontinent after them. If any scholar tries to establish so it will be difficult to prove the time and the way, how they entered and settled into peninsula. The Indus people who were forced to migrate more deeper due to immigration of the Vedic people, mixed up with the indigenous people. It is difficult but not impossible to identify them as the case is with Vedic people.⁸

The question arises, what had been the reason that compelled the historians to prove that the dynasties of ancient India were part of the Varnashram system. These dynasties never said that they belonged to any Varna of the Varnashram society presented by Vedic or Brahmin literatures. Historians often put Puranas as untrustworthy.⁹ They used the evidences of Puranas to support their assertions on many occasions. They refused evidences of Puranas at their will. They accepted what so ever suited them and refused evidences of Puranas which tried to disrupt their story. The methodology adopted by them has never been congruent and constant. Notably, Puranas presented historical things which could be used to recreate the history of India. We lack enough trusted sources to use as evidences in writing our history.

Rigveda, mentioned about the rivalry between Vedic and indigenous people. When non-Aryans were defeated, either made Dasa or became Dasyus.¹⁰ Dasas were slaves whereas the word Dasyus literary means outlaws. This has been found globally that the defeated enemies were captured and were forced to become slaves. The tradition of making slaves was quite ancient and a part of barbarian culture. It has been abolished internationally in new world as it is considered inhumane. Barbarious tribes enjoyed the traditions with cruel intends. Vedic Dasas were forced to accept the terms and conditions of the Vedic people who called them Dasas and would have certainly placed them into lowest class of their social order. Dasyus were different people compare to Dasas.¹¹ Who were Dasyus? As it bears literary meaning as outlaw, the people who never accepted the suzerainty of Vedas. Dasyus never surrendered before the Vedic people. Dasyus are supposed to escape to forests after being defeated or disarmed by the Vedic people. They were not given proper place in the new social order that was advocated by the Brahmin literature. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar has placed them as fifth Varna, not recognized by the Brahmin Varnashrama system.¹² They were boycotted by the society and were not allowed to take part in the social activities of the new society. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar considered them as the Kshatriyas or rulers who were not prepared to be ruled. According to him they were the people deliberately deprived of to rule either by intrigues or by some new definitions evolved under Brahmin ideology. They became the fifth Varna not to be included in the Brahmin system of social order.

It is stated that Chandragupta has been mentioned by Classical writers.¹³ Chandragupta met Alexander, during his visit to north-west India in 325 B.C. Chandragupta has been presented as a boy who was a little younger to become adult. Chandraguptas' presence in western India made some scholars to believe that he belonged to the western India.¹⁴ No strong arguments are needed to deny the assertions. No strong reasons available to deny their statement. It is unnecessary and undesirable to deny that Chandragupta belonged to the western India. What is more important that who were the people, employed by Chandragupta in his army. Classical writers have told that Chandragupta collected outlaws (Dasyus?) and formed his army, with the help of them he is said to have ousted the existing dynasties.¹⁵ The current information furnished by the classical account would have been received from some local people who intended to establish Brahmin ideology against the pre-existing ideology.

The society established under the provisions of the Purushshukta came to exist at what period is a matter of research and scrutiny. When and in which region of Indian subcontinent, the first Varna based society started is still not clear. The Mahajanapadas and Republics, mentioned in Anguttar-nikaya could not be considered the states based on Brahmin ideology. Most of the scholars follow Rhys Davids assertion that placed them in or before sixth century before Christian era. These states said to have existed before lord Buddha. The dates of birth of lord Buddha are 544, 483¹⁶ and 487 B.C. Lord Buddha is an uncontroversial historical figure. Bimbisara, the Haryank king is mentioned as contemporary of lord Buddha. The history of earlier dynasties ruling in northern India lacks recreation. It is clear that Haryankas raised Magadha to the status of an empire. Shishunagas followed them, succeeded by the mighty Nandas. At the time of Macedonian invasion in 325 B.C.

Magadha was ruled by Nanda king. He was ruling over a vast territory. When Alexander overran around 30 states of the north-west India, almost of these states were non-Brahmanical in ideology. Only a couple of the state is supposed to have Brahmanical influence. It is mere assertion and we never come across with any evidence of Sanskrit language in these states. The first official evidence of Sanskrit has been found from second century A.D.¹⁷ It is from western India, from Saurashtra region. Most of the Kings of Indian subcontinent has been using non-Sanskrit languages officially. Historically, Brahmin traditions are visible only during and after Pushyamitra Sunga. Puranas present Brahmin traditions prevalent from much earlier period, but the time presentation is neither logical nor scientific. Some scholars tried to create history based on the evidences of Puranas. It is not difficult for anyone to understand their intentions. Puranas have been criticized by several scholars for their non-historical attitude. Puranas have very soft corner for Brahmin traditions and are blamed for popularizing Brahmin ideology. Nanda king has been criticized for his non-Brahmin followings. Nanda never patronized Brahmin ideology and has been criticized for anti Brahmin attitude. Nanda king is the first all Indian emperor, but never paid any affection by Brahmin traditions. Historians avoided to reconstruct Indian history during the age of Nandas. They avoided to extend the history of Nandas. Most of them believe that the reigning span of Nandas has been mis-presented in Puranas.¹⁸ Post-independence historians believe that the period of Nandas has been unexpectedly extended in some Puranas. They find suitable to deny the evidences of Puranas for Nandas. To reduce the Nanda period and to deny them as the founder of the first all India empire is bewildered. Kathasaritsagar has stated that the first Nanda extended its empire all over the subcontinent and entitled him as Sarvakshatrantaka. One could understand, why Nandas were not accepted as rulers. It was Brahmin objective that refuted Nanda's authority than the people.

Mauryan Kings, on the other hand got much attention from historians. Historians never hesitate to call Mauryans as the first all India rulers. They acknowledge the contribution of Chandragupta in raising the first all Indian empire but attach his achievement to the Brahmin scholar Kautilya. They establish that it was Kautilya a preceptor and teacher of Chandragupta, made Magadh as all India empire. Kautilyan contribution creates confusion.¹⁹ Non-Brahmin texts do not mention him. Even Megasthenese never mentioned Kautilya, the prime minister of Chandragupta.²⁰ The political teacher of Chandragupta was a staunch Brahmin, then why Chandragupta was not following Brahmin ideology. None of the Historians ever tried to explain about it. Bindusara is also believed to be a non-Brahmin. Interestingly Chandragupta has been presented as Jaina. With a single evidence of Jaina text, the historians proved him Jaina.²¹ Buddhist texts make no mention of the event. Most of the scholars tried to present Chandragupta Jaina than anything else. Indian historians show sympathy for Jaina ideology exclusively. The transfer of power from Chandragupta to Bindusara was simple. People with different ideologies held top administrative posts during Bindusara. It is excellent example of religious tolerance. This tradition was prevalent throughout before establishment of Shungas. Pushyamitra was the first ruler who showed excessive support for the Brahmin ideology. Puranas called him "Hindu Terrorist" implies that it was first time when any king started to show intolerance against ideologies other than that of Brahmin at the state level. Some historians believe that Pasendi (Prasenjit) the king of Kosala also supported Brahmin ideology.²² Ajatsatru was arrested for intrigues to oust Pasendi. The Buddhist influence made Pasendi to pardon Ajatsatru.²³ The event does not support the view that Pasendi followed Brahmin ideology. Evidences may support the fact that Pasendi followed a policy of tolerance towards all ideologies that existed in the time. Mallika, Pasendis' sister was follower of Buddhist ideology along with one of the queen. Frequent meetings of Buddhist monks inside the Palace show the extent of influence enjoyed by the Buddhists. The scholars tried to show that Brahmin ideology has got roots deep during Pasendi in the state of Kosal. There are not enough evidences to show that Brahmin ideology has strong base compare to Buddhist. It may be assumed that Brahmins has got earlier success in the state of Kosala but were still struggling to get control.

Scholars like Spooner, believe that Mauryas were Persian by origin.²⁴ Mauryan kings has shown greater affection for Persian traditions. The assertion of Spooner is motivated by intends of other Indian scholars. They are biased by the theory "India was always ruled by the invaders". Persians ruled over the vast territory which would have been influenced certainly by the Persian traditions and customs. India was well connected with the Persian kings. It is fruitless to establish that Chandragupta was not affected by it. Both cultures would have continuous dialogues, which have been denied due to absence of enough evidences. Xenophon²⁵ do mention about Indian ruler, strong enough to decide the conflicts of comparatively weaker kings. Such ruler can be Nanda who has been mentioned by the historians of Alexander. They also mentioned about the mighty power of Nanda king. The evidences of Purana support the fact that the ruler belonged to the genealogy of Nanda. Total nine Nanda kings ruled after Shishunagas. The ruling span of the kings ruling in peace time used to be longer than provide by the scholars. Surprisingly the reigning years of Nanda and Shishunaga kings has been given very short. Interestingly Cyrus²⁶ the great belonged to the sixth century before Christian era, who established such a vast empire. Why, a big empire could not be established in India at the same time. If we put the first Nanda contemporary to Cyrus the great, the reigning years of Nandas will be around 300 years. But our scholars wanted to keep Nandas as a ruler for just 100 years.

Divyavadan placed Pushyamitra in to the family of the Mauryas.²⁷ It has been deliberately rejected by the majority of the historians. Though, it is more suitable to the Brahmin traditions, which approves to appoint family members on vital administrative and army positions. Only junior administrative and army posts can be held by non-family members. If Pushyamitra was a Brahmin, it presents the noble example of tolerance shown by the non-Brahmin rulers of the period. It again reflects that Brahmin ideology was ineffective completely during the age of Mauryas and before them. Brahmin ideology may have been struggling. Some of the texts of Brahmin ideology tried to prove that Mauryas were from the family of Nanda. The writer of Harshacharita calls Pushyamitra an Anarya.²⁹ I don't find anything wrong if Pushyamitra is accepted as member of the Mauryan family and believed to be non-Arya. Interesting to know that the author of Harshacharita was using the word 'Anarya' confirming that there existed clear distinction between Arya and non-Arya people. Pushyamitra after being elevated to the vital position of Chief Commander of the Mauryan army, started to dream for the position of the emperor. It is general phenomenon which can be seen over globally. Pushyamitra was in hurry but was not sure how to achieve it. Brahmins succeeded to understand his desire and come to support him. Pushyamitra acknowledged their support and allowed him to be influenced and dominated by the new ideology that differed completely from the existing ideology. Brahmins have struggled a lot to spread their ideology, which was not acceptable by the masses. No one was ready to adopt their traditions and their language as the popular language was Pali-Prakrit and script was Brahmi. Brahmins had made up their mind to catch vital position with the king and after that implement their rules and traditions with the orders of the king. People were never ready to adopt their ideology which was very offensive and inhumane on various occasions. It was the only way with them to Brahmanise India. Imperial historians have stated that Indian society were oriental one. General societies receive social rules from the societies whereas the social laws were imposed on oriental societies with the help of the political authority. The majority of the laws established by the Brahmin Dharmashastras are dictating and imposing which couldn't believe to have evolved spontaneously from the society. Divided society could help the interests of the alien rule. Pushyamitra was highly gratified by the Brahmins he started to work on the Brahmin agenda. He was appreciated in the Puranas by terms like 'Brahmin Terrorist'.

Brahmin ideology struggled for their public acceptance due to highly developed moral status of the people of the Indian society. Indian society had become a society with high standards and morals by the noble effort of religious leaders like Lord Buddha and political power like Asoka. Brahmins were aware that it was impossible to spread through social acceptance. They were in search of any political power like Pushyamitra. With the help of king they decided to impose their ideology on the society. Brahmins started to gain it though it was not easy task. Brahmins experienced stiff resistance when they started to destroy the existing traditions. One of the Sachiva of the Mauryan dynasty lead this opposition.³⁰ Sachiva was well supported by his one of the close relative, who ruled over the territory of Vidarbha. Brahmin literature mention that wife of Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra, was low caste woman. Her brother was Durgapal to the army post at the bank of river Narbada. He defeated the king of Vidarbha.

It can be stated that a ruler named Pushyamitra patronized Brahmanism and provided all infrastructure required spreading it. It is essentially not required to refuse Pushyamitra of Mauryan origin. He belonged the noble family of Maurya and hence was Chief-commander of the Mauryan army. He was victimized by a struggling ideology. He became hero in Brahmin literature and has been presented as true Brahmin as similar to Gautamiputra Satkarni mentioned in the Nasik edict. Magadha Empire started to lose its glory since then. Brahmin literature started to harass Pataliputra. Pataliputra represented the previous culture and traditions, which was not suitable to new ideology. Ayodhya was made the new centre of political and intellectual activities. Ayodhya never found place in the texts other than Brahmins. It was never mentioned by literary sources before Pushyamitra. Buddhist texts have mentioned either Saket or Shravasti³¹ as the capital of Kosal which was merged in to the mighty empire of Magadha some time during the rule of Haryankas. Ayodhya could have been mentioned as city of less importance. Ayodhya has its importance attached with the glory of Brahmin ideology. Brahmin texts are of very late period. They glorify Ayodhya too much not because of its antiquity but due to intend.

It is difficult to find the history of Pataliputra after rise of Pushyamitra or decline of the Mauryan Dynasty. It does not imply that Pataliputra was destroyed completely, which was impossible. Pataliputra was centre of anti-Brahmin intellect and special culture which existed before Brahmins. Brahmin ideology did all to destroy the glory and status of Pataliputra. Pataliputra could not get destroyed due to its deep rooted traditions and customs. It retained its ruling traditions under ruling dynasties like Lichchhavis etc. People show full respect and gratitude due to Pataliputra. Gupta rulers started episode of Pataliputra-II. Pataliputra never lost its pride of having old traditions and intellectuality. Between decline of the Maurya and rise of Guptas, Pataliputra witnessed the state of transformation of the society. The flooding Brahmin texts refused to identify Pataliputra compare to Ayodhya. If Pataliputra would had been perished, Guptas shouldn't had chosen as their capital. It would have been desirable to make Ayodhya, their new capital. Or some new place had to be decided. What was the necessity to make Pataliputra as capital by Guptas. It was the attachment of the masses that compelled

Guptas to succumb with Pataliputra, which still enjoyed its glory of warriors. Guptas did belong to non-Brahmin origin and were to be acceptable by the masses only if they belonged to indigenous stock of rulers. They paid full respect to the marriage of Chandraguta-Kumaradevi to get legal approval to rule. Again the historians started to establish the Varna of Guptas to present the Brahmin ideology as old as the Guptas. No doubt, Brahmin ideology has got itself recognized at least the level of kings. Guptas exercised various Brahmin traditions to make it popular among the masses also. But it should also be kept in mind that the originators were non-Brahmins by virtue and by history. To gain the required acceptance by the people, they married to Lichchhavi princess and popularized it.

III. Conclusion

Brahmanism gained the ground after Pushyamitra in Indian subcontinent. Historians deliberately tried to present it older. To prove that Brahmanism existed from earlier times they tried to show that Varna system was prevalent before Gupta period. This is excellent example of the bias in History writing, which has been discussed by E.H. Carr. Historians tried to alter Indian history due to biased mindset. They are still trying to establish the same. They become highly aggressive if some historians try to correct it. They don't even allow such scholars to present their research papers in the conferences and seminars. Indian history lacks the international standards and high esteem due to dominance of such tendencies.

Notes & References

- [1]. Historians tried to prove that Mauryas belonged to one of the four Varnas, viz. Brahmin, Kshatriya(Laha, R.K. Mukherjee etc.), Vaishya(P.L. Gupta) or Shudra(K.P. Jaiswal).
- [2]. Burrow, T., *The Early Aryans*, in 'Cultural History of India', ed. A.L.Basham, Oxford, 1977.
- [3]. Mazumdar, R.C., *Ancient India*, MLBD, New Delhi, 1972, p:17
- [4]. Mazumdar, R.C., *Ancient India*, MLBD, New Delhi, 1972, p:1(Introduction). North-west frontier has been an entry gate for various tribes to India.
- [5]. Some prejudiced historians have tried to prove that Africa was without human population. Majority of the Indian historians chose to follow them and prove that Indian subcontinent was without human population before the advent of Aryans.
- [6]. Basham, A.L., Introduction, *Cultural History of India*, Oxford, 1977, p:07.
- [7]. Basham, A.L., Introduction, *Cultural History of India*, Oxford, 1977, p:07.
- [8]. Rigvedic tribes became extinct due to intermixing. As Kurus are formed from intermixing of Rigvedic Tritsu, Bharata & Purus and Krivi became extinct to form Panchalas. See Macdonell & Keith, "Vedic Index", part I, MLBD, repr.1982, p:166-167.
- [9]. The authors of various Indian literary works lacked true spirit of writing history. They had their vested interests dominating historical values. It has been felt strongly to be careful while using their facts in historical writings. See Goyal, S.R., *Maurya Samrajya*, Meghna Prakashan ,Jodhpur,p:187; Ludo Rocher, *The Puranas*, Otto Horrossowitz Verlag, 1986, p:59-67.
- [10]. Dasa & Dasyu words has been used in Rigveda on a number of occasions. The terms had been mentioned by various Indian historians also. See Macdonell & Keith, "Vedic Index", part I, MLBD, repr.1982, p: 356-358 & 347-349.
- [11]. Dasyus do not follow the social laws and always show tendency of violating the social laws.
- [12]. see Ambedkar, B.R., *Who were Sudras*, Thackarey, 1949.
- [13]. Neelkanth Sastri, K.A., *Age of Nandas and Mauryas*, MLBD, New Delhi, 1967, p:14.
- [14]. Some historians opined that Chandragupta conquered the land of Persian country lying in Indian subcontinent before Nandas.
- [15]. Roychoudhury, H.C., *Political History of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1972, p:235.
- [16]. The date of Lord Buddha is not certain. It is believed that Lord Buddha was born sometime between 1036B.C. to 483 B.C. The serious examinations are still on and we could not ascertain any date like 565,544, 487 or 483 B.C., for more Heinz Bechert, (ed.) 'The Dating of the historical Buddha', *Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung,IV,I* may be consulted.
- [17]. Rudradamanas' Junagarha epigraph has been the earliest record in Sanskrit language which represents the Brahmin impacts.
- [18]. Roychoudhury, H.C., *Political History of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1972, p:208. See memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 1, p:12; Matsya Purana states that Mahapadma ruled for atleast 88 years.
- [19]. Majority of the Indian historians tried to show the intend to credit all of the achievements of Chandragupta to Brahmin ideology. They are motivated by the mentions of the Brahmin writings. It include that a Purohita was preceptor and guardian of the king. The historians did so to prove the Brahmin affect more and more and went to extent to prove that all achievements of Chandragupta was just because of a staunch Brahmin Kautilya.
- [20]. Kautilya is a disputed figure whose historicity is still unproved. See Jolly in 1914 quoted by Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol.:III, part II, tr. By S. Jha, MLBD, Delhi, 1963, p:589, f.n.1. Stein, *Megasthenese and Kautilya*, 1921. Keith, A.B., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, OUP, 1928, p:459.
- [21]. Only one wing of Jaina ideology has mentioned about the incident. The intentions are quiet clear that they tried to show that Jainism was favourite ideology of the ruling classes. No other evidence can be traced to support the incident neither the mention of 12 year famine is found else. See introduction to chapter 15 of S.R. Goyal, "Maurya Samrajya", Jodhpur, 1993, p:316.
- [22]. It appears that Brahmin ideology has succeeded to acquire base in the so called Kosal region. Probably the propagators of the Brahmin ideology hoped that the power and vastness of Kosal state will benefit their cause. Unfortunately Kosal failed in future struggle for becoming the super power. It was Magadha which emerged as the powerful state. The rulers of Magadha had the least support in Brahmin ideology. Brahmin ideology believed to impose the social laws from upwards to the societies hence always depended over the support of the ruling classes.
- [23]. R.K. Mukerjee believed that the influence of Buddhist ideology lead to the action of King Pasendi.
- [24]. Spooner D.B., *ASR-1920-21*,p:20; *JRAS-1915*,pp:63-89;405-455. Restovtzeff, *Social and economis history of Hellenistic world* (1941), p:269.
- [25]. Xenophon existed between 430-354 B.C. and believed to have written 'Cyropaedia' in around 370 B.C. Scholars like Heelen Sancisi-Weerdenberg believe that 'Cyropaedia' is a fictional biography. Xenophon was Greek and a disciple of Socrates whereas Cyrus the great was Persian king.
- [26]. Around 550 B.C.

- [27]. Roychoudhury, H.C., Political History of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1972,p:328.
- [28]. Mukerjee, R.K., Chandragupta Maurya and his times, MLBD, New Delhi, repr.1998, p:11.
- [29]. Padey, Rajbali, Prachin Bharat, Vishvavidyalaya Prakashan, Varanasi, 2002, p:186 vide reference 'Harshacharita', Bombay edition, p:199.
- [30]. Roychoudhury, H.C., Political History of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1972, p: 330-331.
- [31]. Davids, T.W. Rhys, The Buddhist India, MLBD, New Delhi, repr.1997.p:39.