

## **Virat Siba – The father of the nation**

**K.N. Mishra**

*History, Patna College, P.U. India.*

---

**Abstract:** *Historians believe Alexander died in June 323 B.C. in Babylon. Had he really died there, the world to-day must have been quite different. It would have been free from gods and goddesses. His remaining alive and clandestine hide became a scourge for India. Of course, his followers were the first to carry on the art of creation of words on a scientific basis; it was their hunger to avenge the defeat which led them to the limit of perversion. They could have defended their claim of superiority even without creating gods and goddesses. It is only the future generation of historians which will judge their wisdom in the acrobatic display of their genius*

**Keywords:** *Kirat(Bhil)-a native community, Religion-Please, take me, Rudra-a name of Siba in the Vedas, Siba-devastator of the enemies, Tandava-death dance.*

---

### **I. Introduction**

Alexander and the domain of God have been a perplexing issue before the historians and the men of reason alike. Many have written on Alexander and yet the riddle related with his birth to death remains unresolved. Scientists do not believe in God and yet they are not certain, People, in general, believe God created man, I believe man created God. This is where I differ from others. Just about two thousand one hundred years ago there was no conception of God and yet men, animals and plants existed as they do today. It was the great fiasco of Alexander the Great at the hands of Siba the Greatest, that necessitated the need to engineer the present vicious creation. Boastful of their superior intellect, the Greeks created the echelon of gods and goddesses from India to Greece. The two places were so distant and sequestered and the means of transport and communication being almost none existing that all the rumour and tale-telling created in India and sent to Greece was recorded there as a part of history, such that it became a bundle of lies and tale-telling. It can be gleaned through such passages as: ‘Generally speaking, the men who have hitherto written on the affairs of India, were a set of liars – Deimachos holds the first place in the list, Megasthenes comes the next, while Onesikritos and Nearchos, with others of the same class, manner to stammer out a few words (of truth).-P.20 [1] ‘ Megasthenes and Eratosthenes, who were both approved men’. P.18 [2]

The situation was extremely tight for the Greeks. They were lodged in a hostile land. Always living a camp life, which is clear from such remarks of Megasthenes: ‘When he had come in to the camp of Sandrocottos’ and ‘Megasthenes says that those who were in the camps of Sandrocottos saw’ &c (P.16-17) [3]. They were faced with the multiple task of creating a language, hiding their disastrous defeat from the countrymen, taking revenge of their defeat, naming different places for future identity, and yet preserving a faithful account for posterity. What the main stream of historians, both in India and Greece, overlooks and condemns as fable and myth are the pieces of history created in its formative period. As Indian epics are not native writings and Greek historians present a macabre scene, we shall have to glean facts with very much care. Even those writers, who openly disparage Megasthenes of lying copiously quote him. This sufficiently underlines the value of his writings. So, we shall chiefly depend on the Mahabharat, the most reliable account of Alexander’s invasion of India preserved anywhere in the world and prepared by Greeks stranded in India, though the style is somewhat taciturn, as also on Megasthenes and Arrian for facts. Perhaps a little more need to be said about the importance of the Mahabharat as a source of Alexander’s history. It is the only book in the hedge of the whole ancient Indian literature which openly claims it to be a history-book. The period of Mahabharat war can be easily ascertained by the fact that the Greeks had taken part in it. As we know Alexander was the first Greek man to invade India, this event cannot be placed before his invasion by any stretch of imagination. I believe the art of creation of words was the greatest invention of man which set the cart of civilization on wheels. The Mahabharat preserves the history of this man-made creation from the very beginning. In short, the whole book is dedicated to the memory of Alexander. Be it the story of Kach- Devayany, Yayati and Puru, Mandhata, Dushyant and Shakuntala or any other story, it presents some aspect of Alexander’s story. A little more illustration is desirable here. What is described at one place as the five sons of Yayati (Yayati himself being Alexander and his five sons being the five groups that he led) are elsewhere described as the five sons of Pandu who waged war with Kurus [representing the native Indians but Alexander, the bad fighter (Duryodhan) has been made their leader]. All these arrangements make it a little difficult to grasp facts. Alexander is in the multiple roles of Krishna, Arjuna, Drona, Bhishma, Shikhandi etc. Lest the things become cumbersome, let me conclude that wherever you find descriptions abominable to the

reason, think twice about it. Do not take it for granted. Can a man be born from a pitcher ( Drona), from river Ganga ( Bhishma), by the sun ( Karna), from the air (Bhim), from the pulpit ( Dhristadhumn and Panchali), similarly from cow, deer, straw etc, when the Mahabharat itself declares that no son can be born except from mother's womb. At such points stop, stare and try to find hidden implications. Same is the case with rebirth stories and one should try to drink deep there.

## **II. Main difficulties in writing the history of Alexander the Great**

At the time when Alexander started his march, places were un-named and the means of communication was almost non-existent. Creation of words was the only means of communication. With the slightest change in the situation the names of the places and people were changed. Even the mountains were located from one place to another. Thus places and people have multiple names. Unaware of this fact the recent historians have written volumes which all present a distorted version of Alexander's history. To make things more explicit, let me tell you that Alexander's name may go in thousands. In the hierarchy of gods, he reigns supreme. In the Mahabharat, he is in multiple roles. God Krishna gives his multiple forms in chapter ten of the Gita, Stories related with all these names are the story of one man. In this maze of different names of people and places, I shall choose few names which are very much popular.

## **III. Alexander's Great March**

When Alexander started his great march, he had the advantage that there were no kings and no kingdoms. He did not have to face any organized army. Even his own horde consisted of different nationalities, such as the Greeks, Iranians, Sakas, Dahae and Kushans. He had recruited men from all the regions which fell on his way. Porus was only a group leader or a chieftain when he encountered Alexander first time. Even the word Greece has its origin in 'Giris' meaning 'be fallen'.

It was all smooth- sailing when he began his journey from Greece, in the unchartered sea. His first troubles began when he reached, what the historians generally call Assakenos. It must be located in the north of Afghanistan. After some initial resistance, it gave way. As on other occasions, he took its leader Vema Kadphises in his horde. This forced subjugation remained a festering sore and at the first opportune moment Vema or Bhim broke away which ultimately resulted in the pathetic death of Alexander. By and large his campaign was a battle field of Gaugamela or 'go chanting and singing fair' before he knocked the doors of India. In his first encounter on the Indian soil with Porus, he won the battle with much difficulty. This happened in the ninth year of his great march. Present history books contain events only up to this point. The tenth was the year of his doom. Instead of carrying forward the number the Greeks put a zero here. Thus originated the decimal system. Wherever Alexander is a good fighter, he is Arjuna, where he is wise and shrewd, he is Krishna. when he performs badly, he is Duryodhan (Duryodhan means bad fighter), See the glowing tribute paid on the death of Duryodhan which will convince that he was none other than Alexander. At a time he was the king of kings. He controlled the mighty army. He was our( Pandavas) family member, he is described as a pious man, etc.P1012. [4]Add to it his own assertion: " I ruled over the world, up to the ocean ( because then the world was limited to the areas he had traversed). I conquered other nations....." (P.1019)[5] This should be seen in the light of his vast empire which stretched from Greece to the Indus. It is also important that soon after his death Arjuna came down the Rath (chariot) and Krishna also alighted the Rath and the rath burnt. The Greek symbol on the flag (monkey) also disappeared. (.P.1016).[6]. We should remember that in Ashokan inscriptions the word rath has been used for ' kingdom'. Here it is pertinent to quote Megasthenes, " This same Megasthenes then informs us that the Indians neither invade others nor do other men invade the Indians.....thus Alexander was the only conqueror who actually invaded India."( P.194-95)[7]

## **IV. What happened in the tenth year?**

Jubilant at the victory over Porus, he marched ahead with new vigour and courage along river Indus. It was an easy go affair till he marched to Gujarat. The water was congenial (Narmada) till he reached river Narmada. But water started boiling when he reached river Tapti.(hot). These rivers and places have been named by the Greeks after their experience The catastrophe was waiting ahead. The mighty Siba, with his men equipped with bow and arrow, was ready to give invaders a befitting reply. Despite all his maneuvers and strategy Alexander could not move an inch. He tried to break the stronghold from several points but nothing succeeded. Sanguine battles were fought at least at three battle fields, of which the two most important were Boukephala and Nysaia (The Nysaioi, however, are not an Indian race, but descendents of those who came in India with Dionysos... p.179. [8] ) These two places, described by the Greeks, survive today as Bhusawal and Nasik. The ferocity of war can be judged by the description of legendary Tandava dance which Siba performs. Countless heads rolled on the ground. Iranians fighting under the leadership of Alexander's son Yama were routed at Bhusawal. Alexander's son was killed. Alexander was fighting in the battle field at Nasik. When the news of disastrous defeat reached him, he broke at the heart and finding no other way, he surrendered. Thus as a captive he

was kept in the cave of Carle. All that I have written above can be corroborated from the stories of Mandavya Risi and Khandava Dah (burning) as also from the story of Prometheus Bound. This is also the gist of Arrians' statement when he says, ".....is designed Meros from the accident that befell the God immediately after his birth." (P.180)[9]. If we do remember that female sex denotes defeat, then this is the theme of Heracles giving birth to a girl child in India.(P.201) [10]. The same can be gleaned from Arjuna's wrestling with Siba. In this wrestling Arjuna was defeated by Siba . A more explicit description is the defeat of Arjuna at the hands of Siba disguised as a Kirat (P.201-4) [11]. I repeat it again, as I have repeated before, the names of the places and people may vary in ancient texts but the story always remains the same.

Megasthenes is believed to have visited three royal courts of Sandrocottos, Seleukos Nicotar and Sibyrtios. ( P.13-14)[12] Sibyrtios is described as the Satrap of Archosia. Place the Caucasus where Vindhya is today (this I have done for valid reasons in one of my articles) Maharashtra will become Archosia. Regarding the word satrap, it might have denoted at some point of time, the greatest ruler or it might have been the vanity of the Greeks. As on other occasions he is counted as one of the peaks of the mountain.

" Of these peaks Korasibie another Kondaske but to the third he himself gave the name of Meros in remembrance of his birth.' p. 157.[13] If he himself is Meros, then Korasibie is Siba (later the word Kora was attached with the meaning 'illiterate', and the third peak is Porus who is described in the Indian literature as Kanva also. However, the Greeks have done justice in deciding the hierarchy of gods. Alexander in the form of Indra, Vishnu, Brahma, Ram and Krishna enjoys the rank of god only, Siba is accorded the rank of greatest of all the gods (Mahadeva).

Though Alexander surrendered before the superior might of Siba, it was a conceited surrender. It is clear from the story of Siba. The 'fire' in Alexander had taken the shape of a pigeon and taken shelter in the lap of Siba or Siba but the hawk (Indra) in him was lurching on.(P.314)[14]. This made Siba pay with his life. ( for fire and Indra being the same person see Geeta. ch. 10). Alexander's position with reference to Virat Siba is well portrayed in his stay in Viratnagar where he was in the role of a dancing girl only. Siba's marriage with the girl of a mountain is again the same story of victor's marriage with the girl of vanquished ruler.

I am tempted to quote the eulogy written in the praise of Siba by the Greeks themselves. " Siba has two forms: one is catastrophic –it infests itself in fire, lightning and the sun. the other is benevolent which is peace-loving and generous. His half body is fire and the other half is the moon. Destructive element in him brings doom, he does good to all etc. For all these reasons , he is called Maheshwar or Mahadeo.(translation mine from P.1509)[14] In the whole of ancient Indian literature the two loftiest donors are –Siba and Karna (Porus) . The two provided shelter to the vanquished army of Alexander and the two paid with their lives for it. Lavish praise for the wisdom, sagacity and valour of Siba or Rudra is omnipresent in the Sanskrit literature and the Mahabharat. (Pages 230,314,812,861,1283,1378,1509, 1524,etc.) [15]. The only advantages the Greeks had, was that they had taken admission in the school of adversity and their stay in a foreign land kept them united. However wise they claim themselves, I do not desist from calling them perverted people.

## **V. God and creation**

How old is the present creation? It is as old as the word GOD itself. To be more accurate about 2073 years old i.e. with the beginning of the Sambat Era. The word God literally means- I went, I performed, I handed over. The Greek alphabet is utter, unadulterated history of Alexander the great. Describing Greek literature even before the inception of letters and words is preposterous . Any event dating back the creation is an absurd proposition. It is all like the smoke that encircles the back-yard before the fire burns. It is just sending the child to the play-ground even before the birth of the father. Know when Brahma or Az (the Creator of the Sanskrit literature) and Azes (from this point on) of the coins and edicts existed. They are credited with establishing Sambat era. Thus Lord Budha , an incarnation of God cannot be placed in the 6th century B.C. i.e. much before the God and creation. His early images resembling Apollo clearly point to his Greek association. Similar is the case with Herodotus and Homer. Herodotus (meaning- as given by the Hero) does not claim himself as an independent authority. Homer's Iliad can better be transcribed in English as 'memoirs of defeated Alexander' and must not precede the Hero. Lastly God has his names in thousands. He is the sun (most illustrious man). of ancient texts. The sun had two sons- -Yama and Manu (pages 37,234,304) [16]. Manu has been described by various names, such as Mana, Mina, Nemi, Milind and Minander, Christ etc. [17]. Nemi is always associated with Arist (Aristotle) in Sanskrit literature forming the name Aristnemi. Apart from Arist, Aristotle is also described as Arstishen, Shringi Rishi etc. In the Greek political Arena he is conspicuous for his long absences from the scene.

These were the periods when he was present in India working as the security adviser of Alexander. Thus Aristotle was a patron of Minander. Alexander's death is often described as a deluge. In the deluge Manu is described as the saviour sailing in a boat. During the period of turmoil and consternation he first went to Greece and thence to Bethlehem .

Thus Christ was born from a manger. The equivalent of manger is NAD, having two meanings . If its second meaning 'consternation' is also adopted in English ,it would be easier for people to know how he emerged

from consternation as no son can ever be born from a manger. The stranded Greeks in India were the authors of the creation. Alexander was their undisputed and indisputable leader. They exalted him to the rank of God. Christ was literally the son of God. For further explanations, please, see [www.esciworld.org](http://www.esciworld.org) [18]

The story I have given in the 'New facts about Alexander the Great' can be read from a large number of books only the style differs. Take for example—Rigveda, which is a book written in the praise of Indra, calls him Apashyat Indra. Apashyat is a synonym of alaxya (invisible). Alaxya+Indra make the word Alaxyendra which is the equivalent of Alexander in Hindi.

Surdas is more unequivocal who says 'Hari hare tavo puni par na pave' (the God was defeated but the world does not know)

Mahabharat is unique in the sense that it calls itself a history and stresses that whatever is here, is elsewhere; what is not here is nowhere in the world. Thus the story of his clandestine escape and return is nowhere in the world, which this book gives in minute details. Mahabharat is the best piece of history on Alexander if all the instructions given in the book are followed scrupulously. It hides nothing. My book 'The Great Alexander' may be of enormous help to those, who want to read Alexander's history through Mahabharat.

God of all religions is one. We do say so. Earlier I have identified the Christian God with Alexander and the Hindu God Indra (the king of the gods) also with Alexander. A few more sentences may be added to it. Lord Krishna openly calls him a God and in chapter 10 of the Gita he gives his many forms, such as- the sun, moon, Indra Kuber, fire, Mt. Meru, ocean, pipal tree etc. Collect all the stories related to these in the Mahabharat with discretion and a complete picture of the history of Alexander's Indian invasion will emerge. The first chapter of the book contains the original story and later sections are luxuriant outgrowth. Arjuna is called Indra himself and sometimes the son of Indra. Arjuna kills only those who were earlier killed by the God (chapter 11, Gita). Thus Mahabharat war is a dramatic replay of the events of Alexander's life. Lord Rama is another incarnation of God. However, his story is a bit tedious to follow. Here the technique of creating the theme can only be hinted upon. In the character of Laxman, Alexander is in full form. And so is Bharat in the role of Kanishka, the immediate successor of Alexander's Indian territory. The character Rama is created by a unique device of transplanting the head of Kanishka on the body of Alexander. Perhaps it is for this reason that all the images of Kanishka go headless. The description of many characters, like Vashishtha, Vishwamitra, Parashuram both in the Ramayan and the Mahabharat and the description of Hanuman as a contemporary of Bhim in the Mahabharat indicates that there is no time gap between Rama and Krishna for no man can live for thousands of years. Siba, a class in himself, occupies a place of honour in both the Ramayana and the Mahabharat. As I have pointed out earlier – the theme remains the same, only the style changes. For the sake of convenience Alexander is made a resident of India. Otherwise the monkey on the flag of Arjuna, that represents his Greek nationality, forms the main force in Rama's army. Do you believe one can fight war with the help of an army of monkeys?

Likewise other religions can also find their God and they will all end up in Alexander.

Modern historians commit a grievous crime by separating father Alexander and son Minander by centuries. It is cruelest of the cruel jokes. The provenance of his coins, which are of very late production, may to some extent confirm the territories of his father for soon after the death of his father (deluge), he sailed in the boat to save his life. Of course, his inscription at Allahabad shows that he was associated with the town his father had founded. It is also difficult to understand where from the Bactrian Greeks emerged, The Mahabharat gives a balanced history by telling that Demetrios (Dhamma or Dharma), his son Yuthydemos (Yuthy, the god) or Yudhisthir (steadfast in war) and Vima Kadphises (Bhim) had come in the band wagon of Alexander. And this description gem fits with the state of affairs. Those who claim Mahabharat war some five thousand years back, befool themselves because Alexander was the first Greek to invade India (as we have seen) and Greeks had taken part in the war. Among many names of Alexander, Kalayavan (Greek, the almighty) is also one. The participation of the Greek king Bhagdutta (meaning, female organ surrendered) gives the result of the Mahabharat war in itself, as I have earlier maintained female sex denotes defeat. Likewise, the presence of Arjuna in the court of Virat (the mightiest) in the form of a dancing girl, should also be seen in the same light.

## **VI. Greek Alphabet and Alexander the Great**

Everyone will look askance if I find the value of Greek letters in Bihari dialects. To be more reliable some shield is needed. I have read vicariously the renowned linguist Dr.

Grierson as having said – 'Bhojpuri is the root of all Indo-Aryan languages. Even if he did not say so, I have the story of Jarasandh at my back. When the paramount power 'Giriraj=Alexander' was reversed, the reversed order of words 'Rajgir' was formed, meaning 'befallen kingdom'. The new word Rajgir is portrayed as the duel arena of Jarasandh. As all know Jarasandh was born in two pieces i.e. Greece and India. (To the best of my knowledge no child born in two equal parts from the middle, can be joined to make a live baby.) Magadh was added in old age {Jara}. It was Jara giantess which joined the two pieces of Jarasandh—Magadh and Greece united, an intact kingdom of Alexander emerged {by reversing the letters of Jara we get the

word raj or kingdom} and so emerged the character of Jarasandh. Greek and Bihari dialects were denizen for quite some time. It would be more correct to say that both were conceived in the womb of Alexander. It was the death of Alexander which caused an abortion—though both organs are still alive. Was it not the wisdom of the wise that cleaved apart Jarasandh from the middle Just one example will serve my purpose . History books prominently mention ‘Nikaia’ as the victory town of Alexander. It is a term of Bihari dialect meaning ‘comfortable here’. This town is none other than Allahabad where he lived a clandestine life and about which I have talked in the earlier article. The very name suggests that it was established by the God. By now you will find some reason behind my finding the value of Greek letters in Bihari dialects. Here below are given the values of Greek letters from dialects, primarily from Bihari dialects.

S.N.	Letters.	Their expansions and connotations
1	alpha	A-lpha=A lurched. It can also be construed as Alexander the father.
2	beta	challenged. It may also stand for his two son(s).
3	gamma	went
4	delta	he/they gave
5	epsilon	here came
6	zeta	when
7	eta	here
8	theta	there
9	iota	came (also when there)
10	kappa	angered
11	lambda	I shall take you
12	mu	myself
13	nu	no
14	xi	kasai (butcher) , gazai ( gleeful). It is here that historians butcher him. 15
	omicron	I did that
16	pi	got
17	rho	stayed
18	sigma	there went
19	tau	you
20	upsilon	you were at the top / you were not at the top
21	phi	expression of denial , may be construed as fie
22	chi	kai=slippery land
23	psi	(psa-i) went away (from the world)
24	omega	O! sing me.

Read connotations from top to bottom. Have I not told the same story in my article ‘New facts about Alexander the Great’? The last letter ‘omega’ invites our special attention. Consider the vast amount of ancient Greek literature as also the ancient and medieval Indian literature—all in the praise of one man. The Greeks stranded in India found the only source of inspiration and unity in Alexander. Names differ, stile differs but the theme remains the same. Do we not say style is the man. If the ancient Greeks said that the Indians sang Homer, it was not Iliad but the Mahabharat—both having the same theme.

### References

- 1,2,3,7,8,9,10,12,13.-----All from J.W.MacCrimdle. *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*. Calcutta, KER, SPINK&Co 1877.
- 4,5,6,11,14,15,16-----All from *The Mahabharat . Hn. Gita Press, Gorakhpur. S.2040 and 2044.*
17. See *Milinda and Miinander identified as one. H.C.Raichaudhury, Pol. Hist.of Ancient India (Hn.) Kitab Mahal 1971.P.335*
- 18 M M L 0837 2006 0487