To commemorate the great work of 2018, the first novel of the series of titles, "The Gift of Knowledge," is being published in a limited edition. This series is a collection of essays written by Dr. Basile Leclerc, Dr. Christian Chopin, and Dr. Basile Leclerc, and edited by Prof. Christian Chopin and Dr. Basile Leclerc. The volume is a collection of essays in honour of Hampana Nagarjuna's promotion of Jain studies.

The volume contains essays that reflect on the importance of books in the study of Jainism, and the role of books in promoting a deeper understanding of the religion. The essays are written by leading scholars in the field of Jain studies and cover a wide range of topics, including the history of Jain literature, the role of books in the spread of Jainism, and the contemporary relevance of Jain thought.

We congratulate the editors and the authors on their contributions to this important work, and we hope that it will be a valuable resource for students and scholars of Jainism.
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Royal Patronage of Jainism
The Myth of Candragupta Maurya and Bhadrabāhu

Piotr Balcerowicz

It is generally assumed that Jainism enjoyed certain measure of royal patronage right from its beginnings. One of the founders of Jainism, Mahāvīra Vardhamāna, is believed to have been related to the royal family of Vaiśālī (Vesālī). His mother Triśalā (Tisalā) is claimed by various Jaina sources to have been a daughter of king Cetaka (Cedaga), a follower of Pārśva order and the king of Vaiśālī who is also said to have been the father of Śrenika (Señiya) and the grandfather of Kūṇika (Kūṇiya), known in Buddhist sources as Bimbisāra (Bimbhisāra) and Ajātasātru (Ajātasattu), respectively. It is further famously claimed that Candragupta Maurya was converted to Jainism by Bhadrabāhu and, following a famine in Ujjainī, accompanied the latter to Śravaṇa-beḷāgolā where he performed the sallekhana rite of ritual suicide.

In the paper, I analyze literary sources as well as palaeographic and archaeological data, and argue that there are strong reasons to maintain that the story of Candragupta’s conversion to Jainism and his subsequent migration to the South and the story of Bhadrabāhu who is believed to have converted Candragupta to Jainism and led the Jaina community to Śravaṇa-beḷāgolā, thereby establishing a Jaina community in Southern India, are both purely of mythical nature with no substantial historical foundation.1 Further, I argue that there is no evidence that could allow one to establish any link between the founder of the Mauryan Dynasty with Jainism, and with Bhadrabāhu in particular.

1. The story of Candragupta

Through a range of textbooks on South Asian history, we have grown accustomed to accept a certain neat parallelism of the royal patronage of the first Mauryan rulers, who one by one (with one exception) favoured all known non-Brahmanic Indian religions:

---

1 For a preliminary study, see: BALCEROWICZ (2016b: 292–299).
Candragupta Maurya—the patron of Jainism, and himself a Jaina monk, Bindusāra—no data as regards his religious affiliation and patronage, Aśoka—the patron of the Buddhists and a ‘Buddhist’ himself, Daśaratha—the patron of the Ājīvikas, and an Ājīvika himself.

Indeed, at its face value, such a religious-sectarian compartmentation looks quite elegant and convincing in its subsumption of the three most important faiths of ancient India. Aśoka’s religious links with and his support for Buddhism are well attested, though a caution has to be exercised as not to treat the evidence extracted from Buddhist texts and his inscriptions as a straightforward confirmation of him becoming a typical Buddhist devotee himself. In addition, there is enough evidence that attest to Daśaratha’s Ājīvikan affiliation or at least his strong sympathy to and support of that creed.\(^2\) The question remains, however, what we can really know about religious affiliation of Candragupta?

Romila Thapar (2003: 178) succinctly presents the well-known and widely accepted story of Aśoka’s grandfather Candragupta Maurya, known as Sandrokottos (Σανδρόκοττος) or Sandrokuptos (Σανδρόκυπτος) to the Greeks:

“The Jaina tradition claims that towards the end of his life Candragupta, by now an ardent Jaina, abdicated in favour of his son Bindusāra and became an ascetic. Together with one of the better-known Jaina elders, Bhadrabhū, and other monks he went to south India, and there he ended his life by regulated slow starvation in the orthodox Jaina manner. A site close to the Jaina centre of Shravana Belgola in Karnataka is associated by local tradition with this story.”

Such a popular view, uncritically repeated in most publications, primarily rests on Jaina inscriptions found in Śravaṇabelagola and Jaina literary accounts of their history. The arguments in favour of Candragupta’s conversion and migration are aptly summarized by R. Narasimhachar (1923: 36–43, “Part: Introduction”), the editor and translator of all the Śravaṇabelagola inscriptions, who—following Edward Thomas (1877)—argues in favour of the theory of Candragupta’s conversion by Bhadrabhū and their migration to the South (1923: 40 ff.), and concludes that “A dispassionate consideration of the abovementioned facts leads one to the conclusion that the Jaina tradition has some basis to stand upon. The evidence may not be quite decisive, but it may be accepted as a working hypothesis until the contrary is proved by future research” (1923: 42). In his argumentation, he points out that

“Chandragupta’s disappearance from public life at a comparatively young age requires some satisfactory explanation. He ascended the throne in or about 322 B.C. when quite young and must have been under fifty when his reign came to a close twenty-four years later about 298 B.C. He is not expressly stated to have died, and no special reason appears for his death at this early age. Had he fallen in battle, or his life been cut short by accident or disease, the circumstance could not fail to have been mentioned. On the other hand, if he retired from the throne in order to devote himself to an ascetic life in the last stage of his existence under the guidance of the most distinguished Jaina teacher then living, namely, the Ṣrutakēvali Bhadrabāhu, this would afford a reasonable explanation of his early disappearance from public notice and of the silence regarding his further career. It is also worthy of notice that the end of his reign coincides with the generally accepted date of Bhadrabāhu’s death. And tradition says that he lived for twelve years after the decease of Bhadrabāhu. His death then occurred when he was about sixty-two years of age, which seems more natural” (1923: 41).

R. Narasimhachar also draws attention to the opinion expressed by Vincent A. Smith (1919), namely that

“The only direct evidence throwing light on the manner in which the eventful reign of Chandragupta Maurya came to an end is that of Jain tradition. The Jains always treat the great emperor as having been a Jain like Bimbisāra, and no adequate reason seems to exist for discrediting their belief. The Jain religion undoubtedly was extremely influential in Magadha during the time of the later Saisunāgas, the Nandas, and the Mauryas.”

Smith further observes that “Once the fact that Chandragupta was or became a Jain is admitted, the tradition that he abdicated and committed suicide by slow starvation in the approved Jain manner becomes readily credible.” However, except for Jaina sources, we have no other evidence to support the view of Chandragupta’s conversion and migration, as was rightly pointed out by Vincent A. Smith (1919), who did nevertheless subscribe to the view himself.

This version of early Indian history has been repeated in most history books of ancient South Asia. But does it stand on solid footing?

As Asim Kumar Chatterjee (1978: 133) rightly notes, “the earliest author that refers to Chandragupta’s conversion to Jainism is Yātīvṛṣabha, the

---

author of the *Tiloyapannatti* (early 7th century), who lived nearly 1000 years after Candragupta Maurya. Śrāvaṇa Belgola, which according to the tradition, was the place of Candragupta’s death, has not produced any inscription which can be dated before 600 A.D.” In a laconic verse, Yatîvṛṣabha mentions that Candragupta, the foremost of the Maurya monarchs, took the vows of a Jaina monk (*jina-dikṣa*) and after him no other monarch renounced the royal life to become a wandering ascetic (*pravrajya*), incidentally contradicting another Jaina tradition that another Maurya King Samprati embraced Jainism. He nowhere alludes to the emperor’s migration to the South or to his link to Bhadrabāhu, or to Śrāvaṇabelagola. This seems to be indeed the earliest reference to Candragupta’s link to Jainism.

It also appears that the earliest reference to Bhadrabāhu’s migration to the South and to Śrāvaṇabelagola is the oldest inscription of Śrāvaṇabelagola, found to the south of Pārśvanātha-basti on the Smaller Hill, or Chikka-beṭṭa/Chandra-giri and dated about 600 CE. The inscription, or rather a part of it most relevant for our discussion, reads:

“... When a calamity in Ujjayinī lasting for a twelve-year period was foretold by Bhadrabāhu-svāmin, who comes from an impeccable old race which is a lineage of great men coming in succession within the lineage of teachers starting with [Mahāvīra’s] chief disciple (*gaṇadhara*) [Indrabhūṭi] Gautama and his immediate disciple Lohārya, [followed by] Jambu, Viṣṇudeva, Aparājīta, Govardhana, Bhadrabāhu, Viśākha, Proṣṭhila, Kṛttikāryya, Jayanāma, Siddhārtha, Dhrīṣṭeṇa, Buddha and others, and who possesses the knowledge of the truth of the *Great Omens* (*mahā-nimitta*) in eight parts (canonical books, *aṅga*), who sees the three times (past, present and future), after he had seen it with the help of the omens, the whole congregation [of Jaina monks] set out from the northern region towards the southern region. Gradually, they reached a locality of several hundred villages, full of happy people, riches, gold, grain, herds of cows, buffaloes, goats and sheep. Thereafter, the chief master named Prabhācandra, having realised that very little time remained for him to live, asked the permission to commit the ritual suicide (*saṁādhi*) himself, which is the best form of asceticism, and abandoned the whole congregation (*saṅgha*), [remained] on this high-peaked mountain, which is distinguished by the name Kaṭavapra,

---

4 TiP 4,1481 = TiP 4,1493:

\[ \text{maudā-dhāresu carimo jina-dikkham dharadi cambagutto ya /} \\
\text{tatto maula-dhāra du ppaavajjam neva genhamti //} \\
\]

5 Inscription 254 (105), dated 1398 CE, in R. NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 121 (ed.), 109 (tr.)), lists the sequence of Gautama, Sudharma, Jambu and Viṣṇudeva, Aparājīta, Govardhana, Nandimitra, Bhadrabāhu.
which is an ornament of the earth surface, the surface of which is full of dark-blue stones resembling huge, disfigured water-laden clouds and is embellished with garlands of flowers and leaves of various fine trees, which abounds in lowlands, valleys, clefts, large caves and abysses full of herds of boars, tigers, panthers, bears, hyenas, snakes and deer, and there having mortified his own body on cold rocks which formed surfaces scattered at the expanse [on top of the hill], accompanied by a single disciple, he committed [the ritual suicide]. In the course of time, seven hundred saints also committed [the ritual suicide]. Thus, let the Jina’s teaching be victorious!”

That is an important piece of evidence, not necessarily in terms of an actual witness of real events that had taken place approximately 900 years before its installation, but as regards the social memory of religious historical account and how it reproduces the past.

The inscription mentions Bhadrabahu who had famously predicted a famine in Ujjayini, but at the same time it emerges that he is not mentioned as the leader of the group of monks that are said to have migrated to the South. To the contrary, the leader of the group was a certain Prabhacandra, not Bhadrabahu, and it was Prabhacandra who set the example of committing the ritual suicide practice in Śravaṇabelagola, not Bhadrabahu, in this first epigraphic account.

Interestingly, the place of Candragiri (called Kaṭavapra or Kaḻappu) in Śravaṇabelagola came to be identified later with both Bhadrabahu, the community leader, and Candragupta Maurya and with their ritual suicides on


7 Certainly, one may speculate that ‘Prabhacandra’ here in fact means the same as ‘Candragupta’ because of the ‘candra’ element, but these two names are both relatively popular and quite distinct to be confused, and their meanings or compound elements do not overlap (e.g. Candraprabha / Prabhacandra).
the hill, despite the fact that the first historical (epigraphic) evidence on the spot mentions Bhadrabāhu only as the one who had predicted the famine, but is completely silent as regards the circumstances of the former’s death and leadership and the latter’s involvement in any way.

This is significant on two counts. First, if we take the inscription as a reliable source of information on the history which is based on verified historical accounts correctly preserving the past and explaining the emergence of a Jaina community in Śravaṇabelagola and in the whole region, it draws a picture completely different from that of later Jaina accounts. Second, if we consider it merely as a product of Jaina legendary narrative, even in that case Bhadrabāhu is not a community leader, the circumstances of his death are unclear, whereas the basti and inscription commemorate the ritual suicide of Prabhācandra, the community leader, and Candragupta plays no role in the story. That would mean that around 600 CE, the legend of Candragupta Maurya converted by Bhadrabāhu to Jainism, migrating to the South to die there a pious death was either no longer known or not yet invented.

The inscription is also significant for still another reason. It mentions Bhadrabāhu’s following lineage, which is very different from a lineage found in the Lineage of the Senior Monks (Śṭhavirāvali) of the Kalpa-sūtra:8 Indrabhūti Gautama, Lohārya, Jambu, Viṣṇudeva, Aparājīta, Govardhana, Bhadrabāhu, Viśākha, Proṣṭhila, Kṛttikāryya, Jayanāma, Siddhārtha, Dhṛtiśeṇa, Buddhila etc.9 This compels one to reconsider the historical accuracy of the inscription and the reliability of either of the two monastic lineage accounts.10 Relying on the Jaina tradition claiming that Candragupta died around 293/298 BCE, which is twelve years after the departure of Bhadrabāhu, the latter would have died in Śravaṇabelagola around 305/310 BCE. In the list of Inscription 1, Bhadrabāhu-svāmin is preceded by 14 teachers. Assuming 25 years for each of them, the genealogy gives us 350 years that would have had to elapse since Mahāvīra’s life, which would mean that Mahāvīra died around 643/648 BCE, i.e. almost 150 years earlier than he apparently really did according to the latest research. Alternatively, assuming that Mahāvīra expired around 400 BCE,11 that would allow

---

8 KSû 1 p. 77–78 = KSû 1 p.137, translated in JACOBI (1884: 286 ff.); Sudharman (Suhamma), Jambū (Jambu), Prabhava (Ppabhava), Śāyymbhava (Sijjaṃbhava / Sejjaṃbhava), Yaśobhadra (Jasabhadda), Bhadrabāhu.
9 On discrepant Jaina accounts of Bhadrabāhu’s lineage, see DHAKY (2004).
10 One wonders whether such names as Viṣṇudeva and Govardhana could be already in use in the fourth century BCE, before the emergence of Viṣṇuism and the cult of Viṣṇu.
approximately six years for each, which is also a historically unlikely alternative.\textsuperscript{12} Besides, a comparison of the names in both lists will reveal that we deal with two quite different traditions that apparently invented their genealogies. All this puts the veracity of the inscription account under serious doubt, which does not mean that other Jaina accounts that essentially differ from it must necessarily be true. Rather, it should make us very cautious and consider a possibility that the history as reproduced in such accounts came to be invented centuries after the events they purport to describe.

On the other hand, the earliest literary reference to Bhadrabāhu’s death is found in the ‘Story of Bhadrabāhu’ (Bhadrabāhu-kathānaka),\textsuperscript{13} a section of Hariśeṇa’s Brhat-kathā-kosā (BKK), composed around 931–932 CE,\textsuperscript{14} where we read that when the whole congregation (saṅgha) left Ujjayinī after the prophecy,

“[Bhadrabāhu] reached a place known as Bhādrapada near Ujjayinī, steadfast, practised hunger for many days long enough. Having performed the fourfold preparatory rites according to the rules, he reached the culmination death. Bhadrabāhu went to heaven”.\textsuperscript{15}

The place where he expired, Bhādrapada, seems to be a made-up name to correspond to Bhadrabāhu, i.e. “The ‘Bhadraean’ place (padā)”, bhādra being an adjective of (derived from) bhadra, and appears to be in the vicinity of Ujjayinī. This would mean, as the story tells us, that Bhadrabāhu did not accompany the Jaina congregation on its way to the South, though no name of Śravānabelagola is ever mentioned.

\textsuperscript{12} A serious possibility to consider is that the list of fifteen teachers in total does not mention all those fourteen who precede Bhadrabāhu-svāmin (among whom there would be another Bhadrabāhu listed as number seven, after Govardhana) but a longer lineage within which ‘our’ Bhadrabāhu-svāmin is listed in the middle of it, preceded by six teachers (from Indrabhūti to Goverddhana) and followed by another seven (from Viśākha to Buddhila). In the latter case, given 25 years on average for each of the teachers as leaders of the community, it would sum up to approximately 150 years, with Mahāyāra’s death around 455/460, which would be more likely.

\textsuperscript{13} BKK 131, pp. 317–319. A brief synopsis of the whole story is provided by Dhaky (2004: 132–133).

\textsuperscript{14} Upadhye’s ‘Preface’ to BKK, A19.

\textsuperscript{15} BKK 131.43–44 (p. 318):

\begin{verbatim}
prāpya bhadrapadaṃ desaṃ śrīmad-ujjayinī-bhavam /
cakārānākam dhīraḥ sa dināni bahūny alam // 43 //
ādhārādhanāṃ samāraṇāḥ vidhiṃ sa caturvidhaṃ /
    samādhī-maraṇaṃ prāpya bhadrabāhur divaṃ yayau // 44 //
\end{verbatim}
Interestingly, two earliest relevant references to Bhadrabāhu significantly differ from the version of the story with which we are well acquainted nowadays. This particular account of the Bhadrabāhu-kathānaka, which has its important Karnātaka regional equivalent in the form of the Bhadrabāhu-bhaṭṭārama-kathe (see below), differs from the earlier inscriptions and other literary, later accounts in some important details. Here, Candragupta is a king of Ujjayinī; there is no mention of Prabhācandra, who is reported as the leader of the whole community in Inscription 1 of Śravaṇabelagola (EP 2, p. 1–2); other leaders of the community are mentioned; there is no mention of Candragupta accompanying the whole saṅgha in his peregrination to the South etc. Hariśeṇa’s account was primarily meant to serve the purpose of explaining the differences between various Jaina sects and their emergence, especially the cases of the Ardhaphalakas and Yapanas (i.e. Yapanīya).

Here, in view of such irreconcilable differences in various accounts, we face two separate questions: whether Bhadrabāhu indeed migrated with the whole congregation to Śravaṇabelagola and died there by starvation, and whether Candragupta Maurya was converted by Bhadrabāhu and accompanied the latter to the South? The first question is a logical precondition for the latter, i.e. in order to accept the story of the conversion and migration of Candragupta, one has to first accept the story of Bhadrabāhu’s migration. However, even if we had enough evidence to prove that Bhadrabāhu did migrate to the South, it would not logically suffice to prove that he was accompanied by Candragupta, a converted Jaina monk.

Unlike in the case of Aśoka, we have no information as regards the age of Candragupta when he ascended the throne or when he died. It is equally likely that he may have died either at a young or old age. All we know is that he ruled for some time between ca. 321/317–293/298 BCE. Further, we have no information under what circumstances his son Bindusāra assumed power, whether because his father died, abdicated voluntarily, relinquished his rule under pressure or even was assassinated. The stories of Candragupta’s abdication are a mere speculation based on very late Jaina legendary sources and a result of the following inference: since Candragupta became a Jaina monk, he could not run the state as an emperor any longer, and since he was not assassinated, he must have abdicated and handed over the empire to his son Bindusāra. All such speculations again rest on the legend of his conversion by Bhadrabāhu.

This lack of information on Candragupta’s life is in no way different from what we may know of most of his descendents, and the sources are consistently silent as regards the circumstances surrounding the death of Candragupta’s descendents. The Greek did usually not report on the
circumstances of the death of Indian rulers, except in rare cases when a
murder involved other Greeks, e.g. Porus.\textsuperscript{16} The Mauryan period obviously
knows no chronicles and hardly any inscriptions, except for Aśoka’s and
Daśaratha’s, and these do not provide any relevant information. In this light
it should not surprise us not to find any explanation as to what happened to
Candragupta: whether he died or disappeared from public life for whatever
reason.

Likewise, we find no reliable evidence as regards the temporal
coincidence of the death of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta, alleged by R.
Narasimhachar, which logically depends on the acceptance of the story of
Candragupta’s conversion and migration. We may not even be certain that
Bhadrabāhu lived around the time of Candragupta. The purported temporal
coincidence of their lives is again a direct consequence of the inference
within the legend which requires that since Candragupta died a pious death
at Śravaṇabelagola, he must have been earlier converted to Jainism by
someone, and since Bhadrabāhu also died the same death in Śravaṇa-
belagola, the former had had to be converted by the latter at some earlier
moment in time. This logic could be called, to use the Indian term, the
\textit{anyonyāśrāya} fallacy, or ‘mutual dependence’ (vicious circle).

Edward \textsc{Thomas} (1877: 24) — and he is followed by R.
Narasimhachar (1923: 41, ‘Part: Introduction’) and a number of
subsequent researchers — points to Megasthenes, as reported in \textsc{Strabo},
xv.i.60, as evidence that Candragupta followed the teachings of the
Śramaṇas, and specifically the Jainas: “the testimony of Megasthenes would
likewise seem to imply that Candragupta submitted to the devotional
teaching of the \textit{seramānas}, as opposed to the doctrines of the Brahmans”.

Megasthenes’ whole relevant report (\textsc{Strabo}, xv.i.49–68) however
simply acknowledges the existence of two major groups of ‘philosophers’ in
the South Asia he knew, viz. the \textit{brahmānas} (βραχμάνας) and \textit{sarmanas}
(Σαρμάνας), or the Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas. The passage, only a part of
which is adduced by \textsc{Thomas} in support, merely states that:

\begin{quote}
“As regards the Garmanes (i.e. Śramaṇas), [Megasthenes] says that the most
respectable among them are called the [forest-dwelling] Hylobii (\textit{Χυλοβίος}
= vāna-prāsīka), who live in woods, and subsist on leaves and wild fruits, [they
wear] the clothing made of the bark of trees, and [they live] without sexual
intercourse and wine; [further Megasthenes says that] they maintain contacts
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} E.g. the report by Diodorus / Triparadeisus; see \textsc{Karttunen} (1997: 256).
with kings who, through messengers, inquire about the causes of things and through them (i.e. the Hylobii) worship and supplicate the Deity.”

The passage neither speaks of any particular king, not to mention Candragupta, nor alludes to any conversion of a monarch by any religious group. The term ‘Garmanes’, or Śramaṇas, is too general to infer from it that it refers to Jaina monks. Further, the description of the forest-dwelling Hylobii, who wear bark garments and live in woods, in no way allows for any identification of them with Jaina ascetics, or even with Ājīvika ascetics historically related to Jainism. Therefore, we can dismiss this account as a relevant source attesting to any contact between monarchs and Jaina mendicants, not to speak of Candragupta and Bhadrabāhu. Furthermore, the Jainas are never mentioned by Megasthenes or other Greek authors of antiquity such as Clement of Alexandria, Porphyry etc., explicitly as a separate group and we may merely infer that they are included into the general category of the *samanaioi* (Σαμάναιοι / Σαρμάναι), i.e. the *śramaṇas / sramanas* (Sanskrit / Prakrit), beside the *brahmanes* (βραχμάνας). But it would be a mistake (and a logical fallacy) to equate the *śramaṇas* with the Jainas, and likewise to speak of any temporal coincidence of Candragupta and Bhadrabāhu on the basis of it.

It is certainly not impossible that Bhadrabāhu was in a group of monks that left Ujjayinī for whatever reason and moved to the South and we may never know the true reasons and background of such a decision to migrate. It may have indeed been some kind of calamity, or famine, which were, and have always been, rather frequent in India that could provide good reasons for a religious community to permanently leave a locality. Alternatively, one may surmise that the migration may have been a natural change of place for a group of wandering Jaina monks, obliged to be constantly on the move for religious reasons or with an intention to convert new groups of people and carry the message of the Jina to the South. Once in Śravaṇabelagola, they found a friendly place to settle or even perhaps some local patronage that

---

17 Strabo, xv.i.60. τοὺς δὲ Γαρμάνας, τοὺς μὲν ἐντιμοτάτους ᾿Ηλωβίως φησίν ὄνομάζοντα, ζώνας ἐν ταῖς ζώοις ἀπὸ φύλλων καὶ καρπῶν ἄρηων, ἑσθῆτος φλοιῶν δενδρείων, ἄφόρισσιν χωρίς καὶ οὐνῳ. τοὺς δὲ βασιλεύσι συνεῖναι, δὲ ἀγγέλων πυθανομένως περὶ τῶν αἰτίων καὶ δὲ ἐκείνων ἑραπεύσασε καὶ ἄμαμενοι τὸ θεῖον.
19 See also Chatterjee (1978: 133)41: “The Greek and Roman historians, who definitely knew the Jains, have not said anything regarding Candragupta’s conversion to that religion. On the other hand, there are indications in their writings that Candragupta was an orthodox Hindu, believing in the sacrificial religion.”
encouraged them to stay there. Or, was it their intention to convert new groups in the South? At the same time, we have to bear in mind that any migration or movement of Jaina monks has to presuppose a prior presence in that spot of a Jaina lay community which would support the monks materially, also in terms of alms.\(^{20}\) In other words, for the Jaina monks to migrate to and settle in Śravaṇabelagola, there would have had to exist there already a Jaina lay congregation. Perhaps the monks were prompted to migrate to the South by an invitation from Śravaṇabelagola? But this never finds any support in Jaina narratives or other legendary sources. The migration, if it really happened, was apparently trivial enough for the contemporaries to leave no trace of it in early inscriptions and no records in literature. Granted that such a migration did take place, being wandering monks of no political affiliation or status, Prabhācandra, as the leader, as well as Bhadrabāhu and other monks were completely free to travel and move across political frontiers of the kingdoms of the fourth/third century South Asia.

The picture however becomes quite different when we put Candragupta Maurya, the founder of an empire, in focus. There are two preconditions to the whole story. The first has been already mentioned, which is Bhadrabāhu’s, Prabhācandra’s and their \textit{saṅgha’s} migration to the South, which is not improbable but for which we find no single evidence prior to 600 CE, i.e. 900 years later, and, methodologically speaking, the burden of proof lies with those who accept the story.\(^{21}\) The second precondition is the political feasibility of Candragupta’s trip to the South, which has never, it seems, been considered by researchers so far. This will be analysed below. If Candragupta’s migration to the South was impossible for whatever reason, then the story of his conversion turns out to be a myth because it is essentially related to the migration legend. Whereas the issue of Candragupta’s conversion may not have been perceived in those days of such importance to leave inscriptions or entrust it to some kind of (canonical) narrative, which is in itself most unlikely that the Jaina writes would not have immediately jumped on such an opportunity to enhance their

\(^{20}\) The monks’ obligation to drink only ‘lifeless’, i.e. boiled water must have developed at a later point of time; it would have effectively barred Jaina monks to wander to places uninhabited by a Jaina lay community; see \textsc{Balcerowicz (2016b: 109–110)}.

\(^{21}\) For an inscription to have a historical value as a testimony of events that happened 900 years earlier, it is required that there had been any continuous tradition preserving an account of the ancient events, and it is most unlikely that such a tradition would have first transpired after 900 years, without any single reference to the original events in any other source before 600 CE.
importance through an early canonical narrative description of the event, the issue of his migration should have potentially been important enough to leave some historical trace.

A decisive factor for accepting the story of Candragupta’s migration to the South is whether such a trip could have been possible at all in political terms. Having abdicated and handed over the power to Bindusāra, Candragupta was certainly unrestricted in his movement as a monk within the limits of his own and his son’s empire. But was he really free to roam peacefully beyond the frontiers of his realm, i.e. in the territories of the neighbouring kingdoms?

Enjoying the status of a former emperor has serious implications for the case of Candragupta’s conversion. Obviously, a monk who had previously been an emperor never ceases to be one. Had Candragupta converted to Jainism thanks to Bhadrabāhu’s efforts, abdicated and joined a religious movement headed by Prabhācandra, he would have nevertheless retained his imperial position and strong political leverage. With certainty, a monkish garb, or rather in the case of a Digambara monk—nudity, would not have changed his rank and appearance of a political figure in the eyes of his neighbours, not even of his own compatriots. It should be borne in mind in this context that he was known as an expansive ruler who had established a kingdom and vigorously enlarged its territory within a short time.

Becoming a Jaina monk and wandering within the borders of his own empire would not have carried any serious political repercussions from the point of view of international relations, provided Śravānabelagola lay within his realm. However, had his empire not extended up to Śravānabelagola, his migration to the location would have involved crossing the frontiers of the neighbouring kingdom or kingdoms, the territories of which were contiguous to that of the Mauryan Empire, and hence they were considered enemies (ari) in the rāja-mandala theory of Indian polity, as we know it for instance from the Artha-śāstra (AŚ 6.2.13–19). A march of a king with his retinue, or of a former king with his monastic cortege, across neighbouring territories could easily be interpreted as hostile and to bode the king’s intention to extend the territories through a pretext. It becomes therefore imperative to determine whether Śravaṇabelagola was within the borders of his empire, which would make his migration possible in political-technical terms and his conversion to Jainism plausible, or it lay outside of the realm of his and his son’s power, which would make his migration virtually impossible and would render the story of conversion a fiction.
This intuition is reflected in what Kulke–Rothermund (2004: 64–65) said, at the same time withholding a conclusive opinion on the matter in the light of the absence of external (Greek) evidence, but tending to accept the account:

“Old Jaina texts report that Chandragupta was a follower of that religion and ended his life in Karnataka by fasting unto death, a great achievement of holy men in the Jaina tradition. If this report is true, Chandragupta must have started the conquest of the south (emphasis—P.B.). At Bindusara’s court there were ambassadors of the Seleukids and of the Ptolemaeans but they have not left us valuable reports as Megasthenes did a generation earlier.”

How extensive was therefore Chandragupta’s empire? All evidence we have at our disposal points in one and the same direction: the Mauryan empire established under unclear circumstances by Chandragupta gradually grew from a state of Northern India to a large empire associated with Aśoka, hence logically speaking had to originally comprise much smaller territories than those of Aśoka’s realm. As W.W. Tarn (1951: 129) observes, “The Mauryan empire as most Greeks knew it was that of Chandragupta and not that of Asoka, that is, it was an empire of Northern India.” All accounts, as scanty as they are, are quite unanimous that Chandragupta succeeded in establishing his empire in northern India, and the south was beyond his control. Indeed, we have no independent evidence that Chandragupta’s empire ever reached the South in any way. On the contrary, we know that Aśoka greatly extended the borders of the kingdom he had inherited from Chandragupta and Bindusāra, the best known and most notorious case being Kalinga (Orissa). We also know that Aśoka had his inscriptions engraved on pillars and rocks throughout his empire, and the inscriptions marked places of special importance following two patterns. The first was to commemorate important places for religious and internal political reasons within the core of his empire, such as places of Buddhist worship and pilgrimage. The second pattern was related to the frontiers and freshly conquered territories. These were militarized sites of local administration, taxation and legions.

In some of his edicts, Aśoka mentions neighbouring territories, which he calls ‘borderers’ (anīta / anītyaka), i.e. neighbours. This allows us to determine some of the frontiers of his empire. His rock edicts—i.e. the second rock edict22 with variants in Dhauli,23 Gīrṇa,24 Jauγaḍa,25 Kālṣī.26

---

22 For the synoptic text, see Hultzsch (1925: 184–186).
23 Lines 1–2, in Hultzsch (1925: 84–85).
Mānehrā27 and Šāhābāzgarhī28—mention the following ‘borderers’ to the south of Asoka’s empire: the Coḷas / Coḍas (a Tamil kingdom, known to Ptolemy) and the Pāṇḍyas (likewise a Tamil kingdom, known to the Greeks and to the author of the Periplus Maris Erythraei as Πανόιος, the Sāṭiyaputra (Sāṭiyaputra), the Keralaputra (known as Κηρόβορος / Κηρόβορος in the Periplus and Κηρόβορος by Ptolemy) and Tambraparṇī (Tāmraparṇī, i.e. Sri Lanka, known to Megasthenes as Παρπάνη).29

In the Survānagiri–Hampī region of the central Deccan (known sometimes as the Siddāpur neighbourhood), we find a rather unusual accumulation of his inscriptions on a relatively small territory within the radius of approx. 100 kilometres. Unlike in many other regions, we deal here not with just one or two stray inscriptions but with a dozen of them, most of them classifiable as minor rock edicts, some as major rock edicts. Their accumulation in the region is a clear sign of its strategic importance. Asoka’s minor rock edicts are found at (Map 1):30

1. Brahmagiri (14°49’ N, 76°48’ E), discovered 1892,
2. Eṟṟaṇu (15°12’ N, 77°36’ E), discovered 1928/29,
3. Gavimath (15°20’ N, 76°10’ E), discovered 1931,
4. Jātiṅga-Rāmeśvara (14°51’ N, 76°47’ E), discovered 1892,
5. Maski (15°57’ N, 76°39’ E), discovered 1915,
6. Niṭṭīr (15°33’ N, 76°50’ E), discovered 1977,
7. Pālkiṃuṇḍu (15°21’ N, 76°8’ E), discovered 1931,
8. Rājula-Manḍagiri (15°26’ N, 77°28’ E), discovered 19th c. / 1952–53,
9. Sannathi (16°49’ N, 76°54’ E), discovered 1989,
10. Siddāpur (14°49’ N, 76°48’ E), discovered 1982,

25 Lines 1–2: amṭā athā codāḥ pāṃḍīvāḥ sāṭiyaputāḥ... i amṭiyoke nāma yona-lājā [e] vā pi tasa amṭiyokasa sāṃmaṭā lājāne..., in HULTZSCH (1925: 102) and in BLOCH (1950: 93–94): 1 codā.
29 Periplus § 54, pp. 94–96 = Periplus § 54, pp. 17–19; see also HULTZSCH (1925: xix).
30 For detailed description, discovery date, geographical coordinates etc., see also ANDERSEN (1990) and FALK (2006).
These eleven sites are Asoka’s southernmost edicts. No single Asoka’s inscription has been discovered beyond this southernmost point. The map also shows the site of Śravaṇabelagola, where Candragupta and Bhadrabahu are reported in Jain sources to have reached:

12. Śravaṇabelagola (12°51’ N, 76°29’ E)

Map 1. Asoka’s edicts of the central Deccan

From the cluster of Brahmagiri–Jaṭiṇga-Rāmeśvara–Siddāpur, it is 230 km to Śravaṇabelagola in a straight line, or approx. 260 km walking distance, whereas it is 350 and 520 km from Āragud and Sannathi respectively to Śravaṇabelagola, which is a significant stretch, requiring about 10-13 days to cover on foot (both for the monks and for the infantry in the Mauryan times).32

31 The measurements done with Google Maps.
32 The fastest marching pace of infantry was about 30 km per day (slowed down by a number of conditions, described in AŚ 10.2.13), see AŚ 10.2.12: yojanaṁ adhamā, adhyārdham madhyamā, dvi-yojanaṁ uttamā, saṁbhavyaṁ vā gatiḥ.—“The marching pace [of the army per day] is [as follows]: the lowest is one mile (ca 15 km), the medium is 1.5 mile (ca 22 km), the highest is two miles (ca 30 km), or as fast as possible,” with one yojana being approx. 14 400 m. See also Thapliyal (2010: 154). The marching speed of approx. 27 km per day in the case of Alexander’s army was considered unusual, see Chrissanthos (2008: 86): “Alexander and his army moved with incredible speed: 200 miles in 11 days,
This aggregation of inscriptions and a complete absence of any edicts or of any other trace of Aśoka’s rule further south may be an indication that the territories around the Survarṇagiri–Hampī were newly conquered by Aśoka and they mark a frontier zone of his empire. This is confirmed by Aśoka’s Maski inscription which strongly suggests that the territories had been freshly conquered, and he visited the site (“the samgha”) one year “and somewhat more” after he had come to call himself the follower of the Buddha (buddha-śākya):34

“(B) Two and a half years [and somewhat more] (have passed) since I am the Buddha-Śākya. (C) [A year and] somewhat more (has passed) [since] I have visited the samgha and have shown zeal.”35

In addition, Brahmagiri inscription (I), confirms that a frontier of Aśoka’s empire was not very far from that site and his neighbours (‘borderers’) were expected to know of Aśoka’s message:

“(I) For the following purpose has this proclamation been issued, [that both the lowly] and those of high rank may be zealous in this manner, and (that even) my borderers may know (it), and (that) this zeal may be of long duration.”36

covering 18 miles a day.” Jaina monks generally cover the distance of 20 km in a day on average.

33 Cf. HULTZSCH (1925: xlv–xlivi), according to whom Aśoka “had spent 256 nights on tour before issuing this and other similar inscriptions in Rūpāṇīth, Sahasrām (Rohtāā District, Bihar, India, 24°57’ N, 84°02’ E), Bairātt (Jaipur District, Rajasthan, India, 27°28’ N, 76°13’ E), Maski and the three Mysore edicts”, i.e. those of Brahmagiri, Siddāpūr and Jaṭāṅga-Rāmeśvara. Most of these inscriptions seem to be near the frontiers of Aśoka’s empire, and the only exceptions, viz. Rūpāṇīth and Bairātt, belong to the middle territories, which may have been important hubs in his military campaigns. Further, this inscription alongside “Rūpāṇīth and cognate edicts must be considered the earliest of all”, see HULTZSCH (1925: xlv–xlivi). For the synoptic text, see ANDERSEN (1990: 123–130).

34 In all other versions of the inscription, buddha-śāke is replaced with upāsake, see the synoptic text in ANDERSEN (1990: 123–130).

35 Lines 1–3 (BC), edited in ANDERSEN (1990: 58–61) and edited/translated HULTZSCH (1925: 174–175): … [a]dh[ar] [t] [yāni] vaśā[ni] am sun[t] budha-śāke - - - - ire - [su] [m] [s]amgha[m] [pa] [gate] - - - [su] miu[pa] [gar] [e] …. See a similar content of Brahmagiri inscription, CD, in ANDERSEN (1990: 29–33) and HULTZSCH (1925: 175–177), which allows for the full reconstruction of the damaged text.

36 Edited in ANDERSEN (1990: 29–33) and edited and translated HULTZSCH (1925: 176–177), lines 5–7: (I) e[t][va]thāya iyam sāvanē sāvāpīte [vyathā] [khudakā] [ca] mahāpāt ca imam pakame’yu [t]i i amitā ca m(e) jāneyu cīraṁtiśte ca iyam [paka] [me] [hōti] … For an alternative translation, see: THAPAR (1977: 259).
Had the Survannagiri–Hampi region been very far from empire frontiers, there would have been no necessity and sense to indicate in the inscription that Aśoka’s proclamation could and should reach them. Interestingly, only a very select number of his inscriptions mention the term *antiyaka*, the ‘borderer’, or a neighbouring territory, and these are the following (see Map 2), with Śravaṇabelagola (12) laying far beyond:

**South:**
1. Brahmagiri (14°49’ N, 76°48’ E),

**West:**
13. Girnār (Junāgal District, India, 21°31’ N, 70°28’ E),
14. Šābbāzgarhī (Mardan District, Pakistan, 34°13’ N, 72°09’ E), and Mānselrā,

**North:**
15. Toprā (Ambala District, Haryana, India, 30°07’ N, 77°10’ E),
16. Kālsī (Dehra Dūn District, India, 30°31’ N, 77°51’ E),

**East:**
17. Dhaufi (Puri District, Orisa, India, 20°11’ N, 85°50’ E),
18. Jaugaḍa (Ganjam District, Orisa, India, 19°29’ N, 84°51’ E),

**Central:**
19. Rūpnāth (Jabalpur District, MP, India; 23°38’ N, 80°02’ E).

Map 2. Aśoka’s edicts mentioning the ‘borderers’
What links all these sites is that they are located at the furthest ends of the empire except for one, namely the Rūpāṇṭḥ edict. Rūpāṇṭḥ, like Bairāṭ (Jaipur District, Rajasthan, India, 27°28’ N, 76°13’ E) of the central region, is however historically closely linked to the cluster of edicts in Maski, Siddāpur and Jaṭṭiṅa-Rāmeśvara, which were all erected around the same time and belong to Aśoka’s earliest edicts.37 The link is highlighted by Hultzsch (1925: xlvii), who explains that “[a]s the tour during which Aśoka issued the Rūpāṇṭḥ edict” — as well as those in Sahasrām, Bairāṭ, Maski, Brahmagiri, Siddāpur and Jaṭṭiṅa-Rāmeśvara (i.e. the so-called three Mysore edicts) — “had been undertaken in his twelfth year when he commenced to be ‘very zealous’, it may be concluded that it was his first dharma-yātā”. The tour seems therefore to have followed the borders of the empire during which Aśoka strengthened his power and erected the edicts.

Who ‘the borderers’ (antā / amityaka) are for Aśoka is also defined in the second separate rock edicts in Dhauli and Jaugada which explain that the ‘borderers’ are ‘unconquered’ rulers (amṭānaṁ avijitānam).38

In the light of the foregoing discussion, it becomes quite certain that Aśoka’s realm of power ended not far south of the cluster of the dozen edicts, including Brahmagiri. In this context, the Conquest of Law (dhamma-vijaye) over the Southern regions of the Colas, Pāṇḍyas (coḍa-paṇḍiyā) and Śrī Laṅka (tambapāṭṭvīva), of which speaks Aśoka in his Thirteenth Major Rock Edict, should by no means be takes literally, i.e. as a military conquest, but strictly interpreted metaphorically. The relevant portion of it reads:

“What the Beloved of Gods [Aśoka] considers is that the foremost conquest is the conquest of Law (dhamma-vijaya). And that has been obtained by the Beloved of Gods both here [in the kingdom] and with all his borderers [in the distance] as far as six hundred miles (yojana), where the Greek king named Antiochus (Antiyoka) reigns, and even further beyond him, where there are four kingdoms, one called Tulamāya (Ptolemy), one called Antekina (Antigonus), one called Makā (Magas), one called Alikasudara (Alexander), and also in the south the Colas and Pāṇḍyas, up to Śrī Laṅka (tambapāṭṭvīva) … Everywhere [people] follow the instruction on Law (dharmānuśāsti) [promulgated by] the Beloved of Gods. Even in places where the envoys of the Beloved of Gods do not reach, having heard of the practice of Law, of the precept, of the instruction

---

38 Dhauli, line 4, in Hultzsch (1925: 97–98); Jaugada, line 4–5, in Hultzsch (1925: 116–118). Cf. Hultzsch (1925: xxxviii): “…the king (Aśoka—P.B.) refers to tribes outside his territories, whom he calls his ‘borderers’ (antā).”
on Law (dharmānusāṣṭī) [promulgated by] the Beloved of Gods, [people] follow Law (dharma) [now] and will follow [it in the future].”39

Putting aside what Aśoka really meant by ‘the conquest of Law’, the text clearly has to be understood in the sense that the instruction of Law reaches both “everywhere”, including the neighbouring territories where envoys (dātā) do reach, and outside, “where the envoys … do not reach”. One cannot therefore speak of a military conquest but rather of Aśoka extending his political influence by other means such as diplomatic relations and religious missions. As we know, Buddhist monks and nuns dispatched by Aśoka often played the role of political agents, spies, messengers, emissaries, envoys and ambassadors, and this is also well reflected in the Artha-śāstra,40 a text the core of which was composed soon after the collapse of the Mauryan empire at the earliest, but enlarged and compiled later.

Aśoka followed his standard policy of promoting his state ideology under the guise of ‘religious’ Dharma to unify imperial administration, and his missionary/espionage activities as well as his support for the new morals (encapsulated under the term dharma) and new rituals served the purpose of strengthening the ties of the central Deccan with his capital in Pāṭaliputra. The sites where he had his pillars erected or his edicts inscribed were meant to serve as places of state ceremonies rather than strictly religious rituals.

We may conclude that the territories south of the cluster of edicts around Brahmagiri, Jaṭṭaṅga-Rāmeśvara and Siddāpur lay beyond Aśoka’s empire. In other words, the lands of the Coḷaras and Pāṇḍyas — a region which also included the Keralaputras of the second Major Rock Edict, i.e. lying beyond the frontier along which Aśoka had his dozen-or-so edicts inscribed — were practically beyond his control. The implication is that these territories were out of reach also for his father Bindusāra and even more so for his grandfather Candragupta, which makes the latter’s pilgrimage to that region highly unlikely if not entirely impossible.

To reach Śrāvānabelagola, Candragupta Maurya would have had to reach out well beyond the frontiers of his former kingdom which he had abandoned. However, such an expedition of a former monarch with a retinue of his co-religionists would have betokened another aggressive military

40 AŚ 1.11–12, 1.16, 2.35, 12, 13.2.
campaign on the part of Pātaliputra, and would have been interpreted either as a cunning stratagem of Candragupta himself or a war campaign waged by his successor under a guise of a religious migration. This in turn would have almost certainly been met with some kind of political or military resistance, of which we hear nothing in the sources. Moreover, a prolonged presence of Candragupta, a former invader (vijigīṣu) in Śrāvaṇabelagola, i.e. in the territory of a neighbouring kingdom, being most probably inimical (ari) by ‘political’ nature, would have been treated with strong suspicion and fear by all neighbours. Even granted Śrāvaṇabelagola had been located in a friendly state (mitra), being the enemy’s enemy, then Candragupta’s movement would have required a passage across the territory of the enemy kingdom (ari) interconnecting Śrāvaṇabelagola and the Mauryan kingdom. The argument holds valid irrespective of whether we apply the Indian traditional rāja-mandala theory of ‘the circle of kingdoms’ of roughly similar size (which was historically not the case during the Mauryan times) or Real Politik of a large expanding empire and smaller dominions surrounding it, fearful of being swallowed by it sooner or later. In addition, a religious migration of this kind to a territory of a neighbouring kingdom, or kingdoms, could have been used as a convenient political and military opportunity by Bindusāra, of whom we know that he also intended to expand the empire, to invade neighbouring countries.

Being an apt monarch who had managed to conquer vast territories in his lifetime, Candragupta would have had to be aware that his permanent presence in the territories of neighbouring kingdom(s) could have been used as a pretext to annex them. Granted that his conversion to Jainism was genuine — unlike in the case of Aśoka’s conversion to Buddhism, which was rather a useful stratagem to provide his empire with a unifying ideology — and a possible indication of Candragupta’s deep sincerity would be his ultimate ritual starvation to death, we would face the following paradox: Why should Candragupta, an ardent neophyte in the tradition of renunciation and respect for life (Pali: jīvucchā; Sanskrit: jugupsā, later replaced with the term ahimsā),41 reach out to new territories in his religious pilgrimage running the risk of possible (and perhaps unintended) consequences of a Kalinga-like war and loss of human life in his search of a new place and environment with no famine? Should he rather not have settled down somewhere within the bounds of his extensive empire where there was food security, granted that it was the real cause of migration? Why should Candragupta follow Bhadrabāhu to the far South instead of suggesting to him another direction of pilgrimage?

Further, as I indicated elsewhere, there are strong reasons to believe that still at the time of Aśoka and his son Daśaratha the second most important religion to Buddhism, promoted by Aśoka, was Ājīvikism, and Jainism hardly played any role. Ājīvikism, strengthened by the support it received from Aśoka and, in particular, by Daśaratha, set certain standards as regards religious architecture and art, had its important religious centre at the site of Barābār and Nāgārjunī Hills mentioned even by the grammarians Kātyāyana and Patañjali, which was later destroyed by the Jaina ruler Khāravela in the second/first (?) century BCE. Jainism was hardly mentioned in Aśoka’s inscriptions: there is just one reference to the Jainas, who come after Brahmins and Ājīvikas, whereas the latter are explicitly mentioned in Aśoka’s four edicts. The latter are also explicitly referred to by ‘Kauṭilya’ (a collective author) in the Artha-śāstra, who does not refer to Jainism even once and is completely oblivious to its existence. This indifference to Jainism in the early palaeographic sources would be quite striking given the fact that the founder of the Mauryan dynasty had been a Jaina monk himself and had made Jainism gain imperial prominence, at least for a while.

The conclusion cannot but be to treat the popular story of Candragupta Maura’s conversion to Jainism and his subsequent migration to Śravaṇabelagolā in the company of Bhadrabāhu as a pure myth that emerged at a much later time, certainly after the erection of the first inscription of Śravaṇabelagolā around 600 CE. His conversion could not be merely his own personal decision concerning his own fate but a political act of international implications which would have potentially had serious repercussions in the southern regions of India. Consequently, the map of the Mauryan empire in Asoka’s times would have looked rather differently, with

42 BALCEROWICZ (2016b: 7).
43 BALCEROWICZ (2016b: 241 ff.).
44 See the seventh pillar edict, B-round the edict, line 25, in HULTZSCH (1925: 132–136), BLOCH (1950: 170): (Z) sanghathasi pi me kate ime viyāpaṭā hohamti ti hemeva bābhanesu āḷḷ[i]vikesu pi me kate ime viyāpaṭā hohamti ti niyamthuesu pi me kate ime viyāpaṭā hohamti nānā-pāsamdesu pi me [ka]fe ime viyāpaṭā hohamti ti,...—“Also with respect to the matters of the [Buddhist] community (saṅgha), I decided that these [high officers (mahā-mātra)] are occupied [with them]. Likewise, with respect to Brahmins and Ājīvikas, I decided that these [high officers] are occupied [with them]. Similarly, with respect to the Nirgrantas, I decided that these [high officers] are occupied [with them]. Also with respect to various [other] heretical sects (pāśānda), I decided that these [high officers] are occupied [with them].”
45 ĀŚ 1.11.13–20; 3.20.16.
new borders marked with new inscriptions further south of which we see no trace beyond the cluster of the Survarṇagiri region.

The myth of Candragupta’s conversion and migration to the south is one of a number of similar myths of appropriation of important real celebrities and mythical personages into the fold of Jainism. Incidentally, Candragupta Maurya is utilised not only in the Jaina myth of Bhadrabāhu, but also in another purely fictitious story of enormous popularity, namely that of Candragupta’s minister and chief advisor Cāṇaka, identified with Kauṭilya, the author of the *Artha-śāstra*.

### 2. The story of Mahāvira

The myth of Candragupta Maurya’s conversion to Jainism by dint of Bhadrabāhu’s intervention is not the earliest or singular case of the appropriation of important political figures by the Jainas. The most eminent and earliest example, both in terms of religious narrative ‘history’ of Jainism and as the earliest literary instance, is probably the genealogy of Mahāvira Vardhamāna as narrated in the *Kalpa-sūtra*46 (first half of the first millennium CE).47 From the account, we learn that Vardhamāna was believed to be related to all most esteemed royal houses of the known Northern India, to the kings of Vaiśālī, Magadha, Avanti and Kauśambī (Fig. 1).

---


47 The text is a composite work with a range of historical layers. Whereas some of its portions, such as the core of the *Theravālī* list (later expanded), may date back to an earlier stage, a large part of it, i.e. the hagiographies of Vardhamāna and other Jinas modelled on the former’s biography, are much later. OHIRA (1994: 35–37, § 113, 118) assigns the text to “the fifth canonical stage” (latter half of the 4th century and 5th century CE) and to “the third *Prāṇīc*” phase, with which dating I concur. The model for Jaina biography writing and invention of the life stories of the religious founders was set by Buddhist literature, including Aśvaghosa’s *Buddhacarita* or certain texts which were later incorporated into the *Lalita-vistara* (1st–2nd centuries CE).
Fig. 1. Vardhamana’s legendary kinship relations.
To conceal the obvious impossibility of such a complex kinship, the opportune linkage came to be established through Trīśālā, Vardhamāṇa’s second mother of Kṣatriya background, and the wife of Siddhārtha of Kaśyapa gotra, after his womb had been transferred from a Brahmin mother Devānandā, the wife of Rṣabhadatta of Koḍāla gotra. The whole story developed very late and no part of it is attested in earliest Jaina sources. We hardly have any tangible piece of information of early date about Vardhamāṇa’s social background, not even any information how he died or what happened to his dead body. 48 Even the existence of two so divergent traditions of Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras as regards his actual parentage is quite telling: 49 apparently there existed no such early tradition in Jainism and the early Jaina ascetics were probably not interested in cultivating it. Furthermore, no single Buddhist text relates Vardhamāṇa to any royal, aristocratic or wealthy family. In Buddhist sources he is merely known as ‘the Son of the Jñāṭ Lineage’ (Pkt. Nātapattra / Skt. Jñāṭputra), 50 of which we learn no details. Had Vardhamāṇa had any links to important clans or families, this would have been most probably taken notice of even in Buddhist and other sources which do happen to report on kings and ancient tycoons of note. 51

3. The story of Bhadrabāhu

The fact that Candragupta, as it appears, never converted to Jainism and did not subsequently reach Śravaṇabelagola to die there a pious death bears direct implications on the story of Bhadrabāhu’s migration to Śravaṇabelagola and his ritual suicide, which likewise has to be accepted as a later invention. What additionally substantiates such a conclusion is a complete absence of any literary account or epigraphic evidence which would mention most of the crucial ingredients of his own story (i.e. putting aside the elements directly associated with Candragupta) prior to 10th century, which are: his presence in Ujjayinī, his prediction of famine, his leadership of the

---

49 See JAINI (1979: 6–10).
50 Sāmaṇa-phala-sutta, DN 2.28–29.
51 Another instance of such an appropriation outside of the realm of politics is provided by the story of Rohagupta, who was responsible for the sixth schism (nīhava) in Jainism, see JACOBI (1895: xxxvii): “The Gainas themselves go still farther, and maintain that the Vaiśeshika philosophy was established by a schismatical teacher of theirs, Khaluya Rōhagutta of the Kauśika Gōtra, with whom originated the sixth schism of the Gainas, the Trairāsika-matam, in 544 A.V. (18 A.D.) The details of this system given in the Āvasyaka, vv. 77–83, are apparently reproduced from Kanāda’s Vaiseshika Darsana… I believe that in this case, as in many others, the Gainas claim more honour than is their due in connecting every Indian celebrity with the history of their creed.”
community and migration to the South, and finally his starvation death in Śravaṇabelagola. Occasionally, and only after 600 CE, some isolated elements of his story are mentioned, but that is too weak an evidence to reconstruct on their basis the whole account and to assume that his complete story was known at that stage. All sources which refer to either of the two motifs (Candragupta’s or Bhadrabāhu’s) postdate the year 600 CE and are contradictory with each other.

Historically the first Śravaṇabelagola inscription referred to above, speaks of Bhadrabāhu as the one who foretold the famine, but it is a certain Prabhācandra who is indicated as the leader that guided the Jaina congregation to the South and who died there, not Bhadrabāhu. Yatīvrṣabha (early 7th century) is the first to mention Candragupta’s conversion, but he is completely silent on Bhadrabāhu’s link to Candragupta and his migration to the South.

The earliest source which mentions Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta side by side is Inscription 31 (17—18) of Śravaṇabelagola, dated around 650 CE, which reads:

“When the faith (i.e. the Jaina religion—P.B.), which had greatly prospered at the time when the pair of the great sages Bhadravāhu and Chandragupta shed lustre on it, became afterwards a little weak, the coral-lipped Śāntisena-muni renovated it; and, on the mountain at Velgoḷa, having given up food and other things, became the lord of the cessation of birth.”52

The text refers to some ideal(ised) Golden Age of the purported great prosperity of Jainism during the time of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta in Śravaṇabelagola, and to a time of religious renaissance under Śāntisena, which is apparently the period which was inaugurated around 600 CE, the first palpable trace of it being Inscription I, “perhaps the oldest epigraph at Śravāṇa Belgoḷa, on which the whole tradition is apparently based.”53 Given all the above, we cannot treat this reference to Jaina prosperity during Mauryan times and to the cooperation of the two personages as a reliable historical evidence. However, we can observe a gradual process of the creation of the foundational myth for Śravaṇabelagola as a new (or renovated) site of religious worship, which required such a ‘history’. The story was most probably meant to lend both authoritative and imperial pedigree to the new site of religious cult and to its local patrons (rulers or administrators), i.e. to the emerging Calukyas of Bāḍāmi, in the similar way as the consecration (pratiṣṭhā) of the monolithic Bāhubalin of Śravaṇa-

---

52 R. NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 6 (ed.), 7 (tr.)).
53 R. NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 39).
belagola, erected between 978 and 984, and similar colossi in the region, served the rulers and dignitaries such as Cēmūḍāraṇya of Gaṅga king Rājamalla IV (974–984), Gaṅgarāja of Hoysala king Viṣṇuvardhana (1108–1142), or Hullarāja of Hoysala king Narasiṃha I (1142–1173) a few centuries later, to boost their leverage and stature.

There is still little research done on the history and presence of Jainism in Kārṇāṭaka in a truly non-partisan manner, i.e. without running the risk of aggrandizing the role of Jainism in the region, and this is a field that should be thoroughly explored in the future. In any case, concrete archaeological and epigraphic evidence to the existence of well-established Jaina communities and religious centres is relatively late. As Ram Bhushan Prasad SINGH (1975: 37–38) notes, in the region “the earliest indication of the congregational worship is furnished by the Kadamba copper plates which are assigned to the middle of the 5th and the 6th centuries”, and belong to the Kadamba dynasty of Banavāśī (345–540), who formed the nucleus of the later Calukyas. The several copper plates, discovered by J.F. FLEET (1877) in 1855 in Cakrafrītha near Halsi, about 400 km north of Śrāvaṇabelagola, commemorate altogether seven land grants (including donations of land for the use by Digāmbara monks) by Kadamba rulers, the first of them being Kākutilaṭhavarman (early 5th century), who were themselves followers of Jainism, which is confirmed by ubiquitous invocations to Jīnendrā, Rṣabha etc. This sudden appearance of Jainism-related material in the period of approximately two centuries, from mid-third to mid-fifth century, archaeologically and epigraphically unattested before, is directly linked to the royal dynasty which embraced and propagated this religion. It concurs with the observation made by NĀΓARAJAIAH (2010: 237): “In Kārṇāṭaka, leaving aside the historical legend, the earliest Jaina epigraph comes from Sosale (Mysore D1), dated circa 5th cent.”, which is located ca. 100 km south of Śrāvaṇabelagola. It should be recalled that we have no evidence at all of a thriving Jaina community in Śrāvaṇabelagola at an early stage, and Incription No. 1 is among two that “seem to be the earliest records extant at Belgoḷa” (NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 70)).

The expansion of Jainism to Śrāvaṇabelagola is connected with the activities of the Bāḍāmi Calukyas, who succeeded the Kadambas both in terms of political power and support for Jainism. After the first inscription, a number of new inscriptions commemorating Candragupta Maurya and

54 CHATTERJEE (1978: 191) opts for 978 as the date of the consecration; SANGAVE (1985: 78–81) argues for Sunday, 13 May 981, which is now the officially adopted date.
55 These are also described under Ind. Ch. 58–Ind. Ch. 64 in GAUR (1975: 33–36).
Bhadrabahu proliferate and the theme becomes a standard narrative. None of the sources earlier than Inscription 1 of Šravanabelagolā makes any reference, or even loose allusion, to either Bhadrabahu or Candragupta Maurya. Interestingly, the Kadamba copper plates referred to above provide information on the legendary history of the dynasty, alluding to earlier mythical personages, heroes and legendary kings, such as Manu, Bhāradvaja and king Sagara, and narrate the Kadambas’ forefathers or family members’ victorious combats against other kingdoms. All these references serve one purpose, namely to promote and elevate the unique royal, semi-divine status of the rulers. Had the story of the two protagonists been in wide, or even in limited circulation during the rule of the Kadambas, it would have most probably found its way into the inscriptions, with Candragupta Maurya being an ideal paragon of the virtues of a monarch who was ready to give away his whole kingdom for the sake of a religious career, not just a handful of nivartanas (measures) of land donated by the Kadambas to Jaina monks. Jaina poets wouldn’t have missed the opportunity to align themselves with such a prominent monarch, the founder of a great dynasty and empire.

Accordingly, the emergence of Šravanabelagolā as a religious site was linked to Bhadrabahu’s story, which was expanded later to ‘appropriate’ the person of Candragupta Maurya and which should be primarily seen as a way to provide legitimacy to Šravanabelagolā as a centre both for religious worship and political power of the rulers who were the patrons of the cult. In the religious ‘history’, Bhadrabahu as a Sruta-kevalin preserving Mahāvīra’s authentic teachings provided scriptural authority to the place, whereas Candragupta bequeathed his imperial prerogatives to rule and set the model of royal power for the local rulers whose duty was to support the cult. Apparently, the complete story was not forged in its final shape until the second half of the tenth century, because still in the early tenth century Hariśeṇa writes that Bhadrabahu died near Ujjayinī and never migrated from the North towards Šravanabelagolā. The existence of such divergent, inconsistent and incompatible versions even at such a late time may testify to

56 Some examples are Inscriptions: no. 64 (40) dated 1163 (R. NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 13 ff. (ed.) / 16 ff. (tr.)), no. 67 (54), dated 1129 (R. NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 24 ff. (tr.))), no. 258 (108), dated 1432 CE (R. NARASIMHACHAR (1923: 116 ff. (tr.))).
a gradual development of the myth, a prominent character of which is Bhadrabāhu.\textsuperscript{58}

Harīṣena’s Bhadrabāhu-kathānaka discussed before finds its important counterpart in the Bhadrabāhu-bhaṭṭārama-kathe of the Vaḍḍārādhanē, said to be the earliest extant prose work in Kannāḍa, by an anonymous author\textsuperscript{59} or perhaps a certain Bhrājīṣṇu.\textsuperscript{60} Its author explicitly refers to Śivakotyācārya’s (alias Śivārya’s) Mālārādhanē, whom also Harīṣena mentions, and both works seem to belong to a similar period of approximately “the first quarter of the 10th cent. A.D.”\textsuperscript{61} The Vaḍḍārādhanē\textsuperscript{62} historically and culturally linked to Karṇāṭaka, differs from other, above-mentioned sources in a number of important details,\textsuperscript{63} for instance it mentions Pāṭaliputra, not Ujjayini, as the capital of Samprati Candragupta, who is said to be the son of Aśoka. It is Samprati who is converted by Bhadrabāhu and sets off to the South in the company of eight thousand monks. They reach “the country of Kalbhappu” (Katavapra), identified with Śravaṇabelagola,\textsuperscript{64} where Bhadrabāhu dies on the Kalbhappu hill (Candrāgiri) as a result of his austerities, and

\textsuperscript{58} Despite himself accepting the tradition, R. Narasimhadhar (1923: 39–40) advises caution: “It will be seen from the accounts given above that the evidence in support of the tradition is not conclusive: it is even discrepant on some important points. Inscription No. 1 does not say that Bhadrabāhu led the saṅgha; and Harishena clearly states that Bhadrabāhu did not go with the saṅgha but died in a part of Ujjayini known as Bāḍhrapada. But the two inscriptions near Seringapatam, probably a little older than Harishena’s period, describe the summit of Chandragiri as marked by the impress of the feet of the great sages Bhadrabāhu and Chandragupta, thus indicating that the two lived there, and a still earlier inscription on Chandragiri itself, No. 31 (17–18), refers to the same two sages though it does not expressly state that they lived there.” The two inscriptions near Seringapatam—i.e. 147 and 148, see Rice (1894: ed.: ‘Seringapatam Taluq’ section, p. 80, tr.: ‘Seringapatam Taluq’ section, p. 34)—are indeed quite late, dated around 900 CE and 904 CE respectively, and both refer to the Inscription 31 (17–18) of Śravaṇabelagola already mentioned (p. 19, n. 52), therefore cannot be taken as independent historical sources.

\textsuperscript{59} According to Khadabadi (1968: 20).

\textsuperscript{60} According to Nagarajaiah (1999: 166), who however provides no source for such identification.

\textsuperscript{61} See an extensive discussion in Khadabadi (1968: 21–28). Nagarajaiah (1999: 166, 168), without even discussing Khadabadi’s arguments or mentioning his research, assigns the author to c. 800 CE.


\textsuperscript{63} This divergence of various accounts served some scholars, such as Jaini (2000: 313, n. 11) or Dhaky (2004: 141), to propose a theory of two Bhadrabāhus, one contemporary of Candragupta, the other contemporary of his descendant (great-great-grandson) Samprati.

\textsuperscript{64} See Settar (1986: 93–94).
Samprati Candragupta dies twelve years later, having lived close to this commemorative shrine on the hillock. Clearly, the author confuses Asoka’s grandson Samprati, associated by other Jaina traditions with Jainism, and Candragupta Maurya, Asoka’s grandfather. As M.A. DHAKY (2004: 131) observes, “the legend of Prabhācandra and his unnamed disciple as noted in the Śravaṇabelagola inscription of c. A.D. 600, is transferred here to, or superimposed on Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta duo. This new legend of the association of those two celebrities with Śravaṇabelagola apparently had come into currency in Karnataka by, or before, circa the mid seventh century and Bhrājīṣṇu (the author of the Vaḍḍārādhane—P.B.) used it to fit it in his narrative context.” Unlike Hariṣena’s tale of Bhadrabāhu, the story narrated in the Vaḍḍārādhane is adapted to the local habitat and was apparently developed in the same intellectual and political environment which was inspired by new political rulers who needed such celebrities to sanctify the new place of religious worship which they sustained. This is substantiated by the changes in which the Vaḍḍārādhane version differs from Hariṣena’s account, and these could be treated as another instance of the appropriation of important personages.

In view of the above it seems unlikely that any migration of Bhadrabāhu and his companions to Śravaṇabelagola ever took place. The story should therefore be treated a myth that started to develop well after 600 CE, i.e. most probably around nine centuries after the events which the myth purportedly describes. I do not wish to claim that we do have evidence that Bhadrabāhu never migrated to the South. Rather I maintain that we find no evidence to buttress the (historically very late) story, which rests on shaky grounds that were first created probably only some time before 600 CE. With the current evidence at out disposal, all we can say about the fate and whereabouts of Bhadrabāhu is that we simply do not know of any tangible evidence concerning him and his migration to the South. However, the burden of proof in this case is with those who accept the story. Unless, the evidence is produced, there is no reason to believe it.

With the evidence and arguments presented so far, we have strong reasons to reject altogether the accounts that Bhadrabāhu migrated to the South and established a Jain centre in Śravaṇabelagola, that Candragupta Maurya was converted by Bhadrabāhu and accompanied him to Śravaṇabelagola, and that both of them performed the sallekhanā rite of ritual suicide on Candragiri hill. These stories carry as little real historical substance as do the myths of the royal family background of Mahāvīra Vardhamāna. It rather appears that the first ruler of note in South Asia of whom we can with certainty know that he patronised Jainism in a significant
manner and who established the first Jaina centre of note in Mathurā was
king Khāravela, as is indicated in his Hāṭhigumphā inscription. In other
words, the historical beginnings of royal patronage of Jainism in South Asia
seem to begin with Khāravela, not with Candragupta Maurya.
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