

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

REFLECTIONS ON THE FATE
OF NORTHWESTERN BRAHMINS*

0. In this presentation I will first discuss what, as I see it, happened to the Brahmins of the extreme north-western parts of the Indian subcontinent during the three centuries separating Alexander of Macedonia's incursions (326-325 BCE) from the beginning of the Common Era. After that, I will consider a form of ritual practice that was apparently in use in the northwest at the time of Alexander, and the way it finds expression in surviving Vedic and para-Vedic literature.

1. There were Brahmins in the northwestern regions from an early date onward. Many Vedic texts, including most notably the *Rgveda*, were composed in the region more or less overlapping with modern Panjab and surroundings, including eastern Afghanistan.¹ More interesting for our present purposes is that the famous Sanskrit grammarian Pāṇini lived in Gandhāra.² What is more, Michael Witzel has recently argued (2011) that Gandhāra played a central role in the formation of the Vedic canon.

¹ See Witzel 1987; 1995: 210 f.

² Grammatical tradition gives Śālatura (north of the Kabul river (*kubhā*) and west of the Indus) as his place of residence, and the Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang records that there was a statue of Pāṇini there. An analysis of Pāṇini's grammar itself confirms his northwestern residence; see Thieme 1935: 76 f.; Scharfe 2009: 28 f.

Regarding Pāṇini's date, the commentator Patañjali appears to have believed that he lived and worked under the Mauryas.³ This possibility cannot be discarded, but he may also have lived earlier, though most probably after 350 BCE.⁴ Pāṇini, therefore, may have been a contemporary of Alexander, or he lived just before or just after the latter's conquests. One thing is sure: Pāṇini lived and worked in a brahmanical milieu.

A strong brahmanical presence in the northwestern part of the subcontinent is confirmed by the Alexander historians. Brahmins are mentioned (sometimes mistakenly as if they constituted tribes),⁵ and they appear to have exerted much political influence in those parts of the subcontinent. In fact, Brahmins aroused Alexander's ire in Sindh, with the result that many of them were slaughtered.⁶

Soon after Alexander's departure, northwestern India became part of the Maurya empire, initially it seems with help of (Kaṭha) Brahmins.⁷ Subsequently, the central rulers in Pāṭaliputra appear to have had difficulty maintaining control in this part of the subcontinent, and it is only fair to assume that Brahmins may once again have played a role in the revolt that took place. In fact, the *Aśokāvadāna* mentions two revolts in Taxila. During the first, the Maurya emperor, Bindusāra, sent his son Aśoka to deal with it. During the second, the then emperor Aśoka sent his son Kuṇāla.⁸ Both times, the *Aśokāvadāna* specifies that evil ministers had inspired the revolt. If we assume that the political situation in Taxila was then more or less the same as when Alexander visited the region, it seems likely that the evil ministers were brahmanical

³ Falk 1994: 326-327.

⁴ Hinüber 1990: 34; Falk 1993: 304.

⁵ See the General Index of McCrindle 1893 under "Kathaia", "Kathaians" (Skt. Kaṭha) and "Kambisthol(o)i" (Skt. Kapiṣṭhala); further Witzel (1997: 304) about the Kaṭha "tribe": "The Greek writers quite obviously identified the name of the local Brahmins with that of the inhabitants of the area."

⁶ Bosworth (1998: 200) speaks of "the greatest repression the Brahman community had probably suffered at any time".

⁷ McCrindle 1893: 406. This initial support may have crystallized out in the legend of Cāṇakya, Candragupta's brahmanical minister.

⁸ Strong 1989: 208 ff.; 271.

counsellors. Recalling the vast numbers of people Aśoka killed and enslaved when conquering Kalinga later on, it seems safe to assume that his suppression of the revolt in Taxila was catastrophic for the local Brahmins. Buddhism, though much beholden to Aśoka, preserved the memory of this ruler as being particularly vicious and cruel, at any rate before his conversion to Buddhism.⁹

There is no textual evidence to prove that the northwestern Brahmins in particular suffered under the Mauryas. And their fate may have improved once Aśoka had come to regret his earlier blood-filled campaigns. Indeed, his subsequent inscriptions often insist that Brahmins, along with others, most notably Śramaṇas, deserve respect. But even in this later part of his life Aśoka did not approve of animal sacrifice, thus depriving the Brahmins of an essential part of their livelihood.¹⁰ What is more, the structure of the Maurya Empire may have deprived them of political support, and therefore of the financial means to carry out their big rituals. We may yet tentatively assume that the northwestern Brahmins could live more or less in peace during the final years of the Maurya Empire.

This changed again after its collapse. Invading Greeks and Scythians (Śaka) made their life miserable (if they were lucky enough to get away with it). This time we have direct testimony of their suffering. A text — the *Yuga Purāṇa* — describes the brahmanical misfortunes, and lays the blame with the Greeks and the Scythians in particular. The author(s) of this text thought that these misfortunes were an indication that the end of the world was near.¹¹

This brief sketch suggests that the northwestern Brahmins may have had a rough time from Alexander onward, interrupted perhaps by one or two short periods of respite. Details are hard to get, but the end result can to at least some extent be verified. The region of Gandhāra, as we saw, was a centre of brahmanical culture when Alexander arrived. More recent texts suggest that

⁹ Strong 1989: 210 f.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Lubin 2013.

¹¹ Bronkhorst 2015.

this was no longer the case just a few centuries later. Consider the following passages, some of which may be more pertinent than others:¹²

The *Assalāyana Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* (MN II p. 149), to begin with, states that the four *varṇas* do not exist among the Yonas and the Kāmbojas, and an inscription of Aśoka claims that there are no Brahmins and Śramaṇas among the Yonas. The *Anuśāsanaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* add that no Brahmins are seen among the Śakas and the Kāmbojas. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (9.3.1.24) speaks in very negative terms about the inhabitants of the region of the seven rivers that flow westward, i.e. the Panjab. The *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* enumerates the names of regions that a good Brahmin should not visit, among them the Āraṭṭas and the Gāndhāras in the northwest. It is not clear where exactly the Āraṭṭas lived; the Gāndhāras, on the other hand, were the inhabitants of Gandhāra, a region that by this testimony was situated outside the realm where orthodox Brahmins were supposed to live at that time. It seems indeed that Brahmanism at the time of Patañjali and perhaps already before him spread mainly toward the east and south, starting from the “land of the Āryas”. This impression is confirmed by recent research about Vedic schools. These schools migrated toward the east and the south, or even the north (Kashmir, Nepal), but it seems they did not return to the northwest. Several late-Vedic texts know Gandhāra as a more or less remote region, and none of the Vedic schools appear to be found there. The regions to the west of those inhabited by Vedic Brahmins are home to the despised Bāhīkas, literally, outsiders. The term *bāhīka* is often confused with *bāhīka* or *bālīka*, which designates the inhabitants of Bactria. The inhabitants of Gandhāra are depicted in the *Mahābhārata* as being beyond the system of *varṇas*, like fishermen.

It would seem, then, that the brahmanical heartland had shifted toward the east, primarily into the western parts of the Ganges valley.¹³

¹² For details, see Bronkhorst 2011: 203 ff.; forthcoming a.

2. In what follows I will start from the assumption that the region of Gandhāra was no longer brahmanized territory two or three centuries after Alexander's conquests. At the time of those conquests the situation had been different. It was in Gandhāra, near the city of Taxila (Takṣaśilā), that Alexander met a number of naked ascetics, one of whom — Calanus (Kalanos) — subsequently accompanied him back into Persia.

Given the strong brahmanical presence in the region of Taxila, it is a priori plausible that these ascetics were brahmanical ascetics. Let us therefore briefly recall what the surviving Indian sources tell us about brahmanical asceticism.¹⁴ Brahmanism developed a form of asceticism that was connected with its sacrificial rites. Big sacrifices required the sacrificer to be consecrated (*dīkṣita*), and this involved various forms of abstinence. Some householders took it upon themselves to live a consecrated life for long periods of time, sometimes even until the end of their days. This tendency crystallized into the *vānaprastha* (forest-dweller); some Vedic and para-Vedic texts depict this way of life as belonging to householders (who are then called *śālīna*, *yāyāvāra*, or *cakracara*), not as yet as constituting a separate *āśrama*.

We know that beside *vānaprasthas*, brahmanical literature knows another type of ascetic, variously called *parivrāj*, *parivrājaka*, *saṃnyāsin* etc. Unlike the *vānaprastha*, the *parivrājaka* abandons his sacrificial fire, and thus renounces his sacrificial life. Historically, as I have argued elsewhere,¹⁵ the *parivrājaka* is not a Vedic ascetic at all: his way of life was borrowed from the eastern region that I call Greater Magadha, and this ascetic pursued no goal that was in any way connected with the Vedic sacrificial tradition, which rather centred around the sacrificial fire. The juxtaposition of these two kinds of brahmanical ascetics was the result of interaction between the two cultural regions concerned: Brahmanism in the

¹³ As Deshpande (1993: 97) points out: "Patanjali's *śiṣṭas* are restricted to the region of Āryāvarta, which interestingly does not extend to cover even Pānini's birthplace of Śālatura, or even his Udīcya region."

¹⁴ See Bronkhorst 1998.

¹⁵ Bronkhorst 2007: 85 ff.

northwestern parts of the Ganges valley, and the various religious currents aiming at liberation from karmic retribution in its eastern parts.

Alexander only visited the northwestern parts of the subcontinent, and never reached the Ganges. He visited these northwestern parts at an early date, less than a century and perhaps barely more than fifty years after the death of the Buddha. To the best of our knowledge, the spread of Buddhism seriously started under the Mauryas, that is, *after* Alexander. The same can probably be said about Jainism. It is therefore highly unlikely that there were Buddhists and Jainas in the regions visited by Alexander.

And yet, Alexander met ascetics, near Taxila.¹⁶ The naked sages he met have become a topos in classical Western literature, so much so that it is probably impossible to derive much useful historical information about their views from this literature. However, one thing appears to be beyond reasonable doubt. One of the Indian ascetics, Calanus (Kalanos), accompanied Alexander's army back into Iran. Having fallen ill, he then decided to take his own life by voluntarily entering into fire. This event was witnessed by numerous soldiers from Alexander's army, and recorded by several Alexander historians.

¹⁶ Herodotus (*Histories* 3.100), writing c. 430-425 BCE and therefore a hundred years before Alexander, describes an Indian tribe in the following terms: "they will not take life in any form; they sow no seed, and have no houses and live on a vegetable diet" (Karttunen 1997a, citing the translation of A. de Sélincourt, revised by A. R. Burn). Witzel (2009: 302-303) concludes from this: "[Herodotus'] relatively early date presupposes a lively culture of ascetics, wandering all over northern India, before c. 430 BCE, and this agrees with the early experiences of the Buddha at age 30 (c. 430 BCE), when he joined other Eastern ascetics and with uncertain Jaina traditions about Pārśva, the supposed predecessor of Mahāvīra, at c. 750 BCE." Karttunen (1997a: 118) is of an altogether different opinion, considering "any link [of Herodotus' description] with Indian ascetics, be they Brahmans, Śaivas, or Jainas, ... to be so thin that it hardly deserves serious consideration." Karttunen then continues: "A further ground for the rejection of this claim is that the description closely parallels the Herodotean description of other distant and primitive peoples." Witzel's statement also overlooks the fact that different kinds of ascetics existed, presumably living in different regions of India, who pursued altogether different purposes, so that any generalizing remark about "a lively culture of ascetics" one hundred years before Alexander runs the risk of seriously misrepresenting the historical situation; he justifies this by "leav[ing] aside the development of religious thought and philosophy, as such data are treacherous" (p. 303).

Scholars have puzzled about this voluntary suicide, and wondered what light it might shed on Calanus's sectarian affiliation. Religious suicide is well known and accepted in Jainism, and there are cases known in Buddhism. But, as I pointed out already, Buddhism and Jainism do not enter into the picture in the region of Taxila. Some scholars exclude Brahmanism, too, arguing that suicide in fire is not part of Brahmanism. They end up inventing otherwise unknown ascetic groups to explain the riddle.

I think it is worth our while to have a closer look at Brahmanism. After all, Brahmanism was deeply preoccupied with the Vedic sacrificial fire, whose victim was often looked upon as a substitute for the sacrificer. "Le seul sacrifice authentique serait le suicide", Sylvain Lévi observed already in 1898 (p. 133). And Heesterman (1993: 173; with a reference to Heesterman 1987) stated: "self-sacrifice is an all-but-ubiquitous theme in the ritual *brāhmaṇa* texts, the victim as well as other offerings being regularly equated with the sacrificer". Biardeau (Biardeau - Malamoud 1976: 38) adds that "la crémation [of the body of the deceased sacrificer] elle-même est conçue comme un sacrifice où le *yajamāna* est devenu la victime".¹⁷ In other words, the sacrificer is or can be the victim in his own sacrifice, with the proviso that most often he is replaced by a substitute; he is himself sacrificed in his fire after his physical death. Clearly there is here, at least in theory, place for sacrificers who decide to forego substitutes or who refuse to wait until they die naturally for other reasons.¹⁸ Moreover, Hellenistic and Roman westerners had no difficulty believing that Indians had the custom of incineration themselves. Karttunen (1997: 64-65) draws attention to Zarmarus or Zarmanochegas, who was a member of the Indian embassy to Augustus at the end of the first century BCE and committed suicide by fire in Athens, and to the Greek Cynic philosopher Peregrinus who imitated the

¹⁷ Further p. 38: "Les funérailles ont donc bien un rapport essentiel à l'activité sacrificielle préalable du mort, en même temps qu'elles en sont le dernier sacrifice, le seul où la victime ne soit plus son substitut."

¹⁸ For an analysis of the sacrifice, in which the victim represents (or is) either the sacrificer or his enemy, see Bronkhorst 2012; further 2012a, 2012b, 2013.

Indian custom by ascending a pyre at Olympia in 167 CE. Karttunen himself remains unconvinced, stating (p. 65): “We need not make too much of those authors who claim that this kind of suicide was the rule among Indian philosophers. The case of Calanus soon became famous and was used as a literary topos. This was therefore not necessarily genuine information about an Indian custom, but merely abstracted from the tragic end of Calanus. Megasthenes knew better, though his criticism was probably excessive.”¹⁹ However, Megasthenes does not constitute a valid counter-argument, for he lived in and primarily described a part of India that was far from Taxila, where Brahmanism was not the dominant ideology.²⁰ To know whether self-immolation in fire existed as a recognized option in the area of Taxila, we should not listen to Megasthenes, or to the Buddhist and Jaina Scriptures, but to Vedic and para-Vedic literature. The following points deserve consideration:

(i) Karttunen, following Hillebrandt (1917) and others, draws attention to a passage from the *Vasiṣṭha Dharmasūtra* (29.4) that states that one reaches the world of Brahma by entering the fire (*agnipraveśād brahmalokaḥ*).

(ii) Self-immolation in the sacrificial fire may have been part of the early Sattrā sacrifice. This is the opinion of Harry Falk (1986: 36 ff.), who adds that this topic was as much as possible avoided by those who brought order in the classical sacrifice, by introducing all manner of substitutes. The following passage from the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* (7.4.9) illustrates this:

Those who perform a Sattrā go to the heavenly world. With the sacrificial gifts they put fire to themselves, with the Upasāda ceremonies they bake themselves, with two [days of the Sattrā] they cut their hair, with two their skin, with two their blood, with two their flesh, with two their bones, with two the marrow. In the Sattrā one is

¹⁹ Similarly Sedlar 1980: 70: “Modern scholarship tends to agree with Megasthenes that suicide was never a recommended form of death for Brahmins.”

²⁰ See Bronkhorst 2007.

oneself the sacrificial gift. Presenting themselves as sacrificial gift, they go to the heavenly world.

The self-immolation is here described in symbolic terms, but the symbolism may be no more than a thin disguise to cover the fact that real self-immolation sometimes took place, or had taken place.²¹

(iii) An analysis of several Saṃnyāsa-Upaniṣads leads Olivelle (1978: § 12.1) to the conclusion that there existed such a thing as *ātura-saṃnyāsa*, renunciation for the sick, undertaken by people with the intention of taking their own life, by way of fire or some other means. Olivelle adds however that at the time when most of the texts he studies were completed “[s]uicide at the conclusion of the rite of renunciation had become obsolete, a practice referred to in the older texts but no longer in vogue” (p. 223).

(iv) There is, furthermore, a Vedic sacrifice, called Śunaskarṇa, in which the sacrificer takes his own life by throwing himself into the fire. This, at any rate, is the opinion of Śabara, the author of the classical commentary (*Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*) on Vedic interpretation, the brahmanical school of thought that remained close to the Vedic Scriptures. According to Śabara, the Śunaskarṇa sacrifice is prescribed by the injunction: “Desiring one’s own death one should perform this sacrifice, if he wishes that he should reach the Heavenly Region without any disease” (*maraṇakāmo hy etena yajeta, yaḥ kāmāyetānāmayaḥ svargaṃ lokam iyām iti*). The crucial part of this sacrifice — the self-immolation of the sacrificer — is, again according to Śabara, also prescribed by an injunction: “Then again, there is the text — ‘When the Ārbhava has begun, the Sacrificer, having covered the Udumbara post with a borderless piece of cloth, says — O Brāhmaṇas, please complete this Sacrifice for me, — and enters the Fire’” (*api cedam āmnāyate,*

²¹ Heesterman (1993: 176) accepts self-sacrifice in this case, but adds that “self-sacrifice is not the ultimate aim but a last resort”.

*ārbhave prastūyamāna audumbarīm parito 'daśena²² vāsasā pariveṣṭya brāhmaṇāḥ parisamāpayata me yajñam iti sampreṣyāgniṃ viśatīti.*²³

Śabara is an author who lived long after the Vedic period, and perhaps some eight centuries after Alexander's visit to India. What is worse, the Vedic and para-Vedic texts that deal with this sacrifice (the *Pañcaviṃśa* and *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇas*, and the Śrautasūtras of Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Hiranyakeśin, Kātyāyana and Lāṭyāyana; see the Appendix) never state explicitly (as does the text cited by Śabara) that the sacrificer enters the fire. It can yet be argued that Śabara preserves an old tradition. Consider the following:

All these Vedic and para-Vedic texts share the peculiarity that the sacrificer dies during the recitation of a certain Vedic verse. None explains how he dies, and how he manages to die at the right moment. Most of the texts leave us with the impression that the sacrificer's death is not altogether natural, but there is no indication whatsoever how it is brought about.²⁴ One, and only one, text (the *Lāṭyāyana Śrautasūtra*) adds that, according to a named authority, the dead body of the sacrificer is subsequently put into the sacrificial fire.

The textual situation is confusing to say the least. One way to make sense of it is that Śabara preserves in explicit terms a tradition that most Vedic and para-Vedic texts avoid being explicit about, perhaps for reasons of changed attitudes with regard to self-immolation. With this possibility in mind, let us return to Calanus.

About the manner of Calanus's death, the Greek sources contain two variants, which Bosworth (1998: 176-177) describes as follows: "In Arrian Calanus reclines on the pyre and remains immobile in the flames. This is part of the material

²² The edition has *sadaśena* for *parito 'daśena*.

²³ Śabara, *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* ad sūtras 10.2.57 and 58; tr. Ganganatha Jha, p. 1721.

²⁴ See however Heesterman 1987: 94: "the position of the sacrificer lying down on the place of the sacrifice between his fires with his head to the south and completely covered over strongly suggests the cremation ritual, which is, generally speaking, the sacrificer's last sacrifice". François Voegeli suggests, in a private communication, that the Śunaskama sacrifice could be meant for a sacrificer who is terminally ill.

extracted from Nearchus, and no variant is adduced from Arrian's other sources. It is Strabo who comments on the lack of agreement in the matter. He cites one tradition, essentially the same as Arrian's, according to which Calanus lies on a golden couch, covers himself and is burned. That is contrasted with another version, presented somewhat elliptically, in which the pyre is built upon 'a wooden house, filled with leaves' and Calanus flings himself ... to be consumed like a beam of timber along with the house. There are obscurities in the story, but it seems clear that it portrayed Calanus *throwing* himself into the flames, not waiting calmly to be consumed." Throwing oneself into the fire is close to Śabara's entering the fire, closer at any rate than patiently waiting to be consumed by fire.

(v) The different sources describing the Śunaskarṇa sacrifice suggest that Vedic and especially para-Vedic literature may sometimes present us with a bowdlerized version of sacrificial practice. With this in mind, look at *Mānava Śrautasūtra* (MŚS 8.25),²⁵ and especially at the following passage: "After having addressed his relatives, he makes the fires rise up in himself. 'For the fire is a comrade, an observer of joy and pain', thus it is said. With the verse: 'This is thy due place of birth, etc.' he shall set fire to himself in the three sacrificial fires." (*sakulyān āmantryātmany agnīn samāropayet sakhā hy agnir vai sākṣī sukṛtasya duṣkṛtasyety ayam arthaḥ/ ayam te yonir ṛtviya ity āhavanīye gārhapatyē dakṣiṇāgnau cātmanaṃ pratāpayet/* MŚS 8.25.6-7). This passage would appear to be about a sacrificer who takes his own life through self-incineration. The only reason to think otherwise is the following context, in which the sacrificer is depicted as still alive.

(vi) Consider next the following passage from the *Kaṭhaśruti* (p. 31 l. 7 - p. 32 l. 3; cited in Bronkhorst 1998: 25):²⁶

²⁵ This passage has been studied by J. F. Sprockhoff (1987); see further Bronkhorst 1998: 23-24.

²⁶ *Kaṭhaśruti* p. 31 l. 7 - p. 32 l. 3: *yajamānasyāṅgān ṛtvijaḥ sarvaiḥ pātraiḥ samāropya yad āhavanīye gārhapatyē 'nvāhāryapacane sabhyāvasathyayoś ca*

Having made the sacrificial priests place all the sacrificial utensils on the limbs of the sacrificer (i.e., of his own), he should place (his five breaths, viz.) *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, *udāna* and *samāna*, that are in (the five sacrificial fires, viz.) *āhavanīya*, *gārhapatya*, *anvāhāryapacana*, *sabhya* and *āvasathya*, all [five of them], in all [of the five sacrificial fires].

Once again, the only reason for believing that this passage does not describe a real sacrifice — the self-immolation of the sacrificer — is the following context, in which, here too, the sacrificer is depicted as being still alive.

Finally a word about the nakedness of Calanus and his fellow-ascetics. Bosworth (1998: 188 n. 70) makes the following observation: “Neither Calanus nor Dandamis can have been enjoining complete nakedness, for even the ascetics themselves retained a loin-cloth to preserve their modesty (cf. Chakraborti [1973] 113-15, 121-2).” The reference to Chakraborti’s *Asceticism in Ancient India* is misleading, for this book points out that brahmanical ascetics *could* be completely naked, as is clear from the following passage (p. 113-114):

[*Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*] (II.9.21.11-12) ordains that the ascetic “shall wear clothes thrown away by others as useless”. He says again that “some declare that he shall go naked”.²⁷ Bodhāyana [*Dharmasūtra*] (II.6.11.19 - 21) says that the ascetic “shall wear a cloth to cover his nakedness”²⁸ ... Vasiṣṭha [*Dharmasūtra* X.9-11] says that the ascetic should cover his body with one piece of cloth or deer-skin or grass cut by cows.²⁹ ... *It is interesting to note that Āpastamba’s hint at nudity of ascetics indicates*

prāṇāpānavyānodānasamānān sarvān sarveṣu samāropayet. Cf. Sprockhoff 1989: 147-148; Olivelle 1992: 129-130.

²⁷ Olivelle 2000: 104: *tasya muktam ācchādanaṃ vihitam/ sarvataḥ parimokṣam eke/*

²⁸ Olivelle 2000: 280: *kaupīnācchādanaḥ/ .../ kāṣṭhyavāsāḥ/*

²⁹ Olivelle 2000: 386: *ekaśāṭīparihitaḥ/ ajinena vā/ gopralūnais tṛṇair avastṛtaśarāḥ* .../ Olivelle translates the last part “cut for the cows”.

the possibility of its practice in some circle in his period even in the Brahmanical fold. (emphasis added)

I do not know whether we can be sure that the sages met by Alexander were completely naked, but even if they were, this cannot be used as an argument against their brahmanical status.

Returning now to the self-incineration of Calanus, it seems safe to conclude that the classical sacrifice as we find it described in various Vedic and para-Vedic texts may be, to at least some extent, a “cover-up” of sacrificial practices that occurred or had occurred.³⁰ Indeed, it makes sense that the para-Vedic literature on sacrifice, like the literature on Dharma that arose along with it and continued until long after, was primarily a scholastic enterprise.³¹ There is no reason to exaggerate this observation, but it does seem to apply to sacrificial self-immolation in fire. This appears to have been a more or less widespread, or at any rate tolerated, practice during some period of Vedic religion. There is no need to push this practice back to the earliest Vedic period, for the history of Alexander provides us with a very precise date, 325 BCE, at which it still occurred. The examples collected by Hillebrandt and others, and the testimony of Śabara, suggest that the practice continued well into the classical period.³²

3. Let me conclude with some speculations based on the different elements that have come up in this paper. The centre of brahmanical culture moved from the northwestern edge of the Indian subcontinent into the Ganges valley after Alexander, and perhaps partly as a result of his military conquests, followed by

³⁰ Interestingly, suicide is not altogether rejected in classical brahmanical literature, but fire is almost completely absent from the methods proposed; see Olivelle 1978.

³¹ This is Rocher’s central insight, emphasized in Davis 2012: 18-19; see also Lubin forthcoming.

³² I learn from the doctoral dissertation (in preparation; University of Lausanne) of Marc Tiefenauer that according to the *Brahmapurāṇa* (214.118) those who have perished in fire (*agnau vipannā[h]*) receive favorable treatment after death.

various military mishaps (Aśoka (?), Greeks, Scythians, others?). This move encouraged and sped up the codification of traditional sacrificial practices. This codification was no innocent affair. Certain practices found less favour in their new surroundings (or among the codifiers), and texts that covered them were modified accordingly. Fortunately, the modifications changed as little as possible, presumably out of respect for tradition, thus giving modern philologists a chance to recognize some of them.

Appendix: Vedic and para-Vedic texts on the Śunaskarṇa sacrifice

The *Pañcaviṃśa* (or *Tāṇḍya Mahā*) *Brāhmaṇa* contains the following passage (17.12.1 - 5-6):

*trivṛd agniṣṭomah sa sarvasvāro yaḥ kāmayetā
'nāmayatā 'muṃ lokam iyām iti sa etena yajeta* (1)

...

*ārbhavapavamāne stūyamāna audumbaryā dakṣiṇā
prāvṛto nipadyate tad eva samgacchate* (5)
*sa eṣa śunaskarnastoma etena vai śunaskarṇo bāṣkiho
'yajata tasmāc chunaskarṇastoma ity ākhyāyate* (6)

Caland (1931) translates this as follows:

A nine-versed agniṣṭoma; this is throughout circumflected. He who wishes: 'May I go to yonder world not through any disease',³³ should perform this (rite). (1)

...

Whilst the *ārbhava-pavamāna*(-laud) is being chanted, he (the Sacrificer) lies down, his head being covered by his uppergarment, to the south of the pillar of udumbara-wood. Then, he meets (his end). (5)

³³ Caland adds in a note: "Sāyaṇa supplies to *anāmayamatā* (should no doubt be *anāmayamatā*, JB) the noun *dehena*: 'With a not sick body.'"

This is the stoma of Śunaskarṇa. This sacrifice was performed by Śunaskarṇa, the son of Baskika; hence it is called Śunaskarṇa's stoma. (6)

The crucial part is section 5. Does it tell us that the sacrificer enters the fire? The formulation of section 5 is too ambiguous to draw a conclusion, but it is hard to imagine that the death of the sacrificer can be scheduled in so precisely without some way to speed it up.

The *Hiraṇyakeśi Śrautasūtra* (17.3.18-23) has the following:

trivṛto 'gniṣtomah/ (18)
śunaskarṇastomah/ sarvasvārah/ (19)
marānakāmo yajeta yah kāmayetānāmayatām svargaṃ
lokam iyām iti vijñāyate/ (20)
yāmyaḥ paśuḥ śukaharita upālabhyaḥ/ (21)
kr̥tānnaṃ dakṣiṇā/ (22)
ārbhave stūyamāne dakṣiṇenaudumbarīm ahatena
vāsasā pattodaśena prāvṛtya dakṣiṇāśirāḥ saṃviśati
brāhmaṇāḥ samāpayatam etaṃ yajñam iti/
yajñasamsthām anu samtiṣṭhate/ (23)

The *Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra* does not mention the name Śunaskarṇa, but the following passage clearly deals with the same sacrifice (22.6.1-6):

marānakāmasya sarvasvārah/ (1)
kr̥tānnaḍakṣiṇah/ (2)
dīkṣādy avajighraty eva bhakṣān/ (3)
apsv avaharaṇam asomānām/ (4)
ārbhave stūyamāne dakṣiṇenaudumbarīm kṛṣṇājine
saṃviśati dakṣiṇāśirāḥ prāvṛtaḥ/ (5)
tad eva mriyate/ (6)

Ranade (1978: 570) translates:

The Sarvasvāra Soma sacrifice (which is the fourth of the four Trivṛt sacrifices) is meant for one who is desirous of having a (successful) end to his life. (1)
 Food cooked properly is the priestly fee for the Sarvasvāra sacrifice. (2)
 From the Dīkṣaṇīyā iṣṭi onwards the Sacrificer consumes his iḍā-portion (just) by smelling. (3)
 The iḍā-portions of the Sacrificer excepting those of the Soma-juice are then to be thrown away into the water. (4)
 The Sacrificer lies down on a black-antelope skin to the south covered with a cloth while the Ārbhava-pavamāna sāman is chanted (in the evening session). (5)³⁴
 (And) he dies at that time. (6).

Both the *Hiranyakeśi* and the *Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra* use the word *saṃviśati*, similar to Śabara's *viśati*; both these words can mean 'enter'. But whereas Śabara's *viśati* has an object (*agnim viśati*; "he enters the fire"), the two Śrautasūtras don't, so that here the other possible translation for *saṃviśati* ("he lies down") may have to be preferred.

The *Āpastamba Śrautasūtra* describes the sacrifice as follows (22.7.20-25):

caturthaḥ sarvasāraḥ śunaskarṇastomaḥ/ (20)
maranakāmo yajeta yaḥ kāmayetānāmayatā svargaṃ
lokam iyām iti/ (21)
yāmyaḥ paśuḥ śukaharita upālabhyaḥ/ (22)
kṛtānnaṃ dakṣiṇā/ (23)
ārbhave stūyamāne dakṣiṇenaudumbarīm
pattodaśenāhatena vāsasā dakṣiṇāśirāḥ prāvṛ[t]aḥ
saṃviśann āha brāhmaṇ[ā]ḥ samāpayata me yajñam iti/
(24)
tadaiva saṃtiṣṭhate/ (25)

Thite (2004: 1314-1315) translates:

³⁴ This translation omits *audumbarīm* ("to the south of the pillar of Udumbara wood") and *dakṣiṇāśirāḥ* ("with the head pointing to the south").

The fourth (nine-versed Ekāha) is the Śunaskarṇastoma in which all the Sāmans are circumflexed at the end (*sarvasvāra*). (20)

A sacrificer desirous of death and one who desires “May I go to heaven without having any disease” should perform (this sacrifice). (21)

In addition to the Savanīya he-goat a yellowish parrot is to be seized as a victim. (22)

Cooked rice (forms) the sacrificial gift. (23)

When the Ārbhava-pavamāna (stotra) is being sung, (the sacrificer) lying down to the south of the Audumbarī (post) with his head to the south and being covered with a new garment the fringes of which should be towards the feet, says: “O Brahmins! Complete the sacrifice for me”. (24)

At that moment only, the sacrifice stands completely established (i.e. concluded). (25)

Caland (1928: 320-321) translates as follows:

Der vierte Ekāha mit neunversigen Stotras ist der Stoma des Śunaskarṇa, in welchem alle Sāmans am Ende zirkumflektiert sind. (20)

Diesen Ekāha verrichte ein zu sterben Wünschender, der den Wunsch hat: “Möchte ich ohne Krankheit zum Himmelraume eingehen.” (21)

Nach dem Savanaopferbock ist dem Yama ein zweiter zu opfern, welcher gelb wie ein Papagei (so!) sein soll. (22)

Der Opferlohn besteht aus zubereitetem Reis. (23)

Während das Ṛbhulob (das erste des Nachmittagsdienstes) abgehalten wird, legt sich der Opferherr südlich von dem feigenhölzern Pfeiler mit dem Haupte nach Süden gekehrt, und durch ein neues Gewand, dessen Fransen über seinen Füßen liegen, gänzlich verhüllt, hin und redet: “Ihr Brahmanen, bringet mir das Opfer zu Ende”. In demselben Augenblick wird das Opfer abgeschlossen.

The *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (2.267) mentions the Śunaskarṇa, but provides few details:

*athaiṣa śunaskarṇastomaḥ/ śunaskarṇo ha vai
vārṣṇyakah (v.l. vāṣkyahah) puṇyakṛd apāpakṛd āsa/ sa
ha cakame — puṇyam evāsmiṇ loke kṛtvāpāpaṃkṛtya
svargaṃ lokam gaccheyam iti/ sa etaṃ yajñam apaṣyat/
tam āharat/ tenāyajata/ tato vai sa puṇyam evāsmiṇ loke
kṛtvāpāpaṃkṛtya svargaṃ lokam agacchat/ sa yah
puṇyakṛt kāmayeta puṇyam evāsmiṇ loke
kṛtvāpāpaṃkṛtya svargaṃ lokam gaccheyam iti, sa etena
yajeta/ puṇyam evāsmiṇ loke kṛtvāpāpaṃkṛtya svargaṃ
lokam gacchati/*

About this sacrifice in the *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra*, Caland (1903: 28) says the following:

Es giebt einen gewissen Ekāha, welchen derjenige verrichten soll, der sich den Tod wünscht, d. h., nach Āpastamba, der ohne Krankheit das Jenseits zu erreichen wünscht. Dieser Ekāha ist auch unter dem Namen sarvasvāra bekannt; in den Yajus-texten trägt er den Namen: “Opfer” oder “Stoma des Śunaskarṇa”. Über dieses Opfer lesen wir in Baudhāyana:³⁵ “Es war einmal ein edler Fürst, der viele Opfer dargebracht hatte, Sunaskarṇa, des Śibi Sohn.³⁶ Dieser, in traurigem Zustande verkehrend, weil er sein Volk *pratihitām* erblickte, fragte seine Opferpriester: “Giebt es wohl ein Opfer, durch dessen Darbringung ich hinscheiden könnte?” “Ja, das giebt es”, antworteten die Opferpriester. Nun schöpfte (bei dem zu seinem Gefallen gehaltenen Somaopfer) der Adhvaryu die Grahās, während er die Opferschnur vom Halse herabhängend trug³⁷ und jedesmal die Pururuc fortliess; der Sāmānsänger sang (?) die Svāra-Sāmāns mit Weglassung des Schlussrefrains; der Hotar sagte die Ṛkstrophen her, während er zurück (? nach Westen ?) hinlief (?). Als er (Śunaskarṇa) von dem Schlussbad zurückkehrte, da starb er. Wen er hasst, für den soll er dieses Opfer errichten,

³⁵ XXI. 17.

³⁶ Im Pañc. Br. heisst er Sohn des Baṣkiha.

³⁷ Wenn *adhonivīti* zu lesen ist. Diese Tracht der Opferschnur ist bekanntlich die beim Pitṛmedha beim Hinaustragen der Leiche üblich.

oder auch er bringe es dar für einen, der (um Erlösung seiner Leiden (?) zu ihm) herantritt. Dann geht er ohne Verzug aus dieser Welt fort (er stirbt) ”.

The quoted passage is as follows (*Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* 18.48):

*śunaskarṇo ha vai śaivyo rājā puṇyakṛd bahuyājy āsa/
sa ha pāpīyāñ janatām pratihitām pratikhyāyartvijah
papracchāsti svit sa yajñakratur yenāham iṣṭvaiva
prayāyām iti/
asti hīti hainam ṛtvijah pratyūcus/
tasmā adhvaryur ayonīn apurorukkān grahān jagrāha/
svarāṇy udgātā sāmāny anaidāny anidhanāni/
parān evargmiyaṃ hotānurvāca/
sa hāvabhṛthād evodetya mamāra/
yaṃ dviṣyāt tasyaivaṃ yajñam kuryād upasṛtam vā
yājayet/
kṣipraṃ haivāsmāl lokāt praiti/*

Kashikar (2003: III: 1243) translates:

King Śunaskarṇa, son of Śibi was benevolent and had performed many sacrifices. Perceiving the people in poor and wretched condition, he asked the priests, “Is there any sacrifice, having performed which I would depart?” “Yes, there is one” the priests replied. The Adhvaryu took for him the Soma-draughts without reciting the formula referring to its birth-place and without the Puroruc. The Udgātṛ chanted the Svarasāmans without the stobha *iḍa* and without the Nidhana. The Hotṛ recited the set of Ṛks consecutively. After having returned from the Avabhṛtha, the sacrificer died. One should perform this sacrifice for one who hates, or one who approaches him (for this purpose). Soon he departs from this world.

The following, too, occur in the *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* (26.33):

athāsmiñ chunaskarṇayajñe

*tilamiśram aśitvā matsyān khāditvā kṣāramātram pibet
atha sāmāpathe samviśet
svapnād eva svapne gacchati*

Kashikar (2003: IV: 1713) translates:

In this Śunaskarṇa sacrifice the sacrificer should eat food mixed with sesame, should eat fish and drink only salt water. He should lie down in the region destined for Sāman-chanting. He becomes asleep and attains (permanent) sleep.

Finally there is the *Lāṭyāyana Śrautasūtra* (8.8.1 & 5-6):

*sarvasvāreṇa yakṣyamāṇo dīkṣāprabhṛti prayateta yathā
sautye 'hani preyām iti/ (1)*

...

*ārbhave pavamāne stūyamāna udumbaryā dakṣiṇā
prāvṛto nīpadyeta kṛṣṇājīnam upastīrya dakṣiṇāśirās tad
eva samgacchate tad eva mriyata iti/ (5)*

*evam mṛtaṃ yajamānaṃ havirbhīḥ saha rjīśair
yajñapātrais cāhavanīye prahr̥tya pravrajeyur iti
śāṅḍilyaḥ/ (6)*

Ranade (1998: 838-841) translates:

One who is going to perform the *Sarvasvāra* (*trivṛt agniṣṭoma*) sacrifice, should make efforts from the consecration ceremony thinking “I will proceed to the yonder world on the day of pressing”. (1)

...

When the *Ārbhava pavamāna* is being chanted he should lie covered to the south of the *Audumbarī* post on a black-antelope skin, having spread the same, with his head to the south. Thus itself he makes his departure. This is the way he breaths his last. (5)

Śāṅḍilya opines that they (the officiating priests) should consign the sacrificer, who is thus dead, to the *Āhavanīya* fire along with the remaining oblations inclusive of the sacrificial utensils containing the residue of the Soma and quit the place. (6)

This passage indicates that the sacrificer is dead before he is consigned to the fire, and this passage (but only this one) is therefore in clear disagreement with the passage quoted by Śabara.

Bibliographic References

- Biardeau, M. - Ch. Malamoud 1976. *Le sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bosworth, A. B. 1998. "Calanus and the Brahman opposition." In *Alexander der Grosse: Eine Welteroberung und ihr Hintergrund. Vorträge des Internationalen Bonner Alexanderkolloquiums, 19.-21. 12. 1996*. Ed. by W. Will. Bonn: Dr. R. Habelt, pp. 173-203.
- Bronkhorst, J. 1998. *The Two Sources of Indian Asceticism*. 2nd edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2007. *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Culture of Early India* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, 2/19). Leiden - Boston: Brill.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2011. *Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, 2/24). Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2012. "Rites without symbols." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 24, pp. 236-266.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2012a. "Buddhism and sacrifice." *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 66.1, pp. 7-17.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2012b. "Can there be play in ritual? Reflections on the nature of ritual." In *Religions in Play. Games, Rituals and Virtual Worlds*. Ed. by Ph. Bornet - M. Burger. Zürich: Pano Verlag, pp. 161-175.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2013. "Des sacrifices humains dans l'Inde ancienne." In *Sacrifices humains: Dossiers, discours, comparaisons*. Actes du colloque tenu à l'Université de Genève, 19-20 mai 2011. Ed. by À. A. Nagy - F. Prescendi. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses, 160). Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 99-105.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2015. "The historiography of Brahmanism". In *History and Religion: Narrating a religious past*. Ed. by B.-Ch. Otto - S. Rau - J. Rüpke. Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 27-44.

- Bronkhorst, J. forthcoming a. "Did Buddhists meet Brahmins in Gandhāra?" In *Reading Outside the Lines*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Caland, W. 1903. *Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana*. Leipzig. Reprint: Kraus Reprint, Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966.
- Caland, W. 1928. *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba: sechszehntes bis vierundzwanzigstes und einunddreissigstes Buch*. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. Reprint: Dr. M. Sändig, Wiesbaden, 1969.
- Caland, W. 1931. *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa: The Brahmana of Twenty Five Chapters*. Reprint: Shri Satguru Publications, Delhi, 1982.
- Chakraborti, H. 1973. *Asceticism in Ancient India*. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak.
- Davis, D. R., ed., 2012. *Studies in Hindu Law and Dharmaśāstra*, by L. Rocher. London - New York: Anthem Press.
- Deshpande, M. M. 1993. "The changing notion of *śiṣṭa* from Patañjali to Bhartrhari." *Asiatische Studien / Etudes Asiatiques* 47, pp. 95-115.
- Falk, H. 1986. *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des vedischen Opfers*. Freiburg: Hedwig Falk.
- Falk, H. 1993. *Schrift im alten Indien. Ein Forschungsbericht mit Anmerkungen* (ScriptOralia, 56). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Falk, H. 1994. "Von Götterfiguren und menschlichen Göttern." In *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*. Ed. by N. Balbir - J. K. Bautze. Reinbek: Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, pp. 313-331.
- Heesterman, J. C. 1987. "Self-sacrifice in Vedic ritual." In *Gilgul: Essays on transformation, revolution and permanence in the history of religions*, dedicated to R. J. Zwi Werblowsky. Ed. by S. Shaked, D. Shulman - G. G. Stroumsa. Leiden etc.: Brill. pp. 91-106.
- Heesterman, J. C. 1993. *The Broken World of Sacrifice. An essay in ancient Indian ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hillebrandt, A. 1917. *Der freiwillige Feuertod in Indien und die Somaweihe*. München. (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, 1914, 4.) Reprint: *Kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart 1987, pp. 206-222.

- Hinüber, O. v. 1990. *Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1989, Nr. 11). Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.
- Jha, G. 1933-36. *Shabara-Bhāṣya*. 3 vol. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Karttunen, K. 1997. *India and the Hellenistic World* (Studia Orientalia, 83). Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Karttunen, K. 1997a. "Greeks and Indian wisdom." In *Beyond Orientalism: The Work of Wilhelm Halbfass and its Impact on Indian and Cross-Cultural Studies*. Ed. by E. Franco and K. Preisendanz. (Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities vol. 59). Amsterdam - Atlanta: Rodopi, pp. 117-122.
- Kashikar, C. G. 2003. *The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra*, critically edited and translated. 4 volumes. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts / Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Lévi, S. 1898. *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*. Paris: Ernest Leroux. Reprint: Brepols, Turnhout 2003.
- Lubin, T. 2013. "Aśoka's disparagement of domestic ritual and its validation by the Brahmins." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 41, pp. 29-41.
- Lubin, T. forthcoming. Review of Davis 2012. *Religions of South Asia*.
- McCrinkle, J. W. 1893. *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Company.
- Olivelle, P. 1978. "Ritual suicide and the rite of renunciation." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 22, pp. 19-44. Reprint: Olivelle 2011: 207-229. (References to the reprint.)
- Olivelle, P. 1992. *Samnyāsa Upaniṣads. Hindu scriptures on asceticism and renunciation. Translated with introduction and notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, P. 2000. *Dharmasūtras. The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Annotated text and translation. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Olivelle, P. 2011. *Ascetics and Brahmins: Studies in ideologies and institutions*. London - New York - Delhi: Anthem Press.

- Ranade, H. G. 1978. *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra: Rules for the Vedic Sacrifices*, translated into English. Pune: H. G. Ranade and R. H. Ranade.
- Ranade, H. G. 1998. *Lāṭyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra*. Volume two. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts / Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Śabara: *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*. Ed. Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyamkara - Gaṇeśaśāstrī Jośī. Poona: Ānandāśrama.
- Scharfe, H. 2009. *A New Perspective on Pāṇini* (Pubblicazioni di "Indologica Taurinensia", 23). Torino.
- Sedlar, J. W. 1980. *India and the Greek World. A study in the transmission of culture*. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Sprockhoff, J. F. 1987. "Kāṭhaśruti und Mānavaśrauta-sūtra: eine Nachlese zur Resignation." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14, pp. 235-257.
- Sprockhoff, J. F. 1989. "Versuch einer deutschen Übersetzung der Kāṭhaśruti und der Kāṭharudra-Upaniṣad." *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 43, pp. 137-163.
- Strong, J. S. 1989. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A study and translation of the Aśokāvadāna*. Princeton University Press. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2008.
- Thieme, P. 1935. *Pāṇini and the Veda: Studies in the early history of linguistic science in India*. Allahabad: Globe Press.
- Thite, G. U. 2004. *Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra* (text with English translation and notes). Volume II. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation.
- Witzel, M. 1987. "On the localisation of Vedic texts and schools (Materials on Vedic Śākhās, 7)." In *India and the Ancient World. History, trade and culture before A. D. 650*. Ed. by G. Pollet (Orientalia Lovaniensia, Analecta, 25). Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, pp. 173-213.
- Witzel, M. 1995. "R̥gvedic history: poets, chieftains and politics." In *Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity. The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia*. Ed. by G. Erdosy. (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, 1). Berlin - New York: de Gruyter, pp. 307-352.

- Witzel, M. 1997 “The development of the Vedic canon and its schools: The social and political milieu. (Materials on Vedic Śākhās, 8).” = Witzel 1997a: 257-345.
- Witzel, M. 1997a. *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New approaches to the study of the Vedas*. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University. Distributed by South Asia Books, Columbia, MO.
- Witzel, M. 2009. “Moving targets? Texts, language, archaeology and history in the late Vedic and early Buddhist periods.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, pp. 287-310.
- Witzel, M. 2011. “Gandhāra and the formation of the Vedic and Zoroastrian canons.” *Travaux de Symposium International “Le livre. La Roumanie. L’Europe”*. Troisième édition — 20 à 24 Septembre 2010. Tomes III: La troisième section — Etudes Euro-et Afro-Asiatiques. Bucarest: Bibliothèque de Bucarest, pp. 490-532.

EWA DEBICKA-BOREK

THE BRAVERY OF SĀḶUVA NARASIṂHA
AND THE GRACE OF NARASIṂHA DEITY¹

The names of the kings of several Hindu dynasties such as the Pallavas, Gangas or Hoysalas (Narasimha, Narasimhadeva, Narasimhavarman) suggest that the worship of Narasimha deity was quite important to them (Sastri 1996). Besides such *avatāras* as Rāma and Varāha, Narasimha seems to be a prominent figure functioning as a model for the king's duties. A point of departure for the considerations presented in this paper is the relevant portions of the *Rāmābhyudaya* (*The Triumph of Rāma*), the Sanskrit poem praising the heroic deeds of Sāḷuva Narasimha, the king of the Vijayanagara Empire who reigned from 1485 until 1491 and established the dynasty of Sāḷuvas. My aim is to discuss what reasons might have been behind the apparent predilection for the cult of Narasimha deity in the case of this particular dynasty (hinted at already in the name given to its founder, Sāḷuva Narasimha) and whether such a predilection could be meaningful in the context of creating the image of Sāḷuva Narasimha's bravery.² Similar pieces of information regarding the genealogy of Sāḷuvas are to be found in another historical poem praising the Sāḷuva Narasimha, namely in the *Sāḷuvābhyudaya* (*The Triumph of Sāḷuva*), as well as in the records of two copperplate inscriptions commissioned after

¹ The research is conducted in the frame of the project funded by the National Science Centre (NCN) on the basis of decision no. 2013/11/D/HS2/04521.

² I would like to thank Prof. Lidia Sudyka for inspiring me to take up the problem of differentiation of Narasimha worship in Andhra as well as anonymous reviewers for their suggestions regarding the present paper.

Sāḷuva Narasiṃha's death by his son, Sāḷuva Immaḍi Narasiṃha (reigned: 1491–1505), but due to limited space I will not refer to them here.

The Sāḷuvas formed the second dynasty of Vijayanagara, and the shortest, as it existed for only 20 years (1485–1505). Its founder, Sāḷuva Narasiṃha, a noble from the Sāḷuva clan, was a commander of a royal army of the Sangama dynasty. To save the kingdom from dissolution after the death of Virūpākṣa II (1485), who could not prevent a power struggle among his subjects and was finally killed by his eldest son, Sāḷuva Narasiṃha, commanded his general Narasa Nāyaka to capture the city and usurped the throne. Throughout his reign the new king had to fight against major internal opposition and chieftains as well as foreign opponents. Still, he managed to revive the horse trade, which had been essential for the Vijayanagra cavalry but was displaced during the reign of Virūpākṣa II, and he also reinforced the efficiency of his army. Sāḷuva Narasiṃha died in 1491 when his two sons were still young and the story repeated itself, as soon the princes were assassinated and the throne of Sāḷuvas was usurped (1505) by the son of Narasa Nāyaka, the regent appointed by Narasiṃha himself, namely Vīra Narasiṃha Rāya, the founder of the third or the Tuluva Dynasty of Vijayanagara (Sastri 1996: 273–275).

Both the *Sāḷuvābhyudaya* and the *Rāmābhyudaya* were composed during Sāḷuvas' time and despite their conventional panegyric form the poems provide some information about the history and ancestors of the dynasty. However, while the authorship of the former is rather certain – it was composed by Rājanātha Ḍiṇḍima (Sastri 1996: 350, Lienhard 1984: 22) the court poet of Sāḷuva Narasiṃha – the authorship of the latter is still problematic. Its composition has so far been usually ascribed to Sāḷuva Narasiṃha himself. However, as Lidia Sudyka proposed recently in her book *Vijayanagara. A Forgotten Empire of Poetesses. Part I. The Voice of Gaṅgadevī* (2013), it is highly possible that we owe it to another poet from the famous Ḍiṇḍima family. Based mostly on the colophons of the subsequent chapters of the *Rāmābhyudaya*, Sudyka draws

the convincing conclusion that its author might have been Aruṇagirinātha Ḍiṇḍima, the court poet of Devarāya II from the Sangama Dynasty (Sudyka 2013: 127–133). His son, Rājanātha Ḍiṇḍima, might have rewritten his work for the sake of dedicating it to the new king, namely Sāḷuva Narasiṃha. In this context Sudyka (2013: 132–133) writes:

“However, that man of military and administrative talents, planning to establish a new dynasty, had to surround his family with an aura of kingship. He did not move the capital of the kingdom to the more convenient for him and secure Candragiri, his patrimony. The ‘City of Victory’ was the symbol of the empire. He could have aspired to imitate the example he witnessed himself — the life at the court of Devarāya II. The Ḍiṇḍima poets were connected with the royal house of Vijayanagara from its very beginning, as is attested by a copper plate grant of Bukka I. Definitely, it must have been essential for a new ruler to have a poet or poets coming from this family at his service. Rājanātha, a son of distinguished Aruṇagirinātha Ḍiṇḍima Kavīndra Sārvabhauma, was an ideal candidate to write a panegyric poem on the king’s ancestors and heroic deeds. It seems that the quickest way to achieve this aim was to rewrite the existent (perhaps unfinished?) poem, or at least its parts, and dedicate it to the new king. It was enough to add information about Narasiṃha and his ancestors to the first canto of the poem and suitable colophons dedicating the poem to the ruler”.

The *Rāmābhyudaya* informs us about the genealogy of Sāḷuvas just before telling the story of Rāma. As Sudyka (2013: 128) observes, the concluding verses of its subsequent *sargas* play with the concept of Narasiṃha as an incarnation of Viṣṇu³

³ For example *Rāmābhyudaya* 147 cd: *viṣṇoḥ śrīnaraṣiṃhaviḡrahabhṛto bhāvormisetau kṛtau | śrīrāmābhyudaye `tra kāvyatilake sargo `yam ādir gataḥ ||* – “Here ends the opening *sarga* in the composition *Triumph of Rāma*, which is an ornament of poetry, a bridge over the waves of *bhāvas*, the composition for/of Viṣṇu who takes the form of Narasiṃha” (in translation of Sudyka (2013: 128)).

– “the victories of Narasiṃha Sāluva are comparable to those of Rāma and he himself is compared to Viṣṇu in his Narasiṃha *avatāra* (an allusion to the name of the usurper).” I would, however, like to draw attention to another motif pointing mostly to the importance of Narasiṃha deity in the case of this particular dynasty and appearing in the introductory verses of the 1st *sarga* of *Rāmābhyudaya*. It is then developed in the 2nd *sarga*⁴ of the *Sāluvābhyudaya* and present in the two abovementioned copperplate inscriptions written in Sanskrit commissioned by the son of Sāluva Narasiṃha. The date of the Bankanakatte copperplate *śāsana* of Immaḍi Narasiṃha corresponds to April 29, 1504,⁵ while that of Chākenhalli (Demasamudra) grant corresponds to 1492.⁶

The *Rāmābhyudaya* introduces Sāluva Narasiṃha as a son of Guṇḍaya, who in turn was a son of Gautama, who was a son of Maṅgi. The great-grandfather of Sāluva Narasiṃha was a founder of the family and played an important role in the Madurai campaign of Kampana, the son of Bukka I. It is said that during this campaign he earned the title ‘Sāluva’ (a hawk used in hunting according to Telugu and Kannada lexicographers). The Sāluvas claimed to be *kṣatriyas*. Traditionally, they migrated from northern Karnataka to Andhra (Durga Prasad 2014: 50).⁷

Rāmābhyudaya 1.34:

putreṣu tasya bahuṣu bhuvanaśrutakṛtiṣu |
kṣamām apālayat kṛtsnām khyāto gautamabhūpatiḥ ||

⁴ It has not been edited so far, therefore I am consulting the text which comes from the manuscript DC No. 11818 & 11819, Government Oriental Mss Library, Chennai. Unfortunately the text is full of lacunas. I would like to thank Prof. Lidia Sudyka for providing me with the copy of the manuscript.

⁵ See *Epigraphia Indica* Vol VII (1902–1903): 80ff.

⁶ See Annual Report of the Mysore Archeological Department for 1924: 96ff.

⁷ *Sāluvābhyudaya* and both inscriptions present Sāluvas’ genealogy similarly. Also, all of them refer to the grace of Ahobilanarasiṃha thanks to whom the Sāluva Narasiṃha was born after his elderly parents retired to Ahobilam and performed penances for the sake of having a child.

Among his (Maṅgi's) many sons, famous around the world, there was a prince called Gautama, who ruled the whole earth.

Rāmābhyudaya 1.37ab:
akhaṇḍamahāśas tasmād abhūd guṇḍayabhūpatiḥ |

From him, possessing absolute power, King Guṇḍaya was born.

Rāmābhyudaya 1.42:
mallāmbikā mahābhāgā tasyāsīt saha cārīṇī |
devī daśarathasyeva kausalyā kulabhūṣaṇam ||

His wife was the eminent Mallāmbikā, a goddess, who like Daśaratha's Kausalyā was the jewel of the family.

Similarly to other sources, the *Rāmābhyudaya* shows Sāluva Narasiṃha as born out of the grace of Narasiṃha deity as a result of his parents' (Guṇḍaya and Mallāmbikā) penances performed in Ahobilam, the distant centre of Narasiṃha worship, located in present-day Andhra in the Nallamala Hills that form a part of the Eastern Ghats. This particular god was the family deity of Guṇḍa (see *Rāmābhyudaya* 1.46). Therefore, as we may suppose, when the long awaited son was born, he was named after him.

Rāmābhyudaya 1.43–1.44:
tataḥ kadācid ekānte sa guṇḍayamahīpatiḥ |
cintām anantām atanot santānāptivilambanāt ||

Then, once, in a secluded place, King Guṇḍaya was endlessly thinking because of the delay in having an heir:

atarpitāgni savanam alakṣitapataṃ nabhaḥ |
anudgatendum ambhodhim aputraṃ māṃ pracakṣate ||

“They consider me, sonless, as an offering with unsatisfied Agni, as a cloud, which dispersed unnoticed, as an ocean, which did not bring out the moon.”

Rāmābhyudaya 1.46–1.48:

*iti cintāparo dhyātvā nṛhariṃ kuladaivatam |
sa tayā saha cārīṇyā tapo 'kuruta duścaram ||*

Lost in thought, having meditated upon Nṛhari, the family deity, he, together with his wife, performed a severe penance.

*tapasā tena santuṣṭas tasya svapne puro 'bhavat |
ahobalanṛsimhas tam abravīd adbhutaṃ vacaḥ ||*

Satisfied with this penance, Ahobalanṛsiṃha⁸ appeared before him in his dream and said marvelous words:

*śauryagāmbhūryasaundaryadhairyaudāryādibhūṣaṇaḥ |
tavāstu tanayo vatsa! sarvorvīcakranāyakaḥ ||*

“My dear child, yours will be a son adorned with heroism, dignity, beauty, intelligence and generosity, the leader of troops of the entire earth.”

Rāmābhyudaya 1.51:

*tathā guṇḍayabhūbhartuḥ tanayo 'bhūt tataḥ phalāt |
nanaguṇagaṇas tasyāṃ narasiṃha iti śrutaḥ ||*

Thus, as a result, the son of King Guṇḍaya, possessing various qualities, known as Narasiṃha, was conceived in her [Mallāmbikā].

These verses provoke two questions: might this strategy of recurrent referring to Narasiṃha be meaningful? And is there

⁸ Both versions of the name are in use: Ahobala[m] and Ahobila[m].

anything behind pointing to a particular, locally known form of the deity, namely Narasiṃha from Ahobilam?

In short, according to a Vaiṣṇava version of a pan-Indian myth of Narasiṃha, the 4th *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, Brahmā granted the demon Hiraṇyakaśipu invulnerability to all conditions as well as to all beings. Neither man nor animal could kill the demon; it could be done neither during the day nor at night, neither within a house nor outside it, neither with a weapon nor by hand, etc. Therefore Viṣṇu appeared in the terrifying form of half a man and half a lion, at dusk, on a threshold etc. and killed him with his claws. However, as Soifer (1992: 104–107) observes, with the development of *bhakti* cults the main reason for the appearance of Narasiṃha on the earth became to save Prahlāda, an ardent worshipper of Viṣṇu, from his father Hiraṇyakaśipu.

Narasiṃha's cult became popular in the times of the Vijayanagara Empire. It happened concurrently with the expansion of settled agriculture into forested zones and the rise of local rulers (Sontheimer 1985: 144). Most probably it was the earliest non-Śaivite cult in the city of Vijayanagara, which appeared there by the early 14th century. According to Verghese (1995: 41) Narasiṃha could not compete in prestige and patronage of Vijayanagara kings with the cults of Paṃpā-Virūpākṣa, Rāma, Viṭhala or Veṅkateśvara. Nevertheless, in contrast to other Vaiṣṇava cults, Narasiṃha's existed there continuously from the pre-Vijayanagara times up to the destruction of the city. In this context one should remember that the pantheon of gods worshipped by the rulers of the Vijayanagara Empire was very expansive and inclusive. Such gods as the abovementioned Narasiṃha, Veṅkateśvara and Viṭhala or, for example, Vīrabhadra or Mailār, had primarily been regional deities worshipped by pastoralists or forest people (Sontheimer 1985, Sinopoli 2000: 375–6). Regarding the tribal past of Narasiṃha, Sontheimer (1985: 145) claims that his roots are theriomorphic and he originated “in a forest, on a hill, in a cave or a ravine”. The autochthonous people visualized it as an animal of the feline order, usually a lion. In the process of

Hinduisation this deity began to be called Narasiṃha and was identified with the *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. In the case of Andhra it seems to be corroborated by the oldest (3rd–4th century AD) representation of Narasiṃha found at Kondamotu, showing a lion with a tail but holding in his two human hands a *gadā* and a *cakra*, both symbols of Viṣṇu (Waheed Khan 1964).

Most often it was the numerical and economic power of tribals that led to their integration into the very dynamic state, along with their gods and beliefs (Durga – Reddy 1992). Yet, as Sinopoli (2000: 376) points out, there are two important factors to be noted in regard to the deities which were elevated in status by Vijayanagara kings:

“First, all were fierce gods, with attributes of warriors and protectors and were explicitly linked to the militaristic qualities of Vijayanagara. (...) Second, (...), the marginal populations from which these deities were drawn, especially the pastoralist communities of the inland southern Deccan, had come to play a very important role in Vijayanagara military and political structure”.

In this light it seems natural that the bravery and martial inclinations of such gods might have inspired warriors and kings, and that is why they were chosen by them as family deities. It is worth noting that such fierce gods happened to be reconciled under one roof despite their sectarian affinity. For example, the Temple of Virabhadra in Lepakshi, patronized by the Tuluva Dynasty, contains a painting of Narasiṃha venerated by a king who, according to Pachner (1985: 337), might be a Śāḷuva.⁹ As Verghese suggests (1995: 45) the reason for the popularity of the Man-Lion during the Vijayanagara Empire might have been the fact that his wrathful nature “suited well the temper of the times”. The terrifying aspect of Viṣṇu, known for killing his enemy the demon, might have caused the rulers of a warring empire to seek his protection and blessing.

⁹ The painting is in a very poor condition today so it is difficult to say anything more (see fig. 2).

Leaving aside the Narasiṃha myth it is also interesting to refer in this context to the association between heroic warriors and lions expressed in the 14th stanza of the 9th chapter of the *Madhurāvijaya* by Gaṅgādevī, the beloved of Kampana, the son of Bukka I of the Sangama Dynasty (14th century AD). As Sudyka (2013: 165–167) observes, the stanza in question¹⁰ employs *rūpaka* and *śleṣa*. The idea of the former is that when the fighting kings encounter enemies on the battlefield they behave like lions. The latter points to the compound *rājasimha*, which might be translated as ‘the kings-lions’ and ‘the kings among lions’. Since according to the *kāvya* convention lions claw the heads of elephants, the behavior of warriors towards their enemies might be interpreted in the same way. Taking into consideration the outcomes of the research of Vassilkov,¹¹ according to whom such epithets like ‘tiger-man’ (*puruṣavyāghra*) or ‘lion-man’ (*narasiṃha*) referring to warriors might be traced to the animal symbolism of Indo-Aryan warrior brotherhood, Sudyka (2013: 167) concludes that “The stanzas from Gaṅgādevī’s poems leave no doubt that the mythological link between a hero (*vīra*) and a lion (*siṃha*) as well as the image of lion-warrior brotherhood was still very much alive in the minds of medieval poets”. In this light it seems not without meaning that the cult of Narasiṃha was patronized by the kings of the Sāluva Dynasty: as mentioned above, it was established by an usurper who, as it happens in such situations, had to fight the opposition and legitimise his newly gained rule.

The importance of a regionally recognized form of Narasiṃha, i.e. Ahobilanarasiṃha, in the case of Sāluva Narasiṃha’s “biography” can be interpreted as opening another dimension in the discussion on the possible strategies of

¹⁰ *Madhurāvijaya* 9.14: *saṅgrāmaḥ anyāṃ abhitaś caranto darpoḍḍhatāḥ kecana rājasimhāḥ |*

pratyarthinām pārthivakuñjarāṇām śirāṃsy abhindaṇḍaḥ nakharaiḥ kharāgraiḥ || –
 “<In their war madness> <certain kingly warriors>, wandered all around the battlefield
 and tore the heads of of their <powerful> adversaries with their sharp nails,
 like<the kings among lions> <aroused by (the smell) of ichor> do to the mighty
 elephants.” (in translation of Sudyka (2013: 165)).

¹¹ See for example Vassilkov 2015. I was not able to consult other articles by him mentioned by Sudyka.

creating the image of a brave, heroic king. Obviously, the recurrent motif of being born out of the grace of Ahobilarasiṃha is rather conventional and cannot be taken literally, but references to Ahobilam, the actual space, may have some historical meaning; for example, it may suggest that during the life of Sāluva Narasiṃha's father this centre of Narasiṃha worship in the Nallamala Hills had already played an important role on the pilgrimage map of the empire. Clearly, temples which were built in the wild areas were very important for the expansion of the settled culture and spreading of religious influences. In addition, most probably for the sake of integration of different language zones within the empire, the rulers of Vijayanagara encouraged pilgrimages and took part in them themselves within the borders of the empire (Verghese 1995: 3).

The earliest literary reference to Ahobilam¹² comes most probably from the *Periya Tirumoli* (1.7.1–10)¹³ of Tirumaṅkai Ālvār, and therefore we may presume that it must have been present in the minds of pious pilgrims until the 8th century. It is difficult to say whether Tirumaṅkai himself visited the hill, yet his depiction of both the sacredness and the wildness of the spot is very vivid and convincing. Apart from praising the god who descended there in his ferocious aspect (*ugra*) to protect his followers and kill the demon Hiraṇyakaśipu, the author mentions terrifying hunters. These hunters are most probably members of the hunter-gatherer Ceñcū tribe that still live in the forests around Ahobilam. Yet, the place did not become recognized as one of the most influential Śrīvaiṣṇava centres until the Ahobila *maṭha* was established there by Ādi vān Śaṭhakopa Jīyar (the 2nd half of

¹² The oldest inscription found in Ahobilam records the gift of Prolaya Vema Reddy, a chief in the army of the Kākaṭīyas (the 14th century AD). His court poet was Yerrāparagada (1325–1353) who praised the Narasiṃha of Ahobilam in Telugu language in the *Narasiṃhapurāṇam* (Sitapati 1981: 14).

¹³ I would like to thank Prof. Govindaswami Rajagopal for consulting this portion of the text, see also Dębicka-Borek 2013.

the 15th century). The bonds with Vijayanagara were reinforced when the first superior of the *maṭha* became a guru of Allasāni Peddanna, a poet in the court of Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya of the Tuluva Dynasty (Raman 1975: 80–81), who visited Ahobilam himself (Sitapati 1982: 15).

As the essence of the Ceñcūs' life has been hunting and gathering, the predatory features of Man-Lion must have spoken to their imagination, hence Narasiṃha might have become a "divine integrator" of the *vana* and *kṣetra*, two spheres constantly mingling in Ahobilam: the local/tribal and that of the so called Great Tradition of Hinduism.¹⁴ The integration of this particular tribe with a settled life is reflected in a widely known pattern depicting a second marriage of a recognized god with a local girl, in this case the marriage of Narasiṃha, who while hunting in the forests of Ahobilam falls in love with a Ceñcū girl (see fig. 1). The story exists in a variety of oral legends, yet through the Sanskrit play *Vāsantikāpariṇayam* ascribed to Śaṭhakopa Yatīndra Mahādeśika (16th century), the 7th superior of the *maṭha* in Ahobilam, it was included into the literature of the Great Tradition of Hinduism, proving the final acceptance of tribal communities there. In the course of time the Ceñcūs have obtained limited rights in the local Narasiṃha temples. Also, the kings of Vijayanagara engaged them in spying on local enemies and Muslim rulers or in tracking the criminals living in the Nallamala hills (Subba Reddy 2010: 225).

Nevertheless, it appears that the remoteness of this particular place prevented the local tradition from full integration into the mainstream Hinduism and created a kind of a mixture of local and orthodox beliefs. Some functions of Narasiṃha remained significant only in the particular surroundings: within the Nallamala forest around Ahobilam he still happens to be associated with a great hunter (Murty 1997: 185). Besides, during the process of "harassing" the wild realm some

¹⁴ According to Sontheimer (1987: 147–148) the *vana* is a wild, forested space with its inhabitants whereas the *kṣetra* is an inhabited space with a regular settled system of agriculture based on the plough. For more on the strategies of joining these two realms in the area of Ahobilam see Dejbicka-Borek 2013.