

XII

MAHISHAMANDALA AND MAHISHMATI

BY J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

THE Dipavaṃsa tells us (8. 1, 2) that :—“The far-seeing Moggaliputta, having by supernatural vision beheld the establishment of the [Buddhist] doctrine in the future in the border-land, sent out the Thēras Majjhantika and others, each with four (*companions*), to establish the doctrine in the border-land for the enlightenment of sentient beings.” And it tells us in verse 5 that the Thēra Mahādēva was thus sent to the Mahisa country, Mahisaratt̥ha, = Mahisharāshtra. The Mahāvaṃsa, in its account of the same matter, calls this territory (12. 3, 29) Mahisamaṇḍala, = Mahishamaṇḍala. Buddhaghōsha, dealing with the missions in his Samanta-Pāsādikā,¹ quotes a verse, very similar to that of the Dipavaṃsa, which mentions it as *ratt̥ham Mahisam*, but uses in his own prose the forms Mahisakamaṇḍala and Mahimsaka°; in the latter case, with the insertion of a nasal in a manner which is not uncommon in Pāli. And this last form is also found in the Jātaka and its commentary.² We adopt the form Mahishamaṇḍala, because it is the one which, in its Pāli shape, has been habitually used by other writers.

Some comments must be made on the passage in the Dipavaṃsa thus cited :—

(1) The sending out of the missions took place just after the Third Council. The Dipavaṃsa, 7. 37, 44, places this Council 236 years after the death of Buddha. The Mahāvaṃsa, 5. 280, places it in the seventeenth year of Aśōka. Both authorities, and Buddhaghōsha, agree that

¹ See the *Vinayapīṭaka*, ed. Oldenberg, 3. 314 ff.

² Ed. Fausböll, 1. 356; 5. 145, 162, 337.

it lasted for nine months. And the Mahāvamsa adds (12. 2) that the missions were sent out in the month Kārttika. We understand the Dipavamsa as referring to the end of the Council, and the Mahāvamsa to the commencement of it. And we thus gather that the Council began about the middle of January, B.C. 247, and ended about the middle of October, and that the arrangements for despatching the missions were made before 6 November.¹

(2) The Dipavamsa, Buddhaghōsha, and the Mahāvamsa all agree that the Council was convened and the missions were sent out by the great priest Moggaliputta-Tissa; not by Aśōka, as is asserted by lax writers.²

(3) The name of the place or territory to which the Thēra Rakkhita was sent is not stated by the Dipavamsa; unless, in verse 6, we may amend *vehāsam abbhuggantvāna*, "having risen into the air (so as to travel through it)", into *Vanavāsam abbhāgantvāna* or *gantvā*, "having gone to Vanavāsa"; or unless *vehāsa* is a corrupt reading of some name (? Vērāta) for which Vanavāsa was afterwards substituted. This name is supplied as Vanavāsī by Buddhaghōsha, and as Vanavāsa by the Mahāvamsa.

(4) The words which we have rendered by "in the border-land" are *pachchantamhi* in verse 1 and *pachchantē* in verse 2: in both cases the locative singular. Professor Oldenberg has rendered them by, respectively, "in the neighbouring countries" and "in foreign countries". In deviating from his choice of words, we have been guided by the point that the term *pachchanta*, = *pratyanta*, 'bordering on, adjacent or contiguous to, skirting',³ is practically the same with that which we have in the expression *pachchantimā janapadā*, presented in, e.g., the Vinayapitaka, Mahāvagga, 5. 13. 12, in defining the limits

¹ See my table in this Journal, 1909. 27.

² See, fully, my remarks in this Journal, 1908. 493.

³ Monier-Williams: and compare Childers.

of the Buddhist Madhyadēśa or Middle Country, and appropriately translated there by "border countries".¹ In the accounts of the missions, the Mahāvamsa has *pachchantēsu*: Buddhaghōsha has *pachchantimēsu janapddēsu*.

(5) Altogether nine missions were sent out. The name of one of the territories is (as we have said) apparently wanting in the Dipavamsa. And another territory, called Gandhāra by it, is called Kasmīra - and - Gandhāra by Buddhaghōsha and the Mahāvamsa. Otherwise, however, the three accounts all agree. The order in which the missions are named is the same in all three. And in the terms of the Mahāvamsa (ed. Geiger, 12. 3-8) the full list of the territories is:—

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1, Kasmīra and Gandhāra. | 5, Mahārātṭha. |
| 2, Mahisamaṇḍala. | 6, Yōnalōka. |
| 3, Vanavāsa. | 7, Himavantapadēsaka. |
| 4, Aparantaka. | 8, Suvannabhūmi. |
| 9, Laṅkāḍīpa, i.e. Ceylon. | |

Now, No. 9, Ceylon, is distinctly not a border-land of any Indian Middle Country. But it was hardly possible to avoid including the mission to Ceylon along with the others. Though, however, that was the most important of all the missions, it is mentioned last; which tends to exclude it from the same category with the others. We therefore separate the other territories from Ceylon, and consider how far they come under the definition of border-lands; that is, of countries more or less adjacent to the Buddhist Middle Country.

We easily recognize what may fairly be called border-lands of that country in No. 1, Kashmīr and Gandhāra, the latter being, roughly, the modern Peshāwar and Rāwal Piṇḍī Districts; in No. 4, Aparānta, 'the western ends', the Konkan, with (we hold) also northern Gujarāt, Kāṭhīāwāḍ, Cutch (Kachchh), and Sind; in No. 5,

¹ For translations of this passage see SBE., 17. 38, and this Journal, 1904. 84. Regarding the impossible dimensions assigned to the country in other works, see my remarks in this Journal, 1907. 653, note 3.

Mahārāshtra, the Dekkaṇ ; in No. 6, Yōnalōka, 'the region of the Yavanas', taken as meaning the Greek settlements in the Panjāb and its western neighbourhood ; and in No. 7, the Himālayan region.

There remain Nos. 2, 3, and 8. As regards No. 8, the case seems fairly clear. Suvāṇabhūmi, = Suvarṇabhūmi, 'the gold-land', is understood by the Burmese to be what is also called by them Rāmaññadēsa ; namely, Lower Burma between the rivers Sittaung and Salwin, with also parts of Pegu and Moulmein.¹ And it has been generally believed, until recently, that that territory is really the Suvarṇabhūmi to which the mission was sent.² This belief, however, is now abandoned, in view of the position, which appears to be well established, that the earliest Burmese Buddhism was Mahāyānist, and reached Burma from China and only in the fourth century A.D.³ We would supplement that by suggesting that the real Suvarṇabhūmi is the country in Bengal which is mentioned by Hiuen-tsiang as Ka-lo-na-su-fa-la-na, = Karṇasuvarṇa ; or else the country along the river Sōn (Śōṇa), also known as Hirāṇyavāha, 'the gold-bearer'.

No. 3, Vanavāsa, can hardly be regarded as a borderland if it really means, as is usually supposed, the territory that belonged to Banawāsi in North Kanara. That understanding, however, is open to question, in view of

¹ For a map of the Rāmañña country see *Ind. Ant.*, 22. 328.

² It has also been understood to be the Golden Khersonēsē of Ptolemy : see, e.g., *Ind. Ant.*, 13. 372.

³ See Taw Sein Ko in *Ind. Ant.* 1906. 212, and Report on Archaeological Work in Burma, 1905-6. 8.

This change of view, of course, does not in any way impeach the credit of the Ceylonese chronicles : quite the reverse. The supposed fact of an introduction of Buddhism into Burma in the time of Aśōka does not rest on either them or the Samanta-Pāsādikā : it rests entirely on the mistaken identification of the Suvarṇabhūmi mentioned by them : they do not say anything to locate that country in Burma.

The Burmese have taken over the names of many Indian countries and places. Notably, in addition to a Suvarṇabhūmi they claim a Vanavāsi, an Aparantaka, a Mahārāṭṭha, and even a Mahimsakamaṇḍala.

the point that Vaijayanti seems better established than Vanavāsī as the more ancient name of Banawāsī. But we must set this detail aside for future consideration.

That No. 2, Mahishamaṇḍala, was a border-land, we propose to show now.

* * * * *

The Imperial Gazetteer of India says that the Mahishamaṇḍala, thus mentioned as one of the territories to which Moggaliputta-Tissa despatched his Buddhist missions, is the modern Mysore.¹ And this has certainly been the belief for a long time past. We do not know exactly with whom it originated. Turnour, in 1837, entered Mahishamaṇḍala as "one of the ancient divisions of India, not identified":² and in 1854 Cunningham said "this country is not known: it may be Maheswara, on the Narbada".³ On the other hand, Wilson, at some time before 1860, explained the Māhishakas of the Mahābhārata as "the people of Mysore".⁴ And the identification of Mahishamaṇḍala with Mysore was presented in 1874 as an established point, needing no citation of authority, by the editor of the *Indian Antiquary* (3. 273). It would seem, therefore, that the belief is based on something which was advanced conjecturally between 1854 and 1860, and was gradually converted into a supposed certainty in a not infrequent manner. And the identification is given as a certainty in two other recent works which are intended, like the Imperial Gazetteer, to be authoritative guides. It is asserted by Mr. Vincent Smith in his *Asoka* (2nd ed., 1909), p. 44; where, by the way, the first component of the name is shown in the mistaken form *mahīśa*, 'lord of the earth'. And, to the extent that Mahishamaṇḍala means, not the whole of the Mysore

¹ Vol. 18 (1908), pp. 162, 169, 253, 261.

² *Mahāwanso*, index and glossary, 16.

³ *Bhilsa Topes*, 117.

⁴ Vishnu-Purāna, translation, 2. 178, note 6.

territory, but "the country round [the city] Mysore", it is presented on p. 14 of Mr. Rice's *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, which book, "published for Government" in 1909, puts forward (we regret to have to say), as sober history for the period before A.D. 750, much fabulous matter which has no basis except in spurious records dating from the tenth century and onwards, in late chronicles which display great ignorance of the real facts of early times, and in legends which we cannot even dignify by calling them traditions.

Support of the views thus expressed has been found in the fact that we have two Aśōka edicts engraved on rocks at Siddāpura, Brahmagiri, and Jaṭṭiṅga-Rāmēśvara in the Chitaldroog District of Mysore: it being also asserted, on the same basis, that Mysore was included in the Maurya empire. That, however, has nothing to do with the case. We cannot here elaborate the history of what is now the Chitaldroog District: but the following brief statement may be made. It was only about A.D. 950 that the Chitaldroog territory first passed into the hands of any ruler who held also the southern part of Mysore, where the modern name-giving capital is. It subsequently developed into a separate petty state, under Poligars: and it was only in A.D. 1779 that it was annexed to the territory of the present rulers of Mysore.¹ It was certainly foreign territory as regards the dominions of Aśōka and his line.² And there is every reason for believing that Isila, the ancient town at which there resided the officials to whom the edicts in question were transmitted from Suvarṇagiri in Magadha, and in the neighbourhood of which they were published on the rocks by them, was at that time, and probably for many centuries afterwards, a subdivisional town of the great kingdom of Vanavāsī,

¹ See the Imperial Gazetteer, 10. 291; and compare Mr. Rice's *Mysore* (1897), 2. 500-4

² See, fully, my remarks in this Journal, 1909. 997.

or more strictly Vaijayantī: it was at any rate not in any territory bearing the name Mysore; no such territory existed then. Further, according to our own view, the first of these two edicts embodies the dying speech of Aśōka, and they were framed some twenty years after the Council and the sending out of the missions: while, according to another view, these two edicts were framed in the thirteenth year of Aśōka, four or five years before the Council, and were probably the very first of his proclamations. From either point of view, these edicts have no connexion with either the Council or the sending out of the missions: except that we believe that Isila was selected as one of the places to which the last words of Aśōka should be communicated, because a Buddhist settlement had been established there as a result of one or another of the missions sent into the territory on the south of the Narbadā.

* * * * *

In looking into this belief that the Mahishamaṇḍala of the Buddhist books is Mysore or some part thereof, the first points that suggest themselves for consideration are:— To what date can we carry back the existence of the name Maisūru, Maisūr (the original of the anglicized Mysore), in its present or any previous form? And what can be the connexion, if there is any, between that name and Mahishamaṇḍala or any such appellation?

An inscription at Nandigunda in the Nañjangūd tāluka of the Mysore District,¹ dated in A.D. 1021, mentions a territorial division named the “Maysunnād”, and places in it Nandigunda itself, which is about twelve miles south-east from the city of Mysore. And the spurious

¹ *Epi. Carn.*, 3 (Mysore). Nj. 134. The text in roman characters gives to the name which I quote the form Mayasun-nād; the translation gives Maysūr-nād; and the text in Kanarese characters gives Maysun-nād. As the Kanarese texts are the bases of what is published in the volumes of the *Epigraphia Carnatica*, I adopt the last form.

record on the Tanjore plates,¹ which purports to have been framed in A.D. 248 but was fabricated not earlier than the tenth century, claims to convey a village, situated in the "Maisunāḍu seventy", named Oṛekōḍu, which is shown by the full details given in the record to be the 'Wurcode' of the Indian Atlas sheet No. 60 (1828) and the 'Varkod' of the quarter-sheet No. 60, S.W. (1892), about seven miles east-by-south from Mysore. These two records locate the territorial division thus mentioned. The second of them marks it as a group of seventy villages. As we know that any such group usually included a leading town or village bearing the same name with the group itself, and as the Kanarese word for 'village, town', is *ūr*, *ūru*, we may venture to assume that the two names thus presented are carelessly written forms of Maysūr-nāḍ and Maisūr-nāḍ: especially because in this group of seventy villages we certainly have the original of the present Mysore tāluka, one of the subdivisions of the Mysore District,² and because an inscription, which is attributed to about A.D. 990, at Kuppehāḷu in the Kaḍūr District,³ appears to mention, among the witnesses to the grant registered by it, "the (officials of the) Maysūr-nāḍ seventy", with reference to probably the same group of villages. And we may thus carry back the existence of the name Mysore in the form Maysūr, and of the city Mysore as a village bearing its present name, to the tenth century. But that is all that we can do.⁴ And it is sufficiently

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, 8. 212: and see my list of spurious records in *id.*, 30 (1901). 215, No. 10. Spurious records, though mostly valueless for chronological purposes, are frequently of considerable use from the geographical and other miscellaneous points of view.

² That the Mysore tāluka now includes one hundred and fifty towns and villages, is of course immaterial. The numbers in the territorial divisions of India have been altered and are still altered from time to time; for improved administrative purposes, as well as because of new villages growing up, and old ones becoming deserted.

³ *Epi. Carn.*, 6 (Kaḍūr). Kd. 9.

⁴ Pending the issue of a proper index to the volumes of the *Epigraphia*

obvious that the place was then nothing but a small one, which had not given its name to even the area which makes up the present Mysore District, and was quite incapable of providing an appellation for the entire territory in which it was situated. This position is borne out by every other consideration; even apart from the point that no remains or other tokens of antiquity are found there, which indicates plainly that we have not even the case of an ancient city sinking into insignificance and then rising again.¹

The territory now known as Mysore, and the district now known as the Mysore District, owe their appellations simply to the accident that the village Mysore has developed into a modern capital. The Mysore territory is composed of provinces and districts which in ancient times had their own quite different names. In the north it includes part of a province known as the Noḷambavāḍi 32,000, and part of the Vanavāsī kingdom generally known in later times as the Banavāse 12,000. The rest of it consists mostly of districts and provinces such as the Kuvalāla 300, the Eḍetore 1000, the Pūnāḍ or Punnāḍ 6000, the Gaṅga 6000, and the Koṅgaḷnāḍ 8000, which were massed under one name as the Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000, meaning "the territory of the Gaṅgas comprising

Carnatica, it is not practical to use them exhaustively. But the above-mentioned three records give the only references that I have been able to find for the Maysūr or Maisūr seventy, and the earliest instances of the existence of the name: and Mr. Rice himself does not claim to have done more; see, e.g., his *Mysore* (1897), 2. 280:—"We find Maisu-nād or Maisur-nād mentioned in inscriptions of the 11th and 12th centuries."

A group of villages known as the Mayse-nāḍ appears to be mentioned in an inscription of A.D. 1136, and in another which is referred to about A.D. 1200: *Epi. Carn.*, 5 (Hassan). Bl. 17; Hn. 139. And the same seems to be mentioned as the Maise-nāḍ in inscriptions of A.D. 1117 and 1174: *ibid.*, Bl. 58, 59, 71. But that is marked by the records as a different group, close to Bēlūr in the Bēlūr tāluka of the Hassan District.

¹ Compare Mr. Rice's remarks in *Mysore* (1897), 2. 280, 281:—"The present town of Mysore cannot perhaps boast of much antiquity . . . Here a fort was either constructed or repaired in the year 1524."

(according to tradition or conventional acceptance) 96,000 cities, towns, and villages".¹ The city Mysore is situated in the southern part of the ancient Gaṅgavāḍi country, the connected authentic history of which, as established by the inscriptions, dates from closely about A.D. 750, when there arose a Gaṅga prince, Śivamāra I, whose descendants ruled till about A.D. 1000.² The first mention of the 96,000 province is found in the inscription of the first year of the rule of Śrīpurusha-Muttarasa, son of Śivamāra I,³ which speaks of "all the subjects of the 96,000", apparently as witnesses to the act recorded in it. The earliest known instance of the use of the full appellation "Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000" seems to be found in an inscription of Eṛeyappa, of the period about A.D. 908 to 938,⁴ which describes that prince as "governing the Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000 as a united whole (lit., in the shade of one umbrella)." And it remained in use, even when the Gaṅgas had passed away, until at least A.D. 1200. For the Gaṅga period, the only recognizable capitals are, as Mr. Rice has told us,⁵ Kōlār and Talakāḍ. And during that period, and for six centuries after it, no mention of the name Mysore in any form, and no allusion to the place, can be found, except as stated on pp. 431-2 above.

¹ Nothing could be clearer than the proof that this is the meaning of these numerical designations: yet Mr. Rice in his recent publication has repeated prominently an old mistake in asserting (p. 174) that the numbers denote the revenue values; and the mistake has found its way, from his previous writings, into the Imperial Gazetteer, 10. 291, note 2. I shall hope to give a separate note on this matter.

² There were, indeed, Gaṅgas in Mysore before A.D. 750, in the sixth and perhaps even the fifth century. But no authentic details are known about them.

³ At Talakāḍ, *Epi. Carn.*, 3 (Mysore). TN. 1.

⁴ At Bēgūr, *Epi. Carn.*, 9 (Bangalore). Bn. 83: previously edited by me in *Epi. Ind.*, 6. 48. The Maḍivāla inscription, *Epi. Carn.*, 10 (Kōlār). Kl. 79, is probably also of the time of Eṛeyappa: if, however, it might really be referred to Raṇavikrama, then the full expression is carried back to about A.D. 810 to 840.

⁵ *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 29.

After the period marked by the Nandigunda and Kuppehālu inscriptions and the record on the Tanjore plates, the town Mysore commences to figure only in connexion with its present rulers, who trace their line back to a certain Hire-Bettāda-Chāmarāja to whom the date of A.D. 1513-52 is assigned.¹ Their ancestors first came to the front in the person of Rāja-Wodeyar, who in 1610 overcame the Vijayanagara viceroy, and established himself at Seringapatam. They appear to have been members of a local family residing at Mysore. And the inscriptions describe them in the simplest terms as belonging to the Ātrēya gōtra, the Āśvalāyana sūtra, and the Rīgvēda śākhā.² But, as they rose to increased prominence, they required, like other great families of Southern India, a Purāṇic pedigree connecting them with either the Solar or the Lunar Race. The latter was chosen. And the account devised for them³ says that some members of the line of Yadu in the Lunar Race went from Dvārakā (in Kāthiāwāḍ) to the Karnāṭa country to visit their family-god Nārāyaṇa at Yadugiri, —Mēlukōṭe in the Seringapatam tāluka, Mysore District, about twenty-five miles north of Mysore; and, seeing the land to be a beauteous one, they settled at Mysore, protecting the people, and doing service to the goddess who guarded the city and whom they adopted as their own deity. In their line there seems to have been born a Chāmarāja; then a son of him, also named Chāmarāja; and then his son, the Hire-Bettāda-Chāmarāja mentioned above. He, it is said, had three sons, amongst whom he

¹ See the table in Mr. Rice's *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 126.

² See, e.g., a copperplate record of A.D. 1614 from Mēlukōṭe, *Epi. Carn.*, 3 (Mysore). Sr. 157.

³ See, e.g., records of A.D. 1647 at Mattigōḍu, *Epi. Carn.*, 5 (Hassan). Ag. 64; of 1662 at Hālagere, vol. 12 (Tumkūr). Kg. 37; of 1675 at Chāmarājnagar, vol. 4 (Mysore). Ch. 92; and of 1686 at Seringapatam vol. 3 (Mysore). Sr. 14. And compare Mr. Rice's book, p. 124 ff.

divided his principality while he was still alive. Two of them died without male issue. And so the whole went to the remaining son, Bōl-Chāmarāja, to whom he had given Mysore itself. The family thus commenced ruling at Mysore. As has been said above, in A.D. 1610 Rāja-Woḍeyar made a step in advance, and established himself at Seringapatam. From 1760 to 1799 the family was under the domination of Haidar Ali and Tipū Sultān. Then, on the defeat and death of the last-mentioned, the British Government placed Mummaḍi-Kṛishṇarāja-Woḍeyar on the throne, and the court was removed back to Mysore, which has continued to be the dynastic capital.

The name Mysore figures freely enough in the epigraphic records of this period; especially in the standing expression “(so-and-so) of Mysore”, with reference to the place of origin, which was used even when Seringapatam was the capital: for instance, *Maisūra Chāmarāja-Woḍeyaru* in a record of A.D. 1633,¹ and *Mahīsūra Kṛishṇarāja - Woḍeyar * avaru* in one of 1717.² In Kanarese prose passages it is found in the various forms of Mahiśūr or Mahiśūr (A.D. 1614), Mayiśūr (1625), Maisūr (1633), and Mahiśāpura (1672).³ In Sanskrit verses it is found as Mahishāpur (A.D. 1639), Māhishī and Māhishīpuravarā (1647), Mahishanagara (1662), Mahisūra (1663), Mahishapurī (1666), Māhishapura (1675), and Mahiśūrapura (1679); but we do not trace any use of the name Māhishmatī, to which we shall come farther on. And the goddess, whose shrine appears to be on the

¹ At Talakād, *Epi. Carn.*, 3 (Mysore). TN. 13.

² At Bēlūru, *Epi. Carn.*, 5 (Hassan). Bl. 29.

³ I can, of course, only quote the forms as they are given in the texts in roman and Kanarese characters in the volumes of the *Epigraphia Carnatica*; and the readings do not always match each other. I have preferred, as a rule, to follow the Kanarese texts, because they are the bases of the others. For the reason stated in a previous note (the absence of a proper index), I cannot guarantee that I have exhausted all the forms: I give only each form, and the earliest instance of it, that I have detected.

Chāmuṇḍibetṭa hill close on the south-east of the city of Mysore, is mentioned as Mahishāsūramardīnī in a record of A.D. 1639,¹ and Mahishāsūramardīnī-Betṭada-Chāmuṇḍēśvarī-Amma in one of 1673:² she is to be regarded as a local form of Chaṇḍā, Chāmuṇḍā, Durgā, as the destroyer of the buffalo-headed demon Mahishāsūra.³ We note the occurrence of the expression *Mahisūra samsthāna*, “the Mysore State”, in an inscription of A.D. 1852,⁴ and perhaps of *Mahisūra samsthāna* in one of 1672–73.⁵ But we do not find any indication of the name Mysore in any form, Kanarese or Sanskrit, having been used to denote either the whole territory or even that portion of it which is now the Mysore District: the application of the name in this way seems to be of purely modern and official origin.

* * * * *

In view of all the facts set out above, it must be clear that any such appellation as Mahishamaṇḍala to denote the Mysore territory or even the country round the city Mysore itself —(assuming that such a term has ever been used at all in that sense, of which there is no evidence)—could only have come into existence after A.D. 1600, when the occasion arose, in devising the Purāṇic genealogy, to Sanskritize the vernacular name, of a place rising to importance, which presented a certain adaptability.⁶ But

¹ At Gajjiganahalli, *Epi. Carn.*, 3 (Mysore). Nj. 198.

² At Birasandra, *Epi. Carn.*, 12 (Tumkūr). Tp. 106.

³ The inscriptions do not seem to show how Yādavas who had come into Mysore to visit their family-god Nārāyaṇa became Śaivas with Durgā as their tutelary deity: and the “tradition” reported by Mr. Rice (his latest book, p. 125) does not furnish any clear explanation.

⁴ At Beḷagōḍu, *Epi. Carn.*, 5 (Hassan). Mj. 40.

⁵ At Mañchanahalli, *Epi. Carn.*, 3 (Mysore). Ml. 69.

⁶ The suggestion (*Epi. Ind.*, 4. 58, note 2) that Mysore is mentioned as Māhishavishaya in the inscription A. of A.D. 945 at Sālōṭgi in the Iṇḍī tāluka, Bijāpūr District, cannot be accepted. This “Māhisha district” is certainly to be located somewhere not very far from Sālōṭgi: and the village Kāñchana-Muduvōl or Kāñchina-Muduvōlāl, which the record places in it, is perhaps the modern ‘Kanchināl’ in the Iṇḍī tāluka.

we can hardly avoid noticing, before we go farther, two observations attached by Mr. Rice to his assertion that the Mahishamaṇḍala of the Buddhist books is the country round the city Mysore.

He has said in the first place:¹—“Mysore, properly Maisūru, derives its name from *mahisha*, Sanskrit for buffalo, reduced in Prākṛit to *mahisa* and in Kannaḍa to *maisa*, and *ūru*, Kannaḍa for town or country”. On the last point we must observe that the Kanarese *ūr*, *ūru*, does certainly mean ‘village, town’, but never ‘country’.² For the rest, does the word *maisa* really exist in Kanarese? It may perhaps be assumed to exist, because Kittel’s Kannaḍa-English Dictionary, though not giving it, does give *maisi*, from the Śabdamaṇḍarpana (thirteenth century), as the *tadbhava*-corruption of the feminine *mahishī*. But no instance is adduced of the actual use of even *maisi*. And the facts set out above make it plain that the Sanskritized forms of the name Mysore were based on the form Maisūr, instead of the reverse being the case. We do not believe that the name even means ‘buffalo-village’: the Kanarese people have their own words, *kōṇa*, ‘a male buffalo’, and *emme*, ‘a female buffalo’, and would naturally have used one or other of them to form any place-name connected with the idea of ‘buffalo’, and would have given us Kōṇanūr or Emmeyūr. We may suggest that the name may just possibly be connected with the Kanarese *mē*, *mēy*, *mēyu*, ‘to graze’, *mēyisu*, ‘to cause to graze’. But we do not put forward even that with any confidence. We prefer to take this name, just as we have to take so many others, as one for which no certain origin can now be found.

Mr. Rice has further said (loc. cit.):—“Mahisa-maṇḍala

¹ *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions* (1909), p. 14, note 1. From an earlier writing by him, this derivation is given in the Imperial Gazetteer, 18. 161.

² Mr. Rice seems to have been thinking of the Sanskrit *uru*, ‘wide, broad’, whence we have *urvī*, ‘the earth’.

appears in the Tamil form *Erumai-nāḍu* in *Māmūlanār's Aganānūru*, which is of the second century." Here, several points arise. In the first place, it does not seem correct to ascribe the *Aganānūru* to *Māmūlanār*, and to assign it to the second century: we are told elsewhere that the *Aganānūru* is an anthology on erotic subjects, consisting of stanzas composed by about a hundred and sixty poets (of whom *Māmūlanār* is one), and that it was compiled by *Uruttiraśanman* under the auspices of a *Pāṇḍya* king named *Ugrapperuvaludi*:¹ and an indication has been given to us that it cannot be placed before the close of the eighth century. Secondly, in view of the inference which is plainly intended, we should like to know exactly what *Māmūlanār* has said about the *Erumai-nāḍu*, and why his 'buffalo-district' is supposed to be *Mysore*: but the vague reference that is given hardly helps us to find the passage. Thirdly, if the name *Erumai-nāḍu* ever existed as an established name of *Mysore*, it is strange that it is not found so used in any of the Tamil historical poems published in the *Indian Antiquary*; nor in any of the numerous Tamil inscriptions which exist in *Mysore* and have been published in the *Epigraphia Carnatica*; nor in any of the Tamil inscriptions from other parts which mention the *Chōla* conquest of *Mysore*; the term used in the latter is always *Gaṅga-pāḍi*, = *Gaṅgavāḍi*. But we may be sure of one or other of two things. Either *Māmūlanār's Erumai-nāḍu* is to be located somewhere in the *Madras Presidency*, where *erumai* is a not infrequent first component of place-names in the *Coimbatore*, *Madura*, *Tinnevely*, *Tanjore*, *Salem*, *North Arcot*, and *Chingleput Districts*.² Or else, in view

¹ See *M. Seshagiri Sastri's Report on a Search for Sanskrit and Tamil MSS. for the year 1893-4*, No. 2, p. 131.

² The *Village Postal Directory of the Madras Circle (1893)* shows, under *e* and *y*, eighteen such names, and is suggestive of there being also others, not correctly spelt there. And, judged by maps, this compilation is not exhaustive.

of the particular nature of the Aganānūru, it denotes the territory with which we shall now proceed to identify the country in which we are interested.

* * * * *

The Mahishamaṇḍala to which Moggaliputta-Tissa sent one of his Buddhist missions is distinctly not the modern Mysore territory or any part thereof. As our first step to its real identification, we take the first component of its name as denoting, not the idea of 'buffalo', but a people whose name is found in the various forms of Mahisha,¹ Mahishaka,² Māhishaka,³ and Māhishika.⁴ The passage in the Bhīṣmaparvan of the Mahābhārata classes the Māhishakas as *janapadā dakṣiṇāḥ*; and the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa calls them *dakṣiṇāpatha-vāsinaḥ*: this means that they dwelt anywhere on the south of either the Vindhya range or the river Narbadā, whichever is taken as the dividing-line between Northern and Southern India: it does not mean that we must look for them in the extreme south. And we may note here that the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, in its account of the various hells and the people who go to them, mentions, amongst those who are doomed to the Rudhirāndha, certain persons to whom it applies the term *māhishika*: here the commentary explains that a wife who dispenses her favours at random is termed *mahishī*, 'a female buffalo', and a husband who condones such conduct is styled *māhishika*.⁵

We will not venture to decide whether the Mahishas, Mahishakas, Māhishakas, Māhishikas, derived their name from being special breeders of buffaloes, or from a laxity

¹ Brihat-Saṁhitā, 9. 10 : Harivaṁśa, 782.

² Brihat-Saṁhitā, 17. 26.

³ Mahābhārata, e.g., 6 (Bhīṣma). § 9. 366 : Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, book 4, chap. 24 (Bombay text, 1866, p. 42a) : Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa (Bibl. Ind.), chap. 57, verse 46.

⁴ Matsya-Purāṇa (Calcutta, 1876), chap. 113, verse 47 ; text in the Ānandāśrama series, 114. 47.

⁵ Book 2, chap. 6 : Bombay text (1866), p. 14b.

of morals which led them to connive at free-love on the part of their wives. But, taking the word as the name of a people, we locate the Mahishamaṇḍala, "the territory of the Mahishas", by recognizing as its capital a city Māhishmatī, which was of considerable antiquity and repute.¹

This city is mentioned by Patañjali in his comments on Vārttikas 10 and 15 under Pāṇini, 3. 1. 26, where he introduces it in illustrating a use of the causal to indicate something remarkable :—"Setting out from Ujjayinī, he makes sunrise (sees the sun rise) at Māhishmatī": he thus indicates that the distance between the two places was appreciable, but could, as a special feat, be covered between sunset and sunrise. It is mentioned as Māhissatī in inscriptions at Sāñchi, in which visitors to the Stūpas are described (in somewhat misspelt terms) as coming from Mahisatī, Māhasatī, Māhisatī.² And it was still flourishing in the thirteenth century: the inscription on the Māndhātā plates of the Paramāra king Dēvapāla³ tells us that in A.D. 1225, when he made the grant recorded in it, he was staying at Māhishmatī, and (we may add) that he made the grant after bathing in the Nāradā.

Some references to this city in the Mahābhārata are as follows :— In 2 (Sabhā). § 30. 1124–63, we are told that the Pāṇḍava prince Sahadēva, in the course of his tour to subjugate the countries of the south (*dakṣiṇā*) for Yudhisṭhira, went to Māhishmatī, and there fought and conquered king Nila: and a story is introduced (1130–43) narrating how the god Agni had conferred on the women of the city the boon of being allowed to behave just as

¹ From *mahisha* we have *mahishmat*, 'possessing buffaloes'. The name Māhishmatī is explained by the St. Petersburg Dictionary as being the feminine of *māhishmata* from *mahishmat*. There are indications that in some of the passages presenting the name Mahishaka, etc., there are various readings which give *shm* instead of *sh* in the third syllable.

² *Epi. Ind.*, 2. 109, No. 111; 389 f., Nos. 313, 314, 317.

³ *Epi. Ind.*, 9. 108.

they might like.¹ In 13 (Anuśāsana). § 2. 89, Daśāsva, one of the hundred sons of Ikshvāku son of Manu, is mentioned as a king of Māhishmatī. And in the same book, § 152. 7187, we are told that the thousand-armed Kārtavīrya, the Haihaya, reigned over the whole earth at Māhishmatī.²

The city is also mentioned in the Harivaṁśa. We are there told in one place (1846-7) that it was founded by king Mahishmat, the heir (*dāyāda*) of Sāhañja who was descended from Yadu through Haihaya:³ but in another passage that the founder of it was king Muchukunda. This last-mentioned person is there treated as a son of Yadu: but elsewhere in the same work (711-14, 6464) he is mentioned as a son of Māndhātri.⁴

* * * * *

Regarding the identity of this city Māhishmatī there have been for a long time two views.⁵ One is that it is Mysore. This had its origin in a conjecture put forward by Wilson in 1822 in the *Calcutta Annual Register*.⁶ It has been asserted recently by Mr. Rice.⁷ So also the

¹ Compare the explanation, mentioned above, of the term *māhishika* as used in the Vishṇu-Purāṇa.

² In accordance with this, certain princes in Southern India, of the 11th and 12th centuries, who claimed to be of Haihaya extraction, used the title "lord of Māhishmatī the best of towns", to indicate their place of origin: see my *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, in the Bombay Gazetteer, vol. i, part 2, pp. 439 and note 2, 450, 451, 457, 523; also *Epi. Ind.*, 4. 86.

³ On the descent compare Vishṇu-Purāṇa, translation, 4. 53 f.

⁴ So also in the Vishṇu-Purāṇa, translation, 3. 268.

⁵ There has also been a third view, which, however, we need not consider; namely, that Māhishmatī is 'Mandlā', the head-quarters town of the Mandlā District, Central Provinces: see Sleeman in JASB. 6 (1837). 622, and Cunningham in *Ancient Geography*, 488.

⁶ See Vishṇu-Purāṇa, translation, 2. 166, note 8.

⁷ See, e.g., his *Mysore* (1897), 1. 280; 2. 280. He has said that Sahadeva crossed the Kāvērī to reach Māhishmatī. I do not find any mention of a Kāvērī in connexion with Māhishmatī in the Calcutta text of the epic. But, in case such a statement is really made anywhere else, it may be noted that the Indian Atlas shows a 'Cavery R.' flowing into the Nabadā from the south about a mile above the place which really is Māhishmatī.

Imperial Gazetteer says (18. 261) that Mysore appears as Māhishmatī in the Mahābhārata. We need say no more about that, beyond making one brief remark. The Mahābhārata tells us that Sahadēva subjugated, next after Nīla of Māhishmatī, the king of Tripura. This place, as is well known, is Tēwar, in the Jabalpūr District. And the statement about Tripura should have been sufficient, for many years past, to prevent any repetition of the idea that Māhishmatī is Mysore.

The more general view has identified Māhishmatī with a town named Mahēshwar, on the north bank of the Narbadā, in the Nimār Zillah of the Indore State, which is shown as 'Mahesar' in the Indian Atlas sheet No. 37, N.E. (1892), in lat. 22° 10', long. 75° 38'. This identification was stated—apparently as an already accepted point—by Wilford in 1807.¹ And it has been last repeated in the Imperial Gazetteer.² The residents themselves seem to believe that Mahēshwar is Māhishmatī; since we gather from the Imperial Gazetteer that they recognize the Māhishmatī-Māhātmya as their local Purāṇa. And, though the names do not match, —Mahēshwar being plainly Mahēśvara, and having no connection with *mahisha*,—support for the view has been found in a passage in the Suttanipāta which tells us that, when the disciples of Bāvāri, the hermit dwelling on the bank of the Gōdhāvāri (*sic*) in the neighbourhood of Aḷaka in the territory of Assaka (verse 997), journeyed to the north to look for Buddha, they went (verse 1011) to Patitṭhāna on the east of Aḷaka, then to Māhissatī, and then to Ujjēni, Gōnaddha, Vēdisā, Vana-Kōsambī, Sākēta, Sāvattihī, and so on.³ This places Māhishmatī between Paithaṇ,

¹ *Asiatic Researches*, 9. 105.

² Vol. 17, p. 9; vol. 21, p. 118.

³ Verse 1011 ends with *Vana-savhayaṃ*; and verse 1012 begins with *Kōsambīn ch = āpi*. The translation (by Fausböll, SBE., 10. part 2, p. 180) says:—“ . . . Vedisā, Vanasavhaya, and also to Kosambī, Sāketa, . . . ” *Vana-savhaya* means 'having the appellation *vana*'. It might of course be taken as denoting some place bearing any such

which is the ancient Pratiṣṭhāna, on the Gōdāvarī, and Ujjain. And Mahēshwar answers well enough to such a location : it is closely about 185 miles north of Paiṭhaṇ and 70 miles south of Ujjain, and is almost on the straight line between the two places. It has, however, been lately shown that this identification is not the correct one.

* * * * *

Mr. Pargiter has drawn attention to two instructive statements about Māhishmatī.¹ One is in the Raghuvamśa, in the account of the *svayamvara* of Indumatī. When the chief portress, who introduces the various suitors, comes to Pratīpa, king of Anūpa, a descendant of the thousand-armed Kārtavīrya, she says (6. 43):—“ Be thou the Lakshmi on the lap of this long-armed (*king*), if thou dost wish to see through the windows of (*his*) palace the Rēvā (Narbadā), charming with rippling waters, which is a girdle round the hip-like ramparts of (*his city*) Māhishmatī.” As Mr. Pargiter has observed, this distinctly

name as Vanapura, Vananagara, or even Vanavāsa : and the division of the verses may be adduced in support of that. But the whole passage is little more than prose, with the addition here and there of suitable words to make it scan. And I venture to take it as speaking of “Kōsambī which had the appellation Vana”, that is “Kauśāmbī in the Forest”, on the strength of the *gaṇa* attached to Pāṇini, 4. 2. 97, which gives the name Vana-Kauśāmbī : it may be mentioned that the *Nava-Kauśāmbī* of the Benares text of the Kāśikā, 2nd edition, is a mistake ; all the other versions have *Vana*². The *gaṇa* presents, in fact, two names ; Kauśāmbī and Vana-Kauśāmbī. But we seem to be justified in taking them as denoting one and the same place by what Hiuen-tsiang says : after his description of Prayāga, he continues (Beal, *Life*, 90, and compare *Si-yu-ki*, 1. 234) :—“ From this, in a south-west direction, we enter a great forest, in which we frequently encounter evil beasts and wild elephants. After going 500 *li* or so, we arrive at Kiau-shang-mi.” Also, the Antagaḍa-dasāo mentions Kōsambakāṇana, “ the Kosamba forest ” (translation by Barnett, p. 81), though it may not place it in the same locality.

At the beginning of the passage in the Suttanipāta, the words are :—Aḷakassa Patitṭhānaṃ purimaṃ. Here, also, I venture to differ from Fausböll, who translated :—“ To Patitṭhāna of Aḷaka first, then to Māhissatī, . . . ”

¹ See his translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, p. 333, note ‡ (issued in 1896), and introd., p. 9 (1905).

locates Māhishmatī, not on the Narbadā, but in the middle of it; that is, on an island in it. The other statement is in the Harivaṁśa, in the passage (5218–27) which narrates the founding of the city by Muchukunda. His father had expressed the desire (5211) that he should found two cities against the mountains Vindhya and Rikshavat, in the shelter of the hills. Accordingly, he first made a settlement on the bank of the Narbadā, at a place full of rough rocks, which he cleared and adorned with a bridge, moats, temples, streets, and groves; and he then made Māhishmatī, at the feet of the two mountains Vindhya and Rikshavat, and also a second city, Purikā, on the bank towards the Rikshavat.

Mr. Pargiter has pointed out that this latter passage marks a locality on the Narbadā where the Vindhya and Sātpurā (Sātpuḍā) ranges contract the valley, and come close to the river; that Mahēshwar does not satisfy the conditions of either of the two statements;¹ and that the place which does satisfy them is the rocky island and village of Māndhātā, now sacred to Śiva, and containing a famous shrine of him as Ōmkāranātha, about thirty-five to forty miles higher up the river. And he has accordingly located Māhishmatī there; a conclusion which we heartily endorse.

This island-village of Māndhātā, belonging to the Khandwā tahsil of the Nimār District, Central Provinces, is shown in the Indian Atlas sheet No. 53, S.W. (1891), as 'Mandhatha', with also the name 'Unkarnath' attached in more conspicuous type, in lat. 22° 15', long. 76° 12', six miles east of 'Barwai', and seven miles east-north-east of 'Mortakka', stations on the Mālwa section of the Rājputānā-Mālwa railway. And the map shows clearly how spurs of the Vindhya and Sātpurā ranges come close

¹ There is no inhabited island there; and the hills do not close in on the river. Moreover, the place does not seem to have any remains suggestive of antiquity.

up to it. In addition to satisfying the conditions of the Raghavaṁśa and the Harivaṁśa, it answers just as well as does Mahēshwar to the statement in the Suttanipāta; being only about thirty miles to the east from the straight line between Paiṭhaṇ and Ujjain, at a distance of closely about 195 miles from the former place and 70 miles from the latter. It answers to Patañjali's indication that the distance between Ujjain and Māhishmati, though appreciable, could be covered, as a special feat, in one night. It is distinctly referable to Southern India, whether we take the Vindhya mountains or the Narbada as the dividing-line between the north and the south. Its present name is well accounted for by the mention of Māndhātri as the father of Muchukunda in one of the versions of the parentage of the latter. And we may locate Purikā, the second city attributed to Muchukunda, on an open area, on the south of the island, where the map shows villages named 'Godurpoora, Bainpoora, Bamunpoora, and Dhooka',¹ and may probably place Muchukunda's preliminary settlement (on the north bank) on the east of the island, where the map shows two villages and 'Jain temples'. It may be added that the Imperial Gazetteer tells us (17. 152) that the village of Māndhātā stands partly on the island, partly on the south bank of the river, and —(a detail in which the place still answers to the words of Kālidāsa)— that on the island it includes rows of houses, shops, and temples, with "the Rao's palace conspicuous above the rest", standing on terraces scarped out of a hill: also, that "upon the summit of the hill are signs of a once flourishing settlement, in the shape of ruined fortifications and temples."

* * * * *

In short, then, we locate the Mahishamaṇḍala, "the territory of the Mahishas", to which Moggaliputta-Tissa

¹ A town Purikā is mentioned in some of the inscriptions at Bharaut: *Ind. Ant.*, 21. 234, No. 83; 236, Nos. 117-9.

sent one of his Buddhist missions in the time of Aśōka, by recognizing it as the country of which the capital was Māhishmatī. We agree with Mr. Pargiter in placing Māhishmatī on the island in the Narbadā which is now known as Māndhātā. And we thus find in the Mahishamaṇḍala a border-land of the Buddhist Middle Country.

Looking to the general features of the country as shown in the Atlas sheets, we may probably take it that the territory belonging to Māhishmatī lay on both sides of the Narbadā, and extended on the west far enough to include Mahēshwar; in short, that it consisted of the present Nimār Zillah of Indore with part of the Nimār District of the Central Provinces. This would help to account for any transfer of the name and traditions of Māhishmatī, along with the Māhishmatī-Māhātmya, to Mahēshwar; a transfer which, if established, may be instructive in some other cases. It would also help to explain the mention of Māhishmatī as a city of the Avantis, the people of Ujjain, in the Dīgha-Nikāya (see this Journal, 1907. 653): it may easily be the case that the Ujjain territory was sometimes bounded on the south by the Vindhya range, but sometimes reached as far as the Narbadā.