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PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION

The *Political History of Ancient India* now arrives at a sixth edition. The continued illness of the author makes the task of revision extremely difficult. It has not been found possible to eliminate mistakes and misprints that may have crept into the volume.

Few important discoveries have been made in the domain of Ancient Indian History and Culture of the period dealt with in the following pages, since the publication of the fifth edition in 1950. It may, however, be noted that certain copper coins of a king whose name has been read as Rāmagupta have been collected by Śrī Advani and others at Bhilsa, bearing the figure of a lion on the obverse. The identity of the ruler is still undecided. The available evidence is not sufficient to indicate whether the ruler in question was a local prince or a scion of the imperial line of Guptas. Mention may also be made of a seal said to have been discovered in the Gṛhotārāma monastery in course of excavations at the site of Kauśāmbī carried on by the University of Allahabad. The seal is "impressed" with one of Toramāṇa, the famous Hun ruler, and seems to confirm the evidence of Somadeva, a Jaina contemporary of Kṛishṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa, regarding Hun penetration deep into the interior of the Ganges valley. The representation of Grumbates (of the Chionitai) as a Kushān ruler accepted by several scholars, is by no means certain.

The author has read with interest the learned notes on the Scythian period by Ludwig Bachhofer, Otto Maenchen Halfen, Dr. Lohuizen, and A. L. Basham, to whom recognition is due. His grateful thanks are also due to Professor Louis Renou of Paris for certain suggestions and constructive criticism.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:

July 2, 1953

H. C. R. C.
PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION

A fifth edition of the *Political History of Ancient India* is now placed before scholars. The author, who has been in very poor health for a long time, has found the task of revision a difficult one. He is conscious of the fact that misprints and other faults justly open to censure have not been avoided. Fresh study of the subject and new discoveries have necessitated a thorough revision of several chapters, preparation of additional notes, omission of parts of the text and other amendments. No pains have been spared to bring the work up-to-date.

Help of various kinds, including revision of Indexes, has been rendered by Mr. Durgadas Mukherji, Dr. Sudhakar Chatterji, Mr. Rabischandra Kar and Dr. Golapchandra Raychandhuri to whom the author’s acknowledgments are due.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:

*March 1, 1950.*

H. C. R. C.
PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

In placing the fourth edition of the Political History of Ancient India in the hands of students of Indian Antiquities the author takes the opportunity of expressing his grateful thanks to scholars and explorers who have made accessible the rich stores of ancient learning and the priceless memorials of vanished glory that hitherto lay hidden beyond the ken of students and investigators. Suggestions and criticisms that earlier editions of the present work received in recent times, though not always of an instructive and informed character, have enabled the author to restate his position in regard to many matters treated in the volume. While unwilling to dogmatise on controversial points the writer of the following pages thinks that he has adduced fresh evidence in support of some of the views that were put forward years ago, long before certain recent notes and dissertations on kindred subjects saw the light of the day. He has also sought to incorporate new material which, it is hoped, may be of some little use to the ever-widening circle of eager inquirers who are interested in the chequered annals of this ancient land.

The Cimmerian veil of darkness that enshrouds not a few obscure spaces in the spectrum of the early history of this country cannot be lifted by the wand of the magician or the trick of the conjurer. Even if such a feat were possible the author confesses that he does not possess the requisite implements.

Help in the laborious task of compiling the indexes has been given by Dr. D. C. Sircar and Professor G. C. Raychaudhuri to whom the author's acknowledgments are due.
PREFACE

The volume that now goes forth before the public could not be made as free from mistakes as the present writer would have wished. Some of the errors and misprints have been noted and corrected but many blunders, justly open to censure, may have escaped attention. For these the author can only crave the indulgence of readers.

The University of Calcutta:
March 31, 1938.

H. C. R. C.
PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

The Political History of Ancient India now arrives at a third edition. An endeavour has been made to make it more accurate and up-to-date. Questions connected with certain dynasties, particularly of the Scythian period, have been treated afresh and several paragraphs have been revised in the light of the new information that may be gathered from literature as well as inscriptions discovered at Shahdaur, Maira, Khalatse, Nāgarjunikonda, Guṇāighara and other places. Footnotes and appendices have been added to explain the author's viewpoint with regard to certain controversial matters. A new feature of the revised edition is the insertion in certain chapters, particularly of Part II, of introductory verses from literature to bring out some salient features of those chapters and incidentally, to show that poets and sages of Ancient India were not altogether unmindful of the political vicissitudes through which their country passed. The author craves the indulgence of the reader for certain misprints that have crept into the text. The labour of revising the Indexes has been performed by Srijuts D. C. Raychaudhuri, G. C. Raychaudhuri and Anilkumar Raychaudhuri.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:

December 13, 1931.

H. C. R. C.
A New edition of the Political History of Ancient India from the Accession of Parkshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty is placed before the public. The work has been out of print for some times and need has long been felt for a fresh edition. Therefore it goes forth once more having been revised and re-written in the light of the new information that is coming in so rapidly and in such vast bulk. No pains have been spared to bring the book up-to-date and make it more attractive to students. Material emendations have been made in almost every chapter. Some of the extracts in Sanskrit have been provided with English renderings.

A new feature of the present volume is the inclusion of a number of maps, and a few chronological and synchronistic tables, which, it is to be hoped, will increase the usefulness of the work. The incorporation of fresh material has necessitated a recasting of the indexes.

The present writer never intended his work to be a comprehensive survey of the political and dynastic history of every Indian province. He is chiefly concerned with those kingdoms and empires whose influence transcended provincial limits and had an important bearing upon the general course of political events in the heart and nerve-centres of the Indian sub-continent. Dynasties of mere local interest (e.g., the Tamil Prachamitas of the far south, or the Himalayan Pratyantas in the far north) have received very brief notice, as these did not acquire an all-India importance till after the Gupta
period when a Jayadeva Parachakra-kāma had intimate dynastic relations with several rulers of the Indian interior, a Lalitāditya pushed his conquests as far as Kanauj, and a Rājendra Chola carried his arms to the banks of the Ganges.

Further, the author does not claim for the period from Parikshit to Bimbisāra the same degree of authenticity as for the age of the Mauryas, the Sātavāhanas and the Guptas. The absence of trustworthy contemporary dynastic records makes it preposterous to put forward such a proposition. In regard to the early period it has been his principal endeavour to show that the huge fabric of sacerdotal and rhapsodic legends is not based solely on the mythical fancy of mendacious priests and story-telling Diaskeuasts; that bardic tales sometimes conceal kernels of sober facts not less trustworthy than the current accounts of the dynasties immediately preceding the raid of Alexander; and that chronological relation of the national transactions before 600 B.C. is not impossible. In trying to demonstrate this he has not confined himself to literature of a particular type, but has collated the whole mass of evidence, Vedic as well as Purānic, Brāhmaṇical as well as non-Brāhmaṇical, Buddhist as well as Jain, Indian as well as Hellenic.

The writer of these pages wishes to acknowledge with sincere thanks his indebtedness to scholars and critics who have helped him with valuable suggestions, and especially to Dr. Barnett, Professor Schrader, Dr. J. L. Charpentier, Mr. H. Subbaiya and Mr. Asananda Nag. He is also grateful for the kind assistance which he received in many difficulties from his friends and colleagues, among whom Mr. Sailendranath Mitra, Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, Mr. H. C. Ray and Mr. J. C. Chakravorti deserve especial mention. His acknowledgments are also due to Srijut Golapchandra Raychaudhuri who gave him
much valuable help in the preparation of maps and the revision of the Indexes. The author does not claim that the Indexes are exhaustive, but he has spared no pains to include all important references.

The University of Calcutta:

April 12, 1927.

H. C. R. C.
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The object of the following pages is to sketch the political history of Ancient India from the accession of Parikshít to the extinction of the Gupta Dynasty. The idea of the work suggested itself many years ago from observing a tendency in some of the current books to dismiss the history of the period from the Bhārata war to the rise of Buddhism as incapable of arrangement in definite chronological order. The author's aim has been to present materials for an authentic chronological history of ancient India, including the neglected post-Bhārata period, but excluding the Epoch of the Kanauj Empires which properly falls within the domain of the historian of Mediaeval India.

The volume now offered to the public consists of two parts. In the first part an attempt has been made to furnish, from a comparison of the Vedic, Epic, Purānic, Jaina, Buddhist and secular Brāhmaṇical literature, such a narrative of the political vicissitudes of the post-Pārikshita-pre-Bimbisārian period as may not be less intelligible to the reader than Dr. Smith's account of the transactions of the post-Bimbisārian age. It has also been thought expedient to append, towards the end of this part, a short chapter on kingship in the Brāhmaṇa-Jātaka period. The purpose of the second part is to provide a history of the period from Bimbisāra to the Guptas which will be, to a certain extent, more up-to-date, if less voluminous, than the classic work of Dr. Smith.

The greater part of the volume now published was written some years ago, and the author has not had
the opportunity to discuss some of the novel theories advanced in recent works like The Cambridge History of India, and Mr. Pargiter's Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.

The writer of these pages offers his tribute of respect to the Hon'ble Sir Asutosh Mookerjee for providing opportunities for study which render it possible for a young learner to carry on investigation in the subject of his choice. To Professor D. R. Bhandarkar the author is grateful for the interest taken in the progress of the work. His acknowledgments are also due to Messrs. Girindramohan Sarkar and Rameschandra Raychauduri for their assistance in preparing the Indexes. Lastly, this preface cannot be closed without a word of thanks to Mr. A. C. Ghatak, the Superintendent, for his help in piloting the work through the Press.
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1 In this work "India" means usually the entire territory known by that name up to August 15, 1947.
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<td>Pt. (Pat.)</td>
<td>Patañjali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rām.</td>
<td>Rāmāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. D. B.</td>
<td>Rakhal Das Banerji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. P. V. U.</td>
<td>Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. V.</td>
<td>Rig-Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāñkh. Šr. Sūtra</td>
<td>Sāñkhāyana Srauta Sūtra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sans. Lit.</td>
<td>Sanskrit Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šanti.</td>
<td>Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Br.</td>
<td>Satapatha Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. B. E.</td>
<td>Sacred Books of the East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. E.</td>
<td>Saka Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. I. I.</td>
<td>South Indian Inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ins.</td>
<td>(A) List of Inscriptions of Southern India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. P. Patrika</td>
<td>Vangīya Sāhitya-Parishat Patrikā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svapna.</td>
<td>Svapnavāsamadatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>Translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up. Br.</td>
<td>Upanishad Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāj. Sam.</td>
<td>Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ved. Ind.</td>
<td>Vedic Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vish.</td>
<td>Vishnu Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political History of Ancient India

PART I

From the Accession of Parikshit to the Coronation of Bimbisāra

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

SECTION I. FOREWORD

No Thucydides or Tacitus has left for posterity a genuine history of Ancient India. But the patient investigations of numerous scholars and archaeologists have opened up rich stores of material for the reconstruction of the ancient history of our country. The first notable attempt to "sort and arrange the accumulated and ever-growing stores of knowledge" was made by Dr. Vincent Smith. But the excellent historian, failing to find sober history in bardic tales, ignored the period immediately succeeding "the famous war waged on the banks of the Jumna, between the sons of Kuru and the sons of Pāṇḍu," and took as his starting point the middle of the seventh century B.C. The aim of the present writer has been to sketch in outline the dynastic history of Ancient India including the neglected period. He takes as his starting point the accession of Parikshit which, according to Epic and Purānic tradition, took place shortly after the Bhārata War.

Valuable information regarding the Pārīkshīta and the post-Pārīkshīta periods has been given by eminent scholars like Weber, Lassen, Eggeling, Caland, Oldenberg, Jacobi, Hopkins, Macdonell, Keith, Rhys Davids, Fick, Pargiter, Bhandarkar and others. But the attempt to
frame an outline of political history from Parikshit to Bimbisāra out of materials supplied by Brāhmanic as well as non-Brāhmanic literature is, I believe, made for the first time in the following pages.

SECTION II. SOURCES

No inscription or coin has unfortunately been discovered which can be referred, with any amount of certainty, to the post-Pārīkshita-pre-Bimbisārian period. The South Indian plates purporting to belong to the reign of Janamejaya\(^1\) have been proved to be spurious. Our chief reliance must, therefore, be placed upon literary evidence. Unfortunately this evidence is, in the main, Indian, and is not supplemented to any considerable extent by those foreign notices which have “done more than any archaeological discovery to render possible the remarkable resuscitation” of the history of the post-Bimbisārian epoch. The discoveries at Mahenjo-Daro and Harappa no doubt constitute a welcome addition to the purely literary evidence regarding the ancient history of India. But the civilisation disclosed is possibly that of Sauvīra or Sovīra (Sophir, Ophir)\(^2\) in the pre-Pārīkshita period. And the monuments exhumed “offer little direct contribution to the materials for political history,” particularly of the Madhya-deśa or the Upper Ganges valley.

Indian literature useful for the purpose of the historian of the post-Pārīkshita-pre-Bimbisārian age may be divided into five classes, viz.:

I. Brāhmanical literature of the post-Pārīkshita-pre-Bimbisārian period. This class of literature naturally contributes the most valuable information regarding the history of the earliest dynasties and comprises:

\(^1\) Ep. Ind., VII, App., pp. 162-63; IA, III, 268; IV, 333.
\(^2\) Cf. IA, XIII, 223; J. Kings. 9, 28; 10, 11.
(a) The last book of the Atharva Veda.

(b) The Aitareya, Satapatha, Pañchavimśa and other ancient Brähmanas.  

(c) The major part of the Brihadāranyaka, the Chhāndogya and other classical Upanishads.

That these works belong to the post-Pārīkshita period is proved by repeated references to Parīkshita, to his son Janamejaya, to Janamejaya’s successor Abhiprātarin, and to Janaka of Videha at whose court the fate of the Pārīkshitas was discussed by the assembled sages. That these works are in the main pre-Buddhist and, therefore, pre-Bimbisārian, has been proved by competent critics like Dr. Rājendralal Mitra, Professor Macdonell and others.

II. The second class comprises Brähmanical works to which no definite date can be assigned, but large portions of which, in the opinion of scholars, belong to the post-Bimbisārian period. To this class belong the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The present Rāmāyana consists of 24,000 ślokas or verses. But even in the first or second century A.D. the epic seems to have contained only 12,000 ślokas as the evidence of the Buddhist Mahā-vibhūshāṇa, a commentary on the Jñānapraśṭhāna of Kātyāyanīputra, suggests. It not only mentions Buddha Tathāgata, but distinctly refers to the struggles of the Hindus with mixed hordes of Yavanas (Greeks) and Sakas (Scythians), Sakān

1 Of special importance are the gāthās or songs in the thirteenth kānda of the Sat. Br. and the eighth pañchikā of the Aitareya.
2 Translation of the Chhāndogya Upanishad, pp. 23-24.
3 History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 169, 202-203, 220.
4 1.4.2—Chaturvīśa-sahasrāṇi ślokānām uktavān rishiḥ.
6 II. 109, 34.
Yavana-miśritān. In the Kishkindha Kāṅḍa, Sugrīva places the country of the Yavanas and the cities of the Sakas between the country of the Kurus and the Madras, and the Himālayas. This shows that the Graeco-Scythians at that time occupied parts of the Pañjāb. The Laṅkā Kāṅḍa apparently refers to the Purānic episode of the uplifting of Mount Mandara, or of Govardhana, Parigrihya girīm dorrhyaṁ vapur Vishnor vidambayan.

As regards the present Mahābhārata, Hopkins says: "Buddhist supremacy already decadent is implied by passages which allude contemptuously to the edīkās or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in III. 190. 65 'They will revere edīkās, they will neglect the gods'; ib. 67 'the earth shall be piled with edīkās, not adorned with godhouses.' With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet, Cāturmahārājika in XII. 339. 40 and Buddhistic philosophy as expounded in the same book."

"The Greeks are described as a western people and their overthrow is alluded to....The Romans, Romakas, are mentioned but once, in a formal list of all possible peoples, II. 51.17, and stand thus in marked contrast to Greeks and Persians, Pahlavas, who are mentioned very often.....The distinct prophecy that 'Scythians, Greeks and Bactrians will rule unrighteously in the evil age to

1 I. 54. 21.
2 IV. 43. 11-12. Note also the references to Vaijayantapura in the Deccan (II. 9. 12), the Drāviḍas (ibid, 10. 37), Malaya and Dārdārā (ibid, 91. 24) Muruchipattana (Muziris, Craganore, IV. 42. 3), practices of the people of the Deccan (II. 93. 13), "the seven flourishing realms" of Yavadvipa (Java), Suvarṇadvipa (Sumatra) in IV. 40. 30, and Karkaṭaka lagna (II. 15. 3).
3 69. 32; cf. Matsyas, 249, 53; Bhāgavata, X. 25, Mbh. III. 101. 15.
4 For some other Purānic allusions see Calcutta Review, March, 1922, pp. 530-02. For references to suttee see Hopkins, J.A.O.S., 13, 173. For 'empire' Rām II. 10. 86.
5 The Great Epic of India, pp. 391-03.
come’ which occurs in III. 188.35 is too clear a statement to be ignored or explained away.’’

The Ādiparvaprāvatī refers to king Aśoka who is represented as an incarnation of a Mahāśura or great demon, and is described as mahāvīryoparājītaḥ, of great prowess and invincible. We have also a reference to a Greek overlord, Yavanādhikapūrṇā, of Sauvira and his compatriot Dattāmitra (Demetrios ?). The Sāntiparvaprāva presupposes the inclusion of the city of Mālinī, in the land of the Aṅgas, within the realm of Magadha. It mentions Yāṣka, the author of the Nīruktā, Varshaganyā, the Śāmkhya philosopher who probably flourished in the fourth or fifth century after Christ and Kāmandaka, the authority, on Dharma (sacred law) and Artha (polity) who is probably to be identified with the famous disciple of Kauṭilya.

The eighteen Purāṇas were certainly known to Alberuni (A.D. 1000), Rājaśekhara (A.D. 900), and the

---

1 I. 67.13-14. Cf. also XII. 5.7 where Aśoka is mentioned with Sālādhāvan.
2 It is interesting to note in this connection that in the Devimāhātmya of the Mārkandeya Purāṇa (88.5) Maurya is the name of a class of Aṣuras or demons: —
Kālakā Daurvritā Mauryāh Kālakayāstathāsuryāh
yuddhāya sajja niṣpaṇtu ēśrayā tvārītā mama

‘‘Let the Kālaka, the Daurvrita, the Maurya and the Kālakya Aṣuras, hastening at my command, march forth ready for battle.’’

Note also the expression surādevīśāṁ of the enemies of the gods, i.e., Aṣuras, used by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (1.3.24) in reference to people ‘‘deluded’’ by the Buddha.

3 Mbh., I 139.21-23.
4 5 1-6.
5 342, 78.
6 318, 59.
8 Śānti, 123, 11.
9 Cf. Alberuni, Ch. XII; Prachanda-Pāṇḍava ed. by Carl Cappeller, p 5 aśkta-dāśa-purāṇa-sāra-saṅgraha-kārini; Mbh. XVIII. 6. 97; Harshacharita, III (p. 86 of Partha’s ed., 1918), Pavāmāna-prokta Purāṇa, i. e., Vāyu Purāṇa; Cf. Sekula-purāṇa-rājarshiki charitābhikārī (III. 87) and Harerica Vīshavirodhini Bālacharitāni (II. 77); BHVS. second ed., pp. 17, 70, 180. The fact that the collection of the essence (sāra-saṅgraha) of all the eighteen Purāṇas is attributed to a very ancient sage by Rājaśekhara proves that the Purāṇas themselves were
latest compiler of the *Mahābhārata* who flourished before A.D. 500. Some of the Purānic chronicles are mentioned by Bāṇa (A.D. 600) and earlier writers. But the extant texts which contain lists of kings of the *Kali Age* cannot be placed earlier than the third or fourth century A.D., because they refer to the so-called Andhra kings and even to the post-Andhras.

It is clear from what has been stated above that the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, in their present shape, are late works which are no better suited to serve as the foundation of the history of the pre-Bimbisāriyan age than are the tales of the *Mahāvaṃśa* and the *Āsokāvadāna* adapted to form the bases of chronicles of the doings of the great Mauryas. At the same time we shall not be justified in rejecting their evidence wholesale because much of it is undoubtedly old and valuable. The warning to handle critically, which Dr. Smith considered necessary with regard to the Pali chronicles of Ceylon, is also applicable to the Sanskrit Epics and *Purāṇas*.

In a recent work Dr. Keith shows scepticism about the historical value of these texts, and wonders at the "naive credulity" of those who believe in the historicity of any event not explicitly mentioned in the Vedas, e.g., "a great Bhārata war." It cannot be denied that the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, in their present shape, contain a good deal of what is untrustworthy; but it has been rightly said that "It is absurd to suppose that fiction completely ousted the truth." The epigraphic or numismatic records of the *Sātavāhanas*, *Ābhīras*, *Vākāṭakas*, *Nāgas*, *Guptas* and many other dynasties fully bear out the

believed by him to have been composed long before the ninth century A.D. The existence of some of the texts in the sixth century A.D. is hinted at by the Nerūr inscription of Maṅgaleśa (IA, VII. 161—Māṅgaleśa-*Purāṇa*-Rāmāyaṇa-Bhārat-ethāsā-kusālah... Vattabhaḥ, i.e., Pulikešī I). The reference in the *Māleśa Purāṇa*, which is regarded as one of the earliest among the Purānic works, to week days (70 46 ; 88 ; 72, 27, etc.) is of value in determining the upper limit.
observation of Dr. Smith that "modern European writers have been inclined to disparage unduly the authority of the Purānic lists, but closer study finds in them much genuine and valuable historical tradition." As to the "great Bhārata war" we have indeed no epigraphic corroboration, because contemporary inscriptions are lacking. But, as will be pointed out in a subsequent chapter, Vedic literature contains many hints that the story of the great conflict is not wholly fictitious. Many of the figures in the Kurukshetra story, e.g., Ballīka Prātipiya (Balbhika Pratiipiya), Dhṛitarāṣṭra Vaichitravirya, Kṛṣṇa Devakiputra and perhaps Sikhaṇḍin Yājñasena, are mentioned in some of the early Vedic texts, and we have a distinct allusion in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa to the unfriendly feeling between the first of these, a prince of the Kuru, and the Śrīñjayas. It will be remembered that the great war described in the epic often takes the shape of a trial of strength between these two peoples (Kurūnāṃ Śrīñjayāṇāṃ cha jīgīshūnāṃ parasparam). In the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa Kurus reproach the Dālbhyas, a clan closely connected with the Pañcchālas who appear to have been among the principal antagonists of the Kuru leaders in the Bhārata War. The Chhāndogya Upanishad, as is well-known, contains a gāthā which eulogises the mare that comes to the rescue of the Kurus. Battle-songs describing the struggle of the Kurus against the Śrīñjayas and associate tribes or clans must have been current at least as yearly as the fifth century B. C., because Vaiśampāyana and his version of the Mahābhārata are well-known to Āśvalāyana and Pāṇini. If, as

1 Mbh., V. 23.9.
2 Cf. also Arjuna identified with Indra in the Sat. Br., V. 4. 3. 7 and Pārtha in the Aśvalāyana Srauta Sūtra, XII. 10 (Vedic Index, I. 522.).
3 Vedic Index, II., p. 63, Sat. Br., XII. 9. 3.
4 Mbh., VI. 45.2.
5 I. 88. 1 (xii, 4).
suggested by Vedic evidence discussed in the following pages, the "great Bhārat war" really took place in or about the ninth century B.C., the broad outlines of the story about the conflict dating from a period not later than the fifth century B.C., cannot be dismissed as wholly unworthy of credence.

Pargiter, unlike Keith, is inclined to give more weight to Purānic tradition than to Vedic evidence, and his conclusions have apparently been accepted by Dr. Barnett. It has eloquently been urged by the former that Vedic literature "lacks the historical sense" and "is not always to be trusted." But do the Purāṇas which represent Śākya as one individual, include Abhimanyu and Siddhārtha in lists of kings, make Prasenajit the immediate lineal successor of Rāhula, place Pradyota several generations before Bimbisāra, dismiss Aśoka with one sentence, make no mention of the dynastic name Sātavāhana, and omit from the list of the so-called "Andhras," princes like Siri-Kubha (Sri-Kumbha) Sātakani whose existence is proved by the incontestable evidence of coins, possess the historical sense in a remarkable degree, and are "always to be trusted"? Pargiter himself, not unosten, rejects Epic and Purānic evidence when it is opposed to certain theories: In this connection it will not be quite out of place to quote the following observations of Mr. V. Gordon Childe: "The Kṣatriya tradition (i.e., Epic and Purānic tradition).....is hardly an unpolluted source of history. The orthodox view is not really based on the priestly tradition, as embodied in

2 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 9 ff.
3 Mirashi in the *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*, Vol. II.
5 *The Aryans*, p. 392.
epexegetical works, but rather on the internal evidence of the Veda itself. The latter carries conviction precisely because the historical and geographical references in the hymns are introduced only incidentally and in a thoroughly ingenuous manner...The same cannot be said of Kṣatriya tradition, which in its recorded form dates from an age (perhaps as late as 200 A.D.) when myth-making had had many centuries to work in, and which might serve dynastic ends." Priority of date and comparative freedom from textual corruption are two strong points in favour of Vedic literature.

III. The third class of literature comprises Brāhma-nical works of the post-Bimbisārīan period to which a date in a definite epoch may be assigned, e.g., the Kauṭilya Arthasastra assignable to the period 249 B. C. to c. 100 A.D.1, the Mahābhāshya of Patañjali between

1 The work was known not only to Bāṇa, the author of the Kādambu, who flourished in the seventh century A.D., but to the Nandiśātra and Patañgas of the Jainas which may have existed in the early centuries A. D. and probably also to the Nyāya-Bhāshya of Vyākṣyāyana, which is criticised by Dignāga and perhaps by Vasubandhu too (I. A. 1915, p. 82, 1918, p. 103). According to some scholars the Arthasastra literature is later than the Dharmaśastras, and dates only from about the third century A. D. But the prevalence of the study of Arthāvidyā in a much earlier epoch is proved by the Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I and the existence of treatises on Arthasastra is rendered probable by the mention of technical terms like "Prāṇaya," "Vishṭi," etc. It is interesting to note that the Kauṭilya, which purports to be a compendium of pre-existing Arthaśāstras, does not quote the views of previous Achāryas or teachers in the chapter on "Prāṇaya" (Bk. V, Ch. 2). It is, therefore, not unlikely that Rudradāman I, who claims to have studied the Arthābhidyā learnt the use of the term from the Kauṭilya itself and not from a pre-Kauṭilyan treatise. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Junāgaḍh epigraphs show a special acquaintance with the Arthasastra literature. The Junāgaḍh inscription of Skanda Gupta for instance, refers to the testing of officials by upadāśe-saro-opadāḥbhīṣcha viśuddhabuddhīḥ, "possessed of a mind that (has been tried and) is (found to be) pure by all the tests of honesty." The verse

Nyāyārjuna-rthasyachā kāḥ samarthah
syād-arjitasya-āpy-attha sakṣhaṇe cha
gopāyitasya-āpi cha eviddhi-ketau
eviddhasya pātra-pratipādenāya

2-1829B
c. 150 B.C. and 100 A.D.), etc. The value of these important works can hardly be overestimated. They form "sheet anchors in the troubled sea of Indian chronology." Their evidence with regard to the pre-Bimbisāriya age is certainly inferior to that of the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads, but the very fact that such information as they contain, comes from persons assignable to a known epoch, makes it more valuable than the Epic and Purānic tradition, the antiquity and authenticity of which can always be called in question.

"Who is capable both in the lawful acquisition of wealth, and also in the preservation of it, when acquired, and further in causing the increase of it, when protected, (and able) to dispense it on worthy objects, when it has been increased" (Mīc.

reminds us of Kauṭ., 1.1—

Dāṇḍāśī; alabdha-labhārtha labāha-parirakshayi, rakṣita-vivardhanti,
vīrdhaḥṣya artheshu praiśpadant cha.

"The science of government, it is a means to make acquisitions, to preserve what is acquired, to increase what is protected and to distribute among the worthy what has been increased,"

Johnston (J. R. A. S., 1909, 1 January, p. 77, f.) points out that the Kauṭīlya Arthaśāstra is not separated by a great interval from Aśvaghosha, and is distinctly earlier than the Jātakamālā of Aryasurā (who flourished before 434 A. D. Winternitz Ind. Lit., Vol. II. 276). An early date is also suggested by the absence of any references to the Denarius in Book II. Chs. 13 and 19. But the mention of Chinabhūmi and Chinapatta in Bk. II, Ch. 11, precludes the possibility of a date earlier than the middle of the third century B. C. The reference must be to the great country of the Far East (Cf. "China which produces silk," Kosmas Indikoplenes, McCrindle's Ancient India, p. 162), and not to any obscure tribe on the outskirts of India. China silk looms large in the pages of classical Sanskrit writers. The great silk-producing country (as well as Kambu, Kauṭ, II. 13) clearly lay outside the horizon of the early Mauryas. The name 'China' applied to the famous land can hardly be anterior to the first emperor of the Ch'in Dynasty (249-210 B.C., Mogi and Redman, The Problem of the Far East, p. 15). A post-Chandraguptan date for the Arthaśāstra is also suggested by (a) the reference to parapets of brick instead of wooden ramparts (II. 8), in connection with the royal seat, and (b) the use of Sanskrit at the Secretariat (II. 10). The imperial title Chakravarti (IX. 1) is not met with in inscriptions before Kharavela. The official designations Samāhārī and Samādhārī find mention in epigraphs of a still later age.

1 For recent discussions about the date of Patañjali see Indian Culture, III, ift, Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Third Session, pp. 510-11.
IV. To the fourth class belong the Buddhist Suttas, Vinaya texts and the Jātakas. Several works of the Buddhist canon are noticed in votive inscriptions at Bharhut and Sāñchi assigned to the second and first centuries B.C. Many of the reliefs found on the railings and gateways of Stūpas of the age depict stories taken from the Jātakas. The texts of the Pali canon are said to have been committed to writing in the first century B.C. They furnish a good deal of useful information regarding the period which immediately preceded the accession of Bimbisāra. They have also the merit of preserving Buddhist versions of ancient stories, and vouchsafe light when the light from Brāhmanical sources begins to fail.

V. To the fifth class belong the sacred texts of the Jainas. Some of the works may go back to a period earlier than the second century A.D. But the canon as a whole was probably reduced to writing in the fifth or sixth century A.D.¹ It gives interesting information regarding many kings who lived during the pre-Bimbisārian Age. But its comparatively late date makes its evidence not always reliable.

CHAPTER II. KURUS AND VIDEHAS.

SECTION I. THE AGE OF THE PARIKSHITAS.

Janah sa bhadramedhati
rashtre rajnah Parikshitah

—Atharva Veda.

We have taken as our starting point the reign of Parikshiti whose accession, according to tradition, took place shortly after the Bhārata War.

Was there really a king named Parikshit? True, he is mentioned in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. But the mere mention of a king in this kind of literature is no sure proof of his historical existence unless we have corroborative evidence from external sources.

Parikshit appears in a famous laud of the Twentieth Book of the Atharva Veda Samhitā as a king of the Kurus (Kauravya) whose kingdom (rāśtra) flowed with milk and honey. The passage runs as follows:—

"Rājñō viśvajñanāsya yo devomartyāṁ ati vaiśvānarasya sushṭutimā sunotā Parikshitah
parichchhināḥ kshemamakarot tama āsanamācharan
kulāyan kṛtvam Kauravyah patirvadati jāyāṁ
katarat ta ā harāṁi dadhi manthāṁ pari śrutam
jāyah patim vi prichchhati rāśtra rājnah Parikshitah
abhīva svah pra jihīte yavaḥ pakrāh patho bilam
janah sa bhadramedhati rāśtra rājnah Parikshitah."

"Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples, the god who is above mortals, who is thought of by all men, of Parikshit! Parikshit has

1 A. V., XX. 127. 7-10.
2 For the meaning of Vaiśvānara, see Brihaddevata, II. 66.
produced for us a secure dwelling when he, the most excellent one, went to his seat. (Thus) the husband in Kurukshetra, when he founds his household, converses with his wife.

"What may I bring to thee, curds, stirred drink or liquor?" (Thus) the wife asks her husband in the kingdom of king Parikshit.

"Like light the ripe barley runs over beyond the mouth (of the vessels). The people thrive merrily in the kingdom of king Parikshit."

Roth and Bloomfield regard Parikshit in the Atharva Veda as a divine being. But Zimmer and Oldenberg recognize him as a human king, a view supported by the fact that in the Aitareya and Satapatha Brahmana the famous king Janamejaya bears the patronymic Pārīkshitā (son of Parikshit). The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, for example, informs us that the priest Tura Kāvasheya "annointed Janamejaya Pārīkshitā with the great anointing of Indra":

"Etena ha vā Aindreṇa mahābhishkekena Turah Kāvasheyo Janamejayaṁ Pārīkshitam abhishishecha."

Referring to king Parikshit, Macdonell and Keith observe: "The epic makes him grandfather of Pratiśravas and great-grandfather of Pratīpa." Now, the epic and the Purāṇas have really two Parikshits. Regarding the parentage of one there is no unanimity. He is variously represented as the son of Avikshit, Anasvā, or Kurukshetra, and is further mentioned as an ancestor of Pratiśravas and Pratīpa. The other Parikshit was a descendant of Pratīpa and, according to a unanimous tradition, a son.

1 Bloomfield, Atharva Veda, pp. 197-98, with slight emendations.
2 VIII. 21.
of Abhimanyu. We shall call the former Parikshit I, and the latter Parikshit II. Was Parikshit I of the Epic and the Purāṇas identical with the Vedic Parikshit as suggested by the authors of the Vedic Index? In support of this view it may be urged that Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka, priest of Janamejaya, son of the Vedic Parikshit, according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, is represented in several Purāṇas as chaplain of the son of Parikshit I who came before the Bhārata heroes. Indrota's son Driti was a contemporary of Abhipratārin Kākshaseni, "son of Kākshasena," and the name of Kākshasena actually appears among the sons of Parikshit I in a genealogical list of the Mahābhārata. Further, like the Vedic Parikshit, Parikshit I had according to a Purānic passage, four sons, viz., Janamejaya, Srutāsena, Ugrasena, and Bhīmasena, and the eldest son had a quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas.

There are, however, other facts which point to an opposite conclusion. The Vedic Parikshit receives in the Athāvāna laud the epithet rāja viśvajānīna (universal king) and is called "a deva (god) who is above mortals." In his days the designation Kauravāya had ceased to be a mere royal patronymic and was applied to ordinary citizens in Kuru land. Kuru had become the eponymous ancestor of the entire race. And lastly, the people throve merrily (janaḥ sa bhadramedhāti) in his realm. These particulars hardly apply to the shadowy Parikshit I of Epic and Purānic lists who is said to have been very near in time

1 Mahābhārata, Adiparva, 94. 52 and 95, 41. Regarding Parikshit I, the Matsya Purāṇa says, 60, 23:

Kurantu dayitāḥ prutsah Sudhanvā Jahnureva cha Parikshiechcha mahatejāḥ pravuraś chārimardanaḥ.

2 Vedic Index, i. 78.
3 Pargiter, AIHT, 114.
4 Vedic Index, i. 373.
5 Mbh. 1. 94, 54.
6 Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 90. 1.
to Kuru himself. On the other hand the Vedic laud corresponds wonderfully, both in content and phraseology with the famous ākhyāna (story) of Parikshit II, son of Abhimanyu, narrated in Chapters 16 to 18 of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. We are told that this Parikshit undertook a digvijaya, conquest of all the quarters, in the course of which he subjugated all the sub-continents (varshāni). He is called the supreme deva who is not to be regarded as the equal of ordinary men (na vai nṛbhīr-naradevaṁ parākhyam sammātum arhasi). He is further styled samrāṭ (emperor) and under his protection people thrive and have nothing to fear (vindanti bhadrānyakutobhayāḥ prajāḥ).

Proof of the identity of this Parikshit (son of Abhimanyu) with his Vedic namesake is also furnished by a later passage of the same Purāṇa which mentions Tura Kāvasheya as the priest of his son Janamejaya:

Kāvasheyaṁ purodhāya Turam turaśmedharāṭ,

samantāt prithivīṁ sarvāṁ jītvā yakṣhyati chādhvaraiḥ.

It will be remembered that the same sage appears as the priest of Janamejaya Parikshita in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa is no doubt a late work. But its evidence does not stand alone. This will be made clear by an examination of the names of the sons of Parikshit given in the Vedic texts and the Epic respectively. The Vedic Parikshit, we are told, had four sons namely, Janamejaya, Ugrasena, Bhimasena and Srutasena. The Epic Parikshit I, on the other hand, had only one son (Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 95,
verse 42 of the *Adi parva* of the *Mahābhārata*, and seven sons (Janamejaya, Kakhasena, Ugrasena, Chitrāsenā, Indrasena, Sushena and Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 94, verses 54-55, and among these the name of *Srutasena* does not occur. Even Janamejaya is omitted in Chapter 95 and in the *Java text*. There is no king of that name immediately after Parikshita I, also in the Kuru-Pāṇḍu genealogy given in the Chellur or Cocanada grant of Virachoha. The Epic poet and the writer of the Choḍa inscription, which is much older than many extant manuscripts of the *Mahābhārata*, therefore, were not quite sure as to whether this Parikshita (I) was the father of Janamejaya and *Srutasena*. On the other hand, according to the unanimous testimony of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, Parikshita II had undoubtedly a son named Janamejaya who succeeded him on the throne. Thus the *Mahābhārata*, referring to Parikshita II, the son of Abhimanyu, says:

*Parikshita khalu Mādravatīṁ nāmapayeme, tvanmātaram. Tasyāṁ bhavān Janamejayaḥ. “Parikshita married Mādravati, your mother, and she gave birth to you, Janamejaya."  

The *Matsya Purāṇa* informs us that

“*Abhimanyoh Parikshittu putrah parapuraṇjayah Janamejayah Parikshitah putrah paramadhārmikah.”  

“*Abhimanyu’s son was Parikshita, the conqueror of his enemy’s city. Parikshita’s son was Janamejaya who was very righteous."*

This Janamejaya had three brothers, namely, *Srutasena, Ugrasena* and *Bhīmasena*:—“*Janamejayah Parikshitah*
saha bhrātribhīḥ Kurukshetre dīrgha-satram upāste; tasya bhrātarāstrayāḥ Śrutasaṇa Ugrasaṇa Bhīmasena iti."’

“Janamejaya, son of Parikṣhit, with his brothers, was attending a long sacrifice at Kurukṣetra. His brothers were three, namely,—Śrutasaṇa, Ugrasaṇa and Bhīmasena.”

Particulars regarding the son and successor of the Vedic Parikṣhit agree well with what we know of the son and successor of the Epic and the Purāṇic Parikṣhit II. Janamejaya, the son of the Vedic Parikṣhit, is mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa as a performer of the Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice. The priest who performed the famous rite for him was Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka. On the other hand, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which also mentions his Aśvamedha, names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. The statements of the Satapatha, and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas are apparently conflicting, and can be reconciled if we surmise that either we are dealing with two different kings of the same name and parentage or the same Janamejaya performed two horse-sacrifices. Which Janamejaya actually did so? Curiously enough the Purāṇas give the information which is needed. The Matsya Purāṇa speaking of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu, and the son of Parikṣhit II, says:

(Dvīr aśvamedham āhṛtya mahāvājasayakāḥ
pravartayitvā tam sarvam rṣhiṁ Vājasaneyakam
vivāde Brāhmaṇaḥ sārdham abhiśapto vanāṁ yayaṁ.2

The quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas, alluded to in the

1 Mbh. 1. 3. 1. In translating Epic passages use has been made of the renderings of Ray and Dutt. See also Purānic texts cited by Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 44. The view that Śrutasaṇa, Ugrasaṇa and Bhīmasena were sons of Janamejaya (Pargiter, Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 115 f.) is clearly opposed to the evidence of the Epic and several Purāṇas, as well as that of Harīsvāmin. Speaking about Parikṣhit, son of Abhimanyu, the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, for example, says (iv. 21. 1): “Yo’yuṁ sāṃpratam avanipatīḥ tasyāpi Janamejaya-Śrutasaṇa-Ugrasaṇa-Bhīmasenaḥ putrās chaścāro bhavishyanti.”

2 50, 63-64. Cf. N. K. Siddhanta, The Heroic Age of India, p. 42.
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last line, is also mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.* According to that text Janamejaya’s priestly opponents were the Kaśyapas. That designation hardly applies to the Gārgyas who quarrelled with the son of *Parikshīt I* because the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* includes them in the Āṅgiras group. On the other hand Vaiśampāyana, who led the opponents of the son of *Parikshīt II*, was undoubtedly a Kaśyapa.

Parikshīt II has thus a better claim than Parikshīt I to be regarded as identical with the Vedic Parikshīt. It is, however, possible that Parikshīt I and Parikshīt II represent a bardic duplication of the same original individual regarding whose exact place in the Kuru genealogy no unanimous tradition had survived. The fact that not only the name Parikshīt, but names of most of the sons (in the *Vishnu* and *Brahma Purāṇas* the names of all the sons) are common to both, points to the same conclusion. In the case of the son and successor of each of the two Parikshīts we have a strikingly similar story of quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas. It will further be remembered that while Tura Kāvasheya is mentioned in the Purānic literature as a *Purohita* of the son of Parikshīt II, Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka is represented as the priest of the son of Parikshīt I. But it is clear from the Vedic texts that both the royal chaplains served the same king who was separated by five or six generations from Janaka, the contemporary of Uddālaka Aruni, Yājñavalkya and Somaśūrma. Doubts may thus be legitimately entertained about the existence of two Parikshīts each of whom had sons and successors.

1 VII. 27.
5 *Vishnu*, IV. 20.1; 21.1; *Brahma*, XIII, 109.
*Vāyu*, 93, 22-25; *Matsya*, 50, 63-64, etc.
with identical names, the heroes of tales of a similar character. The probability is that there was really only one Parikshit in the Kuru royal family, father of the patron of both Tura and Indrota.

Did he flourish before or after the Bhārata War? The necessity felt for offering an explanation of the name Parikshit given to Abhimanyu's son at the end of the Bhārata War, and the explanation itself, probably suggest that the tradition of an earlier Kuru king with the name of Parikshit had not yet come into existence when the tenth book of the Mahābhārata was written.\(^1\)

Parikshit I was possibly invented by genealogists to account for such anachronisms as the mention of Indrota-Parikshita-sāmivāda as an old story by Bhīshma in the twelfth book (Chapter 151). The wide divergence of opinion in regard to the name of the father of the so-called Parikshit I, and his position in the list, is also to be noted in this connection. It shows the absence of a clear tradition. On the other hand there is absolute unanimity in regard to the parentage and dynastic position of the so-called Parikshit II.\(^2\)

---

1. *Mbh. X. 16. 3.*

"While the Kuru line will become extinct (parikshīteshu Kurushu) a son will be born to you (=Uttarā, wife of Abhimanyu). The child will, for that reason, be named Parikshit."

2. The identification of the Vedic Parikshit with the son of Abhimanyu who flourished after the Bhārata War does not seem probable to Dr. N. Dutt, the author of *The Argonauts of India*, pp. 50 ff., because, in the first place, it goes against the findings of Macdonell, Keith and Pargiter who prefer to identify the Vedic Parikshit with an ancestor of the Pāṇḍus. As to this it may be pointed out that the existence of a Parikshit (father of Janamejaya) before the Pāṇḍus, rests mainly on the testimony of those very genealogies which are regarded by Keith as worthless and unreliable (cf. *RPVU* 21, 618). That the name of Janamejaya in this connection is an intrusion into the genealogical texts is evident from its omission from Chapter 95 of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Java text*, the Chellur grant, etc.

Dr. Dutt next argues that the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* makes the four brothers Janamejaya, Sṛutasena, etc., sons of Parikshit I. If he had only perused a subsequent passage (IV. 21. 1.) he would have seen that the *Purāṇa* makes the
The Vedic hymns throw little light on the domestic life or reign-period of Parikshit. From the epic we learn that he married a Madra princess (Mādravatī) and ruled four brothers sons of "Parikshit II" as well and while this later statement finds corroboration in the Mahābhārata, (I. 3. 1.) the earlier does not.

Dr. Dutt next says that it is always risky to attempt identification of kings or the fixing of their dates from an examination of their teacher-priests' names. But why should it be risky if the names and order of succession be genuine? The real risk lies in the rejection of such evidence without sufficient examination. It should be remembered in this connection that the identification of the Vedic Parikshita Janamejaya with his Epic namesake (descendant of Abhimanyu) does not depend mainly on the teacher-priests' names, but on the following facts, viz., (1) absence of any cogent proof of the existence of an earlier Janamejaya Parikshita in view of the omission of his name in the Jata text, Cboja inscriptions etc., and (2) agreement of particulars about the Vedic Parikshat and Janamejaya (e.g., words describing the prosperity of the Kuru realm, the performance of two Aśekamedhas, quarrel with the Kaśyapas), with what we know of Parikshat and Janamejaya who were descendants of Abhimanyu. The question of the chronological relation between the Vedic Parikshat and the Vedic Janaka is entirely independent of this identification. This relation has been determined on the strength of two different lines of evidence. Materials for one have indeed been taken from the Vaiśāṣa list of the Brāhmaṇas. But the succession from Indrota to Somāsūbrha has been reconstructed from incidental notices in the Brāhmaṇa texts themselves which no critic has represented as late.

Dr. Dutt adds that identity of names does not necessarily imply identity of persons. This is a truism which is not remembered only by those who identify Dhrītarāṣṭra Vaishitravīrya with Dhrītarāṣṭra of Kāśī. It has never been suggested in the Political History that the Vedic and Epic Parikshitas and Janamejayas are identical merely because their names are identical.

As to Dr. Dutt's contention that there could not be want of motives in later times on the part of the authors belonging to rival families and schools to associate a certain teacher-priest with a famous king of old, etc., it is not clear which particular case he has in mind in making the statement. The association of Indrota and Tura with Janamejaya, and that of Uddālaka and Yājñavalkya with Janaka is found in the Satapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas and in the Upanishads. Is it suggested that such association is a deliberate concoction or fabrication? But no shred of evidence has been brought forward to prove such a charge. No doubt misrepresentations are met with in the Epics and the Purāṇas (as pointed out by Pargiter and others). But it would not be reasonable to argue that the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads are guilty of deliberate falsification because forsooth there is confusion in the Purāṇas which are undoubtedly of a later date.

Lastly the credibility of the Vaiṣāṣa lists in the Vedic texts has been assailed on the following grounds, viz.,--

(1) Silence of Commentators.
for 24 years dying at the age of sixty. Little credit, however, can be given to the bardic tales that cluster round his name. The only facts that can be accepted as historical are that he was a king of the Kurus, that the people lived prosperously under his rule, that he had many sons, and that the eldest, Janamejaya, succeeded him.

It will not be quite out of place here to say a few words about the realm of the Kurus over which Parikshit ruled. The kingdom, according to epic tradition, stretched from the Sarasvatī to the Ganges. In the Digvijaya-parva it is taken to extend from the border of the land of the Kulindas (near the sources of the Sutlej, the Jumna and the Ganges) to that of the Sūrasenas and the Matsyas (in the Mathurā and Bairāṭ regions respectively), and from the frontier of Rohitaka (Rohtak in the Eastern Punjab) to that of the Pañchālas (of Rohilkhand). It was divided into three parts, Kuru-

(2) Discrepancy between the lists appended to the 10th and 14th books respectively of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa in regard to the authorship of the work and ascription of the work to different teachers.

(3) Scant courtesy shown to an alleged teacher by his pupil.

As to (1), the Āchārīya parampara, succession of teachers, is distinctly alluded to by the commentators. If they did not enter into a detailed explanation, it is because they considered it to be sugamam, sparsam, easily intelligible plain.

(2) There is no Vaiśeṣa list at the close of the 14th book of the Brāhmaṇa proper excluding the Brhadāranyaka Upanishad. There are no doubt lists of teachers at the end of the Upanishad. It is too much to expect that, in the various lists, the entire Brāhmaṇa as well as the Upanishad should be ascribed to the same traditional authority. The Brāhmaṇa and Upanishad text are not works of single individuals. The question of discrepancy, therefore, does not arise. Reference to different traditions regarding the authorship of a particular work, or of particular portions of a work, does not necessarily vitiate any Āchārīya-parampara regarding which we have substantial agreement in the texts.

(3) It is too much to expect that in ancient, as in modern times, all pupils should be equally respectful to teachers. Was not Dhriṣṭadyumna a pupil of Droṇāchārya whom he killed?

1 Ṣṭh. I. 49, 17-26 with commentary. We learn from the Brhadāranyaka Upanishad (III. 8. 1.) that the Parikshit family was intimately known in the Madra country.
jāṅgala, the Kurus proper and Kurukshetra.¹ Kurujāṅgala, as its name implies, was probably the wild region of the Kuru realm that stretched from the Kāmyaka forest on the banks of the Sarasvati to Khāṇḍava near (samipataḥ) the Jumna.² But in certain passages it is used in a wider sense to designate the whole country (deśa, rāśtra³). The Kurus proper were probably located in the district around Hāstinapura (on the Ganges), identified with a place near Meerut.⁴ The boundaries of Kurukshetra are given in a passage of the Taittirīya Aranyakā⁵ as being Khāṇḍava on the south, the Tūrghna on the north, and the Parīṇah⁶ on the west (lit. hinder section, jaghanārdha). The Mahābhārata⁷ gives the following description of Kurukshetra: “South of the Sarasvati, and north of the Drishadvatī, he who lives in Kurukshetra really dwells in heaven. The region that lies between Taruntuka and Marantuka or Arantuka, the lakes of Rāma and Machakruka⁸—this is Kurukshetra which is also called Sāmanta-paṇḍchaka and the northern sacrificial altar (uttara vedi) of the grandsire (i.e., Brahmā).” Roughly speaking, the Kuru kingdom corresponded to modern Thanesar, Delhi and the greater part of the Upper Gangetic Doab. Within the kingdom flowed the rivers Aruṇā (which joins the Sarasvati near Pehoa), Amśumatī, Hiraṇvatī, Āpayā (Āpagā

¹ Mbh., I. 109.1; 149.5-15; II. 26-32; III. 88.294; Ptolemy. VII, i. 42.
² Tataḥ Sarasvatikalā sameshu marudhanavasu
Kāmyakam nāma dadriśur varanam munijunapriyam.

“Then they saw before them the forest of Kāmyaka on the banks of the Sarasvati on a level and wild plain, a favoured resort to anchorites.” Mbh., III, 5.8. For the location of the Khāṇḍava forest see I. 222.14; 223.1.
³ Cf. Mbh., I. 109.24; viii. 1. 17. xii. 37. 28.
⁴ Smith, Oxford History (1919), p. 31. cf. Rām. II. 68. 13: Mbh. I. 128. 29ff; 133. 11; Fargiter DKA, 5; Patañjali, II. 1. 2. anuGangesa Hāstinaipuram.
⁵ Vedica Indes 1. pp. 160-70.
⁶ Cf. the Pāroṣe of Arrian (Indika, iv), a tributary of the Indus.
⁷ 111, 68. 4; 9; 15; 25 40; 52; 200; 204-03.
⁸ Machakruka, Taruntuka and Marantuka are Yaksha deśāropālas guarding the boundaries of Kurukshetra.
or Oghavati, a branch of the Chitang), Kauśikī (a branch of the Rakshī), as well as the Sarasvatī and the Drishadvatī or the Rakshī.\(^1\) Here, too, was situated Saryanāvat, which the authors of the Vedic Index consider to have been a lake, like that known to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa by the name of Anyataḥplakṣā.

The royal residence according to the Vedic texts was apparently Āsandivat.\(^2\) This city may have been identical with Nāgasāhvaya or Hāstinapura, the capital mentioned in the Epics and the Purāṇas. But it is more probably represented by the modern Asandh near the Chitang.\(^3\)

According to epic tradition the kings of Kurukshetra belonged to the Puru-Bharata family. The Puruva connection of the Kurus is suggested by the Rigvedic hymn,\(^4\) which refers to "Kuru-śravaṇa" (lit. glory of the Kurus) as a descendant of Trasadasyu, a famous king of the Pūrūs.\(^5\) The connection of the Bharatas with the Kuruland is also attested by Vedic evidence. A Rigvedic ode\(^6\) speaks of the two Bhāratas, Devaśravas and Devavrata, as sacrificing in the land on the Drishadvatī, the Āpayā and the Sarasvatī. Some famous gāthās of the Brāhmaṇas\(^7\) and the epic tell us that Bharata Dauḥshanti made offerings on the Jumna, the Ganges (Yamunā anu Gaṅgāyām) and the Sarasvatī. The territory indicated in

---

1. For the identification and location of some of the streams see Mbh. III, 83, 95, 161: V. 161. 78; Cunningham's Arch. Rep. for 1878-79 quoted in JRAS, 1883, 363b; Smith, Oxford History, 29; Science and Culture, 1943, pp. 463 ff.
3. See the map, Smith, Oxford History, p. 29, An Āsandī district is mentioned by Flett in his Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts (Bombay Gazetteer, 1, 2, p. 402). But there is no reason for connecting it with the Kuru country.
4. X, 38, 4.
5. Rigveda, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19, 3.
6. Rig. iii. 28; Oldenberg, Buddha, pp. 409-10.
7. Sat. Br. xiii. 5. 4. 11; Ait. Br. viii. 23; Mbh. vii. 66. 8.
these mandatory verses is exactly the region which is later on so highly celebrated as Kuruṣkhetra.

In the opinion of Oldenberg "the countless small stocks of the Saṃhitā age were fused together to form the greater peoples of the Brāhmaṇa period. The Bharatas found their place, probably together with their old enemies, the Pūrus, within the great complex of peoples now in process of formation, the Kuru; their sacred land now became Kuruṣkhetra."

Among those kings who are mentioned in the genealogical lists of the Mahābhārata as ancestors and predecessors of Parikṣhit, the names of the following occur in the Vedic literature:

---

1 The absorption of the Bharatas by the Kuru is suggested by such passages as Kuravena nāma Bhārataḥ (Mbh. XII. 349. 44). In the Rādh. IV. 33. 11 Bharatas are still distinguished from the Kuru. It has been suggested by some scholars, e.g., C. V. Vaidya (History of Medival Hindu India, Vol. II, pp. 265 ff.) that the Bharata of Rigvedic tradition is not to be identified with Daṇḍabhaṇi. The traditional progenitor of the Kuru royal family, but rather with Bharata, the son of Rishabhah, a descendant of the first Manu called Śvāyambhuva. It should, however, be remembered that the story of Bharata, son of Rishabhah, is distinctly late. The Bharata princes and people of Rigvedic tradition are clearly associated with the Kuru country watered by the Sarasvati and the Brāhmaṇa and the names of their rulers, e.g., Divodāsa and Sudās occur in Purāṇic lists of kings descended from the son or daughter of Manu Vaivasvata and not of Manu Śvāyambhuva. The Bharata priests Vaśishtha and Viṣvāmitra Kuśika are connected in early literature with the royal progeny of Manu Vaivasvata and his daughter, and not of Manu Śvāyambhuva. For the association of Vaśishtha with the descendants of Bharata Daṇḍabhaṇi see the story of Sānvarṇa and Tapaṣṭī in the Mahābhārata, I. 94 and 171 t. Viṣvāmitra Kuśika’s association with the Pūru-Bharata family is, of course, well-known (Mbh. I. 94. 33). It may be argued that Bharata, ancestor of Viṣvāmitra, who is called Bharata-rishabhha in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, must be distinguished from the later Bharata, the son of Sakuntalā, daughter of Viṣvāmitra. But there is no real ground for believing that the story of Viṣvāmitra’s connection with the nymphs is based on sober history. The Rigvedic Viṣvāmitra belonged to the family of Kuśika. In the Mahābhārata (I. 94. 39) the Kuśikas are expressly mentioned as descendants of Bharata Daṇḍabhaṇi.

2 Adiṣṭhāra, Chapters 94 and 95.
Puru-ravas Aila, Ayu, Yayati Nahushya, Puru, Bharata Dauhsanti Saudumuni, Ajamidha, Riksha, Samvarana, Kuru, Uchchaisravas, Prati Pratisatvana or Prati sutvana, Balhika Pratipiya, Samtanu, and Dhritarashtra Vaichitravirya.

The occurrence of these names in Vedic texts probably proves their historicity, but it is difficult to say how far the epic account of their relationship with one another or with Parikshit, and the traditional order of succession, are reliable. Some of the kings may not have been connected with the Kurus at all. Others, e.g., Uchchaisravas Kaupayeya, Balhika Pratipiya and Samtanu, were undoubtedly of the same race (Kaurava) as Parikshit.

Puru-ravas Aila, the first king in the above list, is represented in epic tales as the son of a ruler who migrated from Bahlil in Central Asia to Mid-India. It may be

1 Rig Veda, X. 95; Sat. Br., XI. 5, 1, 1.
2 Rig Veda, I. 68. 10; II. 14, etc.
3 R. V., I. 31, 17; X. 63. 1.
4 R. V., VII. 8, 4; 18, 13.
5 Frequently mentioned in the Brahmana literature, cf. Kuru-śravaṇa, Rig Veda, X. 33.4. see however, foot-note 15 below.
7 Atharva-Veda, XX. 129. 2.
8 Sat. Br., XII. 9. 3. 3.
9 R. V., X. 96.
10 Kāśika Samhitā, X. 6.
11 It should, however, be noted that no individual king named Kuru is mentioned in Vedic literature. Kuru is the name of a people in the Vedic texts.
12 Jaiminiya Up. Br., III. 29. 1 Sat Br., XII. 9. 3; Nirukta, ed. by Kshema-rāja Śrīkṛṣṇa Dāsa Śreṣṭhi, p. 130; Brāhaddevata, VII, 155-156; Studies in Indian Antiquities, pp. 7-8.
13 Rām., VII. 103, 21-22. This Bahlil lay outside the Madhyadesa and is associated with Kārdams kings. The reference is doubtless to Balkh or Bactria in the Oxus Valley. For a discussion about its identity see IHQ.1933, 37-39. The Matsya Purāṇa, 13, 14 ff, distinctly mentions Ilayvis-Varsha (in Central Asia) as the realm of the parent of Puru-ravas. Mbh. III. 90. 22-25 however seems to locate the birth place of Puru-ravas on a hill near the source of the Ganges.
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noted in this connection that the *Papañcha-sūdani* refers to the Kurus—the most important branch of the Ailas according to the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*—as colonists from the trans-Himalayan region known as Uttara Kuru.¹ Bharata, another king mentioned in the epic list is described as a lineal descendant of Purū-ravas and of Pūru. But this is doubtful. He is, as we have seen, definitely associated in Brāhmanic and epic gāthās with the land on the Sarasvati, the Ganges and the Jumna, and is credited with victory over the Satvats. The epic tradition that he was the progenitor of the Kuru royal family is in agreement with the Vedic evidence which connects him and his clansmen, Devaśravas and Deva-vāta, with the same territory which afterwards became famous as the land of the Kurus. Uchchaisravas Kaupayeya had matrimonial relations with the royal family of the Pañchālas. But Balhika Prātipīyā could ill conceal his jealousy of the ruler of the Srijayyas,a people closely associated with the Pañchālas in epic tales. The word Balhika in the name Balhika Prātipīyā seems to be a personal designation and there is no clear evidence that it is in any way connected with the Balhika tribe mentioned in the *Atharva Veda* and later texts. It may, however, point to the northern origin of the Kurus² of the "Middle country," a theory rendered probable by the association of the Kurus with the Mahāvrishas³ and the fact that a

¹ Law, Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 16. Note the association of the Kurus with the Mahāvrishas, Vedic Index, II. 279n, and with the Balhikas, Mbh. II. 63. 2.7. In Mbh. III. 145. 18-19 the Uttara Kurus are apparently placed near Mount Kaalāsa and Badari. In other texts they are located much farther to the north. The Kurus of the Madhya-deśa are called Dakaḥśīya-Kurus in Mbh. I. 109. 10

² Note the association of the Prātipeyas of the Kuru assembly with the Balhikas in Mbh. ii. 63. 2.7: Prātipayāḥ Santanavā Bhimasenaḥ sa Balhikah... śripudhvaṃ Kāyuḥ vāchāṁ sambhītā Kaunasāgāhīm.

³ Vedic Index II. 279n 5; Sat Br. (Kārya text); for Balhikas and Mahāvrishas see also Atharva Veda, V. 22. 4-8.
section of the Kuru people dwelt beyond the Himālayas in the days of the Aitareya Brähmana and the Mahābhārata. The history of the Kuru royal line becomes more definite from the time of Śaṅtanu who was fifth in the ascending line from Parikshit. Regarding the events of Parikshit's reign we have little reliable information. We only know that the drought that threatened the Kuru realm in the time of Śaṅtanu had passed away and the people "throve merrily in the kingdom of Parikshit."

The date of Parikshit is a matter regarding which the Vedic texts give no direct information. In the Aihole Inscription of Ravikṛiti, panegyrist of Pulakesin II, dated Saka 556 (expired) = A.D. 634-35, it is stated that at that time 3735 years had passed since the Bhārata War:

\[ Tṛimśatsu tri sahasrēshu Bhāratād āhavād itah saptābda śata-yukteshū gateśvabdeshu pañchasu. \]

The date of the Bhārata war which almost synchronised with the birth of Parikshit, is, according to this calculation, and the testimony of Āryabhaṭa (A.D. 499), 3102 B.C. This is the starting point of the so-called Kali-yuga era. But, as pointed out by Fleet, the reckoning was not founded in Vedic times. It is an invented one, devised by Hindu astronomers and chronologists for the purposes of their calculations some thirty-five centuries after the initial point which they assigned to it. As a matter of fact another school of Hindu astronomers and historians, represented by Vṛiddha-Garga, Varāhamihira and Kalhaṇa, placed the heroes of the Bhārata war 653 years after the beginning of the Kali-yuga and 2526 years before the Śaka era, i.e., in B.C. 2449. This last date

1 Ep. Ind., VI, pp. 11, 12.
2 JRAS, 1911, pp. 479 ff.; 675 ff.
is as much open to doubt as the one adopted by Āryabhaṭa and Ravikirti. The literature that embodies the Vṛiddha-Garga tradition cannot claim any higher antiquity or reliability than the composition of the great astronomer of Kusumapura. The chronology to which it gives preference is not accepted by the Aihole inscription of Ravikirti. A noted writer,¹ who accepts the dating of Vṛiddha-Garga and Varāha, cites only two late cases (op. cit. p. 401) to prove its currency in India, viz., the commentary on the Bhāgavatāmṛita and certain modern Almanacs. His attempts to support this tradition by astronomical calculation based on certain Mahābhārata passages are beset with difficulties. For one thing there is a good deal of uncertainty regarding the starting point of what he calls the ‘Purānic’ or ‘epic’ Kaliyuga. He says (p.399) “most likely the Mahābhārata Kaliyuga truly began from the year 2454 B.C. The year of the Bhārata battle according to his finding is however 2449 B.C. In other words the battle was fought five years after the epic Kaliyuga had already begun. But he himself points out (p. 393) that the battle was fought, according to the Mahābhārata, when it was the junction of (antara, really interval between) Kali and Dvāpara, and 36 years before the year of Krishna’s expiry (p. 399) which was the true beginning of the Kaliyuga. Thus the dates assigned to the beginning of Kali do not agree. These discrepancies demonstrate the unstable character of the ground on which the chronological edifice is sought to be built.

It may be remembered in this connection that Kalhana, who places Gonarda I of Kashmir and the Bhārata War in 2449-8 B.C fixes a date for Aśoka much earlier than Gonarda III (1182 B.C.). This result is opposed to all genuine historical evidence and proves the unreliable

¹ Mr. P. C. Sen Gupta, Bhārata Battle Traditions, JRASB. IV, 1938, No. 3 (Sept. 1939, pp. 303-413).
character of the scheme of chronology which has for its basis a belief in 2449 B.C. as the date of the Bhāratavāpa War. Some writers try to reconcile the conflicting views presented by the schools of Aryabhaṭa and Vṛbddha-Garga by suggesting that the Saka-kāla, of Varāhamihira is really Sākya-kāla, i.e., the era of the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa. This conjecture is not only opposed to the evidence of Kalhaṇa, but is flatly contradicted by Bhāṭottapala who explains Saka-kāla of the Brihat Samhitā passage as Saka-śripa-kāla, era of the Saka king. Varāhamihira himself knew of no Saka-kāla apart from the Sakendrakāla or Saka-bhūpa-kāla, i.e., the era of the Saka king.

A third tradition is recorded by the compilers of the Purāṇas. There is a remarkable verse, found with variants in the historical Purāṇas, which places the birth of Parikṣhita 1050 (or 1015, 1115, 1500 etc. according to some manuscripts), years before Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king of Magadha:

Mahāpadm-ābhishekāt tu
yāvajjanama Parikṣhitaḥ
evam varshasahasram tu
jnayeṣa pancaḥaṣaduttaram.¹

¹ IHQ, 1932, 85; Mod. Rev., June, 1932, 650 ff.
² The Brihat-Samhitā by Varāhamihira with the commentary of Bhāṭottapala, edited by Sudhākara Dwivedi, p. 281.
³ Brihat Samhitā, VIII, 20-21.⁴
⁴ Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 58. From the account of Pargiter it appears that the reading Pāchha-śalottaram, finds no support in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa texts. The variant Satam pāchhadottaram occurs only in some Bhāgavata Mss. ‘Pāchha-śalottaram’ is however unknown to the Matsya. One Matsya Ms. has ‘Sato trayaṃ’. The reading generally accepted by the scribes seems to have been Pāchhaḥad-uttaram. The biggest figure (1500) is probably obtained by the wrong inclusion within the Magadhan list of the Pradyotas of Avanti, and taking the period of Bāhradratha rule to cover 1000 instead of 733 years. 1000 (for the Bāhradrathas) + 162 (for the Pradyotas) + 360 (for the Sājñāṇāgas)=1512 years.
If the reading Pañchāśaduttaram be correct, the verse would seem to point to a date in the fourteenth or fifteenth century B.C. for the birth of Parikshit. It is, however, doubtful if even this tradition can be regarded as of great value. In the first place the divergent readings in the different Mss. take away from the value of the chronological datum. Secondly, the Purāṇas themselves in giving details about the dynasties that are supposed to have intervened between the Bhārata war and the coronation of Mahāpadma mention totals of reigns which when added together neither present a unanimous tradition nor correspond to the figure 1050, which alone finds general acceptance in the Matsya, the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa manuscripts. The discrepancies may no doubt be partially explained by the well-known fact that the Purāṇic chroniclers often represent contemporaneous lines e.g. the Pradyotas and the Bimbisārīds, as following one another in regular succession. But there is another point which deserves notice in this connection. The same passage which says that "from Mahāpadma’s inauguration to the birth of Parikshit, this interval is indeed 1050 years," adds that "the interval which elapsed from the last Andhra king Pulomāvi to Mahāpadma was 836 years." As most of the Purāṇas agree in assigning a period of 100 years to Mahāpadma and his sons who were followed immediately by Chandragupta Maurya, the interval between Chandragupta and Pulomāvi, according to the Purāṇic chronology, will be 836–100–736 years. Now as Chandragupta could not have ascended the throne before 320 B.C., Pulomāvi, according to the calculation of the Purāṇas, cannot be placed earlier than 410 A.D. But this date can hardly be reconciled with what we know about the history of the Deccan in the first half of the fifth century A.D. Contemporary records show that the territory that had acknowledged the sway of Pulomāvi
and his ancestors was at that time under the Vākāṭakas and other dynasties that rose on the ruins of the so-called "Andhra," or Sātavāhana empire. This emphasizes the need of caution in utilizing the chronological data of the Purāṇas.

An attempt has been made in recent times to support the Purānic date for Parikshit and the Bhārata War which is taken to correspond to c. 1400 B.C., by calculations based on the Vamśa lists of teachers and pupils preserved in the Vedic literature. The importance of these lists was emphasized in these very pages as early as 1923. But the data they yield have been made to square with the chronological scheme adumbrated in some of the Purānic Mss with the help of a number of assumptions for which no cogent proofs have been adduced. It has, for instance, been taken for granted that the Vamśa list given at the end of the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad is virtually contemporaneous with those found in the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa and the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa, and that all the lists "must be" dated "not later than c. 550 B.C." (op. cit. p. 70). A few pages further on (p. 77) the date of the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa is stated to be "c. 550 B.C." (the words "not later than" being omitted). The mere fact that the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad and other works of the Śruti literature are generally regarded as Pre-Buddhist cannot be taken to prove that the entire lists of teachers and pupils appended to or inserted in all of them can claim equal antiquity. Scholars in assigning the period before 500 B.C. to the Vedic literature expressly exclude "its latest excrescences." 3 Pāṇini 4 draws

1 See also Raychaudhuri, The Early History of the Vaishnav Sect, second edition, pp. 62ff.
2 Dr. Altekar, Presidential Address to the Archaic Section of the Indian History Congress, Proceedings of the Third Session, 1933, pp. 68-77
3 Winternitz, A History of Indian Literature, p. 27.
4 IV. 3. 105.
a distinction between Vedic works which, to him, are Purānaprokta and those that he does not obviously regard as equally old. The date "c. 550 B.C." has even less justification than the vague words "not later than c. 550 B.C."

It has been stated further that the period separating the priests of Janamejaya from c. 550 B.C. is 800 years. This figure is obtained by accepting the round number 40 for the intervening generations and assigning to each generation in the gurusishya paramparā a period of 20 years. The probative value of this mode of calculation is impaired by the fact that the actual number of teachers of the period given in the Brihadāranyaka Upanishad is 45 and not 40 (p. 70), and the true average length of a spiritual generation is, according to Jain and Buddhist evidence, about 30 and not 20 years. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that if the lists which form the basis of calculation are really to be dated 'not later than c. 550 B.C.,' c. 1350 B.C. (550 + 800) can only be regarded as a terminus ad quem. The terminus a quo still remains to be determined. The uncertainty regarding the date of the particular Vājmśa lists, on which the whole chronological theory rests, lays even the lower limit open to objection.

Tradition recorded in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara points to a date for the Pārikshitas which is much later than that assigned to them by Purānic chroniclers and astronomers of the Gupta Age. It refers to Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī (c. 500 B.C.), as fifth in lineal succession from Parikshit. The evidence is late but the text professes to embody tradition that goes back to Guṇāḍhya who is known to Bāna (c. 600 A.D.) and is assigned to the Sātavāhana period.

1 Jacob, Parīskhṭaparvan, 2nd ed. xvi, Rhys Davids, Buddhist. Sutras Introduction, xlvii.
2 Kathā-sarit-sāgara, IX. 6-7 ff, Penzer, I. 95
A comparatively late date, albeit not the date suggested by the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, can also be inferred from certain passages in the later Vedic texts. We shall show in the next section that Parikshit’s son and successor Janamejaya was separated by five or six generations of teachers from the time of Janaka of the Upanishads and his contemporary Uddālaka Āruṇī. At the end of the Kaushitaki or Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka we find a vaṁśa or list of the teachers by whom the knowledge contained in that Āranyaka is supposed to have been handed down. The opening words of this list run thus:—

"Om! Now follows the vaṁśa. Adoration to the Brahman! Adoration to the teachers! We have learnt this text from Guṇākhya Sāṅkhāyana, Guṇākhya Sāṅkhāyana from Kahola Kaushitaki, Kahola Kaushitaki from Uddālaka Āruṇī."

The passage quoted above makes it clear that Guṇākhya Sāṅkhāyana was separated by two generations from the time of Uddālaka who was separated by five or six generations from the time of Janamejaya. Guṇākhya, therefore, lived seven or eight generations after Parikshit. He could not have flourished much later than Āśvalāyana because the latter, or preferably his pupil, honours his guru Kahola. It is to be noted that we have no personal name prefixed to Āśvalāyana as we have in the case of Sāṅkhāyana. This probably suggests that Vedic tradition knew only of one great teacher named Āśvalāyana. It is significant that both in Vedic and Buddhist literature this famous scholar is associated with one and the same locality, viz., Kosala, modern Oudh. The Praśna Upanishad tells us that Āśvalāyana was a Kausalya, i.e., an

1 Ādhyāya 15.
3 Āśvalāyana Grihya Sūtra, III. 4. 4.
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inhabitant of Kosala, and a contemporary of Kabandhī Kātyāyana. These facts enable us to identify him with Assalāyana of Sāvatthī (a city in Kosala) mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya¹ as a famous Vedic scholar,² and a contemporary of Gotama Buddha and, hence, of Kakuda³ or Pakudha Kachcbāyana. The reference to Gotama’s contemporary as a master of ketubha, i.e., kalpa or ritual, makes it exceedingly probable that he is to be identified with the famous Āśvalāyana of the Gṛihya Sūtras. Consequently the latter must have lived in the sixth century B.C. Guṇākhya Sāṅkhāyana, whose teacher Kahola is honoured by the famous Gṛihyasūtrā-kāra, cannot be placed later than that century. That the upper limit of Guṇākhya’s date is not far removed from the lower one is suggested in the first place by the reference in his Āraṇyaka to Paushkarsādi, Lauhitya and a teacher who is styled Magadhavāsi. The first two figure, in the Ambaṭṭha and Lohichcha suttas, among the contemporaries of the Buddha. The attitude of respect towards a Magadhan teacher in the Āraṇyaka points to an age later than that reflected in the Srauta Sūtras which mention Brāhmanas hailing from the locality in question in a depreciatory tone as Brahmobandhu Māgadha-desīya.⁴

Goldstücker points out⁵ that Pāṇini used the word Āraṇyaka only in the sense of ‘a man living in the forest’. It is Kātyāyana (c. fourth century B.C.) who vouchsafes in a Vārttika the information that the same

---
¹ “Tiṣṇam Vedānam pāragū sanighamdu keṭubhānau”
² As to the equation kabandhī=kakuda, see IHQ, 1932, 608 ff. Kabandha in the Atharva Veda, X. 2, 3 means stropi and āru (hips and thighs). According to Amara kakudmattī has substantially the same meaning.
³ Vedic Index, II. 116. Isolated references to Paushkarsādi and others may not be of much value. What we have to consider is the cumulative effect of the references in the Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka combined with the testimony of Pāṇini and Ápastamba.
⁴ Pāṇini, His Place in Sanskrit Literature, 1914, 99.
expression is also used in the sense of treatises 'read in the forest'. The silence of Pāṇini in regard to this additional meaning of the term, when contrasted with the clear statement of the later grammarian, leaves little room for doubt that Āranyakā in the sense of a forest-treatise was well known to writers traditionally assigned to the fourth century B.C., but not to Pāṇini. It may be recalled in this connection that, unlike Kātyāyana again, Pāṇini does not include the works of Yājñavalkya, a contemporary of Kahola, the teacher of Guṇākhyā, among the older (Purāṇa-prokta) Brāhmaṇas. Svetaketu, another contemporary of Kahola, teacher of Guṇākhyā, is mentioned in the Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba as an avara or modern authority. The reference to Yavanāṇī in the sūtras of Pāṇini and the tradition recorded in the Kāvya-Mīmāṃsā that he made his mark in the city of Pāṭaliputra (founded, as we know, after the death of the Buddha, c. 486 B.C., in the reign of Udāyin), clearly suggest that he could not have flourished before the sage of the Śākyas. Profound as his knowledge is in regard to Vedic literature, Pāṇini is unaware of the existence of Āranyakas as a class of forest-treatises. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to conclude that he could not have been considerably posterior to the great masters of the Āranyakas among whom Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana holds an honoured place. In other words, the upper limit of the date of this teacher almost coincides with the lower. With a date for him in the sixth century B.C. all the evidence accommodates itself.

We are now left with the task of attempting to measure the distance between Guṇākhyā and Parikshit. Professor

1 IV. 3. 105 with commentary quoted on page 106a of Goldastucker's Pāṇini, Yājñavalkyaśadayo hi na chira kāla ityākhyānesha vārtā.  
2 Dharmasūtra, 1. 2. 5, 4-6.  
3 IV. 1. 49.  
4 P. 55.
Rhys Davids in his *Buddhist Suttas* assigns 150 years to the five *Theras* from Upāli to Mahinda. Jacobi, too, informs us that the average length of a patriarchate may be estimated at about 30 years. We may, therefore, assign 240 or 270 years to the eight or nine generations from Parikshit to Guṇākhya Śaṅkhāyana, and place the former in the ninth century B.C.

Parikshit was succeeded on the Kuru throne by his eldest son **Janamejaya.** The *Mahābhārata* refers to a great snake-sacrifice performed by this king. In this connection it is stated that the king conquered Taxila. It is clear from the *Pañchalimśa Brāhmaṇa* and the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* that the epic account of the Kuru king’s *Sarpa-satra* cannot be regarded as having any historical basis. There is hardly any doubt that the *Satra* mentioned in the Vedic texts is the prototype of the famous sacrifice described in the epic. The story seems to have undergone three stages of development. The original tale is concerned with a mythical rite performed by the serpents one of whom was named Janamejaya, who served as an *Adhvaryu* (priest).

“Through this rite the serpents vanquished death.” The next stage is reached in the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.* Janamejaya appears among the kings and princes of the serpents assembled for sacrifice in human shape at Khāṇḍavaprastha (in the Kuru country) with the object of obtaining poison. In the epic the performer of the sacrifice is identified with the Kuru king; and the object of the sacrifice is not the acquisition of immortality for the serpents, or of poison, but the extinction of these

---


2 XXV. 15; *Vedic Index*, I, p. 274.

reptiles. It is impossible to find in the doings of these venomous creatures a reference to an historic strife.1

The conquest of Taxila by the Kuru king may, however, be an historical fact, because King Janamejaya is represented as a great conqueror in the Brähmaṇas. Thus the Aitareya Brähmaṇa says:2 “Janamejayaḥ Pārikshitāḥ samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithivīṁ jayan pariṇāyāśvena cha medhyeneje, tadesaḥ yajña-gathā giyate:

Āsandivati dhāṇyādaṁ rukmināṁ karitasrajam
āścaṁ babandha sāraṅgam3 devebhya Janamejaya iti”

“Janamejaya Pārikshita went round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice.” Regarding this a sacrificial verse is sung:

“In Āsandivat Janamejaya bound for the gods a black-spotted grain-eating horse, adorned with a golden ornament and with yellow garlands.”4

In another passage of the Aitareya Brähmaṇa5 it is stated that Janamejaya aspired to be a “Sarvabhūmi”, i.e., a universal sovereign:

“Evaṁvidam hi vai māmevaṁvido yājyanti tasād
ahāṁ jayāmyabhūtvarīṁ senāṁ jayāmyabhūttvāryaṁ senayaṁ
na mā divyā na mānushya iṣhava richchhantyeshyāmi sarva-
māyuh sarvabhūmīr bhavishyāmīti.”

(Janamejaya Pārikshita used to say) “Those who know thus sacrifice for me who know thus; therefore I conquer the assailing host, I conquer with an assailing host. Me

1 Pañcharaviṇḍa Brähmaṇa, translated by Dr. W. Caland, p. 641; cf. Winternitz, JBBRAS., 1926, 74. ff.; Pargiter, AIHT, p. 285, observes that “the Nāgas killed Pārikshita II, but his son Janamejaya III defeated them and peace was made!”
2 VIII. 21.
3 Variant—abadhnądāścam śāraṅgam—Sat. Br. xiii. 5. 4. 1-2.
5 VIII. 11.
neither the arrows of heaven nor of men reach. I shall live all my life, I shall become lord of all the earth.'

The possession of Taxila in the extreme north-west implies control over Madra or the central Pañjāb, the homeland of Janamejaya's mother Mādravatī. In this connection it may be remembered that the western frontier of the Kuru country once extended as far as the Parinah or Parenos, a tributary of the Indus. Princes of the Paurava race ruled in the territory lying between the Jehelam and the Rāvi down to the time of Alexander, while Ptolemy, the geographer, expressly mentions the Pāṇḍus as the rulers of Sākala (Sialkot) in the heart of this extensive region.

It was presumably after his victorious campaigns that Janamejaya was consecrated with the Punar-abhisheka and the Aindra mahābhisheka, performed two horse-sacrifices and had a dispute with Vaisampāyana and the Brāhmaṇas. The Matsya version, which is considered by the Pargiter to be the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest; but the Vāyu version says he perished and the Brāhmaṇas made his son king. The broad facts of the Purānic narrative are confirmed by the evidence of the Brāhmaṇas. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa refers to one of the horse-sacrifices, and says that the priest who performed the rite for him was Indrota Daivāpi Saunaka. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa mentions the other sacrifice and names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. It also contains a tale stating that at one sacrifice of his he did not employ the Kaśyapas, but the Bhūtavīras. Thereupon a family of the Kaśyapas called Asita-mpiga forcibly took away the conduct of the

1 The Rhāgasvata Purāṇa (1. xvi. 2) mentions Irāvati, daughter of Uttara as the mother of Janamejaya and his brothers.
offering from the Bhūtavīras, We have here probably the germ of the Purānic stories about Janamejaya's dispute with the Brāhmaṇas. Vaiśampāyana, who headed the opponents of Janamejaya, undoubtedly belonged to the Kaśyapa clan. An allusion to the famous quarrel occurs also in the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra (kopāj-Janamejaya Brāhmaṇeshu vikrāntah).

The Gopatha Brāhmaṇa narrates an anecdote of Janamejaya and two ganders, pointing out the importance of Brahmacharya, and the time which should be devoted to it. The story is obviously mythical but it shows that Janamejaya was already looked upon as a legendary hero in the time of the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa.¹

Janamejaya's capital, according to a sacrificial song (yajña-gāthā) quoted above, was Asandivat to which reference has already been made. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa affords an interesting glimpse of life in the royal palace or sacrificial hall:

Samānāntsadam ukshanti hayān kāshṭhabhrīto yathā pārṇān parisrutah kumbhān Janamejayasādana' iti

"Even as they constantly sprinkle the equal prize-winning steeds so (they pour out) the cups full of fiery liquor in the palace (or sacrificial hall) of Janamejaya."²

"Curds, stirred drink or liquor" were favourite beverages of the Kurus already in the days of Parikshit.

If the Mahābhārata is to be believed, Janamejaya sometimes held his court at Taxila, and it was at Taxila that Vaiśampāyana is said to have related to him the story of

¹ Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by R. L. Mitra and Harachandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa, pp. 26 ff (I. 2. 5). In connection with the legend referred to above we hear of a sage named Dantābala Dhaumra who is identified by some writers with Dantāla Dhaumya of the Jaininīya Brāhmaṇa. The conjecture lacks proof. In the Baudhāyana Śruta Sūtra, Vol. III, p. 449, "Dhaumras, Dhumrāyanas and Dhaumyas" find separate mention as distinct members of the Kaśyapa group.

² Sat, Br. XI. 5. 5, 13. Eggeling, V. 95.
the great conflict between the Kurus and the Pândus\(^1\) who had for their allies several peoples including the Sriñjayas. No direct independent proof of this war is forthcoming, but allusions to the hostility of Kurus and Sriñjayas, which forms an important feature of the epic ballads, are met with in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.\(^3\) Moreover Hopkins invites attention to a gāthā in the Chhândogya Upanishad\(^2\) which alludes to the mare which saves the Kuru:

\[\text{Yato yata āvartate tat tad gachechhati mānavaḥ} \]

\[\text{..........................Kurūn aścābhirakshati.} \]

The verse cannot fail to recall the disaster (Kurūnām vaiśasam) referred to in the Mahābhārata.\(^4\)

It may be asserted that the Pândus are a body of strangers unknown to the Vedic texts, and that, therefore, the story of their feuds with the Kurus must be post-Vedic. But such a conclusion would be wrong because, firstly, an argumentum ex silentio is seldom conclusive, and, secondly, the Pândus are, according to Indian tradition, not a body of strangers but in fact scions of the Kurus. Hopkins indeed says that they were an unknown folk connected with the wild tribes located north of the Ganges.\(^5\) But Patañjali\(^6\) calls Bhīma, Nakula and Sahadeva Kurus.\(^7\) Hindu tradition is unanimous in representing the Pândavas as an offshoot of the Kuru race just as the Kurus themselves were an offshoot of the Bharatas.

\(^1\) Mbh., XVIII. 5. 34.

\(^2\) The battle of Kuru-kahatra is very often described a fight between the Kurna and the Sriñjayas (Mbh., VI. 45. 2; 60. 29; 72, 15; 73. 41; VII. 20. 41; 119. 40, VIII. 47. 29; 57, 13; 59 1; 93. 1). The unfriendly feeling between these two peoples is distinctly alluded to in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa XII. 9, 3, 1 ff., Vedic Index, II, p, 63).

\(^3\) IV. 17. 9-10, The Great Epic of India, p. 385.

\(^4\) Mbh. IX. 35. 20.

\(^5\) The Religions of India, p. 388.

\(^6\) IV. 1. 4.

\(^7\) Ind. Ant., I, P. 350.
The very name of the Great Epic betrays the Bhārata (Kuru) connection of the principal heroes and combatants. The testimony of Buddhist literature points to the same conclusion. In the Dasa-Brāhmaṇa Jātaka¹ a king "of the stock of Yuddhīṭṭhila" reigning "in the kingdom of Kuru and the city called Indapatta" is distinctly called "Koravya," i.e., Kauravya—belonging to the Kuru race. The polyandrous marriage of the Pāṇḍavas does not necessarily indicate that they are of non-Kuru origin. The system of Niyoga prevalent among the Kurus of the Madhya-desa was not far removed from fraternal polyandry,² while the law (Dharma) of marriage honoured by the Northern Kurus was admittedly lax.³

Already in the time of Āśvalāyana’s Grihya Sūtra⁴ Vaiśampāyana was known as Mahābhāratāchārya. He is also mentioned in the Taittirīya Aranyaka⁵ and the AshtādhyaVy of Pāṇini.⁶ Whether the traditional reciter of the original Mahābhārata was actually a contemporary of Janamejaya or not, cannot be ascertained at the present moment. But I have found nothing in the Vedic literature itself which goes against the epic tradition. The early Vedic texts no doubt make no reference to the

¹ Jātaka No. 495
² See also my "Political History," pp. 95, 96; Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University), Vol. IX; and the Early History of the Vaishñava Sect, second edition, pp. 43-45. Also Mbh., I, 108, 9-10; 105, 97-98; Winteritz in JRAS, 1897, 755 ff; Āpastamba ii. 27, 3; Bhaṭṭaspati, xxvii. It is to be noted that in spite of the alleged family custom in the Pāṇḍu line no other wife except Draupadī was shared by the Pāṇḍava brothers, and their children had no common wife. In the epic ‘Kuru’ and ‘Pāṇḍu’ no doubt often find separate mention. In a similar way historians distinguish between the related houses of ‘Plantagenet,’ ‘York’ and ‘Lancaster;’ ‘Capet,’ ‘Valois,’ ‘Bourbon’ and ‘Orleans;’ ‘Chablïkya’ and ‘Vāgbhela.’
³ Mbh., I, 122, 7.
⁴ III. 4.
⁵ I. 7. 5.
⁶ IV. 3. 104.
⁷ 6—1893B
Mahābhārata, but they mention Itihāsas. It is well-known that the story supposed to have been recited by Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya was at first called an Itihāsa and was named Jaya or song of victory, i.e., victory of the Pāṇḍus, the ancestors of the king:

Muchyate sarvapāpebhya Rāhuṇā Chandramā yathā
Jayo nāmetihāso' yam śrotavyo vijigishunā.

‘By listening to this story one escapes from all kinds of sin, like the Moon from Rāhu. This Itihāsa (story, legend) is named Jaya (Victory); it should be listened to by those that desire victory.’

Janamejaya’s brothers, Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Srutasena, appear in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Sānkhyayana Śrauta Sūtra as performers of the horse-sacrifice. At the time of the Brāhad-āraṇyaka Upanishad their life and end excited popular curiosity and were discussed with avidity in learned circles. It is clear that the sun of the Pārikshitas had set before the time of the Upanishad, and it is also clear that they had been guilty of some sinful deeds which they had atoned for by their horse-sacrifice. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa quotes a gāthā which says:

---

1. A. V., XV. 6. 11-12.
4. XIII. 5. 4. 3.
5. XVI. 9. 7.
6. Did these three brothers take part in the sacrifices of Janamejaya? Such a participation is clearly suggested by Mbh., I. 3. 1.
7. The question “Whither have the Pārikshitas gone?” does not imply their extinction; Fargiter himself points out that the answer “Thither where Aśvamedha sacrifices go” suggests the opposite because such sacrifices procured great blessings. AIHT., 114. The Rāmāyaṇa, too, includes Janamejaya (II. 64. 42) in a list of kings who attained to a glorious destiny.
"The righteous Pārikshitas, performing horse-sacrifices, by their righteous work did away with sinful work one after another."

It may be presumed that the breach with the 'lords spiritual' of those days was healed in this way and for the time being priests and princes in the Kuru country lived in harmony. The Purāṇas state that Janamejaya was succeeded by Śatānika. Śatānika's son and successor was Aśvamedha-datta. From Aśvamedha-datta was born Adhisīma-kṛishṇa famed in the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas. Adhisīma-kṛishṇa's son was Nichakshu. During Nichakshu's reign the city of Hāstinapura is said to have been carried away by the Ganges, and the king is said to have transferred his residence to Kauśāmbī, or Kosam near Allahabad.

The Vedic texts do not refer in clear terms to any of these successors of Janamejaya or to the city of Hāstinapura which figures as the principal metropolis of the Kurus in the epic and the Purāṇas. The antiquity of the city is, however, clearly proved by the evidence of Pānini. As to the princes the Rig-Veda no doubt mentions a (Bhārata) king named Aśvamedha, but there

---

1 Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 3. Cf. Mbh. XII. 158, 38. The sinful deeds of which the eldest of the Pārīkshitas was guilty, according to the epic, were Brahmākatya and bhūgokhatya (ibid., 150 Verses 3 and 9). Cf. also Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 1.

2 Gaṇgāyāpakṣīte tasmin nagare Nāgaśāhvaye tyaktae Nichakshu nayaram Kauśāmbyah so nicetayați.

When the city of Nāgaśāhvaya (Hāstinapura) is carried away by the Ganges, Nichakshu will abandon it and will dwell in Kauśāmbi.

Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, P. 5.

That Hāstinapura stood on the Ganges is clear from the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 68. 13), the Mahābhārata (I, 128), and the Mahābhāṣya (anughaṅgam Hāstinapuram).

3 VI. 2, 101.

4 V. 27, 4—6.
is nothing to show that he is identical with Āśvamedhadatta. A Satānika Sātrājita is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa as a powerful king who defeated Dhṛitarāṣṭra a prince of Kāsi, and took away his sacrificial horse. He, too, was probably a Bharata,¹ but the patronymic Sātrājita probably indicates that he was different from Satānika, the son of Janamejaya. The Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa, the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa and the Chhāndogya Upanishad mention a Kuru king named Abhipratārīn Kākshaseni, who was a contemporary of Girikshita Auchchamanyava, Saunaka Kāpeya and Dṛiti Aindrota. As Dṛiti was the son and pupil of Indrota Daivāpa (Daivāpi) Saunaka, the priest of Janamejaya,² Abhipraśārīn, son of Kākshasena, appears to have been one of the immediate successors of the great king. We have already seen that Kakshasena appears in the Mahābhārata³ as the name of a brother of Janamejaya. Abhipratārīn was thus Janamejaya’s nephew. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta Śūtra⁴ refer to a prince named Vṛiddhadyumna Abhipratārīna, apparently the son of Abhipratārīn. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa⁵ possibly mentions his son Ratha-grītisa and priest Suchivriksha Gaupālīyana.⁶ The Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta Śūtra⁷ informs us that Vṛiddhadyumna erred in a sacrifice, when a Brāhmaṇa uttered a curse that the result would be the expulsion of the Kurus from Kuru-kshetra, an event which actually came to pass.

¹ Sat. Br. XIII. 5. 4. 19-23.
² Vaimāṇa Brāhmaṇa; Vedic Index, Vol. I, pp. 27, 373.
³ I. 94, 54.
⁵ Trivedi’s translation, pp. 322-23.
⁶ A Gaupālīyana also held the important post of the Sthapati of the Kurus (Baudh. Sr. Śūtra, XX. 25; Vedic Index, I. 123). His relationship with Suchivriksha is however, not known.
Sacrifices threatened to have serious repercussions on the fortunes of the royal family even in the days of Janamejaya. The performance of ritual in the approved form by proper persons seems to have excited as much interest in the Kuru country as philosophical discussions did at the court of Videha. Even in the fourth century B.C. the great Chandragupta Maurya had to attend to sacrifices in the midst of his pressing duties relating to war and judicial administration. A sacrificial error was not a trivial matter, especially in the ancient realm of the Kurus, which was the citadel of Brähmanic ritualism. To religious indiscretions were soon added natural calamities and the effect on the people was disastrous. Mention has already been made of the Purānic tradition about the destruction of Hāstinapura by the erosive action of the Ganges. The Chhāndogya Upanishad refers to the devastation of the crops in the Kuru country by Matachi (hailstones or locusts) and the enforced migration of the family of Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa, who repaired to the village of an unnamed noble or wealthy man, next to a neighbourly prince and ultimately to the court of Janaka of Videha.¹

¹ Chhāndogya, I. 10. 1; Brihad. Upanishad, III. 4. For earlier vicissitudes, see Rīgveda, X. 98 (drought in the time of Saṃtanu); Mbh. I.94 (story of Sañjaya). The Chhāndogya Upanishad says: maṭṣāhiḥ ateshu Kurukkuṭīṣṭyā sahajāyagā Uṣhastir ha Chākrāyaṇa śḥya-grame pradṛśyakā udasa. 'When Kuruland was devastated by hailstones or locusts, Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa repaired with his virgin wife to a magnate's village and there lived in great distress. The plight of the Brāhmaṇa and his wife offers a sad contrast to the condition of the Kauravya and his lady who "throve merrily in the realm of Parikshit." Commentators took maṭṣāhi to mean 'thunderbolt', 'hailstone' or 'a kind of small red bird' or 'locust.' The last meaning accords with the evidence of the Decibhāgaram, X, 13, 110. maṭṣāhi yuthacatleshāh samudayāstu nīrgatāh. The Kansarese word midicē has the same sense (Kittel's Dictionary; Jacob, Scraps from Shadddana, JRAS, 1911, 510; Vedic Index, II, 119; Bhand. Carm. Loc., 1918, 26-27; Bagchi, IHQ, 1933, 253).
The Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa affords a clue to the royal seat of the ‘Ābhipratāriṇa’ branch of the Kuru family whose reign witnessed the beginning of those incidents that spelled disaster to the Kurus. We are told that Dṛiti, apparently the priest of king Abhipratārīn, son of Kakshasena, completed a sacrifice in Khāṇḍava. The same Brāhmaṇa refers to the Abhipratārīṇas as the “mightiest of all their relations.” The passage is significant. It suggests that the great Janamejaya was no more in the land of the living in the days of Abhipratārīn and his descendants, and that the line represented by the latter far outshone the other branches of the Kuru royal family. The existence of distinct offshoots of the line is clearly implied by tradition. One of them held sway in Hāstinapura and later on moved to Kauśāmbī. This is the branch mentioned in the Purāṇas. Another line reigned in Ishukāra. The third and the ‘mightiest’ branch is, as we have seen, connected with Khāṇḍava, the far-famed region where the great epic locates the stately city of Indraprastha. The famous capital which stood close to the site of modern Delhi finds prominent mention in the Jātakas as the seat of a line of kings claiming to belong to the ‘Yuddhiṣṭhila gotra’ (Yudhishṭhira’s gotra or clan).

The prosperity of the Ābhipratārīṇas was short-lived. Great calamities befell the Kurus and the disintegration of the kingdom went on apace. Large sections of the people, including Brāhmaṇas and princes, were apparently forced to leave the country, and to migrate to the eastern part of India. The transference of the royal seat of one

---

1 XXV. 3. 6.  
2 XIV. 1. 12.  
3 II. 9. 4, Caland’s. ed., p. 97.  
4 SBE, xliv. 62.  
5 Cf. Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, III. 156: JAOS, 26. 61. “When Abhipratāraṇa was lying used up with old age his sons divided the inheritance and made a great noise about it.”
brane of the Kuru or Bharata dynasty to Kaśñambī is confirmed by the evidence of some of the plays attributed to Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kaśñambī, is described in the Svapnavāsa-ca-datta as a scion of the Bharata or Bhārata family:

Bhāratānām kule jāto vinīto jñānavāñchhuchih
    tannārhasi balāddhartum rājadharmasya deśikāh

"Thou art born in the family of the Bharatas. Thou art self-controlled, enlightened and pure. To stop her by force is unworthy of thee, who shouldst be the model of kingly duty."

Genealogy of the Parikshita Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parikshit</th>
<th>Janamejaya</th>
<th>Kakbasena</th>
<th>Ugrasena</th>
<th>Srutasena</th>
<th>Bhūmasena</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šatānika</td>
<td>Abhiratārīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āśvamedhadatta</td>
<td>Vṛiddhadyumna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhisīma-kriṣṇa</td>
<td>Rathagṛītīa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīchākhānu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings of Kaśñambī</td>
<td>Kings of Čhāḍjava (Indapatta)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Puruṣic tradition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bhāratānām kule jāto
Vatsānāṁ mūrjaṁ patīḥ, Act IV,
SECTION II. THE AGE OF THE GREAT JANAKA.

Sarve rājño Maithilasya Mainākasyeva parvatāh
nikrishṭabhūtā rājāno..........................

—Mahābhārata¹.

We have seen that a series of calamities sadly crippled the Kurus. The kingdom fell to pieces and one of the princes had to leave the country. During the age which followed the Kuru people played a minor part in politics.

The most notable figure of the succeeding age was **Janaka**, the great philosopher-king of Videha, mentioned in the Vedic texts as the contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇī and Yājñavalkya. The waning power of the Kurus and the waxing strength of the Vaidehas are shown by the fact that while Kuru princes are styled rājan (king) in certain Brāhmaṇas,² Janaka of Videha is called samrāṭ (supreme king). In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa³ the samrāj is asserted to be of higher dignity than a rājan.

That the great Janaka was later than the Pārikshitas admits of no doubt. We shall show later on that he was a contemporary probably of Nichakshu (if Purānic tradition is to be accepted), and certainly of Ushasta or Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa during whose time disaster beffell the Kurus. In Janaka’s time we find the notable achievements, as well as the mysterious fate, of the Pārikshitas, still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of general curiosity in the royal court of Mithilā. In the Brihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad

¹ III. 184. 5. As all other mountains are inferior to Maināka so are kings inferior to the lord of Mithilā.
² Ait., VIII. 14. Pañchavimśa, XIV. 1. 12. etc.
³ V, I, 1, 12-13.
Bhujyu Lāhyāyani tests Yājñavalkya, the ornament of the court of Janaka, with a question, the solution of which the former is said to have previously obtained from a being of superhuman power through the medium of a Madra girl:

"Kva Pārikshitā abhavan"—whither have the Pārikshitās gone?"

Yājñavalkya answers: "Thither where the performers of the horse sacrifice abide." From this it is clear that the Pārikshitās (sons of Pārikshit) must at that time have passed away. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of absorbing interest to men and women in different parts of the country.²

It is not possible to determine with precision the exact chronological relation between Janamejaya and Janaka. Epic and Purānic tradition seems to regard them as contemporaries. Thus the Mahābhārata says that Uddālaka, a prominent figure of Janaka's court, and his son Svetaketu, attended the sarpa-satra (snake-sacrifice) of Janamejaya:—

Sadasya śchābhavad Vyāsah putra-śishya-sahāyavān
Uddālakahār Pramatakaḥ Svetaketusācha Pingalāḥ³

"Vyāsa, assisted by his son and disciple, Uddālaka, Pramataka, Svetaketu, Piṅgala.....officiated as sadasya (priest)."

² Weber, Ind. Lit. 126 ff. In the Journal of Indian History, April, 1938, p. 20, edited by Dr. S. Krishnasvami Aiyangar and others, appears the amazing insinuation that "Mr. Roy Choudhury has......attempted to give Weber's thought and language (as rendered) out as his own, without any reference to Weber." A perusal of the Bibliographical Index (pp. 319, 328) appended to the first ed. of the Political History and p. 27 of the text; the foreword to the subsequent editions, etc., will throw interesting light on the veracity of the writer of the article in question in the Journal of Indian History.
³ Mbh., Adi.. 53. 7.
The *Vishṇu Purāṇa* says that Satānīka, the son and successor of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya.\(^1\)

The unreliability of the Epic and the Purānic tradition in this respect is proved by the evidence of the Vedic texts. We learn from the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^2\)* that Indrota Daivāpa or Daivāpi Saunaka was a contemporary of Janamejaya. His pupil was Dṛiti Aindrota or Aindroti according to the *Jaiminiya Upanishad* and *Vamśa Brāhmaṇas*. Dṛiti's pupil was Pulusha Prāchīnayoga.\(^3\) The latter taught Paulushi Satyayajña. We learn from the *Chhāndogya Upanishad\(^4\)* that Paulushi Satyayajña was a contemporary of Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi and of Uddālaka Āruṇi, two prominent figures of Janaka's court.\(^5\) Satyayajña was, therefore, certainly a contemporary of Janaka of Videha. He was an elder contemporary because his pupil Somāśūrma Śātyayajñī Prāchīnayoga is mentioned in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^6\)* as having met Janaka. As Śātyayajñī certainly flourished long after Indrota Daivāpi Saunaka, his contemporary Janaka must be considerably later than Janamejaya, the contemporary of Indrota.

We should also note that in the lists of teachers given at the end of the tenth book of the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, and the sixth chapter of the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upanishad* Tura Kāvasbeya, the priest of Janamejaya, appears as a very ancient sage who was tenth in the ascending line from Sānjīvīputra, whereas Yājñavalkya and Uddālaka Āruṇi, the contemporaries of Janaka, were only fourth and fifth in

---

2. XIII. 5. 4. 1.
4. V. 11. 1. 2.
6. XL. 6. 2. 1-3.
the ascending line from the same teacher. The lists are
given below:

Janamejaya. Tura Kāvasheya
Yajñavachas Rājastambhaya
Kuśri Kuśri Vājaśravasa
Sāndilya Upaveśi
Vātsya Aruṇa
Vāmakashāyaṇa Uddālaka Āruni } Janaka
Mābitthi Yājñavalkya } the Great
Kautsa Āsuri
Māndavya Āsurāyaṇa
Māndukāyaṇi Prāśnīputra Āsurivāsin
Sānjīvīputra Sānjīvīputra

It is clear from what has been stated above that
Janaka was separated by five or six generations from
Janamejaya’s time. Jacobi and Rhys Davids agree in

1 IO, III.747.
2 It has been stated by certain writers that Janamejaya should be
placed “only a step above Janaka.” They point to the use of laḥ in the verb
bhū in the interrogation Keśa Pārikshitā abharan quoted above. They further
identify Dantābala Dhamma, a contemporary of Janamejaya, according to a
legend narrated in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, with Dantāla Dhumya of the
Jaimintya Brāhmaṇa, who may be assigned to the period of Janaka. It is also
suggested that Bhāllavaya of a certain Brāhmaṇa passage is no other than Indra-
dyumna, JIH., April 1936, 15 ff., etc. Apart from the fact that in the Vedic texts
laḥ and liṣ are at times used alternatively to convey the same meaning (Cf. 37 ante.),
it should be noted that the question ‘Keśa Pārikshitā abharan’ with its answer
was not framed for the first time at the court of Janaka. It is a mūrdhābhīshkita
(traditional)—udākaraṇa attributed to superhuman agency—and, therefore,
cannot be regarded as establishing the synchronism of Janamejaya, Pārikshita
and Janaka Vaideha. As to Dantābala it has already been pointed out (p. 39
above), that the Baudhāyana Srauta Sūtra mentions Dhumras and Dhumyas as
distinct members of the Kāśyapa group. Janamejaya must have passed away
in the days of Dṛiti and the Ābhiratrāṇas. See ante p. 46. See also IHQ,
Vol. VIII, 1932. 600 ff. As to Bhāllavaya, serious students should remember
that it is a patronymic like Ṭreṇya, Bhāradaṇa etc. In the absence of the per-
sonal name, it is uncrtical to identify every Bhāllavaya with Indradyumna him-
self as it is unreasonable to equate every Ṭreṇya with? Udamaya or every
Bhāradvāja with Droṇa or Piśḍola.

3 Pariśikṣā paraṃ, 2nd ed. xviii and Buddhist Suttas. Introduction, p. xlvii
estimating the average length of a patriarchate or generation (in lists relating to spiritual succession) at 80 years. To the five or six teachers from Indrota to Somaśushma, and from Tura to Uddālaka Āruṇi and Janaka, we may, therefore, assign a period of 150 or 180 years. It is, therefore, reasonable to think that Janaka flourished about 150 or 180 years after Janamejaya, and two centuries after Parikshit. If, following a Purānic tradition, we place Parikshit in the fourteenth century B.C., we must place Janaka in the twelfth century B.C. If, on the other hand, we accept a date for Guṇākhya Sānkhyayana, the pupil’s pupil of Uddālaka according to the Sānkhyayana Āraṇyaka, in the sixth century B.C., we must place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C., and Janaka in the seventh century B.C.

The kingdom of Videha, over which Janaka ruled seems to be mentioned for the first time in the Saṃhitās of the Yajur Veda. It corresponds roughly to the modern Tirhut in North Bihār. It was separated from Kosala by the river Sadārīra, usually identified with the modern Ganḍak which, rising in Nepāl, flows into the Ganges opposite Patna. Oldenberg, however, points out

---

1 It has been urged by some critics that pupils are not necessarily younger in age than their preceptors. It may freely be admitted that in particular cases pupils may be of the same age with, or even older than, the guru. But it is idle to suggest that in a long list of successive śāchāryas and śishyās the presence of elderly pupils must be assumed except where the guru is known to be the father of the pupil. Individual cases of succession of elderly śishyās do not invalidate the conclusion that the average duration of a generation is as is suggested by Jacobi and Rhys Davids.

2 Vedā Index, II. 298.

3 According to Pargiter, JASB, 1897, 69—“Videha comprised the country from Gorakhpur on the Rāgī to Darabhanga, with Kosela on the west and Ani on the east. On the north it approached the hills, and to the south it was bounded by the small kingdom of Vaisāli.”

4 Vedic Index II. 299.

5 Buddhā, p. 368 n. Cf. Pargiter, JASB, 1897. 87. Mbh. II. 20. 27.
that the *Mahābhārata* distinguishes the Gaṇḍakī from the Sadānirā: "Gaṇḍakīcha Mahāśoṇam Sadānirām tathaiva cha." Pargiter, therefore, identifies the Sadānirā with the Rāpti.\(^1\) We learn from the *Suruchi Jātaka*\(^2\) that the measure of the whole kingdom of Videha was three hundred leagues. It consisted of 16,000 villages.\(^3\)

*Mithilā*, the capital of Videha, is not referred to in the Vedic texts, but is constantly mentioned in the *Jātakas* and the Epics. It has been identified with the small town of Janakpur just within the Nepāl border north of the place where the Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga districts meet. It is stated in the *Suruchi* and *Gandhāra*\(^4\) *Jātakas* that the city covered seven leagues. At its four gates were four market towns.\(^5\) We have the following description of the city in the *Mahājanaka Jātaka*\(^6\):—

By architects with rule and line laid out in order fair to see,
With walls and gates and battlements, traversed by streets on every side,
With horses, cows and chariots thronged with tanks and gardens beautified,
Videha's far-famed capital, gay with its knights and warrior swarms,
Clad in their robes of tiger-skins, with banners spread and flashing arms,
Its Brahmins dressed in Kaśi cloth, perfumed with sandal, decked with gems,
Its palaces and all their queens with robes of state and diadems.\(^7\)

---

1 If the epic enumeration of the rivers quoted above follows a geographical order as is suggested by the use of the expression *kramaṇa* in the Mbh. II. 20. 27, Sadānirā may be the Burhi Gaṇḍak which is distinguished from the Gaṇḍak proper. Cf. map in *JASB*, 1895.
2 J. 489.
3 J. 406. These are apparently conventional figures.
4 J. 489 and 406.
5 J. 546.
7 For another description of Mithilā, see Mbh. III. 206.6-9.
According to the Rāmāyana1 the royal family of Mithilā was founded by a king named Nimi. His son was Mithi, and Mithi’s son was Janaka I. The epic then continues the genealogy to Janaka II (father of Sitā) and his brother Kuśadhvaja, king of Sāṅkāśya. The Vāyu2 and the Vishnu3 Purāṇas represent Nimi or Nemi as a son of Ikshvāku, and give him the epithet Videha.4 His son was Mithi whom both the Purāṇas identify with Janaka I. The genealogy is then continued to Siradhvaja who is called the father of Sitā, and is, therefore, identical with Janaka II of the Rāmāyana. Then starting from Siradhvaja the Purāṇas carry on the dynasty to its close. The last king is named Kṛiti, and the family is called Janaka-vamśa.

Dhṛitstu Bahulāśvo’ bhūd Bahulāśva-sutaḥ Kṛitiḥ tasmin santishthate vamśo Janakānām mahātmanām5

The Vedic texts know a king of Videha named Namī Sāpya.6 But he is nowhere represented as the founder of the dynasty of Mithilā. On the contrary, a story of the Satapatha Brahmāṇa seems to indicate that the Videhan kingdom owes its origin to Videgha Māthava who came from banks of the Sarasvati.7 We are told that the fire-god went burning along this earth from the Sarasvati towards the east, followed by Māthava and his priest, Gotama Rāhugāṇa till he came to the river

---

1 I. 71.3
2 68. 7-8; 69. 3-4.
3 IV. 5. 1.
4 Sa śāpena Vasishṭhasya Videhā ṣamapadyata—Vāyu P. The story of Vasishtha’s curse on a Videhan king is known to the Brihaddevatā (vii. 59).
5 Vāyu Purāṇa 69, 23. For Janaka as a dynastic designation see also Mbh. III. 153, 17; Rām. I. 67. 8. The use of the expressions Janakānāṁ, Janakaśaṁ etc, does not necessarily indicate that every member of the line bore the personal name Janaka. Cf. Ikshvākuṁ (Rām. I. 5.3), which refers to those who were Ikshvāku-vamśa-prabhavāh (I. 1. 8); Raghunāṁ anvayam, etc.
6 Vedic Index, I, 426.
7 Macdonell Sans. Lit., pp. 214-15; Ved., Ind., II. 266; Sat. Br., 1, 4, 1, etc; Oldenberg’s Buddha, pp. 393-99; Pargiter, J.A.S.B., 1897, p. 86 et seq.
IDENTITY OF THE GREAT JĀNAKA

Sadānirā which flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain, and which he did not burn over. No Brāhmaṇas went across the stream in former times, thinking "it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara (the fire that burns for all men)." At that time the land to the eastward was very uncultivated, and marshy, but after Māthava's arrival many Brāhmaṇas went there, and it was cultivated, for the Brāhmaṇas had caused Agni, the Fire-god, to taste it through sacrifices. Māthava the Videgha then said to Agni, "where am I to abide?" "To the east of this river be thy abode," he replied. Even now, the writer of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa adds, this stream forms the boundary between the Kosalas and the Videhas. The name of Mithi Vaideha, the second king in the Epic and the Purānic lists, is reminiscent of Māthava Videgha.

If Māthava Videgha was the founder of the royal line of Mithilā, Namī Sāpya cannot claim that distinction. The Majjhima Nikāya and the Nimi Jātaka mention Makhādeva as the progenitor of the kings of Mithilā, and a Nimi is said to have been born to "round off the royal house, the family of hermits." The evidence of Buddhist texts thus shows that the name Nimi was borne not by the first, but probably by some later king or kings.

As the entire dynasty of Maithila monarchs was called Janaka-vaṁśa, Vamśo Janakānāṁ mahātmanāṁ, the family of the high-souled Janakas, in post-Vedic literature, and there were several kings bearing the name of Janaka, it is very difficult to identify any of these with the great Janaka of the Vedic texts, the contemporary of

---

1 This is the territory which the Mahābhārata refers to as "Jalodbhava" i.e., reclaimed from swamp (Mbh. II. 30. 4. Pargiter, ibid, 88n).
2 II. 74-83.
3 The evidence of the Brihad-devata (vii. 59) suggests that connection was maintained by Videhan monarchs with their old home on the banks of the Sarasvati, cf. Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, XXV. 10. 16-18 (story of Namī Sāpya).
Āruni and Yājñavalkya. But there is one fact which seems to favour his identification with Siradhvaja of the Purānic list, i.e., the father of Sītā. The father of the heroine of the Rāmāyana is a younger contemporary of Āsvapati, king of the Kekayas (maternal grandfather of Bharata¹), Janaka of the Vedic texts is also a contemporary of Āsvapati, prince of the Kekayas, as Uddālaka Āruni and Budila Āsvatarāsvi frequented the courts of both these princes.² But as the name Āsvapati is also apparently given to Bharata’s maternal uncle,³ it seems that it was possibly not a personal name but a secondary epithet or a family designation like “Janaka.”⁴ In that case it is impossible to say how far the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Sītā is correct. The identification seems, however, to have been accepted by Bhavabhūti. Referring to the father of the heroine, the poet says in the Mahāvīra-charita⁵:

_Teshāmidanīṁ daẏādo_

_vṛddhaḥ SiradhvaJO nṛ pojha_

_Yājñavalkyo muniaryasmai_

_Brahmāparāyaṇam jagau._⁶

It is equally difficult to identify our Janaka with any of the kings of that name mentioned in the Buddhist

¹ Rāmāyana, II. 9. 22.
³ Rāmāyana, VII. 113. 4.
⁴ Against the view that Āsvapati was a family designation common to all members of the line it may, however, be urged that, in the Mbh. vii. 101. 7; 123. 5 Bṛhatksattra, chief of the Kekayas, does not bear that epithet.
⁵ Act I, Verse 14.
⁶ Cf. Act II, verse 48; Uttara-Charita. Act IV, verse 9. In the Mbh. III. 133.4 the contemporay of Uddālaka and Kahoja seems to be called Aindradyumni. (Cf. AIHT. 96.) In Mbh. XII. 310. 4; 3.8. 95, the contemporary of Yājñavalkya is styled Daivarāti. _The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa_ is attributed to this Yājñavalkya (ibid, XII. 313. 11f). Both Aindradyumni and Daivarāti are patronymics and hardly afford a clue to the personal name of the king in question.
Jātakas. Professor Rhys Davids\(^1\) seems to identify him with Mahā-Janaka of the Jātaka No. 539. The utterance of Mahā-Janaka II of that Jānaka

‘Mithilā’s palaces may burn
But naught of mine is burned thereby
indeed reminds us of the great philosopher-king.

In the Mahābhārata\(^2\) we find the saying attributed to Janaka ‘Janadeva’ of Mithilā. In the Jaina Uttar-ādhyāyana, however, the saying is attributed to Namī.\(^3\) This fact coupled with the mention of Nemi in juxtaposition with Arishṭa in the Vishnu-Purāṇa\(^4\) may point to the identification of Namī or Nemi with Mahā-Janaka II whom the Jātaka represents as the son of Arishṭha. If Mahā-Janaka II be identical with Namī, he cannot be identified with Janaka who is clearly distinguished from Namī in the Vedic texts. One may be tempted to identify the Vedic Janaka with Maha-Janaka I of the Jātaka. But proof is lacking.

In the Satapatha Brahmana, the Brihad-āranyaka Upanishad and the Mahābhārata\(^5\) Janaka is called Samrāj. This shows that he was a greater personage than a mere Rājan. Although there is no clear evidence in the Vedic literature of the use of the word Samrāj as emperor in the sense of a king of kings,

---

2. XII. 17. 18-19: 210, 50.
3. “Mithilāyāṁ praṇītāyāṁ
na me dahyati kiñcena”
4. “Api cha bhavaṁ Maithilena gītāṁ
nagaram upāhitam agnīnābhītakṣya
na khalu mama hi dacyate’ tra kiñcitaḥ
svayam idam āha kīla eva bhūmipālaḥ”
5. “Seeing his city burning in a fire, the king of Mithilā himself sang of old,
’in this (conflagration) nothing of mine is burning’.”
7. IV. 5. 13.
8. III. 133. 17.
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still the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa distinctly says that the Samrāj was a higher authority than a Rājan; "by offering the Rājasūya he becomes king, and by the Vājapeya he becomes Samrāj; and the office of king is the lower, and that of Samrāj the higher." In the Āśvalāyana Śrauta-Sūtra Janaka is mentioned as a great sacrificer.

But Janaka's fame rests not so much on his achievements as a king and a sacrificer, as on his patronage of culture and philosophy. The court of this monarch was thronged with Brāhmaṇas from Kosala, the Kuru-Pańchāla countries and perhaps Madra, e.g., Āśvala, Jāratkārava Ārtabāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Uṣhasta(-i) Chākrāyana, Kahoḍa Kaushítakeya. Gārgī Vāchaknavi, Uddālaka Āruṇī and Vidagdha Śākalya. The tournaments of argument which were here held form a prominent feature in the third book of the Brihad-āranyaka Upanishad. The hero of these was Yājñavalkya Vājasaneya, who was a pupil of Uddālaka Āruṇī. Referring to Janaka's relations with the Kuru-Pańchāla Brāhmaṇas, Oldenberg observes: "The king of the east, who has a leaning to the culture of the west, collects the celebrities of the west at his court—much as the intellects of Athens gathered at the court of Macedonian princes."

The Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads throw some light on the political condition of Northern India during the age of the great Janaka. From those works we learn that besides Videha, there were nine states of considerable importance. viz.:


1 Sat. Br., V, 1, 1. 12-13; XII, 8, 3, 4; XIV, 1, 3, 8.
2 X. 3, 14.
3 Bhā. Up. VI. 5, 3.
4 Buddha, P. 398.
The Vedic texts seldom furnish any definite clue as to the exact geographical position of these states. For the location of most of these territories we must, therefore, turn to the evidence of later literature.

The inhabitants of Gandhāra are included by epic poets among the peoples of Uttarāpatha or the northernmost region of India:

Uttarāpatha-janmānah kīrtayishyāmi tān api
Yauna-Kāmboja-Gandhārāḥ Kimātā Barbārāh saha.¹

The country lay on both sides of the Indus,² and contained two great cities, viz., Takshaśilā and Pushkarāvati, alleged to have been founded by two heroes of epic fame:

Gandhāra-vishaye siddhe, tayoh puryau mahātmanoḥ
Takshasya dikshu vikhyāta ramyā Takshaśilā purī
Pushkarasyāpi vīrasya vikhyāta Pushkarāvati.³

The vishaya (territory) described in these lines must have embraced the Rāwalpindi district of the Western Pañjāb and the Peshāwar district of the North-West Frontier Province. A few miles to the north-west of Rāwalpindi and 2,000 leagues away from Banaras,⁴ stood the famous city of Takshaśilā or Taxila. The remains of the great city

---

¹ Ṝabh., XII. 207, 43.
² Rāmāyana, VII. 113, 11; 114, 11; Šindhoro-ubhayahataḥ pāvéve. According to Jātaka no. 406 the kingdom of Gandhāra included Kaśmīra. Hekataios of Miletus (B.C. 549-486) refers to a Gandaric city called Kaspapyros. Stein (JASB, 1899, extra no. 2, 11) equates Kaspapyros with Kaspatyros of Herodotus and says that it must have been situated in that territory where the Indus first becomes navigable, i.e., in the ancient Gandhāra. Kaspatyros was the place at which the expedition under Skylax, sent by Darius to explore the course of the Indus, embarked. Stein (pp. 12-13) rejects the view according to which Kaspapyros represents the Sanskrit Kāśyapapura from which the name Kaśmir is said to have been derived. Kāśyapapura as a place-name is known to Alberuni (1088), but he mentions it as an original designation of Multan. Kāśyapa’s traditional connection with Kaśmir is, however, clear from Rājatarangini, 1,27.
³ Vāyu Purāṇa, 88, 189-90; cf. Rāmāyana, VII. 114, 11.
⁴ Telepatta and Susima Jātakas, Nos. 96, 163.
"are situated immediately to the east and north-east of Sarai-kāla, a junction on the railway, twenty miles north-west of Rāwalpindi. The valley in which they lie is watered by the Haro river. Within this valley and within three and a half miles of each other are the remains of three distinct cities. The southernmost (and oldest) of these occupies an elevated plateau, known locally as Bhir-mound."¹

Pushkarāvati or Pushkalāvati, the Lotus City, (Prākrit Pukkalāoti, whence the 'Peukelaotis' of Arrian) is represented by the modern Prang and Chārsadda, 17 miles north-east of Peshāwar, on the Swāt river.²

Gandhāra is a later form of the name of the people called Gandhāri in the Rīg-Veda and Atharva-Veda. In the Rīg-Veda³ the good wool of the sheep of these tribesmen is referred to. In the Atharva-Veda⁴ the Gandhāris are mentioned with the Mūjavats, apparently as a despised people. The Brāhmaṇa texts refer to Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, and his son Svarjit. The former receives Brāhmaṇic consecration, but observations of the family on ritual are treated with contempt.⁵ In later times the 'angle of vision' of the men of the Madhya-deśa (Mid-India) changed, and Gandhāra became a resort of scholars of all classes who flocked to its capital for instruction in the three Vedas and the eighteen⁶ branches of knowledge.

² Schoff, The Periplus of the Ethiopicae, pp. 133-54; Foucher, Notes on the Ancient Geography of Gandhāra, p. 11; cf. V. A Smith, JASS, 1889, 111; Cunningham, AGI, 1924, 57 f. Strabo (XV. 26) extends Gandaritla westwards to the Chauespes (Kunar?).
³ I. 126. 7,
⁴ V, 22. 14. cf. Mbh. VIII, 44, 45; 45, 8 etc.
⁵ Aiitareya, vii. 34. Satapatha, vii. 1, 4. 10. Vedic Index, i. 432
GANDHĀRA

In a significant passage of the Chhāndogya Upanishad¹ Uddālaka Aruṇi, the contemporary of the Vedic Janaka, mentions Gandhāra to illustrate the desirability of having a duly qualified teacher from whom a pupil "learns (his way) and thus remains liberated (from all worldly ties) till he attains (the Truth or Beatitude, Moksha)." A man who attains Moksha is compared to a blindfold person who reaches at last the country of Gandhāra. The passage runs as follows:

"Yathā somya purushām Gandhārebhyo' bhinadhāksham āniya taṁ tato' tijane visrijet, sa yathā tatra prān vā utaṁ vādharān vā pratyān vā pradhīmaṇīyata—abhinad-dhāksha ānito' bhinadhāksho visrīṣṭaḥ. Tasya yathā-bhinahananā pramuchya prabrūyād etāṁ diśām Gandhārā etāṁ diśām vrajeti. Sa grāmām grāmām prichchhaṇ paṇḍito medhāvī Gandhārān evopasampadyeta, evam eva-hāchāryavān purusho veda."

"O my child, in the world when a man with blindfold eyes is carried away from Gandhāra and left in a lonely place, he makes the east and the north and the south and the west resound by crying 'I have been brought here blindfold, I am here left blindfold.' Thereupon (some kind-hearted man) unties the fold on his eyes and says 'This is the way to Gandhāra; proceed thou by this way.' The sensible man proceeds from village to village enquiring the way and reaches at last the (province) of Gandhāra. Even thus a man who has a duly qualified teacher learns (his way)." ²

The full import of the illustration becomes apparent when we remember that the Uddālaka Jātaka³ represents Uddālaka as having journeyed to Takshaśilā (Takkaśilā) and learnt there of a world-renowned teacher. The

¹ VI, 14.
² Cf. Dr. R. L. Mitra's translation of the Chhāndogya Upanishad, p. 114
³ No. 487.
Setaketu Jātaka¹ says that Śvetaketu, son of Uddālaka, went to Takshaśilā and learned all the arts. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions the fact that Uddālaka Āruṇi used to drive about amongst the people of the northern country.² It is stated in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa³ that Brāhmaṇas used to go to the north for purposes of study. Th: Jātaka tales are full of references to the fame of Takshaśilā as a university town. Panini, himself a native of Gandhāra, refers to the city in one of his Sūtras.⁴ An early celebrity of Takshaśilā was perhaps Kauṭilya.⁵

The Kekayas were settled in the Western Pañjab between Gandhāra and the Beas. From the Rāmāyaṇa⁶ we learn that the Kekaya territory lay beyond the Vipāśa or Beas and abutted on the Gandharva or Gandhāra Vishaya. The Mahābharata⁷ associates them with the Madras (Madrāśa saha Kekayaiḥ). Arrian⁸ places the “Kekians” on the river Saranges, apparently a tributary of the Hydraotes or the Rāvi.

The Vedic texts do not mention the name of its capital city, but the Rāmāyana informs us that the metropolis was Rājagriha or Girivraja:

"Ubbau Bharata-Satrughnau Kekayeshu parantapau pure Rājagrihe ramye mātāmaha-niveśane."⁹

"Both Bharata and Satrughna, repressers of enemies, are staying in Kekaya in the charming city of Rājagriha, the abode of (the) maternal grandfather (of the former)."

¹ No. 377.
³ VII. 6. Vedic Index II. 279.
⁴ Sūtra iv. 3, 93; AGI (1924), 67.
⁶ II. 63. 19-22; VII. 113-14.
⁷ VI. 61. 12; VII. 19. 7. Madra-Kekayaiḥ.
⁸ Indīka, iv; Ind. Ant. V. 332; Me Criddle, Megasthenes and Arrian. 1926, pp. 168, 196.
⁹ Rām., II. 67. 7.
"Girivrajam puravaram sīghram āsedur añjasā"

"The messengers bound for Kekaya) quickly arrived at Girivraja, the best of cities."

The journey from Ayodhyā to the Kekaya capital, a distance of about 650 miles, took seven days. Videha could be reached from Ayodhyā on the fourth day. The distance is about 200 miles. The slower rate is explained by Pargiter by absence of good roads. Cunningham identifies the capital of the Kekayas with Girjak or Jalalpur on the river Jhelam.²

There was another Rājagṛiha-Girivraja in Magadha, while Hiuen Tsang mentions a third Rājagṛiha in Po-bo or Balkh.³ In order to distinguish between the Kekaya city and the Magadhān capital, the latter city was called "Girivraja of the Magadhas."⁴

The Purāṇas⁵ tell us that the Kekayās along with the Madrakas and the Uśinaras, were branches of the family of Anu, son of Yayāti. The Anu tribe is frequently mentioned in the Rīg-Veda.⁶ It appears from a hymn of the eighth Maṇḍala⁷ that they dwelt in the Central Paṇjab, not far from the Parushnī, the same territory which we find afterwards in possession of the Kekayās and the Madrakas.

The king of Kekaya in the time of the Vedic Janaka was Aśvapati, a name borne also by the maternal grandfather and maternal uncle of Bharata.⁸ The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa⁹ and the Chhāndogya Upanishad¹⁰ suggest that the Kekaya monarch was a man of learning and that he instructed a number of Brāhmaṇas, viz. Aruṇa Auyayesi

---

¹ Rām., II. 68. 22.
² Rām., I. 69, 7; II. 71, 13. AGI, 1924, 188; JASR, 1895, 250 ff.
³ Best, Si-yu ki, Vol. I, p. 44.
⁴ S. B. E., XIII, p. 150.
⁵ Matsya, 48. 10. 20; Vāyu, 99. 12-23.
⁶ I. 108. 8; VII. 18. 14; VIII. 10. 5.
⁷ 74.
⁸ Rām. II. 9, 22; VII. 113. 4.
⁹ X. 6. 1. 2.
¹⁰ V. 11. 4 et seq.
Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushi, Mahāśāla Jābāla, Buḍīla, Āśvatarāśvi, Indradyumna Bhāllaveya, Jana Śārkara-kshya, Prāchīnaśāla Aupamanyava, and Uddālaka Āruṇi. The reference to Aruṇa Aupaveśi who belongs to an older generation than Uddālaka, shows that Āśvapati was an elder contemporary of the great philosopher-king of Videha.

The Jain writers tell us that one-half of the kingdom of Kekaya was Aryan, and refer to the Kekaya city called "Seyaviyā." A branch of Kekayas seems to have migrated to Southern India in later times and established its authority in the Mysore country.²

The Madras people were divided into several sections viz., the northern Madras, the eastern Madras, the southern Madras or Madras proper etc. The northern Madras known as Uttarā-Madras, are referred to in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as living beyond the Himavat range in the neighbourhood of the Uttarā-Kurus, possibly, as Zimmer and Macdonell conjecture, in the land of Kaśmir. The eastern Madras probably occupied some district to the east of Siālkot, not far from Trigartta or Kangra.³

The southern Madras were settled in the Central Pañjab in the territory lying to the west of the river Irāvatī or Rāvi.⁴ In later times the eastern limits extended to the Amritsar district which was included within the Madra-deśa in the days of Guru Govind Singh.⁵ The ancient capital (properly puṭa-bhedana) was Śākala or Sāgala-nagara (modern Siālkot). This city is mentioned in the Mahābhārata.⁶

---

⁴ Cod., VIII. 44. 17.
⁵ Malcolm, Sketch of the Sikhs, p. 56.
and several Jātakas\(^1\) and is probably hinted at in the name 'Sākalya,' given to a Vedic teacher who graced the court of Janaka. It stood on the banks of the Āpaga\(^2\) in a tongue of land between two rivers styled the Sākala-dvīpa,\(^3\) apparently corresponding to a part of the Rechna Doāb.

The Madras proper are represented in early post-Vedic works as living under a monarchical constitution. The name of the ruler of the territory in the time of Janaka is not known. It was politically not of much importance. But, like the northern realms described above, it was the home of many famous scholars and teachers of the Brāhmaṇa period such as Madragāra Saunāgāyani and Kāpya Pataṅchala,\(^4\) one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddālaka Ārunī.\(^5\) The early epic knows the Madra royal house\(^6\) as a virtuous family. But in later times Madra earned notoriety as the seat of outlandish peoples with wicked customs.\(^7\)

The country of the Uśinaras was situated in the Madhya-deśa or Mid-India. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^8\) says ‘asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratisṭhāyāṁ diśi,’ ‘in this firmly established middle region,’ lie the realms of the Kuru-Paṅchālas together with Vaśas and Uśinaras. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad also the Uśinaras are associated with the Matsyas, the Kuru-Paṅchālas and the

---

1 E. g., Kālidāsabhedhi Jātaka, No. 479; and Kusa Jātaka, No. 531.
2 Mbh. VIII. 44, 10; Cunn. AČI, 1921, 211f. Cunningham identifies this Āpaga with the Ayak rivulet which rises in the Jamnu hills and joins the Chenāb.
3 Mbh. 11, 26, 5.
4 Weber. Ind. Lit., 126
5 Brihad. Up., III. 7, 1.
6 Cf. Sāvapati and his daughter Savitri.
7 For detailed accounts of the Madras see Dr. H. C. Ray in JASB, 1933, 257; and Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India, p. 214. Mr. S. N. Mitra points out that the Paramattha-dipani on the Therigāthā (p. 127) (wrongly) places Sāgala-nagara in Magadha-raṭhā. But the Āpadāna quotations on p. 131 leave no room for doubt that Madra is the correct name of the kingdom of which Sāgala (Sākala) was the capital.
8 VIII. 14.
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Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushi, Mahāśāla Jābāla, Buḍila, Āsvatarāśvi, Indradyumna Bhāllaveya, Jana Śārkara-kshya, Prāchīnaśāla Aupamanyava, and Uddālaka Āruṇi. The reference to Āruṇa Aupavesi who belongs to an older generation than Uddālaka, shows that Āsvapati was an elder contemporary of the great philosopher-king of Videha.

The Jaina writers tell us that one-half of the kingdom of Kekaya was Aryan, and refer to the Kekaya city called "Seyaviya." A branch of Kekayas seems to have migrated to Southern India in later times and established its authority in the Mysore country.¹

The Madra people were divided into several sections viz., the northern Madras, the eastern Madras, the southern Madras or Madras proper etc. The northern Madras known as Uttara-Madras, are referred to in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as living beyond the Himavat range in the neighbourhood of the Uttara-Kurus, possibly, as Zimmer and Macdonell conjecture, in the land of Kaśmir. The eastern Madras probably occupied some district to the east of Siālkot, not far from Trigarta or Kangra.²

The southern Madras were settled in the Central Pañjab in the territory lying to the west of the river Irāvati or Rāvi. In later times the eastern limits extended to the Amritsar district which was included within the Madra-deśa in the days of Guru Govind Singh.³ The ancient capital (properly puṭa-bhedana) was Śākala or Sāgala-nagara (modern Siālkot). This city is mentioned in the Mahābhārata.⁴

---

¹ Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375.
³ Pāṇini, IV. 2. 107-8; Cf. Association of Madras and Trigarttas, Mbh. VI. 61
⁴ Cf. Mbh., VIII. 44. 17.
⁵ Malcolm, Sketch of the Sikhs, p. 55.
⁶ II. 89. 14. Tatak Śākalamabhytya Madrāyāh puṭabhedanam.
and several Jātakas\(^1\) and is probably hinted at in the name ‘Sākalya,’ given to a Vedic teacher who graced the court of Janaka. It stood on the banks of the Āpagā\(^2\) in a tongue of land between two rivers styled the Śakala-dvīpa,\(^3\) apparently corresponding to a part of the Rechna Doab.

The Madras proper are represented in early post-Vedic works as living under a monarchical constitution. The name of the ruler of the territory in the time of Janaka is not known. It was politically not of much importance. But, like the northern realms described above, it was the home of many famous scholars and teachers of the Brāhmaṇa period such as Madragāra Śaṅgāyani and Kāpya Patañchala,\(^4\) one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddālaka Āruṇi.\(^5\) The early epic knows the Madra royal house\(^6\) as a virtuous family. But in later times Madra earned notoriety as the seat of outlandish peoples with wicked customs.\(^7\)

The country of the Usīnara was situated in the Madhya-deśa or Mid-India. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^8\) says ‘asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratisīthayāṁ disī,’ ‘in this firmly established middle region,’ lie the realms of the Kuru-Pañchālas together with Vaṣas and Usīnara. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad also the Usīnara are associated with the Misyas, the Kuru-Pañchālas and the

---

\(^1\) E. g. Kāliṅgabedhi Jātaka, No. 479; and Kusa Jātaka, No. 531.
\(^2\) Mbh. VIII. 44. 10; Cunn. AGI, 1924, 211f. Cunningham identifies this Āpagā with the Ayak rivulet which rises in the Jammu hills and joins the Chenáb.
\(^3\) Mbh. II. 26. 5.
\(^4\) Weber. Ind. Lit., 126
\(^6\) Cf. Aśvapati and his daughter Śāvitrī.
\(^7\) For detailed accounts of the Madras see Dr. H. C. Ray in JASB, 1922, 257; and Law, Some Ksetriya Tribes of Ancient India, p. 214. Mr. S. N. Mitra points out that the Paramatthā-dīpani on the Therigāthā (p. 127) (wrongly) places Śāgala-nagara in Magadha-raṭṭha. But the Apadāna quotations on p. 131 leave no room for doubt that Madra is the correct name of the kingdom of which Śāgala (Śakala) was the capital.
\(^8\) VIII. 14.
Vaśas. They probably lived in the northernmost part of the Madhya-deśa, for in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa the Usīnaras and the Vaśas are mentioned just before the Udichyas or northerners:1 Kuru-Paṅchāleśhu Aṅga-Magadheshu Kāśi-Kausalyeshu Śālva-Matsyeshu sa Vaśa-Uśinaresha-Udichyeshu.

The Mahābhārata speaks of ‘Usīnara’ as sacrificing on two small streams near the Jumna.2 In the Kathā-sarit-sāgara Usīnara giri is placed near Kanakhala, the ‘sanctifying place of pilgrimage at the point where the Ganges issues from the hills.’3 It is, doubtless, identical with Usira-giri of the Divyāvadāna4 and Usira-dhvaja of the Vinaya Texts.6 Pāṇini refers to the Usīnara country in several sūtras.5 Its capital was Bhoja-nagara.7

The Rīg-Veda9 mentions a queen named Usmarāṇi. The Mahābhārata, the Anukramaṇi and several Jātakas mention a king named Usīnara and his son Śibi.9 We do not know the name of Janaka’s Usīnara contemporary. The Kaushitaki Upanishad tells us that Gārgya Bālāki, a contemporary of Ajātaśatru of Kāśi, and of Janaka of Videha, lived for some time in the Usīnara country.

Matsya is usually taken to “include parts of Alwar, Jaipur and Bharatpur,” being “the kingdom of the king Virāṭa of the Mahābhārata, in whose court the five Pāṇḍava

1 Gop. Br. II. 9.
2 Mbh. III. 130. 21.
4 P. 22.
6 II. 4. 20; IV. 2. 118.
7 Mbh., V. 112. 2. Por Ahvara, a fortress of the Usīnaras, see Ind. Ant., 1885, 322.
8 X, 59. 10.
brothers resided incognito during the last year of their banishment.' But Alwar seems to have been the territory of a neighbouring people—the Sálvas. The Matsya country lay to the south of the Kurus of the Delhi region and to the west of the Súrasenas of Mathurá. Southward it may have approached the river Chambal, westward it reached the Sarasvatí. The Mahábhárata mentions a people called the Apara-Matsyas whom Pargiter places on the hill tracts on the north bank of the Chambal. The Rámáyána has a reference to the Vira-Matsyas in connection with the Sarasvatí and the Ganges. The Matsya capital has been identified by Cunningham with Bairaṭ in the Jaipur State. Pargiter thinks that the capital was Upaplavya. But according to Nílakaṇṭha, the commentator, Upaplavya was "Virāta-nagara-samāpastha-nagarāntaram," a city close to the metropolis, but not identical with it.

The Matsyas first appear in a passage of the Rig-Veda where they are ranged with the other antagonists of Sudās, the great Rigvedic conqueror. The Satapatha Brähmana mentions a Matsya king named Dhvasan Dwaitavana who celebrated a horse-sacrifice near the

1 Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, p. 53.
3 Mbh. II. 31.2-7; III.21-25; IV.5.4; Rám. II.71.5 Pargiter points out (JASB, 1895, 250ff) that the Matsya Country lay southward from Khándjava-prastha (Delhi region). Its position to the west of Súrasena (Mathurá district) is brought out clearly by the description of the journey of the Páṇḍu princes to the court of Virāja. Crossing the Jumna the heroes passed through the territory, north of the Dasārgas and south of the Paśchálas and then proceeded through the countries of the Yákri-Bomas and the Súrasenas to the Matsya realm. From Upaplavya, a suburb of the Matsya capital, to Hásinapura, the metropolis of the Kurus in the epic age, was less than two days' journey by chariot. Vrīkaśthala on the way could be reached by a traveller in the evening on the first day.
4 AGI. 1924, 367; I.A.V. 179. For a Virāta-nagara in South India, see Bomh. Gaz. II. ii, 558.
5 JASB, 1895, 292.
7 VII. 18.6.
Sarasvatī. The Brāhmaṇa quotes the following gāthā (song):

_Chaturdaśa Dvaitavano rājā samgrāmajidd-hayān_  
_Indṛya Vṛitraghne' badhnāttasmād Dwaitavanaṁ sara(itī).

'Fourteen steeds did king Dvaitavana, victorious in battle, bind for Indra Vṛitrahan, whence the lake Dvaitavana (took its name)'. The Mahābhārata mentions the lake as well as a forest called Dvaitavana which spread over the banks of the river Sarasvatī.¹

In the _Gopatha Brāhmaṇa_² the Matsyas appear in connexion with the Śālavas, in the _Kaushitaki Upanishad_³ in connexion with the Kuru-Paṇchālas, and in the _Mahābhārata_ in connexion with the Trigarttas⁴ of the Jālandar Doāb, and the Chedis of Central India.⁵ In the _Manu-Samhitā_⁶ the Matsyas together with Kuru-kshetra, the Paṇchālas, and the Sūrasenakas comprise the holy enclave of the Brāhmaṇa sages(Brahmarshi-desa).

The name of Janaka’s contemporary ruler is not known. That the country was important in the time of the great philosopher-king of Videha, is known from the _Kaushitaki Upanishad_.

The Kuru country tried to maintain its reputation as a home of Brāhmaṇical culture in the age of Janaka. But scholars hailing from that region appear now in the role of students thirsting for philosophical knowledge rather than authorities on sacrificial ritual. This probably points to a new development in the social life of the people, a development that synchronises with the end of the period of prosperity under Parikshit and his immediate successors and the beginning of economic distress hinted at in the _Chhāndogya Upanishad_.⁷ The

¹ _Mbh._ III.24-25  ² _1. 2. 9_  ³ _IV. 1_  ⁴ _Mbh., Bk._ IV.  ⁵ _33-1-2; 33-1-3_  
⁶ _V. 74-16_  ⁷ _II. 19_  ⁸ _1. 10. 1-7._
time was soon to come when they would listen even to the heterodox teaching of new faiths that grew up in Eastern India. For the present Kuru Brāhmaṇas (e.g., Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa) took an active part in discussions about Brahmāṇ and ātman at the court of Videha. The intellectual life of the eastern kingdom must have been greatly stirred by the exodus of Kurus and perhaps also of the Pañchālas that took place about this time. An exodus from Constantinople in a like manner enriched the life of the people of western Europe in the fifteenth century A.D.

If the Purānic list of Janamejaya’s successors be accepted as historical, then it would appear that Nichakshu was probably the Kuru king of Hāstinapura in the time of Janaka.

1. Janamejaya ... 1. Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka
2. Satānīka ... 2. Dṛiti Aṅdrota (son and pupil)
3. Aśva-medha-datta 3. Pulusha Prāchīṇayogya (pupil)
4. Adhisīma-krishṇa 4. Pulushhi Satyayajña (pupil)
5. Nichakshu ... 5. Somaśūshma Sātyayajñī (pupil); Janaka’s contemporary.

Curiously enough, it is Nichakshu who is represented in the Purāṇas as the remover of the seat of government from Hāstinapura to Kauśāmbī. We have some indication that the city of Kauśāmbī really existed about this time. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa makes Proti Kauśāmbeya a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi who figured in the court of Janaka. It is thus clear that Kauśāmbeya was a contemporary of Janaka. Now, Harisvāmin in his commentary on the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa understood

---

Kauśāmbeya to mean a ‘native of the town of Kauśāmbi.’ It is, therefore, permissible to think that Kauśāmbi existed in the time of Janaka, and hence of Nichakshu. There is thus no difficulty in the way of accepting the Purānic statement. According to the Purāṇas the change of capital was due to the inroad of the river Ganges. Another, and a more potent, cause was perhaps the devastation of the Kuru country by Maṭachā. It is also possible that the attitude of the Abhirapatārīṇa branch of the royal family towards sacrificial ritual had something to do with the exodus. From this time the Kurus in the homeland appear to have gradually lost their political importance. They sank to the level of a second-rate power. But the memory of the majesty and power of the Bharata dynasty survived till the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.  

Pañchāla comprised the Bareilly, Budaun, Furrukhabad and the adjoining districts of Rohilkhand and the Central Doab in the modern Uttar Pradesh. It appears to have been bounded on the east by the Gumti and on the south by the Chambal. On the west lay the Yakrillummas and the Śūrasenas of Mathurā. Belts of dense forests separated it from the Ganges and the realm of the Kurus on the north-west. Northward it approached the jungles that cover the region near the source of the Ganges. There is no clear trace in the Vedic literature of the Epic and Jātaka division of the Pañchālas into northern (Uttara) and southern (Dakshina). But it knew an eastern

---

1 Kauśāmbeya may no doubt also mean “a descendant of Kuśāmba.” Even then the city can hardly be dissociated from the eponymous hero of the family. Cf. Kramadīśvara, p. 791—Kuśāmbenā nirūttī Kauśāmbi-nagari.
2 XII. 5. 4. 11-14; 21-23.
3 Mahadadya Bharatānam na pūrvā nāpāre janāh
divyam mārgya ita pakṣābhāhyāṁ nādāpanāḥ saplamānacā (iti)
4 Ṛig-Veda, V. 61. 17-19; Mbh. I. 138. 74; 150f.; 166; IV. 5. 4; IX. 41.
division because the Samhit-ópanishad Bráhmaṇa makes mention of the Práchya (eastern) Pañchálas. The existence of the other two may, however, be hinted at in the expression tryanīka, "threefold", occurring in the Vedic texts. One of the ancient capitals of Pañchála was Kám-pilya which has been identified with Kampil on the old Ganges between Budaun and Furrukhabad. Another Pañchála town Parivakrā or Parichakrā is mentioned in the Satapatha Bráhmaṇa. It is identified by Weber with Ekachakrā of the Mahābhārata.

The Pañchálas, as their name indicates, probably consisted of five clans—the Krivis, the Turvaśas, the Kesins, the Śrīnjayas and the Somakas. Each of these clans is known to be associated with one or more princes mentioned in the Vedic texts—the Krivis with Kravya Pañchála, the Turvaśas or Taurvaśas with Sona Sátrāsaha, the Kesins with Keśin Dālbhya, the Śrīnjayas with Daivavāta, Prastoka, Vitahavya, Suplan or Sahadeva Sārṇjaya and Dush-taritu, and the Somakas with Somaka Sāhadevyā. Of the kings only the first three are definitely associated with Pañchála.

The Krivis appear in a Rigvedic hymn which also mentions the Sindhu (Indus) and the Asiknī (Chenāb). But their actual habitation is nowhere clearly indicated.

1 Ved. Ind., I. 400; Cf. also Patañjali (Kielhorn's ed., Vol. 1, p. 19) and Ptolemy's Prastāke (vii. I. 53) which included the towns of Adisdrā (Ahi chhattrā) and Kanagura (Kanauj).
2 Vedic Index, I. 187.
3 Vedic Index, I. 149; Cumm. in JASB, 1865, 173; AGI, 1924, 413.
4 XII, 5. 4. 7.
5 Vedic Ind., I. 494.
6 According to the Purāṇas (Brahma P. XIII. 94 f.; Cf. Matsya, 50. 3) 'Mudgala,' 'Śrīnjay,' 'Bṛhadisah,' 'Yavinara' and 'Krimilāśva' were the constituent elements of the Pañchāla Janapada.
They are identified with the Pañchālas in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and connected with Parivakrā.

A gāthā of the same work says, ‘When Sātrāsāha (King of the Pañchālas) makes the Aśvamedha offering, the Taurvaśas arise, six thousand and six (sic) and thirty clad in mail.’

Sātrāsahe yajamāne śvamedhena Taurvaśāh udirate trayastrimśah shatsahasrāṇi varminām.

This points to a very close connexion between the Pañchālas and the Taurvaśas. The fusion of the two folks does not seem to be improbable in view of the Purānic statement that, after Marutta, the line of Turvaśu (Turvaśa, Taurvaśa) was merged into the Paurava line of which the Pañchālas are represented as an offshoot. The line of rulers to which Sona belonged seems to be connected in later times with Abichchhatra (in the Bareilly District). The Keśina who are connected with the Pañchālas in Vedic literature probably dwelt on the Gumti. The Srinjayas are associated with the Pañchālas in post-

1 xiii, 5, 4, 7; Krīraya iti ha vai purā Pañchālān āchakshate. Vedic Index, 1. 196, According to Kaśiṭṭān Rūnaw, Acta Orientalia, XVI, iii, 1937, p. 165 Krīya were named after a dragon-demon who was their tribal divinity.

2 Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 401; Sat. Br. XIII, 5, 4, 16. H. K. Deb (Vedic India and Mediterranean men, Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig) suggests the identification of the Turvaśas with the Teresh, or Tursha, one of the allied peoples who fought against Menneptah, or Menephtah, Pharaoh of Egypt (c. 1234-25 B.C.). Breasted, however, identifies the Teresh with the Tyreanians or Etruscans (A History of Egypt, p. 467).


5 Ved. Ind., I. 186-187. The name Keśin Dālbhya suggests a close connexion between the Keśins and the Dālbhyanas whom the Rig-Veda (V, 61, 17-19) places on the Gemati. From Mbh. IX. 41, 1-3 it is clear that this Gemati connected with the Dālbhya family or clan, could not have been far away from Naimisha and the country of the Pañchālas. It must, therefore, be identified with the Gumti which flows past Nimsār near Sitāpur.

Vedic tradition. In the Mahābhārata,¹ Uttamaouajas is called a Pañchālya as well as a Śriṅjaya. The clan probably lived on the Jumna in epic times.² As to the Somakas, their connection with the Pañchālas is known throughout the great epic.³ They occupied Kāmpilya and its neighbourhood.

The royal family of the Pañchālas is represented in bardic tradition as an offshoot of the Bharata dynasty.⁴ Divodāsa, Sudās (a) and Drupada are included among the kings of this line. Divodāsa and Sudās also figure in the Rig-Veda where they are closely connected with the Bharatas.⁵ But they are not mentioned as Pañchāla kings. In the Mahābhārata Drupada is also called Yajñasena and one of his sons is named Śikhandin.⁶ A Śikhandin Yajñasena ia mentioned in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa,⁷ but it is not clear whether we are to regard him as a prince, or as a priest of Keśin Dālbhya, King of the Pañchālas.

The external history of the Pañchālas is mainly that of wars and alliances with the Kurus. The Mahābhārata preserves traditions of conflict between these two great peoples. We are told by the epic that Uttara-Pañchāla was wrested from the Pañchālas by the Kurus and given away to their preceptor.⁸ Curiously enough, the Somanassa Jātaka⁹ places Uttara-Pañchāla-nagara in Kuru raṭṭha. The relations between the two peoples (Kurus and

¹ Mbh. VIII. 11. 31; 75. 9.
² Mbh. iii. 90. 7. with commentary.
³ Cf. Mbh., I. 195. 31; 193. 1; II. 77. 10; Dhriśta-dyumnaḥ Somakānām pravarah; Saumakir Yajñasena iti.
⁴ Mbh., śādi., 94. 33; Matsya, 50. 1-16; Viṣṇu, 99. 194-210.
⁵ Ved. Ind., I, p.363; II., pp. 59. 454
⁶ Mbh., śādi., 166. 24; Bhishma, 190, et seq.
⁷ VII. 4.
⁸ Mbh. i. 166.
⁹ No. 505. The union of Kuru-Pañchālas is hinted at in Jaim. Up, Br. III. 7. 6.
Pañchālas) were sometimes friendly and they were connected by matrimonial alliances. Kesīn Dālbhya or Dārbhya, king of the Pañchālas, was sister's son to Uchchhaisravas, king of the Kurus.¹ In the epic a Pañchāla princess is married to the Pāṇḍavas who are represented as scions of the Kuru royal family.

Of the famous kings of the Pañchālas mentioned in the Vedic literature Pravahaṇa Jaivali is known definitely to have been Janaka’s contemporary. This prince appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Āruṇi, Śvetaketu, Silaka Śālavatya, and Chaikitaśya Dālbhya.² The first two teachers are known to have met the Vedic Janaka.

The kingdom of Kāsi was 300 leagues in extent.³ It had its capital at Vāraṇaśi (Benares) also called Ketumati, Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahma-vaddhana, Pupphavatī, Ramma, and Molini.⁴ The walls of the city were twelve leagues round by themselves.⁵

The Kāsīs, i.e., the people of Kāsi or Kāsi, first appear in the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda.⁶ They were closely connected with the Kosalas and the Videhas. Jala Jātukarnya is mentioned in the Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra⁷ as having obtained the position of Purohita or priest of the three peoples of Kāsi, Videha and Kosala in the lifetime of Śvetaketu, a contemporary of Janaka. Curiously enough, a king named Janaka is mentioned in the

---

¹ Ved. Ind., I. 84, 187, 468. Uchchhaisravas occurs as the name of a Kuru prince in the dynastic list of the Mahābhārata, I. 94, 88.
³ A stock phrase, Dhajavāheṣṭha Jātaka, No. 391.
⁴ Dialogues, Part III, p. 73. Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 50-51. The name Vāraṇaśi is derived from two little rivers between which the city was situated—Vāraṇāyāstathā ek āṣya madhye Vāraṇaśi puri (Pādma, Sṛgga khaṇḍa, xvii. 50).
⁵ Tanḍulanāli Jātaka, No. 5.
⁶ Ved. Ind., II, 116 n.
⁷ XVI. 29, 5.
Sattubhasta Jātaka¹ as reigning in Benares. This prince cannot be the Janaka of the Upanishads, for we learn from those works that, in the time of the famous Janaka, Ajātaśatru was on the throne of Kāsi.

Very little is known regarding the ancestors of Ajātaśatru. His name does not occur in the Purānic lists of Kāsi sovereigns,² nor does the name of Dhṛitarāśṭra, king of Kāsi, who was defeated by Śatānīka Śatrājīta with the result that the Kāsīs down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa gave up the kindling of the sacred fire. A clue to the lineage of Dhṛitarāśṭra is afforded by the Mahāgovindu-Sūttanta³ which represents “Dhataratḥa,” King of Kāsi, as a Bharata prince. The Purāṇas represent the Kāsi family as a branch of the house of Purūravas, the traditional ancestor of the Bharatas. Of the kings mentioned in the chronicles the names of two only (Divodāsa and his son or descendant Daivadāsi Pratardana) can be traced in the Vedic literature. But the later Vedic texts connect them with the Naimishīyas and not with Kāsi.⁴

The Jātakas often refer to the failure of heirs at Benares (aputtakaṁ rājakulam), or the deposition of princes in favour of more competent rulers taken from other families. It is clear that tradition does not regard the Kāsi monarchs as belonging to one and the same dynasty. Some of the kings hailed from Magadha.⁵ Several others were probably of Videhan origin. Many of the princes belonging to these groups had the cognomen, ‘Brahmadatta.’ That Brahmadatta was not the name of one individual

¹ No. 402.
² Vāyu, 99. 21-74; Vishṇu, IV, 8. 2-9.
³ Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, p, 270.
⁴ Kaush. Br. xxvi, 5.
⁵ Cf. Jātakas, 378, 401, 529.
ruler, has been suggested by Mr. Haritkrishna Dev. The Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas refer to a group of one hundred (i.e. many) Brahmadattas:

Satāṁ vai Brahmadātānāṁ
virāṇāṁ Kuravah ātām.°

The "hundred" Brahmadattas are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata.° In the Dummedha Jātaka the name is borne both by the reigning king and his son (Kumāra). In the Gaṅgamāla Jātaka king Udaya of Benares is addressed by a Pachcheka Buddha as "Brahmadatta" which is distinctly stated to be a kulanāma or family designation.

The Brahmadattas were not, however, all of the same extraction. The king-elect of the Darimuka Jātaka was originally a Magadhan prince. Some of the other Brahmadattas were of Videhan lineage. The Mātiposaka Jātaka, for instance, referring to a Brahmadatta of Kāśi, has the following line:

mutto'mhi Kāsirājena Vedehena yasassinā ti.

In the Sambula Jātaka° prince Sotthisena, son of Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, is called Vedehaputta:

Yo putta Kāsirājassa Sotthiseno ti tam vidū
tassāhama Sambulā bhariya, evam jānāhi dānava,
Vedehaputto bhaddan te vane vasati āturo.

Ajātaśatru, Janaka's contemporary on the throne of Kāśi, may have been a Brahmadatta though his exact...
lineage is not known. The Upanishadic evidence shows that he was a contemporary of Uddalaka. The *Uddalaka Jātaka* tells us that the reigning king of Benares in the time of Uddalaka was Brahmadatta.

Ajātaśatru appears in the *Upanishads* as engaged in philosophical discussions with Gārgya Bālāki. In the *Kaushitaki Upanishad* he is represented as being jealous of Janaka’s fame as a patron of learning. The *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* mentions a person named Bhadrasena Ajātaśatrava who is said to have been bewitched by Uddalaka Aruni. Macdonell and Keith call him a king of Kāsi. He may have been the son and successor of Ajātaśatru.

The kingdom of *Kosala* corresponds roughly to the modern Oudh. It seems to have extended northward to the foot of the Nepāl hills. In the east it was separated from Videha by the river Sadānīrā, which was for a time the limit of the Aryan world in that direction. Beyond it was an extensive marshy region, not frequented by Brāhmanas which, after Māthava Videgha’s occupation, developed into the flourishing kingdom of Videha. The story of Māthava makes it clear that the Kosalas fell later than the peoples dwelling on the banks of the Sarasvati but earlier than the Videhas under the influence of Brāhmanical civilization. In the south Kosala was bounded by the river Sarpikā or Syandikā and on the west probably by the Gumti which flowed past the famous Naimisha forest and apparently formed the boundary between the Kosalas and sundry peoples including the

---

1 V. 5, 5, 14.
2 S. B. E., XL1, p. 111.
3 The form Kosala is met with in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* (Vedic Index), I. 195 and later literature.
Pañchálas.¹ In the epic Kosalas proper are distinguished from the Uttara-Kosalas, the Kosalas near the Venvá (Waingangá) and the Prák-Kosalas. The last two peoples were clearly in South India.² The Púrva-Kosalas, apparently not identical with the Prák-Kosalas of the Deccan, dwelt between the river Sarayú and Mithilá.³

The Vedic texts do not mention any city in Kosala. But if the Rāmāyaṇa is to be believed the capital of Kosala (Kosalapura) in the time of the Janakas was Ayodhyá. It stood on the banks of the Sarayú and covered twelve yojanas.⁴ The Ríg-Veda mentions the river Sarayú and refers to an Aryan settlement on its banks.⁵ One of the Árya settlers bears the name of Chitrarathá which occurs also in the Rāmāyaṇa,⁶ as the appellation of a contemporary of Daśarathá. A prince styled Daśarathá is eulogised in a Rígvedic hymn,⁷ but there is nothing to identify him with the Ikshvákú king of that name who appears in the Rāmāyaṇa as the Kosalan contemporary of Siradhvaja Janaka. Daśarathá's eldest son, according to the epic, was Rámá who married Sítá, daughter of Janaka. The Ríg-Veda⁸ mentions an Asura (powerful being) named Rámá but does not connect him with Kosala. The Daśarathá Jātaka makes Daśarathá and Rámá kings of Várānasí and disavows Sítá's connection with Janaka.

¹ Rám, II. 68. 13; 71. 16-18; VII. 104. 15. (Kosalan king sacrificing in the Naimísha forest on the Gumti); cf. Mbh. XII. 355. 2; IX. 41. 3 (Pañchálas apparently not far from Naimísha). In Ríg V. 61. 17-19, the Dálbhyas, a Pañchála people, are placed on the Gumti.
² Mbh. II. 30. 2-3; 31. 12-13.
³ Mbh. II. 30. 28.
⁴ Rám. I. 55. 7. It is in the Fyzabad District of Oudh. For the name Kosalapura see Rám, II. 18. 38.
⁵ IV. 30. 18.
⁶ II. 32. 17.
⁷ I. 126. 4.
⁸ X. 93. 14.
Kosala was probably the fatherland of Janaka’s hotri priest, Āśvala, who was very probably an ancestor of Āśvalāyana Kausalya1 mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a disciple of Pippalāda and a contemporary of Sukeśa Bhāradvāja and of Hiraṇyanābha, a Kosalan prince. The details of Kosalan history will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

1 Āśvalāyapātyam Āśvalāyanaḥ (Śaṅkara’s commentary on Praśna Upanishad, 1. 1).
SECTION III. THE LATER VAIDEHAS OF MITHILA:

NIMI AND KARĀLA.

The Purāṇas give long lists of the successors of Śrīradhvaja Janaka1 whom Bhavabhūti seems to identify with the contemporary of Yājñavalkya.2 With one or two exceptions none of the kings in these lists can be satisfactorily identified with the Videhan monarchs mentioned in the Vedic, Buddhist and Jaina literature. It is, therefore, difficult to say how far the lists are reliable. The identification of any of the kings named in the bardic chronicles with the Vedic Janaka is the most knotty of all problems. We have already noted the arguments that can be urged in support of the view of Bhavabhūti. The mere fact that Śrīradhvaja is placed high in the Purānic lists does not necessarily prove that he actually flourished long before the extinction of the dynasty. It should be remembered in this connection that Pradyota who was in reality a contemporary of Bimbisāra, king of Magadha, is placed by the Purānic chroniclers or scribes some nine generations before that ruler, and Siddhārtha of the Ikshvāku list, a contemporary of Prasenajit of Kosala, is represented as the grandfather of the latter. The evidence of the Vishnupurāṇa3 suggests that there were at times several collateral lines of Janakas who ruled contemporaneously. The problem of Śrīradhvaja must, therefore, be regarded as sub judice. In view of the uncertainty about the identification of this king and his proper place in the

1 Vāyu, 89. 18-23; Vishnupurāṇa, IV. 5. 12-13; 4th edition of this work, pp. 67 ff.
2 Mahābhārata-charita, I, verse 14; II, verse 43; Uttararāma-Charita, IV, verse 9.
dynastic list, it is not easy to determine which of the Videhan kings mentioned in the Purānic chronicles actually came after the contemporary of Ārunī and Yājñavalkya. The evidence of the Jātakas, however, suggests that a king named Nimi, at any rate, ruled after the great Janaka, as he is called the penultimate sovereign of the dynasty. Pargiter places all the kings of the Purānic lists down to Bahulāśva before the Bhārata war, and apparently identifies his son Kṛitakṣaṇa of the Mahābhārata, a contemporary of Yudhishṭhīra. But as there were “Janakas,” even after Yudhishṭhīra, and as two Purāṇas conclude with the remark that with Kṛiti ends the race of the Janakas,” the identification of Kṛiti, the last of the race, with Kṛitakṣaṇa does not seem to be plausible. It is more reasonable to identify Kṛiti of the Purāṇas with Karāla Janaka who, as we shall see below, brought the line of Vaideha kings to an end. The only objection to this view is that Karāla is represented as the son of Nimi, whereas Kṛiti was the son of Bahulāśva. But the cognomen Nimi may have been borne by several kings and Bahulāśva may have been one of them. An alternative theory would be to represent Kṛiti and Karāla as the last members of two collateral lines of Janakas.

The Vedic texts mention besides Māthava and Janaka two other Vaideha kings, namely, Namī Sāpya and Para Āhlāra. Macdonell and Keith identify the latter with Para Āṭṇāra, king of Kosala, about whom we shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Namī Sāpya is mentioned in the Pañchavimśa or Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa as a famous sacrificer. His identification with king Namī of the Uttar-ādhyayana

1 AIBT, p. 149.
2 II. 4. 27.
3 AIBT, pp. 96,330.
4 XXV. 10. 17-18.
Sūtra¹ Nemi of the Vishnu Purāṇa, and Nimi of the Makhādeva Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, and the Kumbhakāra² and Nimi Jātakas³ is more or less problematical. In the last-mentioned work it is stated that a Nimi was the penultimate sovereign of the Maithila family. According to the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra he was a contemporary of Dummukha (Dvimukha), king of Pañchāla, Naggaji (Naggati) of Gandhāra and of Karanḍa (Karakanḍu) of Kalinga. This synchronism accords with Vedic evidence. Durmukha, the Pañchāla king, had a priest named Brāhaduktha⁴ who was the son of Vāmadeva.⁵ Vāmadeva was a contemporary of Somaka, the son of Sahadeva.⁶ Somaka had close spiritual relationship with Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, and Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra.⁷ From this it seems very probable that Durmukha was a contemporary of Nagnajit. This is exactly what we find in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra.

The Nimi Jātaka says that Nimi was “born to round off” the royal family “like the hoop of a chariot wheel.” Addressing his predecessor the soothsayers said, “Great king, this prince is born to round off your family. This your family of hermits will go no further.”

Nimi’s son Kalāra Janaka⁸ is said to have actually brought his line to an end. This king is apparently identical with Karāla Janaka of the Mahābhārata.⁹ In the Arthaśāstra attributed to Kautilya it is stated that “Bhoja,
known by the name of Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relations; so also Karāla, the Vaideha. Karāla, the Vaideha, who perished along with his kingdom and relations, must be identified with Kalara (Karāla) who, according to the Nimi Jātaka, brought the line of Videhan kings to an end. The downfall of the Vaidehas reminds us of the fate of the Tarquins who were expelled from Rome for a similar crime. As in Rome, so in Videha, the overthrow of the monarchy was followed by the rise of a republic—the Vajjian Confederacy.

There is reason to believe that the Kāsi people had a share in the overthrow of the Videhan monarchy. Already in the time of the great Janaka, Ajātaśatru, king of Kāsi, could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan king’s fame. The passage "yathā Kāśyo vā Vaideho vā Ugraputra ujjyam dhanur adhijyam kriyā dvau vāṇavantau sapatnaticyādhinau haste kriyā-opatishṭhad" probably refers to frequent struggles between the heroes of Kāsi and Videha. The Mahābhārata refers to the old story (itiḥāsam purātanam) of a great battle between Pratardana, king of Kāsi according to the Rāmāyana, and Janaka, King of Mithilā. It is stated in the Pāli commentary Param-attha-jotikā that the Lichchhavis who succeeded Janaka’s dynasty as the strongest political power in North

1 The evidence of the Arthadāstra is confirmed by that of the Buddhacharita of Asvaghosa (IV. 80). "And so Karāla Janaka, when he carried off the Brāhmaṇa’s daughter, incurred loss of caste thereby, but he would not give up his love."
2 Brihad Upanishad, III. 8. 2. "As the Ugra’s son from Kāsi or from Videha strings the slackened bow and arises with two foe-piercing arrows in his hand." (Winteritz, Ind. Lit. translation I, 229 with slight emendations).
3 XII. 99. 1-2.
4 VII. 48. 15.
Bihar, and formed the most important element of the Vajjjian Confederacy, were the offsprings of a queen of Kāsi. This indicates a belief in later ages that cadets from the royal family of Kāsi established themselves in Videha.
SECTION IV. THE DECCAN IN THE AGE OF THE LATER VAIDEHAS

The expression "Dakshināpada" occurs in the Ṛig-Veda and refers to the region where the exile goes on being turned out. In the opinion of several scholars this simply means "the south" beyond the limits of the recognised Aryan world. Dakshiṇātya is found in Pāṇini, Dakshināpatha is mentioned by Baudhāyana coupled with Surāśṭra. It is difficult to say what Pāṇini or Baudhāyana exactly meant by Dakshiṇātya or Dakshināpatha. In early Pāli literature the name Dakshiṇāpatha is sometimes coupled with Avanti (Malwa), and in one text it is placed on the banks of the upper Godāvari. In the Nalopākhyaṇa of the Mahābhārata, Dakshināpatha is placed beyond Avanti and the Vindhyas, and to the south of the Vidarbhas and the (Southern) Kosalas. The last-mentioned peoples lived on the banks of the Wardhā and the Mahānadi. In the Digvijaya-parva, Dakshināpatha is distinguished from the Pāṇḍyan realm in the southernmost part of the Madras Presidency. In the Gupta Age it certainly stretched from the land of the Kosalas to the kingdom of Kañcō. In later times it embraced the whole of Trans-Vindhyan India from the Setu (Adam's Bridge) to the Narmadā.

Whatever may have been the exact denotation of the terms discussed above in the earliest times it is certain that already in the age of the later Vaidehas, Nimi and Karūla,

1 X. 61, 8. Vedic Index, I. 337.
2 Baudh. Śautra, I. 1. 29.
3 DPPN. 1. 1050; Mbh. II. 31. 16-17; III. 61. 21-23. Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta; Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 341 n. The Periplus distinguishes Dachinabades (Dakshināpatha) from Damirica (Tamil land).
the Aryans had crossed the Vindhyas and established several kingdoms in the territory that stretched from the Revā or the Narmadā to the Godāvari. One of these realms was Vidarbha. It comprised modern Berar, the Varadātaṇa of the Āin-i-Ākbari, and a considerable portion of the Central Provinces lying between the Wardhā (Varadā) and the Wāingaṅgā. In the north it reached the Payoshnī, a tributary of the Tāptī.¹ Vidarbha was certainly a famous kingdom in the time of Nimi. We have already seen that the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttar-ādhya-yana make him a contemporary of Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, who is known from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa² to have flourished about the same time as Bhīma, king of Vidarbha:

"Etamu haiva prochatuḥ Parvata-Nāradau Somakāya Sāhadevyāya Sahadevyāya Sārṇjayaḥ Babhrave Daivāvridhāya Bhīmāya Vaidarbhāya Nagnajite Gandhārāya."

"This Parvata and Nārada proclaimed to Somaka Sāhadevya, Sahadeva Sārṇjaya, Babhru Daivāvridha, Bhīma Vaidarbha (i.e. of Vidarbha) and Nagnajit of Gandhāra.³"

Vidarbha, therefore, existed as an independent kingdom in the time of Nimi. From the Purānic account of the Yadu family it appears that the eponymous hero of the Vidarbhas, was of Yadu lineage.⁴ The country is mentioned in the Jaimitiṇiya Brāhmaṇa.⁵ It was famous for its Māchalas, perhaps a species of dog, which killed tigers⁶—"Vidarbheṣu mācalas sārmeṣyā apiha sārdulān mārayanti."⁷ The Praśna Upanishad⁸ mentions a sage of

---

¹ Mbh. III. 61, 22-23; 120, 31.
² VII. 34.
³ Matsya Purāṇa, 44, 36; Vāyu Purāṇa, 95, 35-36.
⁴ II, 440: Ved. Ind., II. 297.
⁵ JAOS, 19, 100.
⁶ L. I; II. 1.
Vidarbha named Bhārgava as a contemporary of Āśvalāyana. Another sage called Vidarbhi Kauṇḍinya is mentioned in the Brīhadāraṇyaka Upanishad.¹ The name Kauṇḍinya is apparently derived from the city of Kuṇḍina, the capital of Vidarbha,² represented by the modern Kauṇḍinya-pura on the banks of Wardhā in the Chāṇḍur taluk of Amraoti.³ The association of Vidarbha with Kuṇḍina clearly suggests that Vidarbha of the Vedic texts lay in the Deccan, and not in some hitherto unknown region outside its boundaries as contended by a well-known writer.⁴

If the evidence of the Kumbhakārā Jātaka has any value, then Nimi, king of Videha, mentioned in the work, Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, and Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, must be considered to have been contemporaries of Kauṇḍu of Kaliṅga. It follows from this that the kingdom of Kaliṅga, too, was in existence in the time of Nimi and his contemporaries of the Brāhmaṇa period. The evidence of the Jātaka is confirmed by that of the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta,⁵ makes Sattabha, king of Kaliṅga, a contemporary of Reṇu, king of Mithilā and of Dhataraṭṭha or Dhṛtarāṣṭra, king of Kāsi, mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.⁶ There can thus be no doubt that Kaliṅga existed as an independent

¹ Vedic Index, II. 297.
² Mbb., III. 73, 1-2; V. 157. 14; Harivamśa, Vishṇupārṇa, 59-60.
⁴ Indian Culture, July, 1936, p. 12. Curiously enough, the same writer, who characterises the provisional acceptance of the uncontradicted testimony of the Purāṇas and lexicons in locating tribes mentioned in Vedic literature as unhistorical, has no hesitation in identifying the Satavats of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa with the Vādavas and in placing them in the Mathurā region and adorning districts (ibid., 15). He has not referred to any Vedic text which supports his conjecture regarding the identity of the Satavats and their association with the particular city named by him.
⁵ Dialogues of the Buddha, II. 270.
⁶ XIII. 5, 4, 22.
kingdom in the time of which the Brāhmaṇas speak. It is mentioned both by Pāṇini¹ and Baudhāyana.² The latter regards it as an impure country but evidently not unfrequented by Aryans.³ According to epic tradition it comprised the whole coast from the river Vaitaranī⁴ in Orissa to the borders of the Andhra territory. The southern boundary of the Janapada was not well-defined. It reached Yellamanchili and Chipurupalle in the Vizagapatam district and at times even Pishtapura or Pithapuram, north-east of the Godāvari, but not the river itself which flowed through the Andhra country. Pargiter says that Kaliṅga as a settled kingdom appears to have consisted properly of the plain between the Eastern Ghats (Mahendra range) and the sea. But its kings seem to have exercised suzerainty over the Jungle tribes which inhabited the hills far inland, for the Amarakaṇṭaka range, in which the Narmadā rises, is said to be in the western part of Kaliṅga. That large tracts of the country were covered with forests appears from references to Kaliṅga-ranya in Pāli texts. The windows of the capital city in the days of Kālidāsa looked out on the sea, and the deep roar of the waves drowned the sound of trumpets.⁵ In the days of Yuan Chhwang Kaliṅga occupied a much smaller area. It is distinguished from Wu-t’u (Orissa) and Kung-yü-t’o (Koṅgoda in the Ganjam district) in the north, and An-to-lo (Andhra or Veṅgi) in the south, and seems to have embraced parts of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts. We learn from the Jātakas that an

¹ IV, I, 170.
² I, i, 30-31.
³ There was a considerable Brāhmaṇa population in Kaliṅga in the days of Aśoka (cf. Edict XIII).
⁴ Mbh., III, 114, 4.
⁵ Ind. Ant., 1923, 67; Ep. Ind., XII, 2; JASB, 1897, 98 ff; Kārma, P. II, 39, 9; Pādmas, Svarga-Khaṇḍa, VI, 22; Vāyu, 77, 4-13; Malalasekera, DPPN, 584; Raghuvamśa, vi, 56.
ancient capital of Kaliṅga was Dantapura-nagara. The Mahābhārata mentions Rājapura as the metropolis. The Mahāvastu refers to another city named Siṃhapura. The Jaina writers mention a fourth town called Kam-chaṇapura.

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta refers to another southern realm, namely, Assaka or Āsmaka on the God(h)āvari, which existed in the time of the monarchs Reṇu and Dhata-raṭṭha (Dhrīta-raṣṭra). It was ruled by king Brahmadatta who held his Court at Potana.

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa alludes to princes of the South who are called Bhojas and whose subjects are called

---


2 XII. 4. 3.


4 Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375. The Bhūmikhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa (47.9) mentions Śrīpura as a city in Kaliṅga.

5 Sutta Nīpāṭa, 977; SBE, X, p. ii, 184 Cf. Assagī (Bomb. Gaz. I. 1. p. 593; Megasthenes and Arrian, 1926, 145) of classical writers. Āsmaka is also mentioned by Pāṇini, IV. I. 178. As the name signifies “the stony region”, it can hardly refer to Aśvaka, the land of the Assakenoi in the north-west, which the Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, connect with the Sanskrit āśīra, and Iranian āspa, horse. The Commentator Bhāṭṭavāmī identifies Āṣmaka with Mahārāṣṭra. The capital was Potali or Potana (Challakaliṅga Jātaka No. 301; Assaka J. (207); D. 2. 235; Parishaṭa parvan, I. 92, nagara Potanābhidhe, Bomb. Gaz. I. 1. 385; Law, Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective, 74; Mbb. I. 177. 47; cf. Pādana of Lūḍera' List, 616, and N. G. Majumder's List, 658 (Monuments, p. 365—Visākhā Pāḍā(m)yasa). Dr. Sukthankar points out that the Panḍanya of the printed editions of the Mahābhārata is a late corruption. The older MS. give the name as Potana or Podana. This name reminds one of Bodhan in the Nizam's dominions which lies to the south of the confluence of the Manjīrā and the Godāvari. The city of Podana is said to have been founded by a prince of the Ikshvāku family, who is the eponymous hero of the land of Āṣmaka. The neighbouring people of Mālaka also claimed Ikshvāku descent (Vṛgyu, 88, 177-178).

6 VIII. 14
Satvats: "dakṣiṇasyāṁ diṣi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ rājāno Bhaujiyāyaiva te'bhishichyante Bhoj-etye-nān-abhishiktān-āchakshata—" "in the southern region whatever kings there are of the Satvats, they are anointed for Bhaujya; 'O Bhoja' they style them when consecrated (in accordance with the action of the deities)." In the Satapatha Brahmaṇa the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats, and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice are referred to. These Satvats must have been living near Bharata's realm, i.e., near the Ganges and the Yamunā. But in the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa they probably moved farther to the south. They are placed in the southern region (dakṣiṇā diṣ) beyond the "fixed middle region"—the land of the Kurus, Pañchālas and some neighbouring tribes. The Pañchāla realm, according to epic testimony, extended as far south as the Chambal. The Satvat people of the "southern region" mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, therefore, in all probability, lived beyond that river. Their kings were called Bhojas. This account of the Satvats and the Bhojas, deduced from the Brāhmaṇic statements, accords with Purānic evidence. It is stated in the Purāṇas that the Sātva(ṣ)as and the Bhojas were offshoots of the Yadu family which dwelt at Mathurā on the banks of the Yamunā. We are further told by the same authorities that they were the kindreds of the southern realm of Vidarbha. We have evidence of a closer connection between the Bhojas and the last-mentioned territory. A place called Bhojakaṇa, is included

1 XIII, 5. 4. 21.
2 ibid, XIII, 5.4. 11.
3 Muh., I. 183, 74; Dakṣiṇaḥchāpi Pañchālaṃ yaṣvach Charmayvati nadi.
4 Matsya, 43. 48; 44, 46-48; Vāyu, 94. 52; 95, 18; 96. 1-2; Viṣṇu IV 18. 1-6.
5 Māl., 44. 36; Vāyu, 95. 95-96.
within Vidarbha both by the Mahābhārata and the Harivamśa. The Chammak grant of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II makes it clear that the Bhojakata territory included the Ilichpur district in Berar, a part of ancient Vidarbha. As pointed out by Dr. Smith, the name of Bhojakata, ‘castle of the Bhojas,’ implies that the province was named after a stronghold formerly held by the Bhojas, an ancient ruling race mentioned in the edicts of Asoka. Kālidāsa in his Raghuvamśa calls the king of Vidarbha a Bhoja.

But Vidarbha was not the only Bhoja state. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa refers to several Bhoja kings of the south. A line of Bhojas must have ruled Dāṇḍaka. A passage in the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra runs thus:—

"Dāṇḍakyaḥ nāma Bhojaḥ kāmāt Brāhmaṇa-kanyām abhimanyamānas sabandhu-rāśṭro vinanaśa"—a Bhoja known as Dāṇḍakya, or king of Dāṇḍaka, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa girl, perished along with his relations and kingdom. We learn from the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka that the kingdom of Dāṇḍaki (Dāṇḍaka) had its capital at Kumbhavati. According to the Rāmāyana, the name of the metropolis was Madhumanta, while the Mahācāstau places it at Govardhana (Nāsik).

It is clear, from what has been stated above, that there were in the age of the later Vaidehas, and the treatises called Brāhmaṇas, many kingdoms in the south, both

1 V. 157. 15-16.
2 Vishṇu puraṇa, 60. 33.
4 In Ind. Ant., 1923, 262-63, Bhojakata is identified with Bhat-kuli in the Amraoti district.
5 V. 39-40.
6 Cf. also Mbh., V. 48. 74; 157. 17; Harivamśa, Vishṇu puraṇa, 47, 5.
7 Ed. 1919, p. 11.
8 No. 592.
9 VII. 92. 18.
Aryan and non-Aryan, namely, the Bhoja kingdoms, one of which was Vidarbha, and another, probably, Danḍaka, as well as Aśmaka and Kaliṅga. With the exception of these organised states the whole of Trans-Vindhyān India was occupied by non-Aryan (dasyu) tribes such as the Andhras, Savaras, Pulindas and probably also the Mūtibas.¹

In the opinion of Dr. Smith the Andhras were a Dravidian people, now represented by the large population speaking the Telugu language, who occupied the deltas of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā. Mr. P. T. Srinivās Iyengar argues that the Andhras were originally a Vindhyān tribe and that the extension of Andhra power was from the west to the east down the Godāvarī and Kṛishṇā valleys.² Dr. Bhandarkar points out that the Serivāṇij Jātaka places Andhapura, i.e., the āra or capital of the Andhras, on the river Telavāhā which he identifies with the modern Tel or Telingiri.³ But if 'Seri' or Śrī-rājya⁴ refers to the Gaṅga kingdom of Mysore, Telavāhā may have been another name of the Tuṅgabhadrā-Kṛishṇā, and Andhapura identical with Bevāḍa or some neighbouring city.⁵ The Mayidavolu plates of the early Pallava ruler Śivaskanda-varman prove that the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) embraced the lower valley of the Kṛishṇā and had its centre at Dhaṁkakṣa i.e., Bevāḍa, or some neighbouring city on the south bank of the

¹ *Ait. Br.*, VII. 18.
² *Ind. Ant.*, 1913, pp. 276-78.
³ *Ind. Ant.*, 1918, p. 71. There is also a river called 'Ter' in South India, *Ep. Ind.*., XXII. 29.
⁴ *Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions*, 38. 'Seri' may also refer to Śrī Vijaya or Śrī Vishaya (Sumatra ?).
⁵ The name Telavāhā, oil-carrier, reminds one of the passages "Vikhyāta Kṛishṇā-venṇā (=Kṛishṇā) taila-snehopalabdhā saralatvā" (IA, VIII. 17, cf. *Ep. XII.* 153.) — "with a smoothness caused by sesame oil of the famous (river) Kṛishṇā."
Kṛishṇā.¹ Yuan Chwang applies the name An-to-lo (Andhra) to the district round Ping-ki-lo (Veṅgipura) near Ellore. In later times the Andhra-Khaṇḍa extended from the Godāvari to the borders of Kaliṅga (ärabhya Gautamanaditaṭam ākalingam) and included Pithāpurī (Pithapuram)².

The Ṣavaras and the Pulindas are described in the Matsya and the Vāyu Purāṇas as Dakshiṇā-patha-vāsinah, inhabitants of the Deccan, together with the Vaidarbhās and the Daṇḍakas:

_Teshām pare janapadā Dakshiṇā-patha-vāsinah._

* * * *

Kārūshāścha saha-Ishikā Ātavyāḥ Ṣavaraś tathā Pulindā Vindhya-Pushikā (?) Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha.³ Abhirāḥ saha cha-Ishikāḥ Ātavyāḥ Ṣavaraścha ye Pulindā Vindhya-Mūlikā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha.⁴

The Mahābhārata also places the Andhras, Pulindas and Ṣavaras in the Deccan:

_Dakshiṇā-patha-janmānāḥ sarve naravar-Andhrakāḥ Guhāḥ Pulindāḥ Ṣavaraś Chuchukā Madrakaiḥ (?) saha⁵_

The precise position and extent of the country of the Ṣavaras in the Brāhmaṇa period cannot be shown. They are usually identified with the Suari of Pliny and the Sabarae of Ptolemy, and are probably represented by the

---

¹ Hultsch (Ep. Ind. VI. 85) identified the city with Amaravati. Burgess suggested Dharaṇikoja which lies about 18 miles to the westward from Bezvāḍa, on the right bank of the Kṛishṇā. Ferguson, Sewell and Watters prefer Bezvāḍa itself (Yuan Chwang, II. 316). In the days of the great Chinese pilgrim An-to-lo (Andhra) had its capital at Ping-ki-lo or Veṅgipura in the Kṛishṇā district.

² Watters : II. 260f IA, xx, 93; Ep. Ind., IV, 357.

³ Matyu, 114. 46-48.

⁴ Vāyu, 45. 126.

⁵ Mbh., XII. 307. 42.
Savaralu, or Sauras of the Vizagapatam Hills, and the Savarises of the Gwalior territory.¹

The capital of the Pulindas (Pulinda-nagara) probably lay to the south-east of the Daśārṇas² who dwelt on the river Dasān (Dhasan) in Bundelkhand.³

The location of the territory of the Mūtibas, another Dasyu tribe mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa along with the Andhras, Pulindas, and Savarases, is not so certain. Pliny refers to a tribe called "Modubae," and places them along with other peoples between the "Modogalingae," who inhabited a very large island in the Ganges and the Andarœs (Andhras).⁴ The Modubae are associated with the Molindae and the Uberae, perhaps corresponding to the Pulindas and the Savarases of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. In the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra⁵ the Mūtibas are called Mūvipa or Mūchipa. It is not altogether improbable that the last name is connected with that of the river Musi in the Deccan on which Hyderabad now stands.⁶

¹ Ind. Ant., 1879, p. 262; Cunn. AGI, new ed., pp. 583, 596; The Imp. Gaz. The Indian Empire, 1, 384. Savarases are also found in the south-east portion of the district of Raipur (JASB, 1890, 289), in Sambalpur and Ganjam (ibid. 1891, 33), the western part of the Cuttack district as well as the north-western portion of Vizagapatam (ibid., 1897, 321).
² Mbh., II. 5-10.
³ JASB: 1895, 253; Kālidāsa places them in the Vidiśa or Bhiles region (Meghadūta, 24-25).
⁴ M'Grindle, Megæthenes and Arrian, 1926, p. 139-140.
⁵ XV. 26. 6.
CHAPTER III. MAHĀJANAPADAS AND KINGSHIP

SECTION I. THE SIXTEEN MAHĀJANAPADAS.

The Vedic texts do not throw much light on the political condition of the period which elapsed from the fall of the Videhan monarchy, probably early in the sixth century B.C., to the rise of Kosala under Mahākosala, the father-in-law of Bimbisāra, about the middle of that century. But we learn from the Buddhist Aṅguttara Nikāya that during this period there were sixteen states of considerable extent and power known as the "Solasa Mahājanapada." These states were:

1. Kāsi (Kāśi)
2. Kosala (Kośala)
3. Aṅga
4. Magadha
5. Vajji (Vṛjī)
6. Malla
7. Chetiya (Chedi)
8. Vaṁśa (Vatsa)
9. Kuru
10. Pañchāla
11. Macchhāya (Matsya)
12. Sūrasena
13. Assaka (Aṃśaka)
14. Avanti
15. Gandhāra
16. Kamboja

These Mahājanapadas flourished together during a period posterior to Karāla-Janaka but anterior to Mahākosala, because one of them, Vajji, apparently rose to power after the fall of the Videhan monarchy, while another, namely, Kāsi, lost its independence before the time of Mahākosala and formed an integral part of the Kosalan empire in the latter half of the sixth century B.C.

The Jaina Bhagavati Sūtra\(^2\) gives a slightly different list of the sixteen Mahājanapadas:

---

1 P. T. S. I., 213; IV, 252, 256, 260. The Mahāvastu (I. 34) gives a similar list, but omits Gandhāra and Kamboja, substituting in their place Śibi and Daśārṇa in the Punjab (or Rājputāna) and Central India respectively. A less complete list is found in the Jana-vasabha-suttanta.

2 Sayu xy Uddessa I (Heerne, the Uvāsagadasāo, II Appendix); W. Kirsfel, Die Kosmographie Der Inder, 225.
1. Áṅga  
2. Bāṅga (Vaṅga)  
3. Magaha (Magadha)  
4. Malaya  
5. Mālava (ka)  
6. Achehha  
7. Vachehha (Vatsa)  
8. Kochehha (Kachchha ?)  
9. Pāḍha (Pāṇḍya or Pauṇḍra)  
10. Lāḍha (Lāṭa or Rāḍha)  
11. Bajji (Vajji)  
12. Moli (Malla)  
13. Kāsi (Kāsi)  
14. Kosala  
15. Avāha  
16. Sambhuttara (Sumhottara ?)

It will be seen that Áṅga, Magadha, Vatsa, Vajji, Kāsi, and Kosala are common to both the lists. Mālava of the Bhagavatī is probably identical with Avanti of the Aṅguttara. Moli is probably a corruption of Malla. The other states mentioned in the Bhagavatī are new, and indicate a knowledge of the far east and the far south of India. The more extended horizon of the Bhagavatī clearly proves that its list is later than the one given in the Buddhist Aṅguttara. We shall, therefore, accept the Buddhist list as a correct representation of the political condition of India after the fall of the House of Janaka.

Of the sixteen Mahājanapadas Kāsi was probably at first the most powerful. We have already seen that Kāsi probably played a prominent part in the subversion of the Videhan monarchy. Several Jātakas bear witness to the superiority of its capital Benares over the other cities, and the imperial ambition of its rulers. The Guttīla Jātaka² says that the city of Benares is the chief city in all India. It extended over twelve leagues³ whereas

---

¹ Mr. E. J. Thomas suggests (History of Buddhist Thought, p. 6) that the Jaina author who makes no mention of the northern Rambojas and Gandhāras but includes several south Indian peoples in his list, “wrote in South India and compiled his list from countries that he knew.” If the writer was really ignorant of the northern peoples his Mālavas could not have been in the Pañjab and must be located in Central India. In that case his account can hardly be assigned to a very early date.

² No. 243.

³ “Deśadasa-gejanikom sakala-Bārāpasi-magarom” — Sambhava Jātaka No. 815; Sarabha-miga J., 483; Bhūridatta J., 543.
Mithilā and Indapatta were each only seven leagues in extent.\(^1\) Several Kāsi monarchs are described as aspirants for the dignity of the chief king of all kings (sabbarājunam aggurājā), and lord of the whole of India (sakala-Jambudīpa).\(^2\) The Mahāvagga also mentions the fact that Kāsi was in former times a great and prosperous realm, possessed of immense resources:

"Bhūtapubbam bhikkhave Bārānasīyam Brahmadatto nāma Kāsirājā ahosi aḍḍho māhaddhano māhābhogo mahadbalo māhāvāhano māhāvijito pariṇṇakosa-kottāgāro."

The Jainas also afford testimony to the greatness of Kāsi, and represent Aśvasena, king of Benares, as the father of their Tirthaṅkara Pārśva who is said to have died 250 years before Mahāvīra, i.e., in or about 777 B.C.

Already in the Brāhmaṇa period a king of Kāsi, named Dhṛtarāṣṭra, attempted to offer a horse-sacrifice, but was vanquished by Satānika Sātrājīta with the result that the Kāsis down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, gave up the kindling of the sacred fire.\(^4\) Some of the other Kāsi monarchs were more fortunate. Thus in the Brahāchatta Jātaka\(^3\) a king of Benares is said to have gone against the king of Kosala with a large army. He entered the city of Sāvatthī and took the king prisoner. The Kosāmbi Jātaka,\(^6\) the Kunāla Jātaka,\(^7\) and the Mahāvagga\(^8\) refer to the annexation of the kingdom of Kosala.

---

1. Suruchī, J., 489; Vidhurapandita J., 545.
2. Bhaddasāla Jātaka, 465; Dhenasākha Jātaka, 863.
3. Mahāvagga, X, 2. 3; Vinaya Piṭakam, 1, 349.
5. No. 396.
6. No. 428.
7. No. 586.
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by the Brahmadattas of Kāsi. The Assaka Jātaka refers to the city of Potali, the capital of Assaka on the Godāvari, as a city of the kingdom of Kāsi. Evidently the reigning prince of Potali was a vassal of the sovereign of Kāsi. In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka Manoja, king of Benares, is said to have subdued the kings of Kosala, Aṅga and Magadha. In the Mahābhārata Pratardana, king of Kāsi, is said to have crushed the power of the Vitahavyas or Haihāyas. In the absence of corroborative evidence it is difficult to say how far the account of the achievements of individual kings, mentioned in the Jātakas and the epic, is authentic. But the combined testimony of many Jātakas and the Mahāaṇagga clearly proves that Kāsi was at one time a great, almost an imperial power, stronger than many of its neighbours including Kosala.

We learn from the Bhojājāniya Jātaka that "all the kings round coveted the kingdom of Benares." We are told that on one occasion seven kings encompassed Benares. Benares in this respect resembled ancient Babylon and mediæval Rome, being the coveted prize of its more warlike but less civilized neighbours.

1 The reference in the Mahābhārata (I. 105. 47 ff; 106. 2, 13; 113. 43; 114. 3f; 126, 16; 137, 24) to Kāsi princesses, the mothers of Dhītarāśtra and Pāṇḍu, as Kausalyā, possibly points to the traditional union of the two realms of Kāsi and Kosala in the period when part of the epic was compiled. The expression Kāsi-Kausalyā already occurs in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (Vedic Index. I. 195).
2 No. 207.
3 No. 532.
4 XIII. 30.
5 Dr. Bhandarkar points out that several Kāsi monarchs, who figure in the Jātakas, are also mentioned in the Purāṇas, e. g., Vissāsena of Jātaka No. 263, Udaya of Jātaka No. 458, and Bhallāṭya of Jātaka No. 504 are mentioned in the Purāṇas as Vishvakṣena, Udakasena and Bhallāṭa. Matsya, 49. 57 et seq. Vāyu. 99. 180 et seq.; Vishṇu, IV. 19. 13.
6 No. 23.
7 Jātaka, 181.
The Kingdom of Kosala, as we have seen, was bounded on the west by the Gumti, on the south by the Sarpikā or Syandikā (Sai) river, on the east by the Sadānīrā which separated it from Videha, and on north by the Nepāl hills. It included the territory of the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, possibly on the Gumti, and that of the Sākyas of Kapilavastu in the Nepalese Tarai. In the Sutta Nipāta the Buddha says, "Just beside Himavanta there lives a people endowed with the power of wealth, the inhabitants of Kosala. They are Adichchas by family, Sākiyas by birth; from that family I have wandered out, not longing for sensual pleasures." The Majjhima Nikāya, too, mentions the Buddha as a Kosalan:

"Bhagavā pi Kosalako aham pi Kosalako".

The political subjection of the Sākyas to the king of Kosala in the latter half of the sixth century B.C. is clear from the evidence of the Aggaṇṭa Suttanta and the introductory portion of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka.

Kosala proper contained three great cities, namely Ayodhyā, Sāketa and Śrāvasti or Śrāvastī, besides a number of minor towns like Setavyā and Ukkaṭṭha. Ayodhyā (Oudh) was a town on the river Sarayū now

1 Bām. II. 49.11-12; 50. 1; VII. 104. 15.
2 Aṅguttara Nikāya, I. 188 (PT3); IC. II. 806. In the Rigveda, V, 61, the Dālḥyas, a family or clan closely connected with the Keśins (who possibly gave their name to Kesaputta), are placed on the Gumti.
4 Kosalesu niketino. As pointed out by Rhys Davids and Stede, Niketin means 'having an abode,' 'being housed,' 'living in,' cf. J. III, 492—dumasekhā-niketini.
5 Belonging to the Āditya (Solar) race (cf. Lüders, Ins., 929 i).
6 II. 124.
7 Dīgha Nikāya, III (P.T.S.), 88; Dialogues III. 80.
8 No. 465; Fausboll, IV, 145.
9 Pāṭāsa Suttanta.
10 Ambattha Sutta.
included in the Fyzabad district. Sāketa is often supposed to be the same as Ayodhya, but Professor Rhys Davids points out that both cities are mentioned as existing in the Buddha’s time. They were possibly adjoining like London and Westminster. Sāvatthi is the great ruined city on the south bank of the Achiravati or Rāpti called Sāheṭ-Māheṭ, which is situated on the borders of the Gonda and Bhaṛaich districts of the present Uttar Pradesh.

In the Rāmāyaṇa and in the Purāṇas the royal family of Kosala is represented as being descended from a king named Ikshvāku. Branches of this family are represented as ruling at Kusinārā, at Mithila and at Viśāla or Vaiśāli. A prince named Ikshvāku is mentioned in a passage of the Rig-Veda. In the Atharva-Veda either this king, or one of his descendants, is referred to as an ancient hero. The Purāṇas give lists of kings of the Aikshvāka dynasty from Ikshvāku himself to Prasenajit, the contemporary of Bimbisāra. The names of many of these kings are probably found in the Vedic literature. For example:—

Mandhātri Yuvanāśva is mentioned in the Gopatha Brāhmana. Purukutsa is referred to in the Rig-Veda.

1 Buddhist India, p. 39.
2 Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, 1924, p. 469; Smith, E. H. I., 3rd ed., p. 169. The royal palace at Śrāvasti overlooked the Achiravati (DEPN, II, 170m).
3 The Kuśa Jātaka, No. 531. The Mahāvastu (III. 1) places an Ikshvāku king in Benares—Abhūṣhi Rāja Ikshvāku Yāraṇasyāṁ mahābalo.
4 Vāyu P., 89, 3.
5 Rāmāyaṇa, I. 4. 11-12.
6 X. 60. 4
7 XIV. 39. 9.
8 Vāyu, 88. 67.
9 I. 2. 10 et. seqs
10 Vāyu, 88, 72.
11 I, 63. 7; 112. 7. 14; 174. 2, VI. 20. 10.
In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa① he is styled an Aikshvāka.② Trasadasyu,③ too, finds mention in the Rig-Veda.④ Tryaruna⑤ is also mentioned in the same Veda.⑥ In the Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa⑦ he is called an Aikshvāka Triśānku⑧ is referred to in the Taittirīya Upanishad.⑨ Hariśchandra⑩ figures in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa⑪ and is styled Aikshvāka. Rohita, the son of Hariśchandra⑫ is also alluded to in the same Brāhmaṇa.⑬ Bhagīratha⑭ figures prominently in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa under the slightly different name of Bhageratha⑮ and is called Aikshvāka and ‘Ekarāt’ (sole ruler). Under the name of Bhageratha he is probably referred to in the Rig-Veda⑯ itself. Ambarishā⑰ is mentioned in the same Veda.⑱ The name Ritusarpa⑲ finds mention in a Brāhmaṇa-like passage of the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.⑳ Daśaratha and Rāma㉑ bear names that are known to the Rig-Veda.㉒ But these personages and a few others mentioned above are not connected in the Vedic texts with the Ikshvāku family or with Kosala.

Hiranyanābha Kausalya,㉓ is mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a rājaputra or prince.㉔ He is undoubtedly

---

① XIII. 5. 4. 5.
② Cf. reference to the Rig-Veda, IV, 42, 8 in this connection.
③ Vāyu, 88, 74.
④ IV. 33. 1; VII. 19. 3, etc
⑤ Vāyu, 88, 77.
⑥ V. 27.
⑦ XIII. 3. 12.
⑧ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑨ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑩ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑪ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑫ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑬ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑭ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑮ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑯ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑰ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑱ Vāyu, 88, 109.
⑲ Vāyu, 88, 109.
㉑ Vāyu, 88, 109.
㉒ Vāyu, 88, 109.
㉓ Vāyu, 88, 109.
㉔ Vāyu, 88, 109.
connected with Para Āṭñāra (Āhlāra), the Kosala-Videhan king, mentioned in a gāthā (song) occurring in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa¹ and the Saṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra,² as well as a passage of Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa.³ The gāthā as quoted in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa gives to Para the patronymic ‘Hiraṇyana-nābha’, while the Śrauta Sūtra identifies Para with Hiryanābha himself. It is difficult to say whether the original gāthā extolling the deeds of Para Āṭñāra (Āhlāra) gave to that conqueror the name ‘Hiraṇyana-bha’ or the patronymic ‘Hiraṇyana-bha’. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa is the older of the two works mentioning the prince’s exploits and is, therefore, more likely to preserve the original text than the sūtra. According to the Praśna Upanishad, Hiryanābha, the father, was a contemporary of Sukeśa Bhāradvāja,⁴ who was himself a contemporary of Kausalya Āśvalāyana.⁵ If it be true, as seems probable, that Āśvalāyana of Kosala is identical with Assalāyana of Sāvatthī mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya⁶ as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha, he must be placed in the sixth century B. C. Consequently Hiryanābha and his son, Hiraṇyana-bha too, must have flourished in that century.

Some of the later princes of the Purānic list, e.g., Sākya, Sudhodana, Siddhārtha, Rāhula and Prasenajit, are mentioned in Buddhist texts. The exact relations of Hiraṇyana-bha (and Hiraṇyana-bha) with Prasenajit, who also flourished in the sixth century B. C. are not known. The Purānic chroniclers make Hiraṇyana-bha an ancestor of Prasenajit, but are not sure about his position in the dynastic list.⁷ Further they refer to

¹ XIII. 5. 4. 4. Āṭñārasya Paraḥ putro’vam medhyamabandhayat
² XVI. 9. 18. Hiraṇyana-bhaḥ Kausalya diśah pūrṇā amanśhata (iti)
³ II. 6. Ṛṣṭhī
⁴ VI. 1. Praśna, I. 1.
⁵ II. 147 et. seq.
⁶ AIHT., 173.
Prasenajit as the son and successor of Rāhula, and grand-
son of Siddhartha (Buddha). This is absurd, because
Prasenajit was of the same age as the Buddha and
belonged to a different branch of the Ikshvāku line. The
Tibetans represent him as the son of Brahadatta.\(^1\) It
is clear that no unanimous tradition about the parentage
of Prasenajit and the position of Hiranyanābha in the
family tree has been preserved. Hiranyanābha, or prefer-
ably his son, performed an Ṛṣvamedha sacrifice and was
apparently a great conqueror. Is this ruler identical with
the "Great Kosalan" (Mahākosala) of Buddhist tradition ?
If he really flourished in the sixth century B.C., he may
have been identical with 'Mahākosala' of Buddhist texts.

Pargiter admits that several Purānic passages
make Hiranyanābha (and therefore also his son) one of
the "future" kings after the Bhārata battle.\(^2\) He was
the only prince of antiquity who is styled in the Vedic
literature both a Kausalya and a Vaideha. That de-
scription admirably fits Mahākosala whose daughter, the
mother of Ajātasatru according to Buddhist tradition,
is called Kosalādevī as well as Vedehi (Vaidehi).

A word may be added here regarding the value of
the Purānic lists. No doubt they contain names of some
real kings and princes. But they have many glaring
defects, defects which are apt to be forgotten by writers
who make these the basis of early Indian chronology.

(1) Ikshvākuoids of different branches and perhaps
princes of other tribes, e.g., Trasadasyu, king of the
Pūrus,\(^3\) Rituparna, king of Ṣaphāla,\(^4\) Sudhodana of

---

1 Essay on Guṇādhya, p. 173.
2 A.I.H.T., 173.
3 Rig-Veda, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3.
20. 3. Rituparna is, however, not distinctly called an Akshevāka. But from the
rarity of the name it is possible to surmise that the epic and Purānic king of
that designation is meant.
Kapilavastu and Prasenajit, king of Srāvastī, have been mixed up in such a way as to leave the impression that they formed a continuous line of monarchs who ruled in regular succession.

(2) Contemporaries have been represented as successors and collaterals have been represented as lineal descendants, e.g., Prasenajit, king of Srāvastī, is represented as the lineal successor of Siddhārtha and Rāhula, though he was actually a contemporary of Siddhārtha, i.e., the Buddha, and belonged to a separate line of the Ikshvāku family.

(3) Certain individuals have been omitted, e.g., Vedhas (father, or ancestor of Hariśchandra), Para Ṛiṇāra (unless he is identical with Hiranyanābha), and Mahākosala.

(4) Names in the list include Śākya, the designation of a clan, and Siddhārtha (Buddha) who never ruled.

It is not easy to find out all the kings of the Purānic chronicles who actually ruled over Kosala. Some of the earlier princes, e.g., Purukutsa, Trasadasyyu, Hariśchandra, Robita, Rītuparna and a few others, are omitted from the list of the kings of Ayodhyā given in the Rāmāyaṇa.1 We gather from the Vedic literature that many, if not all, of these monarchs ruled over territories lying outside Kosala. The only kings or princes in the Purānic list who are known from the Vedic and early Buddhist texts to have reigned in Kosala, or over some outlying part of it, are Hiranyanābha,2 Prasenajit and Śuddhodana.

1 I. 70.
2 In the Sat. Br. XIII. 6. 4. 4-5, Hiranyanābha is described as Kausalyārāj, but not as an Ikshvāka. On the other hand, Purukutsa Daurgaha is styled Ikshvāka-rājā but not as Kausalya, as it a distinction between Kausalya and Ikshvākha is meant. The two terms need not refer to kings of the same dynasty ruling over exactly the same territory. As a matter of fact Trasadasyyu is known to be a king of the Pūrūṇa. An Ikshvākha styled Vārahna, connected with the Vrishnis (?), is mentioned in Jaim. Up. Br. 1, 5, 4.
KOSALAN CHRONOLOGY

The Buddhist works mention a few other sovereigns of Kosala, but their names do not occur in the epic and Purānic accounts. Some of these kings had their capital at Ayodhyā, others at Sāketa, and the rest at Sārvastī. Of the princes of Ayodhyā, the Ghaṭa Jātaka mentions Kālasena. A Kosalarāja reigning in Sāketa is mentioned in the Nandiyamiga Jātaka. Vaṅka, Mahākosalā and many others had their capital at Sāvatthī or Sārvastī. Ayodhyā seems to have been the earliest capital, and Sāketa the next. The last capital was Sārvastī. Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in the Buddha’s time, but Sāketa and Sārvastī were included among the six great cities of India.

The chronology of ancient Kosala is in a state of utmost confusion. If the Purāṇas are to be believed, a prince named Divākara occupied the throne of Ayodhyā in the time of Adhisima-krishṇa, great-great-grandson of Pari-kshit. But, as has already been pointed out above, the princes who are mentioned as his successors did not form a continuous line of rulers who reigned over the same territory in regular succession. It is, therefore, a hopeless task to measure the distance separating him from the Buddha and his contemporary with the help of the traditional dynastic lists alone. It is also not known when the older capitals were abandoned in favour of Sārvastī. But it must have been some time before the accession of Prasenajit, the contemporary of the Buddha, of Bimbisāra, and of Udayana of Kauśāmbi, supposed to be a descendant of Adhisimā-Krishṇa.

1 No. 454.
2 No. 385.
3 E.g., the Kosalarāja of J. 75; Catta (336); Sabbamittta (512); and Prasenajit.
4 Buddhist India, p. 94.
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We learn from the Mahāvagga\(^1\) that during the period of the earlier Brahmadattas of Kāsi, Kosala was a poor and tiny state with slender resources: Dīghīti nāma Kosalarājā ahosi daliddo appadhano appadhogo appabalo appavāhano appavijito aparipuṇṇa-kosa-koṭṭhāgūro.

In the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., however, Kosala was a mighty kingdom which contended first with Kāsi, and afterwards with Magadha for the mastery of the upper Ganges valley. The history of these struggles is reserved for treatment in later sections. The rivalry with Magadha ended in the absorption of the kingdom into the Magadhan Empire.

Aṅga was the country to the east of Magadha and west of the chieftains who dwelt in the Rajmahal Hills (Parvatavāsinah). It was separated from Magadha (including Modāgiri or Monghyr) by the river Champā, probably the modern Chāndan.\(^2\) The Aṅga dominions, however, at one time included Magadha and probably extended to the shores of the sea. The Vidhūra Paṇḍita Jātaka\(^3\) describes Rājagrihā as a city of Aṅga. The Sāntiparva of the Mahābhārata\(^4\) refers to an Aṅga king who sacrificed on Mount Vishṇupada (probably at Gayā). The Sabhāparva\(^5\) mentions Aṅga and Vaṅga as forming one Vishaya or kingdom. The Kathā-sarit-sāgara says\(^6\) that Viṭaṅkapur,

---
\(^1\) S. B. E., XVII, p. 294.
\(^2\) According to Pargiter (JASB, 1897, 95) Aṅga comprised the modern districts of Bāgalkot and Monghyr, and also extended northwardly up the river Kauśikī or Kośi and included the western portion of the district of Purane. For it was on that river that Kāśyapa Vibhāṣādaka had his hermitage. His son Bāhayaśrīṅga was beguiled by courtesans of Aṅga into a boat and brought down the river to the capital. In Mbh. ii. 30. 20-22, however, Modāgiri (Monghyr) and Kauśikī-Kachevā had rulers who are distinguished from Karna whose realm (Aṅga) clearly lay between the Māgadhas and the Rājās styled Parvatavāsin.

---
\(^3\) No. 548.
\(^4\) 29, 35, JASB, 1897, 94.
\(^5\) 44. 9; cf. VI. 18. 28. Aṅgas and Prāchyas,
\(^6\) 95, 35; 26, 115; 82. 3-16.
Aṅga, 107

a city of the Aṅgas, was situated on the shore of the sea. The imperial glory of Aṅga is doubtless reflected in the songs of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa1 which describe the 'world-conquest' (Samantam sarvataḥ prithivim jayan) of one of its ancient kings in the course of which girls of aristocratic families (āḍhyā-duhitri) were brought as prizes from different climes.

Champā, the famous capital of Aṅga, stood at the confluence of the river of the same name2 and the Ganges.3 Cunningham points out that there still exist near Bhāgalpur two villages, Champānagara and Champāpura, which most probably represent the actual site of the ancient capital. It is stated in the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Harivamsa that the ancient name of Champā was Mālinī:4

Champasya tu purī Champā yā Maliny-ābhavat purā.

In the Jātaka stories the city is also called Kāla-Champā. The Mahā-Janaka Jātaka5 informs us that Champā was sixty leagues from Mithilā. The same Jātaka refers to its gate, watch-tower, and walls. Down to the time of Gautama Buddha's death it was considered as one of the six great cities of India, the other five being Rājagriha, Srāvasti, Sāketa, Kauśāmbī, and Benares.6 Champā was noted for its wealth and commerce, and traders sailed from it to Suvarṇa-bhūmi in the Trans-Gangetic region for trading purposes.7 Hindu

1 Ait. Br. VIII. 22.
2 Jātaka 506.
3 Mbh., iii, 84, 163; 307, 26 (Gaṅgāyāḥ Sutavishayāḥ Champāmanu yayau purim); Waiters, Yuan Chouang II. 181; Daśakumāra Charita, II. 2.
4 Matayu, 48, 97; Vaiyu, 99, 105-106; Hariv., 31. 49; Mbh., XII. 5. 6-7; XIII. 42. 16.
5 No. 539.
6 Mahā-parinibbāna Sutta.
7 Jātaka, 539, Fausboll's Ed., VI, p. 34.
emigrants to southern Annam and Cochin China are supposed to have named their settlement after this famous Indian city.\textsuperscript{1} Other important cities in Áṅga were Assapura (Aśvapura) and Bhaddiya (Bhadrika).\textsuperscript{2}

The earliest appearance of Áṅga is in the Atharva Veda\textsuperscript{3} in connection with the Gandhāris, Mūjavats, and Magadhās. The Rāmāyana tells an absurd story about the origin of this Janapada. It is related in that epic that Madana or Anaṅga, the god of love, having incurred the displeasure of the God Siva fled from the hermitage of the latter to escape his consuming anger, and the region where "he cast off his body (āṅga)" has since been known by the name of Áṅga.\textsuperscript{4} The Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas attribute the foundation of the kingdom to a prince named Áṅga.\textsuperscript{5} The tradition may claim some antiquity as Áṅga Vairochana is included in the list of anointed kings in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.\textsuperscript{6} The consecration of this ruler with the Aryan ritual styled the Aṅḍra mahābhishēka causes some surprise as the Bodhāyana Dharma Sūtra groups the Áṅgas with peoples

\textsuperscript{1} Ind. Ant., VI. 229. Itinera, 58. Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 35. Nundalal Day, Notes on Ancient Áṅga, JASB, 1014. For the Hindu colonisation of Champa, see Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol., III, pp. 137 ff. and R. C. Majumdar, Champa. The oldest Sanskrit inscription (that of Vemant) dates, according to some scholars, from about the third century A. D. The inscription mentions a king of the family of Śri Māra-rāja.

\textsuperscript{2} Malalasekera, DPPN, 16; Dhammapada Commentary, Harvard Oriental Series, 29. 59. Cf. Bhaddiya (Bhadrika or Bhadrikā of Jain writers). It is possibly represented by Bhadariyā, 8 miles south of Bhāgalpur (JASB, 1914, 387).

\textsuperscript{3} V. 22. 14.

\textsuperscript{4} JASB, 1914, p. 317; Rām., I. 23. 14.

\textsuperscript{5} Mbh. I, 104, 53-54; Mātṛga P. 38, 19.

\textsuperscript{6} VIII. 22; cf. Parigiter, JASB, 1897, 97. In connection with the gifts of the Áṅga King mention is made of a place called Avachatuka:

\begin{quote}
Duṣadāgasaḥsahasyasya dattreṇaḥ sva-bhaktuḥ
śrāntaḥ pārākṛtaḥ prajapad dāneti-āṅgasya Brāhmaṇah.
\end{quote}

The epithet 'Vairochana' given to the Áṅga King reminds one of 'Vairochani' of the Mātṛga P. 48, 59.
of mixed origin, and the Mahābhārata brands an Āṅga prince who, by the way, is distinguished from Karna, and is described as skilful in handling elephants, as a Mlechchha or outlandish barbarian. In the Matsya Purāṇa the father of the eponymous hero of the Āṅgas is styled Dānavarshabhah (chief among demons).¹

About the dynastic history of Āṅga our information is meagre. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta refers to king Dhataraṭṭha of Āṅga.² The Buddhist texts mention a queen named Gagarā who gave her name to a famous lake in Champā. The Purāṇas³ give lists of the early kings of this country. One of these rulers, Dadhivahana, is known to Jaina tradition. The Purāṇas and the Harihamśa⁴ represent him as the son and immediate successor of Āṅga. Jaina tradition places him in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. His daughter Chandanā or Chandrabāla was the first female who embraced Jainism shortly after Mahāvira had attained the Kevaliship.⁵ Satānika, king of the Vatsas of Kauśāmbi, near Allahabad, is said to have attacked Champā, the capital of Dadhivahana, and in the confusion which ensued, Chandanā fell into the hands of a robber, but all along she maintained the vows of the order.

Between the Vatsas and the realm of Āṅga lived the Magadhas, then a comparatively weak people. A great struggle was going on between this kingdom and its great

¹ Bodh, Dh. S. I. 1. 29; Mbh. VIII. 22. 18-19; Mat. P. 48. 60. Note also the connection of Āṅgas with Nishadās in Vāyu, 62, 107-23. The Purāṇa describes the royal family as Ātrivamśasamūtpanna. In the Aiṭaṇya Brāhmaṇa, however, an Aiṭaṇya appears as the priest of the Āṅga King. For a discussion of the origin of the Āṅgas and other kindred tribes, see. S. Lévi pre-Aryan et Pre-Dravidien dans l’Inde,” J. A. Juillet-septembre, 1923.
² Dialogues of the Buddha, 11, 270.
³ Matsya, 48, 91.108; Vāyu, 99, 100-112.
⁴ 32. 43.
⁵ JASB, 1914, pp. 320-21. For the story of Chandanabāla see also Ind. Culture, II. pp. 682 ff.
eastern neighbour. The Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka describes Rājagriha, the Magadhan capital, as a city of Āṅga while the Mahābhārata refers to a sacrifice which an Āṅga king probably performed at Gayā. These details may indicate that Āṅga succeeded in annexing Magadha. Its frontier thus approached the Vatsa Kingdom whose monarch’s alarm may have been responsible for an attack on Champā. The Āṅga king preferred to have friendly relations with Kauśāmbī, possibly because he was threatened by the reviving power of Magadha. Sri Harsha speaks of a ruler of Āṅga named Driḍhavarmān who gave his daughter in marriage to Udayana, son and successor of Satānīka and secured his help in regaining his throne.

The success of Āṅga did not last long. About the middle of the sixth century B. C. Bimbisāra Sreṇīka, the Crown Prince of Magadha, is said to have killed Brahmadatta, the last independent ruler of Ancient Āṅga. He took Champā, the capital, and resided there as his father’s Viceory. Henceforth Āṅga becomes an integral part of the growing empire of Magadha.

Magadha corresponds roughly to the present Patna and Gayā districts of South Bihār. It seems to have been bounded on the north and the west by the rivers Ganges and the Son, on the south by spurs of the Vindhyan range, and on the east by the river Champā which emptied itself into the Ganges near the Āṅga capital. Its earliest capital was Girivraja, the mountain-girt

1 Champeyya Jātaka.
2 Cowell, VI. 183.
3 Priyadarśikā, Act IV.
4 Hardy, A Manual of Buddhism, p. 163n (account based on the Tibetan Dulva), JASP, 1914, 321.
5 Mbh. II. 20. 29; Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta (Dialogues ii. 94) and DPPN, I. 331 which show that the Vṛjī frontier commenced from the northern bank of the Ganges as Ukkāvelā or Ukkachēlā, was included within the limits of that state; Champeyya Jātaka (506); Fleet, CII, 227; DPPN, 403. In the epic period the eastern boundary of Magadha proper may not have extended as far as the Champā river as Modāgiri (Monghyr) finds mention as a separate state.
city, 1 or old Rājagriha, near Rājgir among the hills in the neighbourhood of Gayā. The *Mahāvagga* 2 calls it "Giribbaja of the Magadhas" to distinguish it from other cities of the same name, e.g., Girivraja in Kekaya. The *Mahābhārata* refers to it not only as Girivraja, but as Rājagriha, 3 Bārhadhratha-pura 4 and Māgadha-pura, 5 and says that it was an almost impregnable city, *puram durādharmah samantataḥ*, being protected by five hills, viz. Vaihāra, the grand rock (*Vipūlaḥ śailo*), Varāha, Vrishabha, Rishigiri and Chaityaka 6 with their compact bodies (*rakshantivābhisamhatya samhataṅgā Girivrajan*). From the *Rāmāyana* we learn that the city had another name, Vasumati. 7 The *Life of Hiuen Tsang* mentions still another name, Kuśāgra-pura. 8 Indian Buddhist writers give a seventh name, Bimbasāra-pūrī. 9

In a passage of the *Rig-Veda* 10 mention is made of a territory called Kīkāṭa ruled by a chieftain named Pramaganda. Yāska 11 declares that Kīkāṭa is the name

---

1 Broadley in *JASB*. 1872, 299. Girivraja was at one time identified with Giryek on the Pāñchāna river about 36 miles north east of Gayā, 6 miles east of Rājgir (Fargiter in *JASB*, 1897, 86).
2 S. B. E., XIII. 150.
3 Mbh. I. 113. 27; 204. 17; II, 21. 34; III. 84, 104.
4 II. 24. 44.
5 Gorathāṁ girimāśādaya dadṛśur Māgadhāṁ puram, II, 20. 30;
21, 13.
6 The names given in the Pāli texts (DPPN, II. 721) are Pāñḍava, Giijhkūṭa, Vebhāra, Isigili and Vepulla (or Vaṅkaka). The Pāli evidence may suggest that *Vipula* in the *Mbh*. verse is a name, and not an epithet. In that case Dr. J. Wenger suggests Chaitykaṇḍhacakāḥ (five goodly Chaityakas) for Chaityakapāṇḍhacamā, (with Chaityaka as the fifth). For a note by Keith see *IHQ*, 1939, 169-64.
7 I. 32. 8.
8 P. 113. Apparently named after an early Magadhan prince (Vāyu. 99, 921; *AIHT*, 149).
9 Law, *Buddhaghoṣha*, 87 n.
10 III. 59. 14.
11 *Nirukta*, VI, 32.
of a non-Aryan country. In later works Kikaṭa is given as a synonym of Magadha.¹

Like Yāska the author of the Brihad-dharma Purāṇa apparently regarded Kikaṭa as an impure country which however, included a few holy spots:—

*Kikaṭe nāma deśe' sti Kāka-karnaśhyako nripāḥ prajānāṁ hitakṛinnityāṁ Brahma-dveshkarastathā tatra deśe Gayā nāma puṇyadeśo' sti viśrutaḥ nadi cha Karṇadā nāma pitṛīnāṁ svargadāyinī² Kikaṭe cha nṛito' pyesha pāpabhūmau na saṁśayāḥ.³*

It is clear from these verses that Kikaṭa included the Gayā district, but the greater part of it was looked upon as an unholy region (pāpabhūmi, doubtless corresponding to the anārya-nivāsa of Yāska). Kāka-karna of line 1, may be the same as Kāka-varṇa of the Śaisunāga family.

The name Magadha first appears in the Atharva-Veda⁴ where fever as wished away to the Gandbāris, Mūjavats, Aṅgas, and Magadhās. The bards of Magadhā are, however, mentioned as early as the Yajur-Veda.⁵ They are usually spoken of in the early Vedic literature in terms of contempt. In the Vṛātya book of the Atharva Saṁhitā,⁶ the Vṛātya i.e., the Indian living outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism, is brought into very special relation to the puṁśchali

---

¹ Kikaṭeśhu Gayā puṇyā puṇyāṁ Rājagrihaṁ yanam Chyāranaagyāstramaḥ puṇyoṁ nadi puṇyā Puṇāḥpunā.

² Cf. Vāyu, 108. 73; 106. 23. Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 1, 3. 24: Buddho namānajana-sutaḥ Kikaṭeśhu bhavishyati: ibid vii, 10, 19; Sridhara: “Kikaṭeśhu madhye Gayā-pradeśe”. Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi: “Kikaṭā Magadhaḥvayāḥ.” For an epigraphic reference to Kikata see Ep. Ind. II. 292, where a prince of that name is connected with the Maurya family. See also ‘Kekaṭeyaka’ (Monuments of Sānci, I. 309)

³ Madhya-Khaṇḍam, XXVI. 20, 22.

⁴ XXVI. 47; cf. Vāyu p. 78. 22, Pāda Pātalakhaṇḍa, XI. 45.

⁵ Vāj. Saṁh XXX. 5; Vedic Index, II. ‘116. For the connection of the Māgadhās with Magadhā, see Vāyu P. 62. 147.

⁶ XV, ii. 5—Sraddhā puṁśchalo Mitro Māgadhō...etc; Griffith II. ‘186,
(harlot) and the Māgadha. "In the eastern region (Prāchyaṁ disi)" faith is his harlot, Mitra his Māgadha (bard or panegyrist). In the Śrauta Sūtras the equipment characteristic of the Vṛātya is said to be given, when the latter is admitted into the Aryan Brāhmaṇic community, to the so-called Brāhmaṇas living in Magadha, Brahmabandhu Māgadhadesīya. The Brāhmaṇas of Magadha, are here spoken of in a disparaging tone as Brahmabandhu. In the Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, however, the views of a Magadhavāsī Brāhmaṇa are quoted with respect. The Vedic dislike of the Magadhas in early times was due, according to Oldenberg, to the fact that the Magadhas were not wholly Brāhmaṇised. Pargiter suggests that in Magadha the Aryans met and mingled with a body of invaders from the east by sea.

With the exception of Pramaganda no king of Magadha appears to be mentioned in the Vedic literature. The earliest dynasty of Magadha according to the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas is that founded by Brihadhratha, the son of Vasu Chaidya-Uparichara, and the father of Jarāsandha. Rāmāyana makes Vasu himself the founder of Girivraja or Vasumatī. A Brihadhratha is mentioned twice in the Rig-Veda, but there is nothing to show that he is identical with the father of Jarāsandha. The Purāṇas give lists of the "Brihadhratha kings" from Jarāsandha's son Sahadeva to Rupunjaya, and apparently make Senājit, seventh in descent from Sahadeva, the

2 Vedic Index, 11, 116.
3 Note also the expression rājānaḥ kṣatrapā- bandhavah applied to Magadhā kings in the Purāṇas (Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 22)
4 Buddha, 4096.
6 1. 63. 30.
7 1. 82, 7.
8 1. 36. 18; X, 49, 6.
9 15, 1880.
contemporary of Adhisīma-Kṛishṇa of the Pārikshita family and Divākara of the Ikshvāku line. But in the absence of independent external corroboration it is not safe to accept the Purānic chronology and order of succession of the princes as authentic.\(^1\) Bṛihadrathas and certain princes of Central India are said to have passed away when Pulika (Punika) placed his son Pradyota on the throne of Avanti,\(^2\) i.e., the Ujjain territory. As Pradyota was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha, and as the Purānic passage, “Bṛihadratheshvati-teshu Vitihotreshu-Avantishu,‘when the Bṛihadrathas, Vitihotras and Avantis (or the Vitihotras in Avanti) passed away’,” suggests that the events alluded to here were synchronous, it is reasonable to conclude that the Bṛihadratha dynasty came to an end in the sixth century B.C.

Jaina writers mention two early kings of Rājagṛha named Samudra-vijaya and his son Gaya.\(^3\) Gaya is said to have reached perfection which had been taught by the

\(^1\) Cf. supra, pp. 80f, 104, discussion about later Vaidheha and Kosalan kings. The number of ‘the future Bṛihadrathas’ is given as 16, 22 or 32, and the period of their rule, 723 or 1000 years (DKA, 17, 69). The last King Ripuṇjaya or Arinjaya (ibid 17 n 96) reminds one of Arindama of the Pāli texts (DPPN.ii. 402).

\(^2\) Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 18: cf., IHQ, 1930, p. 683. There is no reason to believe with the late authors of the Kāthā-sarit-sāgara and certain corrupt passages of the Purāṇas, (IHQ, 1930, pp. 679, 691), that there was a Pradyota of Magadha distinct from Mahāsena of Avanti who is called Pradyota by several earlier writers, Buddhist as well as Brāhmānical. The use of the expression ‘Avantishu’ (DKA, 18) in the Purānic passage which refers to the dynastic revolution brought about by Pulika, the identity of the names of the Purānic family of Pradyota with those of the Avanti line of Mahāsena, and the mention in reference to Pradyota of the Purāṇas, of epithets like ‘Pranatasāmanta’ and ‘nagarjarīta’ which remind one irresistibly of Chanḍa Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti as described in Buddhist literature, leave little room for doubt that the Pradyota of the Purāṇas and Pradyota of Avanti cannot be regarded as distinct entities.

\(^3\) S.B.E. XLV. 86, A king named Gaya is mentioned in Mbh., vii. 64. But he is described there as a son of Amṛtarasayas.
Jinas. But little reliance can be placed on uncorroborated assertions of this character.

The second Magadhan dynasty, according to the less corrupt texts of the Purāṇas, was the Śaisunāga line which is said to have been founded by a king named Śişunāga. Bimbisāra, the contemporary of the Buddha, is assigned to this family. Áśvaghoṣha, an earlier authority,\(^1\) refers however, in his Buddha-charita\(^2\) to Śrenya i.e., Bimbisāra, as a scion, not of the Śaisunāga dynasty, but of the Haryaṅka-kula, and the Mahāvaṁśa makes ‘Susunāga’ i.e., Śişunāga, the founder of a distinct line of rulers which succeeded that of Bimbisāra. The Purāṇas themselves relate that Śişunāga ‘will take away the glory of the Pradyotas’ whom we know from other sources to be contemporaries of the Bimbisārīds:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ashta-trimsachchhatam bhāvyāh} \\
\text{Pradyotāḥ pañcha te sutāḥ} \\
\text{hatvā teshāṁ yaśāḥ kṛitsnam} \\
\text{Śişunāgo bhavishyati.}\(^3\)
\end{align*}
\]

If this statement be true, then Śişunāga must be later than the first Pradyota, namely Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena, who was, judged by the evidence of the Pāli texts, which is confirmed in important details by the ancient Sanskrit poets and dramatists,\(^4\) a contemporary of Bimbisāra and his son. It follows that Śişunāga according to the last-mentioned authorities, must be later than those kings. But we have seen above that the Purāṇas make Śişunāga an ancestor of Bimbisāra and the progenitor of his family. This part of the Purānic

---

\(^1\) Áśvaghoṣha was a contemporary of Kanishka (C. 100 A.D.) (Winternitz, Lieit. II. 257). On the other hand the Purānic chronicles presuppose Gupta rule in the Ganges Valley (DKA, 53), C. 320 A.D.

\(^2\) XI. 2; Raychaudhuri, IHQ, I (1925), p. 87.

\(^3\) Vāyu Purāṇa, 99; 314.

\(^4\) Indian Culture, VI, 411.
account is not corroborated by independent external evidence.\(^1\) The inclusion of Vārāṇasī and Vaiśālī within Śiśunāga’s dominions\(^2\) proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan rule in those regions. The Mālalāṅkāravatthu, a Pali work of modern date, but following very closely the more ancient books, tells us that Śiśunāga had a royal residence at Vaiśālī which ultimately became his capital.\(^3\) "That monarch (Śiśunāga) not unmindful of his mother’s origin re-established the city of Veśāli (Vaiśālī), and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagriha lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered. The last statement indicates that Śiśunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagriha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. It may be argued that the Purāṇas make Girivraja, and not Vaiśālī, the abode of Śiśunāga (Vārāṇasyāṁ sutam sthāpya śrayishyatī Girivrajam); and as Udāyin, son of Ajātaśatru was the first to transfer the capital from that stronghold to the newly founded city of Pāṭaliputra, Śiśunāga’s residence in the older capital points to a date earlier than that of the founder of the more famous metropolis. But the fact that Kālaśoka, son and successor of Śiśunāga, is known to have ruled in Pāṭaliputra shows that he came after Udāyin,

---

1 We may go even further and characterise certain statements of the Purānic bards as self-contradictory. Thus (a) Pradyota is said to have been anointed when the Vitihotras had passed away, (b) Śiśunāga destroyed the prestige of the Pradyotas and became king, and yet (c) contemporaneously with these Śiśunāga kings 20 Vitihotras (and other lines) are said to have endured the same time.

ete s spheres bhacishyanti
ekahālaṁ mahikshītaḥ (DKA, 24).

2 Dynasties of the Kali Age, 21; S. B. E., XI, p. xvi.

3 If the Deśāśrīnat-Puttalikā is to be believed, Vaiśālī continued to be graced by the presence of the king till the time of the Nandas.

4 Śiśunāga, according to the Mahāvaṁśāṭika (Turnour, Mahāvaṁśa, xxxvii), was the son of a Lichchhavi rāja of Vaiśālī. He was conceived by a naga-śobhini and brought up by an officer of state.
the founder of that city. The further fact of removal of capital in his reign too—which must be regarded as a second transfer—shows that his predecessor had reverted to the older stronghold apparently as a place of refuge. The event alluded to in the words “śrayishyati” Girivrajam need not necessarily imply that Girivraja continued to be the capital uninterruptedly till the days of Siśunāga.

The origin of the Haryāṇka line, to which Bimbisāra belonged according to Aśvaghosa, is wrapped up in obscurity. There is no cogent reason why this dynastic designation should be connected with Haryāṅga of Champa mentioned in the Harivamśa and the Puraṇas. Haryāṇka-kula may simply be an expression like “aulikara-lāṇchhāna ātma vamśa” of a Mandasor Inscription, pointing to the distinctive mark or emblem of the family. Bimbisāra was not the founder of the line. The Mahāvamśa states that he was anointed king by his own father when he was only 15 years old. He avenged a defeat of his father by the Aṅgas and launched Magadha into that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kalinga.

1 SBB, XI, p. xvi.
2 31, 49; Vāyu, 99, 108; J.C. Ghosh in ABORI, 1938 (xix), pp. i. 82.
3 Hari has the sense of ‘yellow’, ‘horse’, ‘lion’, ‘snake’, etc.
4 Geiger’s translation, p. 12. This disposes of the view of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (Carm. Lec. 1918) who makes Bimbisāra the founder of his dynasty and says that he was a general who carved out a kingdom for himself at the expense of the Vajjis.
5 Turnour, N. L. Day and others mention Bhātiya or Bhaṭṭiya as the name of the father. The Tibetans, on the other hand, call him Mahāpadma. Turnour, Mahāvamśa, I. p. 10; J. A. S. B., 1872, i 298; 1914, 321; Essay on Guṇḍāhya, p. 173. The Puraṇas name Hemajit, Kālajit, Kāhetraja or Kāhatraja as the father of Bimbisāra. If the Puraṇic account is correct Bhātiya or Bhaṭṭiya may have been a secondary name or epithet comparable to the names ‘Seniya’ and Kūpiya of Bimbisāra and Ajītasastru respectively. But it is not safe to rely on an uncorroborated statement of the Puraṇas, particularly when there is hardly any unanimity with regard to the form of the name.
The *Vajji* (*Vriji*) territory lay north of the Ganges and extended as far as the Nepāl hills. On the west the river Gāndak possibly separated it from the Mallas and perhaps also the Kosalas. Eastwards, it may have approached the forests that skirted the river Kośi and the Mahānandā. It is said to have included eight confederate clans (*āṭṭhakula*), of whom the old *Videhas*, the *Lichchhavis*, the *Jñātṛikas* and the *Vṛijis* proper were the most important. The identity of the remaining clans remains uncertain. It may, however, be noted that in a passage of the *Śūtrakritāngas*, the *Ugras*, the *Bhogas*, the Aikṣhvākas and the Kauravas are associated with the Jñātris and the Lichchhavis as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly.\(^1\) The *Aṅguttara Nikāya*,\(^2\) too, refers to the close connection of the Ugras with Vaiśāli, the capital of the Vṛijian confederation.

The old territory of the *Videhas* had, as already stated in an earlier section, its capital at Mithilā which has been identified with Janakpur within the Nepāl border. The *Rāmāyaṇa* clearly distinguishes it from the region round Vaiśāli.\(^3\) But in Buddhist and Jaina texts the distinction is not always maintained and Videha is used in a wider sense to include the last-mentioned area.\(^4\)

The *Lichchhavi* capital was definitely at Vaiśāli which is represented by modern Besarh (to the east of the Gāndak) in the Muzaffarpur district of Bihār. It is

---


\(^2\) I. 26; III. 49; IV. 906.

\(^3\) *Rām.* I. 47-48.

\(^4\) The *Āchārāṅga Sūtra* (II. 15, § 17; S. B. E., XXII, Intro.) for instance places the *Sahāniceśa* of Kunḍagrāma near Vaiśāli in Videha. The mothers of Māhavīra and Ajātaśatru are called Videha-dattā and Vedehi (Vaiḍebi) respectively.
probably identical with the charming city called Viśālā in the epic.

Viśālāṃ nagarīṁ ramyāṁ divyāṁ svargopamāṁ tadā.

We learn from the introductory portion of the Ekapanṇa Jātaka² that a triple wall encompassed the town, each wall a league distant from the next, and there were three gates with watch-towers.

The Lichchhavi territory may have extended northwards as far as Nepal where we find them in the seventh century A.D.

The Jñātrikas were the clan of Siddhārtha and his son Mahāvīra, the Jina. They had their seats at Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma and Kollāga, suburbs of Vaiśālī. In the Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta,³ however, the abode of the “Nāḍikas” (identified by Jacobi with the Nātikas or Jñātrikas)⁴ is distinguished from Koṭīgāma (Kuṇḍagrāma?). Though dwelling in suburban areas Mahāvīra and his fellow clansmen were known as “Vesālie,” i.e., inhabitants of Vaiśālī.⁵

The Vrijis proper are already mentioned by Panini. Kauṭilya⁷ distinguishes them from the ‘Lichchhivikas’. Yuan Chwang⁸ too, draws a distinction between the Fu-li-chih (Vrijii) country and Fei-she-li (Vaiśālī). It seems that Vriji was not only the name of the confederacy but also of one of its constituent clans. But the Vrijis, like the Lichchhavis, are often associated with the city of Vaiśālī (including its suburbs) which was not only the capital of the Lichchhavi clan, but

---

¹ Bām. Ādi, 45. 10. ² No. 149. ³ Ch. 2. ⁴ S. B. P. XXII. Intro. ⁵ Hoernle Uvāsaga-dasdo, II, p. 4 n. ⁶ IV. 2. 131. ⁷ Arthaśāstra, Myrsce Edition, 1919, p. 378. ⁸ Watters, 11, 81. Cf. also DPPN, 11, 814; Gradual sayings, III. 62; IV. 10. According to Smith (Watters, II, 310) the Vriji country is roughly equivalent to the northern part of the Dabhanga district and the adjacent Nepalese Tarai.
also the metropolis of the entire confederacy.¹ A Buddhist tradition quoted by Rockhill² mentions the city proper as consisting of three districts. These districts were probably at one time the seats of three different clans. The remaining peoples of the confederacy viz., the Ugras, Bhogas, Kauravas, and Aikshvākas, resided in suburbs, and in villages or towns like Hatthigāma, Bhoganagara, etc.³

We have seen that during the Brāhmaṇa period Videha (Mithilā) had a monarchical constitution. The Rāmāyaṇa⁴ and the Purāṇas⁵ state that Viśāla, too, was at first ruled by "kings." The founder of the Vaisālika dynasty is said to have been Viśāla, a son of Ikshvāku according to the Rāmāyaṇa, a descendant of Nabhaśa the brother of Ikshvāku, according to the Purāṇas. Viśāla is said to have given his name to the city. After him came Hemachandra, Suchandra, Dhūmrāśva, Sṛiṇjaya, Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākutsthā and Sumati. We do not know how many of these Vaisālika "kings" (nripas) can be accepted as historical and

¹ Cf. Majjhima Nikāya, II, 101: The Book of the Kindred Sayings, I. (Sāṃyutta Nikāya), by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 257.—"A certain brother of the Vaijjan clan was once staying near Vesāli in a certain forest tract".

² Life of Buddha, p. 62.

³ For the Ugras and Bhogas see Hoernle, Uvāsaga-daso, II, p. 139 (§210); Bṛih. Up. III. 8. 2; S. B. E., XLV, 71n. in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, I. 26 (Nipāṭa I. 14. 6), the Ugras are associated with Vaiśāli (Uggo gahapati Vesālīko), and in IV. 212 with Hatthigāma. A city of Ugga is mentioned in the Dhammapada commentary, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 30, 184. Hoernle refers (Uvāsaga-daso, II, App. III, 57) to a place called Bhoganagara, or 'City of the Bhogas'. The Mahā-parinibbāna Sutta mentions Bhantāgāma, Hatthigāma, Ambāgāma, Jambuṇāma and Bhoganagara on the way from Vaiśāli to Pārā (Digha, II, 122-26). Cf. also Sutta Nipāṭa, 104. The association of a body of Kauravas with the Vaijjan group of clans is interesting. Kuru Brāhmaṇas, e.g., Uṣasati Chākryāya had begun to settle in the capital of Videha long before the rise of Buddhism. For the Aikshvākas of Vaiśāli, see Rām. I. 47, 11.

⁴ I. 47, II. 17.

⁵ Vāyu, 86, 16-22; Vīśṇu, IV. 1. 18.
as having actually ruled as monarchs in North Bihār. A king named Sahadeva Sārīnjaya is mentioned in the Sata-patha Brāhmaṇa.¹ In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa² he is mentioned with Somaka Sāhadevya. None of these kings, however, are connected with Vaiśālī in the Vedic literature. The Mahābhārata speaks of a Sahadeva (son of Śrīnjaya) as sacrificing on the Jumna,³ and not on the Gandak. The presence of Ikshvākuids as a constituent element of the Vrijian confederacy, which had its metropolis at Vaiśālī, is, however, as already stated, suggested by the Sātrakritāṅga.

The Vrijian confederation must have been organised after the decline and fall of the royal houses of Videha. Political evolution in India thus resembles closely the developments in the ancient cities of Greece where also the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by aristocratic republics. The probable causes of the transformation in Greece are thus given by Bury: “In some cases gross misrule may have led to the violent deposition of a king; in other cases if the succession to the sceptre devolved upon an infant or a paltry man, the nobles may have taken it upon themselves to abolish the monarchy. In some cases, the rights of the king might be strictly limited in consequence of his seeking to usurp undue authority; and the imposition of limitations might go on until the office of the king, although maintained in name, became in fact a mere magistracy in a state wherein the real power had passed elsewhere. Of the survival of monarchy in a limited form we have an example at Sparta; of its survival as a mere magistracy, in the Archon Basileus at Athens.”

¹ II. 4. 4. 3-4.
² VII. 34. 9.
³ Mbh. III. 90. 7, with commentary.
The cause of the transition from monarchy to republic in Mithila has already been stated. Regarding the change at Viśālā we know nothing.

Several scholars have sought to prove that the Lichchhavis, the most famous clan of the Vṛjijan confederacy (Vajjiraṭṭhavāṣi hi pasatthā)¹, were of foreign origin. According to Smith they had Tibetan affinities. He infers this from their judicial system and the disposal of their dead, viz., exposing them to be devoured by wild beasts.² Pandit S. C. Vidyābhūṣāna held that the name Lichchhavi (Nichchhivi of Manu) was derived from the Persian city of Nisibis.³ The inadequacy of the evidence on which these surmises rest has been demonstrated by several writers.⁴ Early Indian tradition is unanimous in representing the Lichchhavis as Kshatriyas. Thus we read in the Mahā-parinibbāṇa Suttaṇa: “And the Lichchhavis of Vesālī heard the news that the Exalted One had died at Kusināra. And the Lichchhavis of Vesālī sent a messenger to the Mallas, saying: “The

¹ DPPN, 11, 814.
² Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 233 ff. In the case of Tibet we have only three courts as against the seven tribunals of the Lichchhavis (viz. those of the Vimichchhaya mahāmattas) (inquiring magistrates), the Vohārikas (jurist-judges), Suttadharas (masters of the sacred code), the Aṭṭhakutiakas (the eight clans, possibly a federal court), the Senāpati (general), the Uparāja (Viceroy or Vice-Consul), and the rājā (the ruling chief) who made their decisions according to the pavana potthaka (Book of Precedents). Further, we know very little about the relative antiquity of the Tibetan procedure as explained by S. C. Das which might very well have been suggested by the system expounded in the Aṭṭhakathā. This fact should be remembered in instituting a comparison between Tibetan and Vajjian practices. Regarding the disposal of the dead attention may be invited to the ancient practices of the ‘Indus’ people (Vats, Excavations at Harappā, I. ch. VI.) and the epic story in Mbh. IV. 5. 28-33.
³ Ind. Ant., 1902, 143, ff; 1908, p. 78. There is very little in Vidyābhūṣāna’s surmise except a fancied resemblance between the names Nichchhivi and Nisibis. Inscriptions of the Achaemenids are silent about any Persian settlement in Eastern India in the sixth or fifth century B.C. The Lichchhavi people were more interested in Yaksha Chaityas and the teaching of Mahāvīra and the Buddha than in the deities and prophets of Iran.
⁴ Modern Review, 1919, p. 50; Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, 26ff.
Exalted One was a Kshatriya and so are we. We are worthy to receive a portion of the relics of the Exalted One.’” In the Jaina Kalpa Sūtra Triśalā, sister to Cheṭaka of Vesālī, is styled Kshatryāṇī.

Manu concurs in the view that the Lichchhavis are Rājanyas or Kshatriyas.

Jhallo Mallaścha rājanyād vrātyān Nichchhivireva cha. 
Naṭaścha Karanaśchaiva Khaso Drāviḍā eva cha.

It may be argued that the Lichchhavis, though originally non-Aryans or foreigners, ranked as Kshatriyas when they were admitted into the fold of Brāhmaṇism like the Drāviḍians referred to in Manu’s sloka and the Gurjara-Pratīhāras of mediæval times. But unlike the Pratīhāras and Drāviḍas, the Lichchhavis never appear to be very friendly towards the orthodox form of Hinduism. On the contrary, they were always to be found among the foremost champions of non-Brāhmaṇical creeds like Jainism and Buddhism. Manu testifies to their heterodoxy when he brands them as the children of the Vrātya Rājanyas. The great mediæval Rājput families (though sometimes descended from foreign immigrants) were never spoken of in these terms. On the contrary, they were supplied with pedigrees going back to Śri Rāma, Lakshmana, Yadu, Arjuna and others. A body of foreigners who did not observe ceremonies enjoined in the Brāhmaṇic code, could hardly have been accepted as Kshatriyas. The obvious conclusion seems to be that the Lichchhavis were indigenous Kshatriyas who were degraded to the position of Vrātya when they neglected Brāhmaṇic rites and showed a predilection for heretical doctrines. The Rāmāyana, as we have seen, represents

1 SBE, XXII, pp. xii, 227.
2 X. 92.
the Vaiśālikā rulers as Ikshvākus. The Pāli commentary Paramatthajotikā traces their origin to Benāres. The comparison of the Lichchhavis to the "Tāvatiṃsa gods" hardly accords with the theory that represents them as kinsmen of snub-nosed peoples who lived beyond the Himalayas. "Let those of the brethren" we are told by a personage of great eminence "who have never seen the Tāvatiṃsa gods," gaze upon this company of the Lichchhavis, behold this company of the Lichchhavis, compare this company of the Lichchhavis—even as a company of Tāvatiṃsa gods."

The date of the foundation of the Lichchhavi power is not known. But it is certain that the authority of the clan was well established in the days of Mahāvīra and Gautama, in the latter half of the sixth century B.C., and was already on the wane in the next century.

Buddhist tradition has preserved the names of eminent Lichchhavis like prince Abhaya, Oṭṭhaddha (Mahāli), generals Siha and Ajita, Dummuha and Sunakkhatta. In the introductory portion of the Ekapanna and Chuilla Kālinga Jātakas it is stated that the Lichchhavis of the ruling family numbered 7,707. There was a like number of viceroys, generals, and treasurers. Too much importance should not be attached to these figures which are merely traditional and may simply point to the large number of

---

4. 149.
5. 301.
6. Another tradition puts the number at 68,000 (DPPN, II. 781 n). The Dhammapada Commentary (Harvard Oriental Series, 30, 168) informs us that the rājās ruled by turns.
mahallakas\textsuperscript{1} or elders in the clan. The real power of administration especially in regard to foreign affairs seems to have been vested in a smaller body of nine Ganarājās or archons. The Jaina Kalpasūtra\textsuperscript{2} refers to the nine Lichchhavis as having formed a league with nine Mallakis and eighteen clan-lords of Kāśi-Kośala.\textsuperscript{3} We learn from the Nirayāvalī Sūtra that an important leader of this alliance was Cetaka whose sister Triśālā or Videha-dattā was the mother of Mahāvīra, and whose daughter Chellana or Vaidehi was, according to Jaina writers, the mother of Kūnika-Ajatasatru.

The league was aimed against Magadha. Tradition says that even in the time of the famous Bimbisāra the Vaisālians were audacious enough to invade their

---

\textsuperscript{1} Cfr. The Vajji Mahallakā referred to in Digha, II. 74; Aṅguttara, IV. 19.

\textsuperscript{2} § 128.

\textsuperscript{3} Nava Mallai (Mallati) nava Lechchhāti (Lechchhatti) Kāśi Kośalagā (variant Kośalaka) aṭṭhārāsa vi gaṇarājāno.

The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu, ed by Hermann Jacob, 1879, Jinaśarita, p. 65 (§ 128); Nirayāvalīya Suttam (Dr. S. Warren), 1879, § 26; SBE, XXII, 1884, p. 266.

Dr. Barua is inclined to identify the nine Lichchhavis and the nine Mallakis with the eighteen gaṇarājās who belonged to Kāśi and Kośala. He refers in this connection to the Kalpadruma-kalikavyākhyā which represents the Mallakis as adhipas (or overlords) of Kāśi-jeśa, and the ‘Lechchhakas’ as adhīpas of Kośala-jeśa, and further describes them as sāmantas or vassals of Cetaka, maternal uncle of Mahāvīra (Indian Culture, Vol. II, p. 810). It is news to students of Indian history that in the days of Mahāvīra the kingdom of Kāśi and Kośala acknowledged the supremacy of the Mallas and Lichchhavis respectively, and formed part of an empire over which Cetaka presided. Even Dr. Barua hesitates to accept this interpretation of the late Jaina commentator in its entirety and suggests that the nine Mallas and the nine Lichchhavis...derived their family prestige from their original connection with the dynasties of Kāśi and Kośala. The Paramattha-jotikā (Khuddaka pāṭha commentary), however, connects the Lichchhavis not with the dynasty of Kośala but with that of Kāśi. The divergent testimony of these late commentators shows that they can hardly be regarded as preserving genuine tradition. There is no suggestion in any early Buddhist or Jaina text that either the Lichchhavia or the Mallas actually ruled over any grāma or nigama in Kāśi-Kośala (see Indian Culture, II, 808). The gaṇarājās of Kāśi-Kośala apparently refer to the Kālāmas, Śākyas and other clans in the Kośalan empire.
neighbours across the Ganges. In the reign of Ajātaśatru the tables were turned, and the great confederacy of Vaiśāli was utterly destroyed.

The Malla territory, ancient Malla-raṭṭha, the Malla-rāṣṭra of the Mahābhārata, was split up into two main parts which had for their capitals the cities of Kusāvatī or Kusinārā and Pava. The river, Kaguttā, the Cacouthes of the classical writers, identified with the modern Kuku, probably formed the dividing line. The division of the people is also known to the great epic which draws a distinction between the Mallas proper and the Dakshaṇa or Southern Mallas. There is no agreement among scholars regarding the exact site of Kusinārā. In the Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta it is stated that the Sala Grove of the Mallas, the Upavattana (outskirt or suburb) of Kusinārā, lay near the river Hiranyavatī. Smith identifies the stream with the Gaṇḍak and says that Kuśinagara (Kusinārā) was situated in Nepāl, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the Little, or Eastern Rāpti with the Gaṇḍak. He, however, admits that the discovery in the large stūpa behind the Nīṛvāṇa temple near Kasiā on the Choṭa Gaṇḍak, in the east of the Gorakhpur district, of an inscribed copper-plate bearing the words “[parini]r vāṇa-chaitye tāmrapattā iti,” supports the old theory, propounded by Wilson and accepted by Cunningham, that the remains near Kasiā represent Kuśi-nagara.

1 Sū-gu-ki, Bk. IX.
2 DPPN, II. 781-82.
3 VI. 9, 34.
4 Kusa Jātaka, No. 531; Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 136 ff, 161-62.
5 AGI (1924), 714.
6 Mbk. II. 30. 3 and 12.
7 JRAS, 1916, 659; Dīgka, II. 137.
8 EHI, third ed., p. 189 n.
9 ASI, A. R. 1911-12, 17 ff., JRAS. 1913, 152. Kasiā is a village that lies about 35 miles to the east of Gorakhpur (AGI, 403).
Pāvā was identified by Cunningham1 with the village named Padaraona, 12 miles to the N.N.E. of Kasiā, and separated from it by the Bādhi Nala (identified with the ancient Kakutthā). Carleyle, however, proposes to identify Pāvā with Fāzilpur, 10 miles S.E. of Kasiā and separated from it by the Kuku.2 In the Saṅgīti Suttanta we have a reference to the Mote Hall of the Pāvā Mallas named Ubbhaṭaka.3

The Mallas together with the Lichchhavis are classed by Manu as Vrātya Kshatriyas. They, too, like their eastern neighbours were among ardent champions of Buddhism.

Like Videha, Malla had at first a monarchical constitution. The Kusa Jātaka mentions a Malla king named Okkāka (Ikshvāku). The name probably suggests that like the Sākyas4 the Malla princes also claimed to belong to the Ikshvāku family. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta they are sometimes called Vāseṭṭhas, i.e., “belonging to the Vasishṭha gotra.”5 The Mahāsudassana Sutta mentions another king named Mahāsudassana.6 These rulers, Okkāka and Mahāsudassana, may or may not have been historical individuals. But the tales that cluster round their names imply that Malla-ratṭha was at first ruled by kings. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence of the Mahābhārata7 which refers to an overlord (adhipa) of the Mallas. During the monarchical period the metropolis was a great city and was styled

1 AGI, 1924, 498.
2 Kukutthā; AGI, 1924, 714.
3 DPPN, II. 194.
7 II, 30, 3.
Kusāvāti. Other important cities were Anupiyā and Uruvelakappa.¹

Before Bimbisāra’s time the monarchy had been replaced by republics² and the chief metropolis had sunk to the level of a “little wattel and daub town,” a “branch township” surrounded by jungles.³ It was then styled Kusinārā.

The relations of the Mallas with the Lichchhavis were sometimes hostile and on other occasions friendly. The introductory story of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka⁴ contains an account of a conflict between Bandhula the Mallian, Commander-in-chief of the king of Kośala, and 500 elders of the Lichchhavis. The Jaina Kalpasūtra, however, refers to “nine Mallakis” as having combined with the Lichchhavis, and the seigniors of Kāsi-Kośala against Kūnika-Ajātaśatru who, like Philip of Macedon, was trying to absorb the territories of his republican neighbours. The Malla territory was finally annexed to Magadha. It certainly formed a part of the Maurya Empire in the third century B.C.

Chedi was one of the countries encircling the Kurus, parītaḥ Kurūṇ, and lay near the Jumna.⁵ It was closely connected with the Matsyas beyond the Chambal, the Kāsis of Benares, and the Kārushas in the valley of the Son,⁶ and

¹ Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 149. Dialogues, Pt. III (1921), 7; Gradual Sayings, IV. 293. Anupiyā stood on the banks of the river Anomā which lay thirty leagues to the east of Kapilavastu. It was here that the future Budhā cut off his hair and put on the robes of the ascetics. (DPPN, I, 81, 102).
³ Khudda-nagaraka, ujjāgala-nagaraka, sākhā-nagaraka.
⁴ No. 405.
⁵ Pargiter, JASB, 1895, 253 ff; Medh. L. 63. 2-58; IV. i. 11.
⁶ Medh. V. 22, 25; 74 16; 198. 2; VI. 47, 4; 54. 8.
is distinguished from the Daśārṇas who lived on the banks of the Dhasan. In ancient times it corresponded roughly to the eastern part of modern Bundelkhand and some adjoining tracts. In the mediæval period, however, the southern frontiers of Chedi extended to the banks of the Narmadā (Mekala-Sutā):

Nadīnām Mekala-sutā nṛpāṇāṁ Raṇavigrahaḥ
kavanāṁ cha Suranandaś Chedi-maṇḍala-maṇḍanāṁ

We learn from the Chetiya Jātaka that the metropolis was Sotthivatī-nagara. The Mahābhārata gives its Sanskrit name Śuktimati, or Suktī-sāhavya. The Great Epic mentions also a river called Śuktimati which flowed by the capital of Rājā Uparichara of the Chedi-vishaya (district). Pargiter identifies the stream with the Ken, and places the city of Śuktimati in the neighbourhood of Banda. Other towns of note were Sahajāti, and Tripuri, the mediæval capital of the Janapada.

1 Princesses of Daśārṇa were given in marriage to Bhīma of Vidarbha and Virabāhu or Subāhu of Chedi (Mbh. III. 69. 14-15).
2 Pargiter (JASB, 1895, 253) places Chedi along the south bank of the Jumna from the Chambal on the north-west as far as Karwi on the south-east; its limits southwards may have been, according to him, the plateau of Malwa and the hills of Bundelkhand.
4 No. 422.
5 III. 20. 50; XIV. 83. 2; N. L. Dey, Ind. Ant., 1919, p. vii of Geographical Dictionary.
6 I, 63. 35.
7 JASB, 1895, 255, Mārkandaṭya P., p. 850.
8 Aṅguttara, III. 355 (P.T.S.). Aṣāmā Mahāchundo Chetisu viharatī Sahajātīyāṁ. Sahajāti lay on the trade route along the river Ganges (Buddhist India, p. 103). Cf. the legend on a seal-die of terra-cotta found at Bhita, 10 miles from Allahabad (Arch. Epol. Ind., 1909-10, by Marshall, JRB, 1911, 129 f.)—Sahijitīgī vigamaś, in letters of about the third century B.C. see also JBRs, XIX, 1933, 293.
9 Tripuri stood close to the Netbudda not far from modern Jubbulpore. In the Haimakosa it is called Chedinagari (JASB, 1895, 249). The city finds mention in the Mbh. III. 253. 10, along with Kośala, and its people, the Traipuras, are referred in VI. 87. 9. together with the Mekalas and the Kurnbindas.
The Chedi people are mentioned as early as the Rig-Veda. Their king Kasu Chaidya is praised in a Dānastuti (praise of gift) occurring at the end of one hymn. Rapson proposes to identify him with ‘Vasu’ of the Epics.

The Chetiya Jātaka gives a legendary genealogy of Chaidya kings, taking their descent from Mahāsammata and Māndhātā. Upachara, a King of the line, had five sons who are said to have founded the cities of Hatthipura, Assapur, Sihapura, Uttarapañchāla and Daddarapura. This monarch is probably identical with Uparichara Vasu, the Paurava king of Chedi, mentioned in the Mahābhārata, whose five sons also founded five lines of kings. But epic tradition associates the scions of Vasu’s family with the cities of Kauśāmbī, Mahodaya (Kanauj) and Girivraja.

The Mahābhārata speaks also of other Chedi kings like Damaghosha, his son Siśupāla Sunītha and his sons Dhṛishbāketu and Sarabha who reigned about the time of the Bhārata war. But the Jātaka and epic accounts of the early kings of Chedi are essentially legendary and in the absence of more reliable evidence, cannot be accepted as genuine history.

We learn from the Vedabbha Jātaka that the road from Kāśi to Chedi was unsafe being infested with roving bands of marauders.

1 VIII. 5. 37-39.
2 Hatthipura may be identified with Hatthinipura or Hāstinapura in the Kuru country. Assapurā with the city of that name in Aṅga, and Sihapura with the town of Lāla from which Vijaya went to Ceylon. There was another Sihapura in the Western Punjab (Watters I. 248). Uttarapañchāla is Ahichhatakra in Rohilkhand. Daddarapura was apparently in the Himalayan region. (DPPN, I. 1054).
3 I. 63. 1-2.
4 I. 63. 30.
5 Rāmāyaṇa, I. 32. 6-9; Mahābhārata, I. 63. 30-33.
6 No. 49.
Vaṁśa or Vatsa was the country south of the Ganges of which Kauśāmbī, modern Kosam, on the Jumna, near Allahabad, was the capital. Oldenberg is inclined to identify the Vaṁsaśas with the Vaśas of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. But the conjecture lacks proof. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions a teacher named Proti Kauśāmbeya whom Harisvāmin, the commentator, considers to be a native of the town of Kauśāmbī. Epic tradition attributes the foundation of this famous city to a Chedi prince. The origin of the Vatsa people, however, is traced to a king of Kāsi. It is stated in the Purāṇas that when the city of Hāstinapura was washed away by the Ganges, Nichakshu, the great-great-grandson of Janamejaya, abandoned it, and removed his residence to Kauśāmbī. We have already seen that the Purānic tradition about the Bhārata or Kuru origin of the later kings of Kauśāmbī is confirmed by two plays attributed to Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī, is described in the Svapnavāsavadatta and the Pratijñā Yaugandharāyana as a scion of the Bhārata-kula.

The Purāṇas give a list of Nichakshu’s successors down to Kshemaka, and cite the following genealogical verse:

1 Rām. II, 52. 101.
2 Nariman, Jackson and Ogden, Priyadarśikā, lxxvi; the Brīhat Katha Śloka Saṁgraha (4. 14, cf. 8, 21) explicitly states that Kauśāmbī was on the Kālindī or Jumna. Malalasekera, DPPN, 694. The reference in one text to the position of the city on the Ganges is possibly due to its proximity to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna in ancient times, or to a copyist’s error.
3 Buddha, 333 n.
4 Sat. Br., XII, 2. 2. 13.
5 See p. 70 ante.
6 Rām., I, 32. 3-6; Mbh. I, 63. 31.
7 Harivamśa, 29. 73; Mbh., XII, 49. 80.
8 Svapna, ed. Gaṇapati Śāstri, p. 140; Pratijñā, pp. 61, 121.
Brahma-kshatrasya\textsuperscript{1} yo yonir
vam\textit{\textasciitilde}o devarshi-sat\textit{\textasciitilde}rita\textit{\textasciitilde}h
Kshemakam pr\textit{\textasciitilde}pya r\textit{\textasciitilde}\textit{\textasciitilde}\textit{\textasciitilde}j\textit{\textasciitilde}nam
samsth\textit{\textasciitilde}hm pr\textit{\textasciitilde}psyati vai kai\textit{\textasciitilde}au.

"The family honoured by gods and sages (or divine sages), from which sprang Br\textit{\textasciitilde}hma\textit{\textasciitilde}nas and Kshatriyas (or those who combined the Br\textit{\textasciitilde}hma\textit{\textasciitilde}na and Kshatriya status) will verily, on reaching Kshemaka, come to an end (or be interrupted) in the Kali Age."

The criticism that has been offered in this work in regard to the Ikshvakus and Magadhan lists of kings applies with equal force to the Paurava-Bh\textit{\textasciitilde}rata line. Here, too, we find mention of princes (\textit{e.g.}, Arjuna and Abhimanyu) who can hardly be regarded as crowned \textit{\textasciitilde}r\textit{\textasciitilde}pas or monarchs. It is also by no means improbable that, as in the case of the Ikshvakus and the royal houses of Magadha and Avanti, contemporaries have been represented as successors and collaterals described as lineal descendants. There is, moreover, no unanimity in regard to the names of even the immediate predecessors of Udayana, the most famous among the later kings of the family. These facts should be remembered in determining the chronology and order of succession of the Bh\textit{\textasciitilde}rata dynasty of Kau\textit{\textasciitilde}ambi. The earliest king of the line about whom we know anything definite is \textit{\textasciitilde}t\textit{\textasciitilde}n\textit{\textasciitilde}na II of the Pur\textit{\textasciitilde}nic lists. His father’s name was Vasudana according to the \textit{\textasciitilde}t\textit{\textasciitilde}nu\textit{\textasciitilde}nas, and Sahasr\textit{\textasciitilde}n\textit{\textasciitilde}na according to ‘Bh\textit{\textasciitilde}sa.’ \textit{\textasciitilde}t\textit{\textasciitilde}n\textit{\textasciitilde}na himself was also styled Parantapa.\textsuperscript{2} He married a princess of Videha as his son is called

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Brahma-Kshatriya\textit{\textasciitilde}n\textit{\textasciitilde}n kula of the inscriptions of the Sena kings who claimed descent from the Lunar Race to which the Bharatas, including the Kurus, belonged.

\textsuperscript{2} Buddhist India, p. 8.
Vaidehi putra. He is said to have attacked Champā, the capital of Aṅga, during the reign of Dadhivāhana. His son and successor was the famous Udayana, the contemporary of the Buddha and of Pradyota of Avanti and therefore, of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru of Magadha.

The Bhagga (Bharga) state of Suṁsumāragiri, 'Crocodile Hill', was a dependency of Vatsa. The Mahābhārata and the Harivamśa testify to the close connection of these two territories and their proximity to the principality of a Nishāda chieftain, while the Apadāna seems to associate Bharga with Kārusha. The evidence points to the location of Suṁsumāragiri between the Jumna and the lower valley of the Son.

The Kuru realm was according to the Mahā-Sutasoma jātaka three hundred leagues in extent. The reigning dynasty according to the Pali texts belonged to the Yuddhiṭṭhila gotta, i.e., the family of Yudhiṣṭhīra. The capital was Indapatta or Indapattana, i.e., Indraprastha or Indrapat near modern Delhi. It extended over seven leagues. We hear also of another city called Hatthinipura, doubtless, the Hāstināpura of the epic, and a number of nīgamas or smaller towns and villages besides

1 Sapna-rāsaśodatta, Act VI, p. 129.
2 JASB, 1914, p. 321.
3 Jātaka, No. 359; Carmichael Leo., 1918, p. 63.
4 II. 30. 10-11.

"Vatsabhumiṅcha Kaunteya vijīgye balavān balat Bhargagyāmadhipanchaiva Nishādādhipatīn tathā.

"The mighty son of Kunti (i., e. Bhimasena) conquered by force the Vatsa country and the lord of the Bhargas and then the chieftain of the Nishādas"

5 29. 73. Pratardanaśya putrau dva

"Pratardana had two sons, Vatsa and Bharga."

6 DPPN, II. 345

7 No. 537.

8 Dhāmakāri Jātaka, No. 413; Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka, No. 496.

9 Jātaka Nos. 537, 545.

10 The Buddhist Conception of Spirits; DPPN, II. 1819.
the capital, such as Thullakoṭṭhita, Kammāssadamma, Kuṇḍi and Vāraṇāvata.1

The Jātakas mention the Kuru kings and princes styled Dhanañjaya Koravya,2 Koravya,3 and Sutasoma.4 We cannot, however, vouch for their historical existence in the absence of further evidence.

The Jaina Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions a king named Ishukāra ruling at the town called Ishukāra in the Kuru country.5 It seems probable that after the removal of the elder branch of the royal family to Kausāmbi and the decline of the Abhipratārīnas, the Kuru realm was parcelled out into small states of which Indapatta and Ishukāra were apparently the most important. "Kings" are mentioned as late as the time of the Buddha when one of them paid a visit to Ratṭhapāla, son of a Kuru magnate, who had become a disciple of the Śākya Sage. Later on, the little principalities gave place to a Saṅgha possibly, a republican confederation.6

Pañchāla, as already stated, comprised Rohilkhand and a part of the Central Doab. The Mahābhārata, the Jātakas and the Divyāvadāna8 refer to the division of this country into two parts, viz, Uttara or Northern Pañchāla and Dakshiṇa or Southern Pañchāla. The Bhāgirathī (Ganges) formed the dividing line.8 According to the

1 The epic (Mbh. V. 31, 19; 72, 15 etc.) has a reference to four villages, viz., Avisthala Vrikṣasthala, Mākandi, Vāraṇāvata.
2 Kurudhamma Jātaka, No. 276; Dhūmakāri Jātaka, No. 413; Sambhava Jātaka, No. 515; Vīdhura Pañḍita Jātaka, No. 545. Dhanañjaya is, as is well-known, a name of Arjuna.
3 Daśa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka, No. 495; Mahā-Sutasoma Jātaka, No. 537.
4 Mahā-Sutasoma Jātaka. Cf. the Mahābhārata, I. 95. 75 where Sutasoma appears as the name of a son of Bhima.
5 S. B. E., XLV, 62.
6 DPPN, II. 706 f.
7 Arthāśāstra, 1919, 378.
8 P. 438.
9 Mbh., I. 138. 70. For divisions in Vedic times see 70 f. ante,
Great Epic, Northern Pañchāla had its capital at Ahichchhatra or Chhatravatī, the modern Rāmnagar near Aonlā in the Bareilly District, while Southern Pañchāla had its capital at Kāmpilya, and stretched from the Ganges to the Chambal.¹ A great struggle raged in ancient times between the Kurus and the Pañchālas for the possession of Northern (Uttara) Pañchāla. Sometimes Uttara Pañchāla was included in Kururaṭṭha (-rāṣṭra)² and had its capital at Hāstinapura,³ at other times it formed a part of Kampilla-raṭṭha (Kāmpilya-rāṣṭra).⁴ Sometimes kings of Kāmpilya-rāṣṭra held court at Uttara Pañchāla-nagara, at other times kings of Uttara Pañchāla-rāṣṭra held court at Kāmpilya.⁵

The history of Pañchāla from the death of Pravāhaṇa Jaivala or Jaivali to the time of Bimbisāra of Magadha is obscure. The only king who may perhaps be referred to this period is Durmukha (Dummukha), the contemporary of Nimi,⁶ who is probably to be identified with the penultimate sovereign of Mithilā.⁷ In the Kumbhakaṇa Jātaka it is stated that Durmukha’s kingdom was styled Uttara Pañchāla-raṭṭha (-rāṣṭra); his capital was not Ahichchhatra but Kampilla (Kāmpilya)-nagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Karaṇḍu, king of Kaliṅga, Naggaji (Nagnajit), king of Gandhāra, and Nimi, king of Videha. The Aitareya Brahmana⁸ credits him with extensive conquests and names Brihaduktha as his priest:

¹ Mbb., I. 138. 78-74.
² Somanassa Jātaka, No. 505 ; Mahābhārata, I. 138.
³ Diegavadāna, p. 495.
⁴ Brahmadatta Jātaka, No. 323 ; Jayaddisa Jātaka, No. 513 and Ganḍa-tindu Jātaka, No. 530.
⁵ Kumbhakāra Jātaka, No. 408.
⁶ Jātaka, No. 408.
⁷ Jātaka, No. 541.
⁸ VIII. 23.
"Etam ha vā Aindram Mahābhishekām Brihadukthān Rishir Durmukhāya Pañchālāya procachā tasmādu Durmukhā Pañchālo Rājā san vidyāya samantam sarvatah prithivim jayan pariṇaya."

"This great anointing of Indra Brihadukthha, the seer, proclaimed to Durmukha, the Pañchāla. Therefore, Durmukha Pañchāla, being a king, by this knowledge, went round the earth completely, conquering on every side."¹

A great Pañchāla king named Chulani Brahmadatta is mentioned in the Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka,² the Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra,³ the Svapna-vāscavadattā⁴ and the Rāmāyana.⁵ In the last-mentioned work he is said to have married the daughters (kanyā) of Kuśanābha who were made hump-backed (kubja) by the Wind-god. In the Jātaka, Kevatta, the minister of Brahmadatta, is said to have formed a plan for making Chulani chief king of all India, and the king himself is represented as having laid siege to Mithilā. In the Uttar-ādhyayana Brahmadatta is styled a universal monarch. The story of this king is, however, essentially legendary, and little reliance can be placed on it. The Rāmāyanić legend regarding the king is only important as showing the connection of the early Pañchālas with the foundation of the famous city of Kanyakubja (Kanauj) whose name (city of the hump-backed maiden) is accounted for by the curse to which the story refers.⁶

² 546.
³ S. B. E., XLV. 57-61.
⁴ Act V.
⁵ I. 32.
⁶ Cf. Watters, Yuan Chwang, I. 341-42. The point seems to be missed by Ratilal Mehta, Pre-Buddhist India, 43 n. The name Kanyakubja or Kanyakubja is already met with in the Mahābhārata, I. 175. 3; V. 119. 4. Kanyakubj occurs in the Mahābhāṣya IV. 1. 2. (233), along with Abichchātri. Kaṇḍakujja appears in Pāli texts (DPPN, I. 408).
The Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra mentions a king of Kāmpilya named Sañjaya who gave up his kingly power and adopted the faith of the Jinas.¹ We do not know what happened after Sañjaya renounced his throne. But there is reason to believe that the Pañchālas, like the Videhas, Mallas and Kurus, established a Saṅgha form of government of the Rāja-sabd-opajīvin type.²

Matsya was the extensive territory between the hills near the Chambal and the forests that skirted the Sarasvatī, of which the centre was Virāṭa-nagara or Bairāṭ in the modern Jaipur State. The early history of the kingdom has already been related. Its vicissitudes during the period which immediately preceded the reign of Bimbisāra of Magadha are not known.³ It is not included by the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra among those states which had a Saṅgha or non-monarchical form of government. The probability is that the monarchical constitution endured till the loss of its independence. It was probably at one time annexed to the neighbouring kingdom of Chedi. The Mahābhārata⁴ refers to a king named Sabhaja who reigned over the Chedis as well as the Matsyas. It was finally absorbed into the Magadhān Empire. Some of the most famous edicts of Aśoka have been found at Bairāṭ.

A family of Matsyas settled in the Vizagapatam region in mediæval times.⁵ We are told that Jayatsena, the lord of Utkala, gave to Satyamārtanda of the Matsya family in marriage his daughter Prabhāvati, and appointed him to

¹ S.B.E., XLV. 80-82.
² Arthaśāstra, 1919, p. 378. The Elders of this type of corporations or confederations took the title of Rāja. One of these rājas was apparently the maternal grandfather of Vīsākha Pañchālīputra, a disciple of the Buddha (DPN. II. 109).
³ 66 ff ante.
⁴ V. 74. 16; cf. VI. 47, 67; 52. 9.
⁵ Dibbida plates, Ep. Ind., V, 108.
rule over the Oḍḍavādi country. After twenty-three generations came Arjuna who ruled in 1269 A.D.

The Śūrasena country had its capital at Mathurā which, like Kauśāmbī, stood on the Jumna. Neither the country nor its metropolis finds any mention in the Vedic literature. But Greek writers refer to the Sourasenoī and their cities Methora (Mathurā) and Cleisobora. Buddhist theologians make complaint about the absence of amenities in Mathurā. They were apparently not much interested in its kettledrums,¹ or in the śātakas (garments) and kārshāpanas (coins) about which Patañjali speaks in the Mahābhāṣyā.² A highroad connected the city with a place called Verañjā which was linked up with Śrāvasti and the caravan-route that passed from Taxila to Benares through Soreyya, Saṅkassa (Saṅkāsya), Kaṇñakujja (Kanyākubja or Kanauj), and Payāga-Patiṭhāna (Allahabad).³

In the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas the ruling family of Mathurā is styled the Yadu or Yādava family. The Yādavas were divided into various septs, namely, the Vitihotras, Sātvatas, etc.⁴ The Sātvatas were subdivided into several branches, e.g., the Daivāvridhas, Andhakas, Mahā-bhojas and Vṛishnis.⁵

Yadu and his tribe are repeatedly mentioned in the Rig-Veda. He is closely associated with Turvāṣa and, in one place, with Druhyu, Anu and Pūru.⁶ This association is also implied by the epic and Purānic legends which state that Yadu and Turvāsu were the sons of the same parents, and Druhyu, Anu and Pūru were their step-brothers.

¹ Gradual Sayings, II. 78; III. 183.
² I. 2. 48 (Kielhorn I. 19).
³ Gradual Sayings, II. p. 66: DPPN. II. 438, 990, 1311.
⁴ Matsya, 43-44: Vāyu, 94-96.
⁶ I. 108. 8.
We learn from the *Rig-veda* that Yadu and Turvaśa came from a distant land, and the former is brought into very special relation to the *Paršus* or Persians. The Sātvatas or *Satvats* also appear to be mentioned in the Vedic texts. In the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an *Āsvamedha* sacrifice, are referred to. The geographical position of Bharata’s kingdom is clearly shown by the fact that he made offerings on the Sarasvatī, the Jumna and the Ganges. The Satvats must have been occupying some adjoining region. The epic and Purānic tradition which places them in the Mathurā district is thus amply confirmed. At a later time, however, a branch of the Satvats seems to have migrated farther to the south, for in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* the Satvats are described as a southern people who lived beyond the Kuru-Paṇḍha area, i.e., beyond the river Chambal, and were ruled by Bhoja kings. In

1. I. 36. 18; VI. 45. 1.
2. VIII. 6. 46. Epigraphic evidence points to a close connection between Western Asia and India from about the middle of the second millennium B.C. *Rig* Vedic Gods like Śrya (Shurias), Marut (Maruttash), Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, the Nāsatyas, and even *Daksha* (dakash, star, CAH. I. 553) figure in the records of the Kassites and the Mitanni.
3. XIII. 5. 4. 21 *Satānikāḥ samantāsu medhyāṁ Sātṛjīto hayam ādatta yajñāṁ Kāśināṁ Bharataḥ Satvatāmīva.*

The *Mbh.* vii 66. 7 (mā sattevāni viṣṭijah) seems to miss the import of the Brāhmaṇic gāthā.


*Ashṭāsaptatīṁ Bharato Daņushántarī Yamunānamu Gaṅgāyāṁ *Vṛitragnore* badhāt pañcchāpanchāstāmay hayān Mahākarma (variant mahadadya) Bharatasya na pūre nāpare fanāḥ dīvyam martyā iva hastāgāhyām (variant bāhūbhāyāṁ) nodāpuḥ pañca māṇavā (iti).

*So śvameghaśaṭteneshtīva* Yamunānamu viryaśeṇ tristātvām Sarasvatiyām Gaṅgāmanu chaluḥśatān...

5. VIII. 14. 3.
the Purānas also we find that a branch of the Satvats was styled Bhoja:


It is further stated that several southern states, Māhishmati, Vidarbha, etc., were founded by princes of Yadu lineage.2 Not only the Bhojas, but the Devāvrdha branch of the Sātvatas finds mention in the Vedic literature. Babhru Daivāvrdha6 is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa4 as a contemporary of Bhima, king of Vidarbha, and of Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. The Andhakas and Vrishnis are referred to in the Ashītādhyāyi of Paṇini.5 In the Kauṭiliya Arthaśastra6 the Vrishnis are described as a Saṅgha, i. e., a republican corporation. The Mahābhārata, too, refers to the Vrishnis, Andhakas and other associate tribes as a Saṅgha,7 and Vāsudeva, the Vrishṇi prince, as Saṅgha-mukhya (Elder or Seignior of the confederacy). The name of the Vrishṇi corporation (gana) has also been preserved by a unique coin.8 It is stated in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas that Kausa, like Peisistratus and others of Greek history, tried to make himself tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and that Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, a scion

1 Vishṇu IV. 13. 1-6. In Mbh. VIII. 7. 8 the Sātvata-Bhojas are located in Anarta(Gujrāt).
2 Mat., 43. 10-20; 44. 33; Vāyu, 94, 26; 95. 35.
3 Vāyu, 96. 15; Vishṇu, 13. 3-5.
4 VII. 34.
5 IV. 1. 114; VI. 9. 34.
6 P. 12.
7 XII. 31. 25.
8 Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, p. 119; Allen, CCAI, pp. civf, 281.
of the Vṛṣṇi family, killed him. The slaying of Kamsa by Kṛṣṇa is referred to by Patañjali and the Ghaṭa Jadaka.1 The latter work confirms the Hindu tradition about the association of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva’s family with Mathurā (Uttara Madhurā).2

1 No. 454.
2 The city is so called to distinguish it from Mādura in South India. The question of the historical existence of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva has been discussed in my Early History of the Vaṃśavāna Sect, 1st ed., pp. 26-35; 2nd ed., pp. 51 ff. and my Political History of Ancient India, 1st ed., 1923, p. 312.

Several scholars reject the identification of Kṛṣṇa of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas with the historical Kṛṣṇa of the Chhāndogya Upanishad (III. 17). But we should remember that—

(a) Both the Kṛṣṇas have the metronymic Devakiputra, son of Devaki, which is rare in early times.

(b) The teacher of the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa belonged to a family (Āṅgirasa) closely associated with the Bhojas (Ṛg-Veda. III. 53. 7), the kindreds of the Epic Kṛṣṇa (Mbh., II. 14. 33-34).

(c) The Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa and his Guru Ghora Āṅgirasa were worshippers of Śūrya (the Sun-god). We are told in the Śāntipareṇa (335. 19) that the Śāvatva-vidhi taught by the Epic Kṛṣṇa was prāk-Śūrya-mukha-nilśīta.

(d) An Āṅgirasa was the Guru of the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa. Āṅgirasi Śruti is quoted as “Śrutiśiṣantamā Śrutiḥ” by the Epic Kṛṣṇa (Mbh., VIII. 69. 85).

(e) The Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa is taught the worship of the Sun, the noblest of all rights (jyotir-uttamamiti), high above all darkness (tamasaspari). This has its parallel in the Gītā (XIII. 18—jyotishāmapi tajjyotis tamasaḥ param uchāya; f) The Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa is taught to value, not any material reward (dakṣīṇā), but rather the virtues of tapodānam ārjavam ahamā satyavachanam.

The Gītā also eulogizes action performed not for the material fruit thereof. Stress is laid in Gītā XVI. 1-2 on the virtues enumerated in the Upanishads.

The Purāṇa no doubt represent Sāndipani, and not Ghora, as the great teacher of Kṛṣṇa. But it has to be remembered that according to the Vishnu Purāṇa (V. 21. 19) Kṛṣṇa went to the sage Sāndipani to learn lessons in the science of arms (astraśikṣā):

Tataḥ Sāndipaniṁ Kāśyam Avantipuraṁvāsinam astraśārthāṁ jagmaṇuvirant Baladeva-Janārdanau.

The Harivamśa, too, informs us (Vishnuparāsa, 33, 4 ff.) that the residence of Kṛṣṇa, who was already a śrutidhara, with his Guru Sāndipani was due to his desire of receiving lessons in the science of the bow (dhanurveda-dhikirśarthaṁ). The Veda that he learnt from this teacher is not termed akhila Veda, or Traft, but simply sāṅga-Vedam, the Veda with its auxiliary treatises. The only Veda that is expressly mentioned is the Dhanurveda (and not the Traft) together with its four divisions (chatushpāda), etc. The compilers of the Bhāgavata and Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇas ( Bhāg. X. 45. 31 ff.; BV, Janmaḥaya, 101-102 ) introduce
The final overthrow of the Vrishnis is ascribed to their irreverent conduct towards Brähmanaś. It is interesting to note that the Vrishñis and the Andhakas are branded as Vṛātyas, i.e., deviators from orthodoxy in the Droṇa parva of the Mahābhārata. It is a remarkable fact that the Vrishṇi-Andhakas and other Vṛātya clans, e.g., the Lichchhavis and Mallas, are found in historical times on the southern and eastern fringe of the ‘‘Dhruvā Madhyama dis’’ occupied by the Kuru-Paṇḍālas and two other folks. It is not improbable that they represent an earlier swarm of Aryans who were pushed southwards and eastwards by the Pūru-Bharatas, the progenitors of the Kuru Paṇḍālas. It may be remembered that the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa actually refers to the defeat by Bharata of the Satavats—the progenitors of the Vrishṇi-Andhakas. And the Great Epic refers to the exodus of the Yādavas from Mathurā owing to pressure from the Paurava line of Magadha, and probably also from the Kurus.

The Buddhist texts refer to Avantiputta, king of the Sūrasenas, in the time of Mahā-Kachchāna, one of the

details about the study of all the Vedas, Upanishads, treatises on law, philosophy, polity, etc., which are not found in the relevant passage of the Vīshṇu Purāṇa, which, according to critics like Bankim Chandra Chaṭṭopādhyāya, represents an earlier and more reliable tradition. Residence with Śāndipani, therefore, does not conflict with the view that Krṣṇa accepted the discipleship of Ghōra for purposes of religious and philosophical studies (see EHVS. 2nd ed., pp. 76-74; Śāndipani already knew him to be a Shrutiḍhara (versed in the Shruti or the Vedas; Hari-
vaśīda, Vīśṇuparṇa, 33, 6).

Real discrepancies in regard to certain names are sometimes met with in Vedic and epic versions of several legends e.g., the story of Śukṛhaśeṣa. But these are not regarded as adequate grounds for doubting the identity of the leading character of the Vedic Ikṣvāka with that of the corresponding epic tale.

1 Mahābhārata, Manusala parva, I. 15-22; 2. 10; Arthasastra, 1919 p. 12; Jātaka Eng. trans. IV. pp. 55-56 V, p. 188. Fausboll, IV. 871; V. 967.
2 141. 15.
4 M. 2· 33, DPPN, II. 438.
chief disciples of Śākyamuni, through whose agency Buddhism gained ground in the Mathurā region. The name of the king suggests relationship with the royal house of Avanti. A king named Kuvinda is mentioned in the Kāvyā-Mimāṁśā. The Sūrasenas continued to be a notable people down to the time of Megasthenes. But at that time they must have formed an integral part of the Maurya Empire.

Assaka (Aśmaka) was situated on the banks of the Godāvari. Its capital, Potali, Potana or Podana is possibly to be identified with Bodhan in the Nizam’s dominions. This accords with its position between Mūlaka (district round Paiṭhān) and Kalinga to which Pāli texts bear witness. In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka we find Assaka associated with Avanti. This may suggest that Assaka included at that time Mūlaka and some neighbouring districts and thus its territory approached the southern frontier of Avanti.

In the Vāyu Purāṇa Aśmaka and Mūlaka appear as scions of the Ikshvāku family, and the Mahābhārata speaks of the royal sage Aśmaka (Aśmako nama rājarshi) as having founded the city of Podana. This probably indicates that the Aśmaka and Mūlaka kingdoms were believed to have been founded by Ikshvāku chiefs, just

---

1 3rd ed., p. 50. He prohibited the use of harsh conjunct consonants.
2 Sutta Nipāta, 977.
3 Chulla-Kāliṅga Jātaka, No. 301; D. 2. 275; Law, Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective, 74; Mbh. I. 177. 47. As pointed out by Dr. Sukthankar the older mss. give the name as Potana or Podana and not Paudanya. This agrees with the evidence of the Mahāgovinda Suttanta (Assakānaścha Potanam) and the Parisīṣṭha parvan (1. 92) — nagare Potanābhidhe.
4 Sutta Nipāta, 977; Jātaka No. 301.
5 Cf. Bhandarkar, Carm. Loc., 1918, pp. 53-54. It appears from the Mahāgovinda Suttanta that at one time Avanti extended southwards as far as the Narmadā valley and included the city of Māfishmati which stood on the banks of the famous river.
6 89. 177-178; Mbh. I. 177. 47.
as Vidarbha and Dandaka were founded by princes of the Yadu (Bhoja) family. The Mahāgovinda Suttaṁa mentions Brahmadatta, king of the Assakas, as a contemporary of Sattabhu, king of Kaliṅga, Vessabhu, king of Avantı, Bharata, king of Sovira, Reṇu, king of Videha, Dhataraṭṭha, king of Aṅga and Dhataraṭṭha, king of Kāśi.¹

We learn from the Assaka Jātaka² that at one time the city of Potali was included in the kingdom of Kāśi, and that its prince, Assaka, was presumably a vassal of the Kāśi monarch. The Chulla Kālinga Jātaka mentions a king of Assaka named Aruṇa and his minister Nandisena, and refers to a victory which they won over the king of Kaliṅga.

Avantı roughly corresponds to the Ujjain region, together with a part of the Narmada valley from Mandhātā to Maheshwar, and certain adjoining districts. Late Jaina writers include within its boundaries Tumbavana or Tumain in the Guna district of the Gwalior state about 50 miles to the north-west of Eran.³ The Janapada was divided into two parts by the Vindhyas; the northern part drained by the Siprā and other streams had its capital at Ujjain and the southern part washed by the Narmada had its centre at Māhissatī or

¹ Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, p. 270. The last-mentioned prince is known to the Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 22.

² No. 207.

³ Iha eva Jambudeipa pāg Bhartārdha vibhūshanam
Avantiriti deko 'sti svargadeśya riddhibhiḥ
tatra Tumbavanaṁti vidyate sanniceśanam.
Parīśhtaparvan, XII. 2-3

For the position of Tumbavana, see Ep. Ind., XXVI. 115ff.
Māhishmatī usually identified with the rocky island of Māṇḍhātā.  

Buddhist and Jain writers mention several other cities of Avanti, viz., Kuraraghara ("osprey's haunt"), Makkarakaṭa, and Sudarśanapura. The Mahāgovinda Suttaṁta mentions Māhissatī as the capital of the Avantis, and refers to their king Vessabhu. The Mahābhārata, however, distinguishes between the kingdoms of Avanti and Māhishmatī, but locates Vinda and Anuvinda of Avanti near the Narmadā.  

The Purāṇas attribute the foundation of Māhishmatī, Avanti, and Vidarbha to scions of the Yadu family. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa also associates the Satvats and the Bhojas, branches of the Yadu family according to the Purāṇas, with the southern realms.  

The Purāṇas style the first dynasty of Māhishmatī as Haihaya. This family is already known to the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra and figures in the Shoḍaśa-rājika and other episodes of the epic. The Haihayas are said to have overthrown the Nāgas who must have been the aboriginal inhabitants of the Narmadā region. The Matsya Purāṇa

---

1 In J. V. 183 (DPPN, I. 1050) Avanti is placed in Dakṣiṇāpatha. This is hardly reconcilable with the view that only the southern part is meant by the expression Avanti Dakṣiṇāpatha (Bhandarkar, Carm. Lec. 54).

2 Paragitor in Mark P.; Fleet in JRAS, 1910, 444f. There is one difficulty in the way of accepting this identification. Māṇḍhātā lay to the south of the Pāriyātra Mts. (W. Vindhyas), whereas Māhishmatī lay between the Vindhya and the Rūkṣa—to the north of the Vindhya and to the south of the Rūkṣa, according to the commentator Nilakaṇṭha (Harivamsa, II, 38, 7-19). For identification with Maheśvara, once the residence of the Holkar family, see Ind. Ant., 1875, 346ff.

For Māṇḍhātā, see ibid, 1876, 53.

3 Lüders Ins. No. 469: Gradual Sayings, V. 31: Law, Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 188; DPPN, I. 193: Kathākoka, 18.

4 Narmadāmabhitaḥ, Mbh., II. 31.10.

5 Matsya, 43-44; Vāyu, 96-96; Ait. Br., VIII. 14.

6 Matsya, 43, 8-29; Vāyu, 94, 4-29.

7 Arthaśāstra, p. 11; Mbh. vii. 86, 6 etc.; Saundara Nanda, VIII. 45.

8 Cf. Nagpur; and Ind. Ant., 1884, 83; Bomb. Gaz. I. 2913, etc.
mentions five branches of the Haihayas, namely Vithotras Bhojas, Avantis, Kundikeras or Tundikeras and the Tala-
jaughas. When the Vithotras and Avantis (or the Vitho-
trias in Avanti) passed away, an amatyas, minister or
governor, named Pulika (Puniika), is said to have killed
his master and anointed his own son Pradyota in the very
sight of the Kshatriyas. In the fourth century B.C.,
Avanti formed an integral part of the Magadhan Empire.

The kingdom of Gandhara included within its bound-
aries the vale of Kasmira and the ancient metropolis of
Takshaśilā, which lay 2,000 leagues from Benares, but
nevertheless attracted students and enquirers from the
most distant provinces.

The Puranas represent the Gandhāra princes as the
descendants of Druhyu. This king and his people are
mentioned several times in the Rīg-Veda and apparently
belonged to the north-west, a fact that accords with the
Purānic tradition. Mention has already been made of the
early king, Nagnajīt who is reported to have been a con-
temporary of Nimi, king of Videha, Durmukha, king of
Pañchāla, Bhima, king of Vidarbha, and "Karakanḍu,"

1 43. 48-49.
2 We need not infer from this statement that the family of Pupika sprang
from one of the lower orders of society (e.g., cowherds). The point in the Purānic
account is that the dynastic change was brought about by an amatyas, a civil
functionary (not a senāpati like Pushyanittra), and that the army (Kshatriyas)
looked on, i.e., treated the matter with indifference or silent approval. In the
time of Megasthenes soldiers (kshatriya, khattiya-kula) and councillors
(amatyas, amachcha-kula) were distinct orders of society (cf. also Fick, Ch.
173.
3 Jataka, No. 406; Telepatta Jataka, No. 96; Susima Jataka, No. 163.
5 Vedic Index, I. 385.
6 Kumbhakara Jataka; Ait. Br., VII. 34; Sat. Br. VIII. 1. 4. 10; Uttarā-
dhyayana Sūtra. A Nagnajit also appears in the Mahābhārata as the Gandhārian
contemporary of Kṛishṇa (V. 48. 75). But the same epic mentions Śakuni as the
King of Gandhāra in the time of Kṛishṇa and the Pāṇḍavas.
king of Kaliṅga. Jaina writers tell us that those princes adopted the faith of the Jainas. As Pārśva (777 B.C.?) was probably the first historical Jina, Nagnajit, if he really became a convert to his doctrines, should have to be placed between 777 B.C. and cir. 544 B.C., the date of Pukkusāti, the Gandhārian contemporary of Bimbisāra. The conversion to Jainism, however, does not accord with the story related in the Jātaka about his own elevation and that of his confrères to the status of Pachcheka Buddhas, or with the interest which the king or his son Svarjit evinced in Brāhmaṇic ritual. It is, however, to be noted that the views of the family in such matters were not treated with respect. The rival claims of different sects need not be taken too seriously. The only fact that emerges is that tradition knew the family to be interested in religious matters and holding views that did not strictly conform to traditional Brāhmaṇism.

In the middle of the sixth century B.C. the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Pukkusāti (Pushkarasārin) who is said to have sent an embassy and a letter to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, and waged war on Pradyota of Avanti who was defeated. He is also said to have been threatened in his own kingdom by the Pāṇḍavas who occupied a part of the Pañjab as late as the time of Ptolemy. In the latter half of the sixth century B.C. Gandhāra was conquered by the king of Persia. In the Bahistān inscription of Darius, cir. 520-518 B.C., the Gandhārians (Gadara) appear among the subject peoples of the Achaemenid or Achaemenian Empire.  

---

1 SBE., XLV. 87.
2 Sat. Br., VIII. 1. 4. 10. Vedic Index, I. 432.
3 Buddhist Indiа, p. 28; DPPN, II. 215; Essay on Guṇḍaḥya, p. 176.
Kamboja is constantly associated with Gandhāra in literature and inscriptions.¹ Like Gandhāra it is included in the Uttarāpatha, i.e., the Far North of India.² It should, therefore, be clearly distinguished from "Kambuja" in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula (i.e., Cambodia),³ and must be located in some part of North-West Indo-Pakistan close to Gandhāra. The Mahābhārata connects the Kambojas with a place called Rājapura.⁴—"Karna Rājapuram gatvā Kāmboja nirjita-stvayā." The association of the Kambojas with the Gandhāras enables us to identify this Rājapura with the territory of that name mentioned by Yuan Chwang⁵ which lay to the south or south-east

¹ Mbh., XII. 207. 43; Anguttara N., P. T. S., I. 213; 4. 252, 256, 261; Rock Edict V of Aśoka. Quite in keeping with the association with Gandhāra, famous for its good wool (fig. V. 1. 136. 7), is the love of Kambojas for blankets (Kambola) to which Yāska (II. 2) bears testimony.

² Cf. Mbh., XII. 207. 43. Rājatarāṅgṛi, IV. 163-165. The chronicle does not place Kamboja to the north of Kashmir. It simply places the territory in the Uttarāpatha, and clearly distinguishes it from the land of the Tukhāras, apparently lying further to the north.

³ For the Hindu colony of "Kambuja" see Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, III. pp. 100 ff.; B. R. Chatterji, Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia; R. C. Majumdar, Kambujadeśa (Meyer Lectures).

⁴ Mbh., VII. 4. 5.

⁵ "Karna having gone to (gatrā) Rājapura" vanquished the Kambojas. The passage can hardly imply that Karna marched to Kamboja "via Rājapura." It is also futile to suggest that Rājapura had anything to do with Rājagriha in Bactria (as is done by a writer in the Proceedings and Transactions of the Sixth Oriental Conference, Patna, p. 109). The Ram. I. 6. 22; the Mbh. VII. 119. 14. 26. and the Mudrārākshasa, II. clearly distinguishes Kamboja from Bālhika (Bactria).

⁶ Watters, Yuan Chwang, Vol. I. p. 984. Cunningham (AGI, 1924, p. 148) identifies Rājapura with the chiefship of Rajaori to the south of Kashmir. The fact that the Mahābhārata (II. 27) makes separate mention of Kamboja and Abhisāra (with which the Rajaori region is identified) need not mean that the two were absolutely distinct entities in all ages. Does not the Great Epic (II. 30. 24-25) distinguish between Suhma and Tāmrālipīti, and does not the Dasa-kumāra-charita with equal emphasis place Dāmalīpta in Suhma? The truth is that Rajaori formed only a part of Kamboja which included other areas as well. The ruling family of Rājaouri (Rajaori) in later times were the Khaśas (Stein in JASB, 1899, Extra No. 2, 28).
of Punch. The western boundaries of Kamboja must have reached Kāhiristān. Elphinstone found in that district tribes like the 'Caumojee,' 'Camoze,' and 'Camoje' whose names remind us of the Kambojas.\(^1\)

Kamboja may have been a home of Brāhmānic learning in the later Vedic period. The Vyāsa Brāhmaṇa actually mentions a teacher named Kāmbhoja Aupamanyava.\(^2\) The presence of Āryas (Ayyo) in Kamboja is recognised in the Majjhima Nikāya.\(^3\) But already in the time of Yāska the Kambojas had come to be regarded as a people distinct from the Aryans of the interior of India, speaking a different dialect.\(^4\) We have further changes in later ages. And in Bhūridatta Jātaka\(^5\) the Kambojas are credited with savage (Non-Aryan) customs:

\begin{quote}
ete hi dharmā anariyarūpā
Kambojakānāṁ vitathā bahunnan ti.\(^6\)
\end{quote}

These are your savage customs which I hate,
Such as Kamboja hordes might emulate.\(^7\)

This description of the Kambojas agrees wonderfully with Yuan Chhwang's account of Rājapura and the adjoining countries. "From Lampā to Rājapura the inhabitants are coarse and plain in personal appearance, of rude violent dispositions...they do not belong to India proper,

---

\(^{1}\) Elphinstone, An Account of the Kingdom of Kābul, Vol. II, pp. 375-377; Bomb. Gaz. I, 1, 496n; JRAS, 1843, 140; JASB, 1874, 260n; Wilson, Vishnu P., III. 292. With the expression assānam ayatanam, 'land of horses,' used by Pāli texts in reference to the Kambojas (DPPN, I. 526. cf. MBh. vi. 90. 3) may be compared the names Aspasioi and Assakoni given by classical writers to the sturdy tribes living in the Alishang and Swat valleys in the days of Alexander (Camb. Hist. Ind. I. 352n).

\(^{2}\) Vedic Index, I. 127, 138; Yāska, II. 2.

\(^{3}\) II. 149.

\(^{4}\) II. 2; JRAS, 1911, 801f.

\(^{5}\) No. 543.

\(^{6}\) Jātaka, VI. 208.

\(^{7}\) Cowell's Jātaka, VI. 110.
but are inferior peoples of frontier, (i.e., barbarian) stocks."¹

The Kambojas in the Epic period had their metropolis probably at Rājapura. Dvārakā, mentioned by Rhys Davids as the capital in the early Buddhist period, was not really situated in this country, though it was connected with it by a road.² A real city of the Kambojas was apparently Nandi-nagara mentioned in Lüders’ Inscriptions Nos. 176 and 472.

The Vedic texts do not mention any king of Kamboja. But, as has already been pointed out, they refer to a teacher named Kamboja Aupamanyava who was probably connected with this territory. In the Mahābhārata the Kambojas are represented as living under a monarchical constitution.³ The Epic makes mention of their kings Chandravarman and Sudakshiṇa. In later times the monarchy gave place to a Saṅgha form of government. The Kautilya Arthaśāstra⁴ speaks of the Kambojas as a 'vārtā-śastr-opajīvin' Saṅgha, that is to say, a confederation of agriculturists, herdsmen, traders and warriors. Corporations of Kambojas (Kambojānāṇcha ye ganāḥ) are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata.⁵

¹ Watters I. 284; for the Kambojas, see also S. Lévi: "Pré-Aryen et Pré-Dravidiens dans l’Inde," JA, 1923.
³ Cf. I. 67. 32; II. 4. 22; V. 165. 1-3; VII. 90. 59, etc.
⁴ P. 378.
⁵ VII. 89. 88.
SECTION II. AN EPIC ACCOUNT OF THE MAHĀJANAPADAS

An interesting account of the characteristics of the peoples of most of the Mahājanapadas described above is to be found in the Karna parva of the Mahābhārata.¹

The Kurus, Pañchālas, Matsyas, Kosalas, Kāsīs, Magadhas, Chedis and Śūrasenas receive praise. Patriots hailing fromĀṅga include their country in this list:

Kuravaḥ saha Pañchālaḥ Śālvā Matsyāḥ sa-Naimishāḥ
Kosalāḥ Kāśayo’ṃgāścha Kalinā Māgadhāstathā
Chedayaśca mahābhūgā dharmam jānanti śāsvatam
brāhmaṇaḥ Pañchālaḥ Kauraveyāstu dharmam
Satyam Matsyāḥ Śūrasenāścha yajñam.

"The Kauravas with the Pañchālas, the Śālvās, the Matsyas, the Naimishas, the Kosalas, the Kāsīs, the Āṅgas the Kalingas, the Magadhas, and the Chedis who are all highly blessed, know what the eternal Law of Righteousness is. The Pañchālas observe the Vedic code, the Kauravas the law of right conduct, the Matsyas truth, and the Śūrasenas sacrificial rites."

The Magadhas comprehend hints, the Kosalas understand from what they see,—the Kurus and Pañchālas gather the sense from half-expressed words, while the Śālvās need full instruction.

िन्गिताज्ञास्च भण्डारिताम्।
वर्धितोऽक्षमविवाक्ताम्।

In gināśaḥ Maṇḍānāḥ prekshitajñāśaḥ Koṣalāḥ.
ارد्धहोक्ताः Kuru-Pañchālaḥ Śālvāḥ kvitṣaṇusāsanāḥ.

¹ Mahābhārata, VIII. 40. 29; 45. 14-16; 28; 34; 40.
² The Naimishas occupied Nimsār, 20 miles from Sitāpur, on the left bank of the Gumti river (Ayyar, Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India, 91).
The Aṅgas had their detractors and come in for a good deal of condemnation along with the Madras and the Gandhāras:

Āturāṇāṁ parītāgaḥ sadāra-suta-vikrayaḥ
Aṅgeshu vartate Karna yeshāṁ adhipatir bhavān.

"The abandonment of the afflicted and the sale of wives and children are, O Karna, prevalent among the Aṅgas whose overlord thou art."

Madrakeshu cha samsrīshāṁ
śauchāṁ Gāndhārakeshu cha,
rāja-yājaka-yājye cha
nashṭāṁ dattāṁ havir bhavet.

"Amongst the Madrakas all acts of friendship are lost as purity among the Gāndhārakas, and the libations poured in a sacrifice in which the king is himself the sacrificer and priest."

The verses quoted above give a fair idea of the attitude, mainly of poets of the western part of the Madhyadeśa towards most of the Mahājanapadas of Northern India.
SECTION III. THE FALL OF KĀŚI AND THE ASCENDANCY OF KOSALA

Kośalo nāma muditah sphīto janapado mahān
—Rāmāyana.

The flourishing period of the sixteen Mahājanapadas ended in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. The history of the succeeding age is the story of the absorption of these states into a number of powerful kingdoms, and ultimately into one empire, namely, the empire of Magadha.

Kāśi was probably one of the first to fall. The Mahāvagga and the Jātakas refer to bitter conflicts between this kingdom and its neighbours, specially Kosala. The facts of the struggle are obscure, being wrapped up in legendary matter from which it is impossible to disentangle them. The Kāsīs seem to have been successful at first, but the Kosalas were the gainers in the end.

In the Mahāvagga ¹ and the Kosambi Jātaka ² it is stated that Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, robbed Dīghati, king of Kosala, of his realm, and put him to death. In the Kunāla Jātaka ³ we are told that Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, owing to his having an army, seized on the country of Kosala, slew its king, and carried off his chief queen to Benares, and there made her his consort. The Brahāchatta ⁴ and Sona-Nanda Jātakas ⁵ also refer to the victories of Kāśi monarchs over Kosala.

¹ S.B.E., XVII, 294 09.
² No. 428.
³ No. 596.
⁴ No. 536.
⁵ No. 532.
Success, however, did not remain long with the Kāśis.¹ In the Mahāsīlava Jātaka² king Mahāsīlava of Kāśi is said to have been deprived of his realm by the ruler of Kosala. In the Ghatā³ and Ekarāja Jātakas⁴ Vaṅka and Dabbasena, sovereigns of Kosala, are said to have won for their country a decided preponderance over Kāśi. The final conquest of the latter kingdom was probably the work of Kaṁsa, as the epithet Barānasīggho, *i.e.*, “seizer of Benares” or Kāśi is a standing addition to his name.⁵ The interval of time between Kaṁsa’s conquest of Kāśi and the rise of Buddhism could not have been very long because the memory of Kāśi as an independent kingdom was still fresh in the minds of the people in the Buddha’s time and even later when the Āṇguttara Nikāya was composed.

In the time of Mahākosalas (about the middle of the sixth century B.C.) Kāśi formed an integral part of the Kosalan monarchy. When Mahākosalas married his daughter, the lady Kosalādevi, to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, he gave a village of Kāśi producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money.⁶

In the time of Mahākosalas’s son and successor, Pasenadi or Prasenajit, Kāśi still formed a part of the Kosalan empire. In the Lohicheha Sutta⁷ Buddha asks a person named Lohicheha the following questions: “Now what think you Lohicheha? Is not king Pasenadi of Kosala in possession of Kāśi and Kosala?” Lohicheha

---

¹ Cf. Jātaka No. 100.
² No. 61.
³ No. 355.
⁴ No. 903.
⁵ The Sesa Jātaka, No. 282; the Tesakuna Jātaka, No. 521; Buddhist India, p. 25.
⁶ Harita Mātā Jātaka, No. 239; Vaddhaki Sūkara Jātaka, No. 263.
replies, "Yes, that is so, Gotama." We learn from the Mahavagga that a brother of Pasenadi acted as the viceroy of Kāsi.

The Samyukta Nikāya speaks of Pasenadi as the head of a group of five Rājās. One these was probably his brother, the viceroy of Kāsi. Among the remaining princes and chiefs we should perhaps include the rājanya Payāsi of Setavyā mentioned in the Payāsi Suttanta and the ruler of the Kālamas of Kesaputta.

Another Rājā of the group was apparently the Sākya chief of Kapilavastu. His political subordination to the Kosalan monarchs appears from several texts. The ruler of Devadaha may have ranked as another notable vassal of Kosala.

It was probably during the reign of Mahākosala, that Bimbisāra was anointed king of Magadha. With the coronation of this famous ruler ends the period with which this part of the work deals.

---

1 Cf. Gradual Sayings, V. 40. "As far as the Kāsi-Kosalans extend, as far as the rule of Pasenadi, the Kosalan rājā, extends, therein Pasenadi, the Kosalan Rājā, is reckoned chief."
2 S.B.E., XVII, 195.
3 The Book of the Kindred Sayings, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, I., p. 106.
4 Cf. Milinda, IV. 4. 14; the Vimāna-catthu commentary; Law, Heaven and Hell, 79, 88. Payāsi occurs as the name of a village in a Sāhet Mahet Inscription. It has been identified with a village close to the findspot of the record (Ray, DHNI, I. p. 521).
5 Indian Culture, II. 608; Aṅguttara, I. 168.
7 Kapilavastu, Devadaha and Koliya are sometimes mentioned as three distinct states (DPPN, I, 102). The subordination of the Sākyas to the King of Kosala necessarily implies the latter's control over Devadaha which was in part, at any rate, a Sākyan city.
SECTION IV. KINGSHIP.

We have endeavoured to give in outline the story of the political vicissitudes through which Northern India and a considerable portion of the Deccan passed from the accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisāra. We shall now attempt a brief survey of some of the institutions of the age without which no political history is complete. We have seen that during the major part of the period under review the prevailing form of government was monarchical. The later Vedic texts and auxiliary treatises give us a few details about the rank and power of the rulers in the different parts of India, their social status, the methods of their selection and consecration, the chief members of their household, the civil and military services, the limitations of royal authority and popular participation in affairs of the state. Even when all scarps of information are pieced together, the picture is dim. The facts gleaned from Vedic sources which alone can, with confidence, be referred to the period before 500 B.C. have to be elucidated or supplemented by post-Vedic data embodying traditions about the heroic age that preceded the rise and growth of the Magadhan Empire.

The various kinds of rulership prevalent in different parts of India are thus described in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa: ¹

"Etasyām Prāchyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Prāchyaṁāṁ rājānaḥ. Sāmrājyaṁāva te bhishichyante Samrāṭ- ityenān-abhishiktānācakshata etānena Devānāṁ vihitimānu.

¹ VIII. 14

Etasyāṁ Pratīchhyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Nichyānāṁ Rājāno ye’pāchṛyanāṁ Svārājyāyaiva te’bhisichhyante Svārāt-ityanān-abhishiktānāchakhshata etāmeva Devāṇāṁ vihitimanu.


Etasyāṁ dhrucāyāṁ Madhyamāyāṁ pratishṭhāyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Kuru-Paṁchālaṁāṁ Rājānah sa Vaś-Ośinarāṇāṁ Rājāyāyaiva te’bhisichhyante Rāj-etyenān-abhishiktānāchakhshata etāmeva Devāṇāṁ vihitimanu.”

“In this eastern quarter, whatever kings there are of the eastern peoples, they are anointed for overlordship (Sāmrājya); ‘O Overlord’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In the southern quarter whatever kings there are of the Satvats, they are anointed for paramount rule (Bhaujiya); ‘O Paramount Ruler’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this western quarter, whatever kings there are of the southern and western peoples, they are anointed for self-rule (Svārājya); ‘O Self-Ruler’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this northern quarter, the lands of the Uttara-Kurus and the Uttara-Madras, beyond the Himavat, their (kings?) are anointed for sovereignty (Vairājya); ‘O Sovereign’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this firm middle established quarter, whatever kings there are of the Kuru-Paṁchālas with the Vaśas and Uśinaras, they are anointed for kingship; ‘king’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods.” ¹

Several scholars assert that Vairājya means a kingless state. But in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,1 a king consecrated with Indra’s greatunction is called Virāṭ and worthy of Vairājya. When a king consecrated with the Punarabhisheka (renewed anointment) ascends his Āsandi or throne, he prays for attaining Vairājya as well as other kinds of royal dignity. Sayana takes the word Vairājya to mean pre-eminence among kings, itarebhyo bhupatibhyo vaisīṣhtyam. This is virtually the sense of the word that Dr. Keith accepts in his translation.

The Sukraniti,2 too, understands Virāṭ to denote a superior kind of monarch. In the Mahābhārata Krishna is lauded as Samrāṭ, Virāṭ, Svarāṭ and Sura-rāja.3 If the Uttara-Kurus and the Uttara-Madras are to be regarded as republican, it is not because of the use of the term Vairājya, but because in their case it is not the rājan but the janapada which is said to be anointed for sovereignty. It should, however, be remembered that already in the Brāhmaṇa period Uttara-Kuru has become a devakshetra which the arms of a mortal could not reach.4

It is not easy to decide whether all the terms Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārājya, Vairājya and Rājya referred to essentially different forms of royal authority in the Brāhmaṇic period. But two terms at least, namely, Sāmrājya and Rājya are clearly distinguished from each other by the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.5

1 VIII. 17.
2 B. K. Sarkar’s Translation, p. 24; Kauṭilya (VIII.2), however, takes Vairājya to mean a system of government which comes into existence by forcible seizure of a country from the legitimate ruler for purposes of exploitation. XII. 49. 11; cf. 68. 54.
3 Ait. Br. viii. 23. The existence of Gaṇas and of Gaṇajyeṣṭhas are hinted at Rig. V. I. 23, 8; II. 23, 1; X. 34, 12; 112, 9; Sat. Br. XIII. 2. 8, 4. etc.
4 V. 1. 1. 12-13; cf. Kātyāyana Srauta Sūtra, XV. 1. 1. 2.
Rājā vai Rajasūyeneshťvā bhavati, Samrāṭ Vājapeyen-
āvaran hi Rājyaṁ param Sāmṛājyam. Kāmayeta vai Rājā
Samrāṭ bhavitum avaran hi rājyaṁ param Sāmṛājyam. Na Samrāṭ kāmayeta Rājā bhavitum avaran hi rājyaṁ param
Sāmṛājyam.

"By offering the Rājasūya he becomes Rājā and by
the Vājapeya he becomes Samrāj, and the office of Rājan
is the lower and that of Samrāj, the higher; a Rājan
might indeed wish to become Samrāj, for the office of
Rājan is the lower and that of Samrāj the higher; but
the Samrāj would not wish to become a Rājā for the office
of Rājan is the lower, and that of Samrāj the higher."

In the Rig-Veda, and later on in the Purāṇas, Bhoja
appears as a proper name. But the Brāhmanas regard
it as a royal designation, applicable to the consecrated
monarchs of the southern region. The word Caesar
furnishes a parallel. Originally the name of a Roman
dictator and of members of his family, it is used, in later
ages, as a title by Roman and German Emperors. As
to Svārājya it is sometimes taken to mean uncontrolled
dominion, and is opposed to Rājya.

The king was usually, though not always, a Kshatriya.
The Brāhmanas were considered to be unsuited for
kingship. Thus we read in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa—"To
the king (Rājan) doubtless belongs the Rājasūya; for by
offering the Rājasūya he becomes king, and unsuited for
kingship is the Brāhmaṇa."

1 III. 53. 7.
2 ‘Bhoja’ may have reference to the king or chieftain as ruler, protector
or devourer of his people (Vidāmattā). It appears as an official designation in
several inscriptions of Southern India (Ind. Ant. 1876, 177; 1877, 25-26). In
Mbh. I. 84. 22, it is applied to a ruler and his family who are deprived of many
of the attributes of sovereignty (arājā Bhojaśabdām teṣaṁ tatra prāpṇyaṁ
sāneśayaṁ).
3 Kāthaka Samhitā, XIV. 5; Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, I. 11, 5, etc.; Vedic
Index, II. 221.
4 V. I. I. 12; SBE, XLII; Eggeling Sat. Br., Part III, p. 4.
Rājña eva rājasūyam. Rājā vai rājasūyenedhīvā bhavati
na vai Brāhmaṇo rājyāyālam avaraṁ vai rājasūyām param
Vājapeyam.

A Brāhmaṇa king is, however, contemplated in a
passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.¹ We have references
to Śūdra, Āyogava and even non-Aryan kings in other
Vedic texts. King Jānaśruti Pauṭrāyana is branded a
Śūdra in the Chhāndogyā Upanishad.² King Marutta
Āvikshita is styled “Āyogava” in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.³
Āyogava denotes, in legal codes, a member of a mixed
caste, a descendant of a Śūdra by a Vaiśya wife.⁴ Nishāda
sthapatis (kings or chieftains) figure in a Srauta sūtra
and the Rāmāyana. In the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa
it is stated that even an anārya “obtains,” pṛāpnoti,
kings.⁵ This points either to non-Aryan kings or to the
admission of anāryas into the dominions of Aryan rulers.
The Jātakas and the Great Epic refer to kings of various
castes including Brāhmaṇas.⁶

Kingship was sometimes hereditary, as is indeed
shown by several cases where the descent can be traced.
Mention may be made in this connection of the Pārikshitas
and the kings of Janaka’s line; hereditary kingship is
also suggested by the expression Daśapurushamrājya—a
kingdom of ten generations—occurring in the Satapatha
Brāhmaṇa.⁷ But elective monarchy was not unknown.⁸

¹ VIII. 23 (story of Atyarāṭī’s offer to Vāsiṣṭha Sātyahavya).
² IV. 2. 1-5. Apparently Śūdra kings were not unknown in the age.
³ Xlll. 5. 4. 6.
⁴ Manu-Saṁhitā, X. 12.
⁶ Cf. Jātakas, 73, 492, Mbh. I. 100. 494; 138. 70.
⁷ XII. 9. 3. 1-3; cf. also the reference to the birth of an heir to the throne
(Ait. Br. VIII. 9 and to the king as Rājput, VIII. 17.
⁸ Reference may be made in this connection to the passages of the Aitareya
Brāhmaṇa (e.g., VIII. 12) describing the choice and consecration of divine rulers
(Ghoshal, A History of Hindu Political Theories, 1927, p. 26), and notices of
royal election in post-Vedic texts looking back to an early period, e.g., Mbh., I. 94.
The selection was made sometimes by the people and occasionally by the ministers. The choice was ordinarily limited to the members of the royal family only, as is shown by the legend in Yāska\(^1\) of the Kuru brothers Devāpi and Saṁtanu, and the story in the Saṁvara Jātaka\(^2\) of the Kāśi princes Upoṣatha and Saṁvara. In the Jātaka the councillors ask a reigning king, "When you are dead, my lord, to whom shall we give the white umbrella?" "Friends," said the monarch, "all my sons have a right to the white umbrella. But you may give it to him that pleases your mind."

At times the popular choice fell on persons who did not belong to the ruling dynasty. Such may have been the case when the Śrīnajayas expelled their hereditary ruler together with the Sthapati.\(^3\) Clear instances of popular preference for individuals outside the royal family are furnished by the Jātakas. The Pādañjali Jātaka,\(^4\) for instance, tells us that when a certain king of Benares died, his son, Pādañjali by name, an idle lazy loafer, was set aside, and the minister in charge of things spiritual and temporal was raised to the throne. The Sachchaṁkira Jātaka,\(^5\) relates a story how nobles, Brāhmaṇas and all classes slew their king and anointed a private citizen. Sometimes the candidate comes from a place outside the realm. The Darimukha\(^6\) and Sonaka Jātakas\(^7\) tell

---

1. Nirukta II. 10; Ved. Ind. II, 211.
2. Sāt Br. XII, 9, 3, 1 ff.
3. No. 462.
5. No. 73.
7. No. 530.

21-1599B
us how on failure of heir at Benares a prince of Magadha was elected king.

The monarch during the Brāhmaṇa period was usually allowed to have four queens, viz., the Mahishī, the Parivṛktī, the Vāvātā and the Pālāgali. The Mahishī, was the chief wife, being the first one married according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Parivṛktī was the neglected or discarded wife, probably one that had no son. The Vāvātā is the favourite, while the Pālāgali was the daughter of the last of the court officials. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, however, refers to the “hundred” wives of king Hariśchandra. In the Jātaka period several kings kept a bigger harem. We are told in the Kusa Jātaka that king Okkāko (Ikshvāku) had sixteen thousand ladies in his harem among whom Śilavatī was the chief (aggamahī). The king of Benares according to the Dasaratha Jātaka, had the same number of wives. In the Suruchi Jātaka, a king of Mithilā says, “Ours is a great kingdom, the city of Mithilā covers seven leagues, the measure of the whole kingdom is 300 leagues. Such a king should have sixteen thousand women at the least.” Sixteen thousand appears to have been a stock phrase. The number is evidently exaggerated. But it indicates that the kings of the Jātaka period were extreme polygamists who frequently exceeded the Brāhmaṇic number of four or even a hundred queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession or election with an elaborate ritual which is described in several Brāhmaṇas, and for which the appropriate formulas (mantras) are given in the Vedic Saṁhitās. Those

1 VI. 5. 3 1. Ved. Ind., I 478.
2 Weber and Pischel in Vedic Index, I, 478.
3 VII. 18.
4 No. 531.
5 No. 461. The Rāmāyaṇa (II. 34. 13) allows this king only 750 ladies besides the chief consorts.
6 No. 482.
who aided in the consecration of the king were called Rājakartri or Rājakrit, i.e., "king-maker." In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^1\) the persons meant and specified are the Sūta (minstrel, chronicler or charioteer), and the Grāmanī, leader of the host or of the village.\(^2\) Prof. Rādhākumud Mookerji observes:\(^3\) "It is apparent from the lists of persons aiding in the royal coronation that both official and non-official or popular elements were represented in the function." The principal ceremonies or sacrifices of royal inauguration were the Vājapeya, the Rājasūya, the Punar-abhisheka and the Aindra Mahābhisheka.

The Vājapeya (lit. "the drink of strength") bestowed on the performer a superior kind of kingship called "Sāmrājya," while the Rājasūya or royal inauguration merely conferred the ordinary monarchical dignity.\(^4\) The Punar-abhisheka, or renewed consecration, made the king-elect eligible for all sorts of royal dignity, viz., Rājya, Sāmrājya, Bhauṣṭya, Svārājya, Vairājya, Pāramesṭhya, Māhārājya, Adhipatya, Svāvaśya and Atiṣṭhatea.\(^5\) The object of the Aindra Mahābhisheka (the great anointing of the king of the celestials) is thus described:

"Sa ya ichchhed evamōcit Kshatriyam āyaṁ sarvā jītir-jayetāyaṁ sarvāmlokaṁ vindetāyaṁ sarvasmāṁ Rājñāṁ Sraishṭhyam, Atiṣṭhām, Paramatām gachchheta, Sam-

---

1 III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18.
2 The post of Grāmanī seems to have been ordinarily held by a Vaiśya (Vedic Index, I. 247; II. 334; Camb. Hist. 131; Sat Br. V 3. 1. 6.)
3 The Fundamental Unity of India, p. 83.
4 Rājya, cf. Sat Br., V. 1. 12-13; some texts while agreeing that the Vājapeya is a Sāmrājasa says that the Rājasūya is a Varuṇa-saṅga, consecrated to the universal sway wielded by Varuṇa. Tait. Sāni. (V. 6. 2. 1) and Br. (II. 7. 6. 1); Sat. Br. V. 4. 3. 2; Keith, The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, 340; Mahābhārata, Bk. II. 12. 11-13 etc.
5 Ait. Br. VIII. 6. For the meaning of these terms see Keith's translation quoted below. Keith's rendering of some of the expressions, e.g., Bhauṣṭya and Vairājya, is, however, hardly satisfactory.
rājyaṃ, Bhanijyāṃ, Śvārājyaṃ, Vairājyaṃ, Pārāmēṣṭhyāṃ, Rājyaṃ, Māhārājyaṃ, Ādhipatyāṃ, ayaṁ samanta-paryāyi syāt Sārvabhaumah sārvayusha a’ntādā parārddhāt prithivyai samudraparyantāyā Ekarāḥ iti tametena Aindreṇa Mahābhisekena kṣhatriyam sāpayītvābhishiñcet. 1

"If he who knows thus should desire of a kṣatrita, May he win all victories, find all the worlds, attain the superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all kings and overlordship, paramount rule, self-rule, sovereignty, supreme authority, kingship great kingship and suzerainty, may he be all-encompassing, possessed of all the earth, possessed of all life, from the one end up to the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler;’ he should anoint him with the great anointing of Indra, after adjuring him’’ 2

The Vājapeya rites 3 include a race of 17 chariots, in which the sacrificer is allowed to carry off the palm, and from which, according to Eggeling, the ceremony perhaps derives its name. Professor Hillebrandt would claim for this feature of the sacrifice the character of a relic of an old national festival, a kind of Indian Olympic games. After the chariot race the next interesting item is the mounting of a pole, having a wheaten ring or wheel 4 on the top, by the sacrificer and his wife, from which homage is made to the mother earth. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa says, ‘‘Truly he who gains a seat in the air gains a seat above others.’’ 5 The royal sacrificer having descended from the pole, is offered a throne-seat

1 At. Br. VIII. 15.
2 Keith, HOS, Vol. 28.
3 Sat. Br. V. 1. 1. 5. if; S.B.E., xli; Vedic Index, II. 281; Keith, Black- yajus, cviii-cixi; RPVU, 339f.
4 Gaudhāmāth chaśāhālam, “a wheaten headpiece (Eggeling)” “a wheel-shaped garland of meal” (S. B. E., xli 31; Keith R. P. V. U, 339; Sat. Br. V. 2. 1. 6).
5 Sat. Br., V. 2, 1. 22.
with a goatskin spread thereon and addressed by the Adhvaryu (priest) in the following words:

"Thou art the ruler, the ruling lord (yantri, yamana) —thou art firm and steadfast (dhrupa, dharuna)— (here I seat) thee for the tilling, for peaceful dwelling (kshema), for wealth (raya), for prosperity (posha), i.e., for the welfare of the people, the common weal."\(^1\)

The Rājasūya consisted of a long succession of sacrificial performances which began on the first day of Phālguna and spread over a period of upwards of two years.\(^2\) The rite is described at great length in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.\(^3\) Besides much mere priestly elaboration, the ritual contains traces of popular ceremonial. The popular features are chiefly these:

(1) The Raitinīm havinshi\(^4\) or presents to the divinities of the bejewelled ones (or those possessed of the jewel offering), viz., the chief queen and court officials;

(2) The Abhishechanīya\(^5\) or besprinkling ceremony;

(3) The dig vyāsthāpana\(^6\) or the king’s symbolical walking towards the various quarters as an indication of his universal rule;

(4) Treading upon a tiger skin,\(^7\) thus gaining the strength and the pre-eminence of the tiger;

(5) Narration by the hotri priest of the story (ākhyāna) of Sunahṣepa.\(^8\)

---

1 Sat. Br., V. 2. I. 25; The Fundamental Unity of India, p. 80.
2 Keith, Black Yajus, pp. exii-exiii, RPVU, 341; Vedic Index, II. 219; SBE., xli, p. xxvi.
3 V. 2.3.9 (et seq.) S. B. E., xii, 42-118.
4 Sat. Br. V. 3. 1. M. Louis Renou says—"les offrandes ne sont pas faites aux ratnim mais aux divinités dans les maisons de chaque ratnim."
5 Sat. Br. V. 3. 3-4
6 Sat. Br. V. 4. 1. 3; Keith, Black Yajus, op. cit.
7 Sat. Br. V. 4. 1. 11.
8 Ait. Br. vii, 13 ff; Keith, RPVU, 341n.
(6) A mimic cow raid against a relative; or a sham fight with a member of the ruling aristocracy (rājanya);  
(7) Enthronement;  
(8) A game of dice in which the king is made to be the victor;  

The recipients of the sacrificial honours called "Ratnīnām havīṇshi" were the divinities in the houses of the Ratnins, i.e., of the chief members of the royal household and of the king's civil and military service, viz.—  
1. The Senānī (Commander of the army).  
2. The Purohita (Royal Chaplain).  
3. The Mahīṣī (Chief Queen).  
4. The Sūta (Charioteer and Bard).  
5. The Grāmanī (Leader of the Host or Village Headman).  
6. The Kshattṛi (Chamberlain)—forerunner of the Antaravamsika or Superintendent of the Seraglio of later times.  
7. The Sāṅgrahīṭṛi (Treasurer)—forerunner of the Sannidhāṭṛi of the Arthaśāstra.  
8. The Bhāgadugha (Collector of the Royal Share, i.e., Taxes)—forerunner of the Samāḥartṛi.  
9. The Akśāvāpa (Keeper of the Dice).  

1 RPVU, 342; cf. Sat. Br. V. 4. 3. 3. et seq.  
2 Cf. Tailtirīga Sanskrit, I. 8. 15 with commentary; Vedic Index II. 219.  
3 Sat. Br. V. 4. 4. 1.  
4 Sat. Br. V. 4. 4. 6; Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda, etc., p. 342.  
6 The importance of this office is shown by the cases of Sumantra and of Saṅjaya who is called a Mahāmātra (Mbh XV. 16. 4).  
7 Cf. the Adhikīrtas appointed for grāmas or villages by the paramount ruler (Samrāś) mentioned in the Prāṇa Upanishad (III, 1).  
8 Vidura was the Kshattṛi (Mbh, I. 200, 17; II. 66. 1, etc.) at the Kuru Court. For the views of different commentators see Vedic Index, I. 271.  
9 Cf. the position of Kāṅka (Yudhisthīra) at the Matsya Court.
10. The *Go-vikartana* (lit. Cutter-up of Cattle, i. e., the King’s Companion in the Chase).

11. The *Pałagala* (Courier)—forerunner of the *Dūta* (*Sāsanahara*, etc.).

The most essential part of the *Rājasūya* was the **Abhisheka** or besprinkling. It began with offerings to the deities Savitā Satyaprasava, Agni Grihapati, Soma Vanaspati, Brihaspati Vāk, Indra Jyeshṭha, Rudra Paśupati, Mitra Satya and Varuṇa Dharmapati. The consecration water (*Abhishechanīyā Āpaḥ*) was made up of seventeen kinds of liquid including the water from the river Sarasvatī, sea-water, and water from a whirlpool, a pond, a well and dew. The sprinkling was performed by a Brāhmaṇa priest, kinsman or brother of the king-elect, a friendly Rājanaya and a Vaiśya.

The two most important kinds of *Abhisheka* were the Punar-abhisheka and the Aindra Mahābhisheka.

The **Punar-abhisheka** or Renewed Anointment is described in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. It was intended for Kshatriya conquering monarchs. The first interesting part of the ceremony was the king’s ascent to the throne or *Asandi* which was made of *udumbara* wood with the exception of the interwoven part (*vivayana*) which consisted of *muñja* grass. Then came the besprinkling. Among other things the priest said: “Do thou become here the

---

1 Curiously enough, this list of the *ratnīs* does not include the *Sthapati*, probably a local ruler, vassal chief, or governor who is, however, mentioned in *Sat. Br. V. 4* 4.17, in connection with the concluding ceremonies of the *rājasūya*. The sacrificial sword (*aphyā*) given by the priest to the king is passed on successively to the king’s brother, the *rūta* or the *sthapati*, the *grāmaśi* and finally to a tribesman (*sajāta*). The post of *sthapati*, was held by *Uparikṣa* or governors of *Bhūkta* (provinces) in the Gupta period (*Fleet. CII. p. 130*). Slightly different lists of *ratnās* are found in the *Taittirīya* texts. A group of eight *vīras* finds mention in the *Pāñchavimśa Brāhmaṇa* (*Camb. Hist. Ind. I. 138*). In *Sat. Br. XIII. 5. 4. 8* we have reference to the *Parīceśhtri*, the *Kshattṛi* and the *Sabhāśads* in connection with a performance of the horse-sacrifice.

2 VIII. 5-11.
overking of kings; the great of the great people, the supreme ruler of the people (or the peasantry).”

Rājñām tvam Adhirāja bhaveha; Mahāntam tvā mahinām Samrājam charshaṅinām.”

The king was next required to get down from the throne and make obeisance to the holy power (Brahman);

“Brahmaṇa eva tat Kṣatram vaśam eti tad yatā vai Brahmanah Kṣatram vaśam eti tad rāśṭram samṛiddham tad vīravadāhāsmin vīro jāyate,”

“verily thus the lordly power (Kṣatra) falls under the influence of the holy power (Brahman). When the lordly power falls under the influence of the holy power, that kingdom is prosperous, rich in heroes; in it a hero or heir (vīra) is born.”

Here there is provision for the prevention of royal absolutism.

Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, was evidently consecrated with the Punar-abhisheka.

The Aindra Mahābhīsheska or Indra’s great anunction consisted of five important ceremonies. In the first place, an Oath is administered by the priest to the king-elect:

“From the night of thy birth to that of thy death for the space between these two, thy sacrifice and thy gifts, thy place, thy good deeds, thy life and thine offspring let me take, if thou play me false.”

Next follows the Ārohaṇa or enthronement. When the king is seated on the throne we have the Utkrośana or proclamation. The king-makers should say “The Kṣatriya, if not proclaimed, cannot show his strength, let us

1 Keith, HOS. 25 (slightly emended).
4 Keith.
5 Ait. Br., VIII. 11. A second coronation of the Ceylonese king Devānāmiya Tissa is referred to by the chronicles (Geiger’s trans. of the Mahāvamsa, p. xxxii).
7 Keith; Ait. Br., VIII. 15.
8 Ait. Br., VIII. 17.
proclaim him. "Be it so" (the people reply). Him the king-makers proclaim saying:

'Him do ye proclaim, O men (janāh) as king and father of kings ... The sovereign lord of all beings (Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati) hath been born, the eater of the folk (Viśāmattā) hath been born, the destroyer of enemies (Amitrānāṁ hantā) hath been born, the protector of the Brāhmaṇas (Brāhmaṇānāṁ goptā) hath been born, the guardian of the law (Dharmsya goptā) hath been born.'

Here we have the important attributes of kingship. In the words Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati (supreme lord of all beings) we have a reference to the king’s sovereignty and imperium. The expression Viśāmattā, devourer of the folk, alludes to his power of taxation. As Amitrānāṁ hantā he exercises supreme command to weed out enemies. The epithet Brāhmaṇānāṁ goptā gives expression to his special relations with the hierarchy, while the style Dharmsya goptā points to his duties in connection with the preservation of the laws and their proper administration for the promotion of the common weal (yoga-kshema).

When the king has been proclaimed there is an address with the formula, abhimantrāṇa.¹

Varuṇa the Wise One
Hath set him down, preserving order,

...... for kingship ......

Then comes the anointment (abhishechana)

The following kings are said to have been consecrated with the Aindra Mahābhīshēka; Janamejaya Pārikshita, Sāryāta Mānava, Satānika Sātrājīta, Āmbāṣṭhyā, Yudhāṁśraushṭi Augrasainya, Viśvakarmā Bhauvana, Sudās Paijavana, Marutta Āvikshita, Āṅga Vairochana and Bharata Dauḥṣhyanti.² The first-mentioned king,
and probably the third, fourth, fifth and ninth also, belonged to the post-Parikshit period. Durmukha Pāñchāla and Atyarāti Jānantapi were informed of the efficacy of the rite. The first made good use of the advice. But the latter who neglected his priest, and wanted to conquer the Uttara-Kurus, whom "no mortal man could vanquish," perished at the hands of a king of the Śibis.

Closely connected with the Aindra mahābhīsheka was another important ceremonial called the Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice. All the kings who were, according to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, actually consecrated with Indra’s great function are represented as "going round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offering the horse in sacrifice" (samantam sarvataḥ prithiviḥ jayan pariyaśvena cha medhyeneje). To the list of kings and princes who performed the famous rite the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa adds the names of the Pārikshitas (or Pārikshitiyas) Bhūmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena; the Kosalan king (Kausalya-rāja) Para Ātpāra Hairanya-nābha; the Aikshvāka king Purukutsa Daurgaha; the Pāñchāla kings Kraivyā, the superman of the Kravis (Krivinām atipurusha) and Sona Sātrāsāha; the Matsya king Dhvasan Dyaityavana, and the Śvinka king Rishabha Yājñātura. The Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra says that a paramount king (Sārvabhauma Rāja) may perform the

---

1 Satānika defeated Dhritarāṣṭra of Kāśi who, according to the Mahāgovinda Suttanta was a contemporary of Satrabhu of Kaliṅga and of Brahmadatta of Assaka. As the Deccan kingdoms are not referred to in pre-Pārikshita works, it is probable that Satānika and his contemporaries flourished after Pārikshita. Ambāshbhyā and Yudhāntraushti were contemporaries of Parvata and Nārada who were very near in time to Nagnajit, the contemporary of Nimi, probably the penultimate king of Vīdeha. Aṅga was probably the immediate predecessor of Dādivahana who, according to Jaina evidence, flourished in the 6th century B.C.

2 XIII. 5. 4. 1-29,
Aśvamedha. 1 The Aṣva or steed for a year roamed under guardianship of a hundred princes, and a hundred nobles, a hundred sons of heralds (or charioteers) and village headmen, a hundred sons of warriors and treasurers 2 (chamberlains?) equipped with various kinds of defensive and offensive weapons. If the year were successfully passed the steed was sacrificed. The features of the rite included panegyrics of the sacrificer along with righteous kings of yore by lute-players including a Rājanya who sings to the lute three songs made by himself, "such war he waged, such battle he won." There is also a "circle of tales," Pārīplava Ākhyāna which lasts by series of ten days for the whole year.

The kingship disclosed in Brāhmānic songs and ritual is not merely a "Patriarchal Presidency." The monarch is not merely a chief noble, the first among equals, 'President of a Council of Peers.' In a famous Atharvānic land the rājā of the Kurus, is extolled as a deva who

1 XX. i. 1. Variant readings (e. g. upgasārevbhaunnamese) of the relevant text seem hardly acceptable; Cf. Baudh. XV. 1. Even as late as the time of Bhasubhūti (eighth century A. D.) the Aśvamedha was looked upon as "the super-eminent touchstone to test the might of warriors conquering the world and an indication of the conquest of all the warriors."-Aśvamedha iti vīśveṣajyānaṃ Kshatriyāṇāṃ mārjasvālaṃ sarva-kshatriya-parībhāvi mahānukkaraṇaṁ (Uttara-Rāma-charitām, Act IV, translated by Vinayak Sadashiv Patwardhan). The sacrifice seems also to have been performed in early times to atone for sinful work. There was also a Vishñuate adaptation of the famous rite—no animals being killed on the occasion, and the oblations prepared in accordance with the precepts of the Āranyakas. Reference may be made to the story of Uparichara Vaṇu in the Sāntiparva of the Mahābhārata, Ch. 335-339 (Raychaudhuri, EHYVS., 2nd ed., 192). Regarding the significance of the Aśvamedha see also D. C. Sircar's note in Indian Culture 1, pp. 311 ff; II. 780ff.

2 Sat. Br. XIII. 4. 2. 5. tayajato purastadrakshitāra upakliptā bhavanti. Rājaputraḥ kavacchināḥ satam rājanyāni nishāhāgināḥ satam sitagyamāṇān putrā bhuparśhināḥ satam Kshatra Saṅgrahottarīnām putrā dāndināḥ satam kṣatramsautam niraśtam yāsmīnnaṁ mārjasvālaṁ." 3 S. B. E. xlv. pp. 298ff; Pārīplava Ākhyāna in Sat Br. XIII. 4. 3. 2; Keith, Black Yajur, pp. cxxxi f; RPVU, 345 f; Hopkiss, GEI 365, 386.
surpassed mere mortals (martyas). The consecrated king is the lord of all beings. He is called "viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati," and is further described as the devourer of the people—viśāmattā.¹ "Rūjā ta ekāṁ mukham tena mukhena viśoṭsi."² He is surrounded by armed kinsmen and retainers.³ He can "banish a Brāhmaṇa at will, mulct and overpower a Vaiśya at will, and exact labour from or slay a Sudra at will."⁴ Further he claims the power of giving his kingdom away to anybody he liked. In the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad Janaka says to Yājñavalkya, "So'ham Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi māṇchāpi saha dāsya'yeti."⁵

The king, however, was **not an absolute despot** in practice. His power was checked, in the first place, by the Brāhmaṇas. We have seen that the most powerful sovereigns, even those who were consecrated with the Punarabhisheka, had to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the 'holy power' (Brahman) that was the repository of culture and education in those days. We learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,⁶ and the Kauṭāliya Arthaśattra⁷ that even a powerful king like Janamejaya was humbled by the Brāhmaṇas. Karāla Janaka met his doom for a crime against a Brāhmaṇa maiden. The Vṛishnis perished on account of their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas.⁸ This shows

---

¹ *Ait. Br.,* VIII. 17
² *Kaush.,* Up., II. 6.
³ *Ait. Br.,* iii. 48. "Sixty-four armed warriors assuredly were his (a Kuru's) sons and grandsons." When a Pañchāla king makes an offering there arise "Six thousand and three and thirty warriors clad in mail." *Sat. Br.* XIII, 5. 4, 16; cf. 4. 2. 5.
⁴ *Ait B r.* vii. 29.
⁵ *Brih.,* Up., IV. 4. 23.
⁶ VII. 27.
⁷ Ed. 1919, p. 11.
that not only kings, but republican corporations (Saṅgha), too, had to cultivate friendly relations with the Brāhmaṇas.

The second check was supplied by the ministers individually or in council, and village headmen who aided in the consecration of the king and whom the king consulted on important occasions. In the Vedic texts the Sūta and the Grāmaṇi are styled Rājakartī or Rājakṛit, i.e., King-maker. "Rajakṛitāḥ Sūta-Grāmaṇyāḥ." The very title indicates their importance in the body politic. They, as well as the other Ratnins, figure prominently in the sacrifice of royal inauguration.

The existence of a Royal Council (Sabha) is clearly suggested by references to sabhāsads in Vedic texts, particularly in connection with king Marutta Āvikshita. In the Rāmāyaṇa the sabha is clearly a body in which the Rājakartris have a place along with the amātyas and the Rājapurohitā (royal chaplain). The claim of the ministers and headmen to be consulted is recognised in Pāli texts while dealing with the period down to the time of Bimbisāra. The Mahāvagga says, "King Brahmadatta of Kasi, O Bhikkhus, having entered Benares, convoked his ministers and counsellors (Amaçe Pārisajje sannipatā petvā) and said to them: 'If you should see, my good sirs, young Dīghāvu, the son of king Dighiti of Kosala, what would you do to him?'" The Mahā assūroha Jātaka refers to a king who by beat of drum through the city gathered together his counsellors (amachcha, amātya). The Chulla-Sutasoma Jātaka refers to the eighty

---

1 Sat. Br., III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 16; In Rām. II. 67. 2; 79. 1. the king-masters are dvijātayāh.
2 Ait. Br. viii. 21; Sat. Br. XIII. 5. 4 6
3 II. 67. 2-4.
5 No. 302.
thousand councillors of a king headed by his general,¹ (Senāpati pamukhāni asitī amachcha sahāssāni). The power of councillors (amātyas) to depose a prince and elect a king is recognised in the Pādaṇjali, Saṅvara, and Sonaka Jātakas respectively. There is evidence regarding special gems of village headmen. We are told that “when Śenīya Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, was holding an assembly of the eighty thousand Grāmikas (Village headmen) he sent message to Soṇa Kolivisa.”¹²

Another check was supplied by the general body of the people (Jana, Mahājana) who were distinct from the ministers and Grāmaniṣ, or Grāmikas, and who used to meet in an assembly styled Samiti or Parishad in the Upanishads.³ In the Utkroṣana passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa⁴ the people (Janāḥ) are clearly distinguished from the Rājakartāraḥ among whom, according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa⁵ were included the Sūta and the Grāmaṇi.⁶ That the Samiti or Parishad was an assembly of the whole people, is apparent from such expressions as “bhūyishṭhāḥ Kuru-Paṇḍhālāśāgata bhavītāraḥ...”⁷ “Paṇḍhālānāṁ Samitim eyāya”, “Paṇḍhālānāṁ Parishadam ājagāma,” “samaagā Śiva yo huvā”. The Chhāndogya Upanishad⁸ mentions the Samiti of the Paṇḍhāla people presided over by king Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, Śvetaketurh

¹ Cowell’s Jātaka, V, p. 97 (No. 525); ‘eighty thousand’ is a stock number and should not be taken too literally.
³ In the Jām. Up. Br. II. 11. 4. we find a reference to the Parishad, the Sabha and the Samsad. It is not clear, if these are distinct institutions. The sabha and the samiti are, however, distinguished in the Atharva-Veda.
⁵ III, 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18.
⁸ V 3. 1.
CHECKS ON ROYAL AUTHORITY

Āruṇeyāh Pañcchālānām Samitīm eyāya; tam ha Pravāhano Jaivalir uvācha." The Brihadāranyaka Upanīṣad uses the term Parishad instead of Samiti, "Śvetaketur ha vā Āruṇeyāh Pañcchālānām Parishadāmājagāma." The analogy of the Lichchhavi Parishā and of similar assemblies mentioned in Buddhist works shows that the functions of the Kuru and Pañcchāla Parishads were not necessarily confined to philosophical discussions only. The Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa refers to disputations (saṃvāda) and witnesses (upadrāṣṭri) in connection with popular assemblies, and informs us that the procedure among the Kurus and the Pañcchālas was different from that of Śūdras. The people took part in the ceremony of royal inauguration. The Dummedha Jātaka refers to a joint assembly of ministers, Brāhmaṇas, the gentry, and the other orders of the people.

That the people actually put a curb on royal absolutism is proved by the testimony of the Atharva-Veda where it is stated that concord between king and assembly was essential for the former’s prosperity. We have evidence that the people sometimes expelled and even executed their princes together with unpopular officials. Thus it is stated in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, "Now Dush-ṭaritū Pauṁsāyana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come to him through ten generations, and the Śrīñjayas also expelled Revottaras Pāṭava.

VI. 2. 1.
2 III. 7. 6.
3 Ait. Br., VIII. 17.
4 No. 80; cf. Vessantara Jātaka (No. 547), Vol. VI, pp. 490 ff. The whole Sivi people assembled to discuss a matter of public importance, to give advice to the king and to inflict punishment on a prince.
5 VI. 88. 3.
6 XII. 9. 3. 1 et seq.; Eggeling, V. 269,
Châkra Sihapati."" The Aitareya Brâhmaṇa refers to personages who were expelled from their kingdoms (rāṣṭras) and who were anxious to recover them with the help of the Kshatriya consecrated with the Punarabhiseka. Such persons were the Indian counterparts of the French "emigrants" who sought to reclaim revolutionary France with the help of the troops of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns. We learn from the Vessantara Jātaka that the king of the Sivis (Sabis) was compelled to banish prince Vessantara in obedience to "the people's sentence" (Sivinām vachanatthena samhā raṭṭhā nirajjati).

The king was told:

"Sache tvāṁ na karissasi Sivinām vachanām idāṁ maṁne tam saha puttena Sivihatthe karissare ti"
The bidding of the Sivi folk if you refuse to do
The people then will act, methinks, against your son and you.

The king replied:

"Eso che Sivinām chhando chhandāṁ na panudāmase"
Behold the people's will, and I that will do not gainsay.

The Padakusalamānava Jātaka tells a story how the town and the countryfolk of a kingdom assembled (jānapadā negamā cha samāgatā), beat the king and priest to death as they became a source, not of weal, but of woe (lit. fear, yato khemam tato bhayam), and anointed a good man as king. A similar story is told in the Sachchāṁkira Jātaka. We are told in the Khandaḥāla Jātaka that

---

1 For the designation 'Sihapati', see ante, p. 167.
2 VIII. 10.
3 Cf. Lodge, Modern Europe, p. 517.
4 No. 547; Text VI. 400-502. The Sibis are known to Ait. Br. viii, 29.
5 No. 492.
6 No. 73.
7 No. 542.
the people of one kingdom killed the minister, deposed the king, made him an outcaste and anointed a prince as king. The ex-king was not allowed to enter into the capital city. Fick\textsuperscript{1} points out that in the Telapatta Jātaka a king of Takshaśilā says that he has no power over the subjects of his kingdom. This is in striking contrast with the utterance of Janaka quoted above.\textsuperscript{2} Evidently the Royal power had declined appreciably, at least in some of the north-western Janapadas, since the days of Janaka.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} The Social Organisation in North-East India, trans. by Dr. S. K. Maitra, pp. 113-114. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar follows him in Carmichael Lectures, 1918, 134f.

\textsuperscript{2} P. 172, "Bhagavate Vīdehān dadāmi".

\textsuperscript{3} Note the references to elected kings (e. g. amongst the Kathaioi) and autonomous folks by the historians of Alexander in the fourth century B.C. The Ambashtaas had a strong monarchy in the Brāhmaṇa period (Ait. Br. viii 21). In the days of Alexander (Inf. Alex. 252) the constitution was democratic.
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PART II

From the Coronation of Bimbisāra to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I. FOREWORD.

The following pages deal with the political history of India from the time of Bimbisāra to that of the Guptas. For this period we are fortunately in possession of authentic historical materials in addition to literary tradition to which reference has already been made in the first part of the book. These materials are derived principally from the following sources: inscriptions, coins, accounts left by foreign observers and works of Indian authors of known date and authenticity.

Inscriptions engraved on stone and copper undoubtedly form the most copious and important source. Hardly less important are the coins which constitute almost the sole evidence of the history of certain dynasties and republican communities of the second and first centuries B. C. Foreign accounts, especially the records of Greek diplomats and navigators and of Chinese annalists and pilgrims, are especially valuable in connection with the vexed question of Indian chronology. Works of Indian writers of known epochs, that illumine the darkness of our period, and afford interesting glimpses of political history, are extremely rare and comprise the Mahābhāṣṭya (Great Commentary) of Patañjali, the
Kalpanāmanḍitikā of Kumāralāta, the Life of Vasubandhu by Paramārtha and the Harsha-charita (Deeds of Harsha) by Bāṇabhaṭṭa.

For the history of the period from Bimbisāra to Aśoka the writer of these pages cannot in some respects claim much originality. The subject has been treated by Rhys Davids and Smith, and a flood of new light has been thrown on particular dynasties by Geiger, Bhandarkar, Rapson, Jayaswal, Malalasekera, Jackson, Herzfeld, Hultzsch and others. Use has in some cases been made of the information contained in their works, and it has been supplemented with fresh data gathered mainly from epical, Jaina, Buddhist and classical sources. As instances it may be pointed out that attention to the name Haryanaka, given to the Bimbisārid family by Aśvaghosha, was first drawn in these pages. The tradition recorded in the Harsha-charita and Jaina works regarding the tragic end of Śiśunāga's line and origin of the Nandas has been collated with the evidence of the Graeco-Latin writers. Epic data have been used largely to illustrate the dawn of Magadhan ascendancy, locate tribes like the Kambojas and the Pulindas who figure in the Aśokan edicts, and to explain expressions like stryadhaksha, vihārayatā, anusaṁyāna etc. Old materials have also been presented in many cases in a new shape, and the author's conclusions are often different from those of former writers.

In the chapter on the Later Mauryas the author has examined the causes of the dismemberment of the Maurya Empire, and drawn pointed attention to the Gārgī Saṁhitā, the Hou Hanshu, etc. and has tried to demonstrate the unsoundness of the current theory that "the fall of the Maurya authority was due in large measure to a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇs."

1 The Chapter on the Later Mauryas was published in the JASB, 1920 (No. 18, pp. 305 ff.).
The treatment of the history of the Early Post-Mauryan and Scythian periods, though not entirely original, is different in many respects from that of previous authors. It has not been possible to accept the current views with regard to the lineage of Pushyamitra and the history and chronology of several dynasties, notably of the Early Sātavāhanas, the Greeks of Sākala, and the Saka-Pahlavas of the Uttarāpatha or North-West India. As early as 1923 the writer of these pages assigned to the Nāgas of the Jumna valley and Eastern Malwa and the Bhāraśivas their proper place in the history of the post-Kushan period, a fact which has been ignored in some wellknown publications.

In the account of the Gupta period use has been made of the mass of fresh materials accumulated since the publication of the works of Bühler, Fleet, Smith and Allan. The notices of the most famous ruling family of the age in early epigraphs and literature, which are sometimes overlooked, have received due attention, its relations with southern dynasties like the Vākaṭakas have been discussed, and an attempt has been made to present a connected history of the so-called 'Later Guptas.'

1 The Chapter on the so-called Later Guptas was published in the JASB., 1920 (No. 19, pp. 313 ff),
SECTION II. LOCAL AUTONOMY AND IMPERIAL UNITY.

The chief interest of the political history of the post-Bimbisāriān Age lies in the interplay of two opposing forces, one centrifugal, the other centripetal, viz., the love of local (Jānapada) autonomy and the aspiration for imperial unity. The former ideal is best expressed in the words of Manu—sarvam paravaśam duḥkham, sarvam ātmavaśāṁ sukham,1 "subjection to others is full of misery, subjection to self leads to happiness." The predilection for local self-rule was in part fostered by geographical conditions. The intersection of the land of India by deep rivers and winding chains of mountains flanked by dreary deserts or impenetrable forests, developed a spirit of isolation and cleft the country asunder into small political units whose divergences were accentuated by the infinite variety of local conditions. But the vast riparian plain of the north and the extensive plateau in the interior of the Deccan Peninsula, decked with green by the life-giving streams that flow from the majestic heights of the Himālayas and the Western Ghats, fostered an opposite tendency—an inclination towards union and coalescence. The sands which choked the Sarasvatī, the floods that swelled the Lauḥītya, the dangers that lurked in the Mahāṭavī proved no effective bar to unity. The five hills of Girivraja could not permanently withstand the conquering heroes who were charged with an imperial mission. The head of the Vindhya bent in reverence before the sage who was bringing the culture of the Ganges valley to the banks of the Godāvari and the Tāmraparṇi.

1 Manuśrākhítā, IV. 160.
The desire for union under one political authority became manifest as early as the Brāhmaṇa period and found expression in passages like the following:—

"May he (the king) be all-encompassing, possessed of all the earth, possessed of all life, from the one end up to the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler (ekarat)."

The ideal persists throughout our period and inspired poets and political philosophers who spoke of the thousand yojanas ( leagues) of land that stretch from the Himālayas to the sea as the proper domain of a single universal emperor (chakravarti-kṣetra) and eulogised monarchs who protected the earth decked with the Ganges, as with a pearl necklace, adorned with the Himavat and the Vindhyā, as with two earrings, and robed with a swinging girdle in the shape of the rocking oceans.

The imperial ideal had to contend with the centrifugal tendencies of Jānapada (provincial and tribal) autonomy. The two forces operated in successive epochs almost with the regularity of the swing of the pendulum. The aspiration for a unity that transcended local boundaries owed its success not a little to the presence of another factor in Indian politics—the danger threatening from foreign invaders. It was only when the "earth was harassed by the barbarians" (Mlechchhairudvejyamānā) that she sought refuge in the strong arms of Chandra Gupta Maurya, the first great historical emperor of India—whose dominions undoubtedly overstepped the limits of Āryāvarta. Among the early empire-builders of the south was a prince who rid his country of the Scythians, Greeks and Parthians (Saka-Yavana-Pahlava-nishūdana). And the rulers who revived the imperial glory of the Gangetic Provinces in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., were warriors who humbled the pride of the Scythian "Son of Heaven" and
braved the wrath of the Saka king in his own city. According to sacred legends Vishnu in the shape of a Boar had rescued the earth in the aeon of universal destruction. It is significant that the worship of the Boar Incarnation became widely popular in the Gupta-Chalukya period. The poet Visakhadatta actually identifies the man in whose arms the earth found refuge when harassed by the Mlechchhas, who "shook the yoke of servitude from the neck" of his country, with the Vārāhi-tanu (Boar form) of the Self-Existent Being. Powerful emperors both in the north and the south recalled the feats of the Great Boar and the mightiest ruler of a dynasty that kept the Arabs at bay for centuries actually took the title of Ādivarāha or the Primeval Boar. The Boar Incarnation then symbolized the successful struggle of Indians against the devastating floods issuing from the regions outside their borders that threatened to overwhelm their country and civilisation in a common ruin.
CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF MAGADHA

Sarvamūrdhābhināmesha mūrddhini jvalishyati
prabhāhara' yam sarveshām jyotishāmiva bhāskaraḥ
enamāśadya rājānaḥ samriddha-balavāhanā
vināśamupayāsyanti śalabhā iva pāvakam.

—Mahābhārata.¹

SECTION I. GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE PERIOD
C. 544 B. C. to 324 B. C.

The most remarkable feature of the age that commenced
with the coronation of Bimbisāra c. 545—44 B.C.,²
and ended with the retirement of Alexander from India
and the accession of Chandra Gupta Maurya (324 B. C.),
is the rise of a New Monarchy in the Eastern part of
the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent which is already heralded
by a Brāhmaṇa passage cited above³:

"In this eastern quarter (prāchyaṁ diśī), whatever
kings there are of the eastern peoples, they are anointed
for supreme kingship (Śamrājya); 'O supreme king
(Samrāt they style them when anointed.'"

The eastern peoples, prāchyas, are not enumerated
in the same manner as those of the southern, the northern
and the central regions. But it may be safely assumed that
the name used in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa stands for the
Prasii of the Graeco-Roman writers. The most famous nations
of the east in the Brāhmaṇa-Upanishad period were the
Kāśis, the Kosalas and the Videhas. But a new star was

¹ II. 19 10-11.
² See below, Section VII.
³ Pp. 166-7
soon in the ascendant. Under the vigorous kings of the race of Bimbisāra and Nanda Magadha played the same part in ancient Indian politics as Wessex did in pre-Norman England and Prussia in Hohenzollern Germany. Several circumstances contributed to the pre-eminence of the new aspirant for imperial power—its position of vantage between the upper and lower parts of the vast riparian plain of Northern India, the possession of an almost unassailable stronghold amidst five hills, and another at and near the confluence of several rivers, the arteries of commerce and navigation in those days, a superbly rich and fruitful soil, and resources including a powerful elephant corps which greatly impressed the classical writers and writers in polity.

But strategic position and material wealth cannot suffice to raise a nation to greatness. As Burke says, it is the quality and spirit of the people ‘that give all their life and efficacy to them’. As in several Atlantic lands, so in Magadha, we have a fusion of folks and cultures. Kīkatās mixed here with enterprising clans coming from upper India as Celts did with Latins and Teutons in Mediaeval France and some adjoining territories. It is not difficult to find out two strands in the cultural—no less than the racial—texture of the population. The same nation that produced relentless fighters and, ‘exterminators of kings’ and clans like Jarāsandha of epic legend, Ajātaśatru, Mahāpadma, Chandaśoka (the ruthless conqueror of Kalinga) and perhaps Samudra Gupta, hearkened at the same time to the devout teachings of Madhyama Pratibodhiputra, Vardhamāna Mahāvira, and Gautama Buddha, and played a conspicuous part in the propagation of a world religion as it did in the establishment of an empire embracing nearly the whole of India. The birth of Ajātaśatru and the enlightenment of the Buddha took place in the same country and the same age, and they met in Rājagriha as Charles V and
Martin Luther did at Worms. The symbol of aggressive imperialism stood face to face with the preacher of piety and morality, leader of a movement that was destined to convulse a continent. The two ideologies did not long remain apart. They were harmonised and the magician who worked the miracle was Dharm-āsoka who combined in himself the imperial tradition of his forbears as well as the spiritual fervour of the sage of the Śākyas.

A characteristic of the people of Magadha was an elasticity of social behaviour which was absent in the system which developed on the banks of the Sarasvati and the Drishadvati. In their country Brāhmanas could associate with Vṛātyas, the Rājanya could admit the Śudra girl to the harem, the Vaiśya and even the Yavana could be promoted to gubernatorial office, hereditary rulers of aristocratic lineage could be expelled to make room for the offspring of a narga-sobhini, and the “royal throne of kings” was not beyond the reach of a barber.

Magadhan rulers and chancellors like Vassakāra (Varshakāra) and Kauṭilya, were not over-scrupulous in their methods. Tradition credits some of them with the use of Machiavellian diplomacy in disintegrating kingdoms and republics, and invention of engines of destruction which worked with deadly effect. But they had the sagacity to evolve an administrative system in which princes royal, ministers of state as well as leading men of villages had their due share. Foreign diplomats and pilgrims in the fourth century B.C., as well as the fifth and seventh centuries A. D. speak of their sense of justice, their hospitals, charitable institutions and public works. They believed in ceaseless endeavour with the object of realising the dream of a united Jambudvīpa (Greater India) integrated by political as well as spiritual ties. In the Magadha bards, the rulers of Girivraja and Pātaliputra had a body of devoted men who could rouse popular
enthusiasm in a cause in which they believed. These singers and chroniclers have left a legacy which is invaluable to the student of ancient history.

The rise of Magadha synchronised with, and may have been a contributory cause of, an exodus of people from the Madhya-deśa to the outlying parts of India, notably the west and the south. The displacement of the Yādavas in antiquity is vouched for by epic tradition. It is well-known that the Vṛishnis and cognate clans of Dvārkā in Kāthiawār and several peoples of the Deccan claimed Yādu lineage. It was in the period under review that the Far South of India comes definitely within the geographical horizon of the grammarians and foreign diplomats some of whom graced the Durbar of Magadhan kings. Sapta-Sindhu had at last developed into Jam udvīpa. And the time was not distant when a notable attempt would be made to impress the stamp of unity on it in the domain of culture and politics.

In making their prowess felt throughout the vast sub-continent of India the great men of Magadha had at first to face three problems, viz., those presented by the republics mainly on their northern frontier, the monarchies that grew up on the Rāptī, the Jumna and the Chambal and the foreign impact that made itself felt in the Punjab and Sind. We turn first to the republics.
SECTION II. REPUBLICS IN THE AGE OF BIMBISĀRA.

It was Rhys Davids who first drew pointed attention to the survival, side by side with the monarchies, of a number of small aristocratic republics in the age of the Buddha and of Bimbisāra.¹ The most important amongst these states were the Vṛijians of North Bihār and the Mallas of Kusinārā (Kuśinagara) and Pāvā. An account of both these peoples has already been given.² Among the smaller republics we find mention of the Sākyas of Kapilavastu, the Koliyas of Devadaha and Rāmagāma, the Bhaggas (Bhargas) of Sunṣumāra Hill, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana.

The Sākyas were settled in the territory bordered on the north by the Himālayas, on the east by the river Rohinī,³ and on the west and south by the Rāptī.⁴ Their capital, Kapilavastu, stood close to the western bank of the Rohinī, some eight miles to the west of the famous Lumbinivana,⁵ the place of the Buddha's nativity, the site of which is marked by the Rummindei pillar of one of the greatest of his followers.⁶ The city is possibly mentioned in the Tīrthayātrā section of the Mahābhārata⁷ under the name of Kapilāvata. It was connected by roads with the capitals of the Kosalas and

¹ Buddhist India, p. 1.
² Supra pp. 118ff, 126ff.
³ A tributary of the Rāptī (Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 96). Cunningham (AGI, new ed. 476) identifies it with the Kohāna.
⁴ Rapson Ancient India, p. 161; Oldenberg, Buddha, pp. 95-96.
⁵ AGI (new ed) 476.
⁶ Kapilavastu is sometimes identified with Pipāwā in the north of the Bāsīl district, or Tilaura Koṭ and neighbouring ruins in the Tarāi about 10 miles to the N.W. of Pipāwā. (Smith, EHI, third ed., p. 169.)
⁷ III, 84. 31.
the Vrijikas, and through them with the other great cities of the age. The Sakyas had a town called Devadaha which they appear to have shared with their eastern neighbours, the Koliyas. They acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of Kosala and, like him, claimed to belong to the solar (Āditya) race and Ikshvāku family.

The Koliyas claim to have been cadets from the royal house of Benares. Tradition connects them with the cities of Rāmagāma and Devadaha. The river Rohini separated their capital from that of the Sakyas, and helped to irrigate the fields of both the clans. "Once upon a time in the month of Jetṭhamūla when the crops began to flag and droop, the labourers from amongst both the peoples assembled together." Then followed a scramble for water. Bloodshed was averted by the mediation of the Buddha. From the mutual recriminations in which they indulged, we learn that the Sakyas had the custom of marrying their own sisters. Cunningham places the Koliya country between the Kohāna and Aumi (Anomā) rivers. The Anomā seems to have formed the dividing line between the Koliyas on the one hand and the Mallas and Moriyas on the other.

The Bhaggas (Bhargas) are known to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Ashtādhyayi of Panini. The former work refers to the Bhārgāyaṇa prince Kairiśi Sutvan. In the latter half of the sixth century B.C., the Bhagga state was a dependency of the Vatsa kingdom; for we learn from the preface to the Dhonasākha Jātaka, that prince Bodhi, the son of Udayana, king of the Vatsas, dwelt

1 DPPN, I. 639f. The Koliya capital stood close to the eastern bank of the Rohini.
2 The Kunāla Jātaka (introductory portion).
3 DPPN, I. 690, Cunn. AGI (new) 477; 491 ff.
4 VIII. 28.
5 IV. i. III, 177.
6 No. 358.
BULIS AND KĀLĀMAS

in Sumīsumāragirī and built a palace called Kokanada. The Mahābhārata and the Harivāṁśa also testify to the close connection between the Vatsas and the Bhargas (Bhaggas) and their proximity to the Nishādās. The testimony of the epic and the Apadāna seems to locate them in the Vindhyān region between the Jumna and the Son.¹

Regarding the Bulis and the Kālāmas we know very little. The Dhammapada commentary² refers to the Buli territory as the kingdom of Allakappa, and says that it was only ten leagues in extent. From the story of its king’s intimate relationship with king Veṭhadīpaka it may be presumed that Allakappa lay not far from Veṭhadīpa, the home of a famous Brāhmaṇa in the early days of Buddhism, who made a cairn over the remains of the Buddha in his native land.³ The Kālāmas were the clan of the philosopher Ālāra, a teacher of Gautama before he attained to Sambodhi.⁴ The name of their nigama (town) Kesaputta, reminds us of the Kesins, a people mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa⁵ and probably also in the Ashtādyāyī of Pāṇini,⁶ and connected with the Pañchālas and Dālḥyias who appear in the Rig-Veda,⁷ as settled on the banks of the Gomati. Kesaputta itself seems to have been annexed to Kosala,⁸ and no doubt acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of that powerful state.

¹ MBh., II, 30, 10-11; Hariv., 29, 73, DPPN, II, 345; Supra p. 133.
³ Majumdar Sāstri connects Veṭhadīpa with Kasia (AGI, 1924, 714); cf. Fleet in JRAS, 1906, p. 900n; Hoey suggests that Veṭhadīpa is Bettish in the Champaran District of Bihār.
⁴ Bhaṭṭācharī, XII. 2.
⁶ VI, 4, 166.
⁷ V, 61.
⁸ The Aṅguttara (P. T. S., I, 188; Nipāta III, 65).
The Moriyas (Mauryas) were the same clan which gave Magadha its greatest dynasty. They are sometimes spoken of as of Sākya origin, but the evidence is late. Earlier evidence distinguishes between these two clans. The name is derived, according to one tradition, from mora (mayūra) or peacock. The place where they settled down is said to have always resounded with the cries of these birds. Pipphalivana, the Moriya capital, is apparently identical with the Nyagrodhavana or Banyan Grove, mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, where stood the famous Embers Tope. Fa Hien tells us that the Tope lay four yojanas to the east of the river Anomā, and twelve yojanas (probably some 54 miles) to the west of Kusinārā.

It will perhaps not be quite out of place to say here a few words about the internal organisation of the republics. Space, however, forbids a detailed treatment of the subject. They fall mainly into two classes, viz., those that were constituted by the whole or a section of a single clan (kula) e.g., the Sākyas, the Koliyas, the Mallas of Kusinārā, the Mallas of Pāvā etc., and those that comprised several clans like the Vrijis (Vajjis) and the Yādavas. The distinguishing feature of a state of this type is the absence of one single hereditary monarch who exercised full control over it. The Basileus, if he survived at all, must have done so as a mere magistracy or as a dignified

1 "Then did the Brāhmaṇa Cānakka anoint a glorious youth, known by the name Candagutta, as king over all Jambudīpa, born of a noble clan, the Moriyas." Geiger, Mahāvamsa, p. 27; DFPN, II. 673.
2 Mahaparinibbāna Sutta.
3 Rhys Davids, Buddhist Suttas, p. 185; Watters, Yuan Chüang, II, pp. 23-24; Cunningham, AGI, new ed., pp. 491f, 496f.
4 AGI (new) 491, Legge, Fa Hien, p. 79; Watters, I, 141; cf, JRAS., 1903.
As Kasia (Kusinārā, Kuśinagarā) lay 35 miles to the east of Gorakhpur (AGI, 493), the Moriya city could not have been situated very far from the last-mentioned town. The Moriyas seem also to have been close neighbours of the Koliyas beyond the Anomā and the Mallas of Anupiṣṭa on the banks of that river.
part of the constitution. The efficient part comprised a president (chief, gaṇapati, gaṇa-jyestha, gaṇarāja, saṃgha-mukhya) and a council of archons taken from the ruling class. Such a president was Cheṭaka of Vaiśāli and Akouphis of Nysa in later times, the terrestrial counterpart of Indra, in his capacity as the Jyeshṭha of the Marud-gana. According to a Jain tradition the number of members of the supreme executive in charge of foreign and military affairs was in some states nine. There were functionaries like uparājās and senāpatis who exercised judicial and military functions. All these Elders possibly answer to the Mahallakas of Pāli texts and Mahattaras of the Vāyu Purāṇa, whom it was the duty of the citizens to respect and support.

Some of the clans possibly had an elaborate system of judicial procedure with a gradation of officers. Others, notably the Koliyas, had a police force which earned notoriety for extortion and violence. Reverence for tradition, especially for traditional religion with its shrines and ministers, was a feature that recalls the part that ancestral religion played in ancient Babylonia and modern Nippon.

Perhaps the most important institution of the free republics was the Parishā, the popular assembly, where young and old held frequent meetings, made their decisions and carried them out in concord. Kettledrums were used by an officer (styled subhāpāla in the epic) to

---

1 Cf. the case of Ugrasena among the Yādavas.
2 Rīg-veda I. 23. 8; cf. II. 23. 1.
3 Nava Mallai, Nava Leschekhai etc. supra p. 125. In Nysa the governing body consisted of 300 members. The number of "leading men of cities and provinces" entrusted by the Kabudrakas with power to conclude a treaty is not definitely stated.
4 Vāyu, 96. 35.
5 DPPN, I. 690.
6 Kindred Sayings II. 178 (reference to kettledrum of the Dasārhas; cf. Mbh., I. 220. 11.)
bring the people to the Mote Hall, called Santhāgāra in the Pali texts. The procedure is perhaps analogous to that followed in the Kuru-Pañchāla assembly mentioned in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa, in a palaver in Śakra's heaven described in the Mahāgovinda Suttanta, or in formal gatherings of the Chapters of the Buddhist Order referred to in the Vinaya texts. Members "are seated in a specified order. After the president has laid the proposed business before the assembly, others speak upon it, and recorders take charge of the unanimous decision arrived at." If there is any disputation (samevāda) the matter is referred to a committee of arbitrators. It is possible that technical expressions like āsana-prajñāpaka (seat-betokener), ātti (jñapti, motion), śalāka-gahāpaka (ballot-collector), gaṇa-pūraka (whip), ubbāhikā (referendum) found in the Rules of the Order, were adopted from those in use in the assemblies of the free tribes or clans.

SECTION III. THE MINOR PRINCIPALITIES AND THE GREAT MONARCHIES

An important feature of Indian history throughout the ages is the presence of numerous petty Rājās holding their courts either in some forest region, mountain fastness, or desert tract away from the main currents of political life, or in a riparian or maritime district, each separated from his neighbour by a range of hills, a stream, a forest or an expanse of sandy waste. It is impossible to enumerate all such tiny states that flourished and decayed in the days of Bimbisāra. But a few deserve notice. Among these were Gandhāra ruled by Paushka-rasārin or Pukkusāti, a remote predecessor of Āmbhi, Madra governed by the father of Khemā, a queen of Bimbisāra, Roruka (in Sauvīra or the Lower Indus Valley) under the domination of Ruḍrāyana, Surasena ruled by Avantiputta (either a successor of, or identical with, Subāhu), and Āṅga under the sway of Dṛṇhavaranma and Brahmadatta.

It is difficult to say anything about the ethnic affiliation of these rulers. The form of the names indicates that they were either Aryans themselves or had come under the influence of Aryan culture. But there were certain principalities which were definitely styled Nishbāda in the epic, and Ālavaka, (forest-folk of Yaksha-infested land) in the Pāli texts and were doubtless of non-Aryan origin.

One of these, the realm of Ālavaka, demands some notice as the relic of a past that was fast disappearing. This little state was situated near the Ganges and was probably identical with the Chanchu territory visited by Yuan

1 *Diryāvadāna*, p. 545.
Chwang (Hiuen Tsang). Cunningham and Smith identify it with the Ghazipur region. The name is derived from the capital Álavī² (Sanskrit Aṭavī, cf. Aṭavika) or Álabhiyā³ which stood close to a large forest that doubtless suggested the particular nomenclature.⁴ In the Abhidhānappadīpikā Álavī finds a place in a list of twenty famous cities: Bāraṇasī, Śāvatthī, Vesālī, Mithilā, Álavī, Kosambhī, Ujjēnī, Takkasilā, Champā, Sāgala, Sūr, sumāragira, Rājagaha, Kapilavatthu, Sāketa, Indapaṭṭa, Ukkaṭṭha,⁵ Pātaliputtaka, Jettuttara,⁶ Saṁkassa⁷ and Kusinārā. The Chullavagga³ mentions the Aggālave shrine at Álavī which the Buddha honoured by his visits, as it lay on the way between the capitals of Kosala and Magadha. In the Uvāsagadāsāo the king of Álabhiyā is named Jiyasattū (Jita-ṣatru, conqueror of enemies). But Jiyasattū seems to have been a common designation of kings³ like the epithet Devānampiya of a later age.¹⁰ The name is given also to the rulers of Śāvatthī, Kampilla, Mithilā, Champā, Vāṇiyagāma, Bāraṇasī and Polasapura,

---

¹ Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 61, 340.
³ Uvāsagadāsāo II, p. 108; Appendix, pp. 51-53.
⁴ Cf. The Book of the Kindred Sayings, Vol. I, p. 160. The derivation of the name of the country from aṭavī was suggested by Hoernle who also pointed out the reference in the Abhidhānappadīpikā. Cf. also the references to forest peoples and kingdoms in the inscriptions of Asoka and Somuṇdra Gupta.
⁵ A town in the Kingdom of Kosala (Dialogues of the Buddha, 1, 108).
⁶ Near Chitor (N. L. Dey).
⁷ Sanskrit Saṁkasa or Kapithikā which is identified by Cunningham with Saṁkasa on the Ikshumati river, in the Farukhabad District, U. P. (Cunn, AGI, new ed. pp. 425f, 700).
⁸ VI. 17; cf. also Gradual Sayings, IV. 147; DPPN, I. 296.
¹⁰ In Babylon, however, the style "favourite of the gods" is found as early as the age of Hammurali (Camb. And. Hist, 1. p. 511; I. C., April-June, 1946, p. 241).
who were all contemporaries of Mahāvīra.\footnote{Cf. Hoernle, \textit{Uvāsaga-dasāo}, II, pp. 6, 64, 100, 103, 106, 118, 166. In the \textit{Ārya Mañjuśrī Mūla Kalpa} (ed. G. Sāstri, p. 645), a king of Gauḍa is styled "Jitātra". It is absurd to suggest, as does Hoernle (p. 103 n.), that Jiyasattu, Prasenajit and Cheḍaga were identical. \textit{Cf. Indian Culture}, II, 806.} Buddhist writers refer to other “Yakkha” principalities besides Ālavaka.\footnote{Cf. \textit{Sutta Nipāta}, S.B.E., Vol. X, ii, p. 45.}

The most important factors in the political history of the period were, however, neither the republics nor the forest principalities but the \textbf{four Great Kingdoms} of Kosala, Vatsa, Avanti and Magadha.

In \textit{Kosala} king Mahākosala had been succeeded by his son Pasenadi or Prasenajit. As already stated, the Kosalan monarchy had spread its tentacles over a vast area extending perhaps from the Gumti to the Little Gaṇḍak and from the Nepalese Tarāi to the Ganges, possibly even to the eastern part of the Kaimur range. It counted amongst its vassals several rājās,\footnote{For the identification of the \textit{Rājās}, see Part I ante, 155f.} including, doubtless, the rulers of the Kāśis, the Śākyas and the Kālāmas. Among its officials were two Mallas, Bandhula and his nephew Dirgha Chārāyaṇa,\footnote{\textit{Majjhima N.} II, p. 118. He is probably identical with the person of that name mentioned in the \textit{Kautūhiya Arthaśāstra} and inscriptions (\textit{nīlīṅjita Chārāyanāh}, \textit{Ep. Ind.} III. 210) as a writer on polity. and by Vatsyāyana as an authority on Erotics.} who must have helped their sovereign to secure influence in the tiny state beyond the Little Gaṇḍak from which they came. “Nine Mallakis” appear as allies of the rulers of Kāsi-Kosala in Jaina texts. Friendship with the “Visālikā Līchchhavī” and with Seniya Bimbisāra,\footnote{\textit{Majjhima N.} II, p. 101.} the master of Magadha, must have favoured peaceful penetration in the east and left the king free to organise his kingdom and dealing drastically with robbers and savages who menaced the road from...
Sāketa to Sāvatthī, and interfered with the peaceful life of the monks.

The character of such a man, one of the leading figures of the age, who had received his education at Taxila, and became a friend of the Buddha, deserves study and we have an admirable exposition by Mrs. Rhys Davids. "He is shown combining like so many of his class all the world over, a proneness to affairs of sex with the virtues and affection of good 'family man', indulgence at the table with an equally natural wish to keep in good physical form, a sense of honour and honesty, shown in his disgust at legal cheating, with a greed for acquiring wealth and war indemnities, and a fussiness over lost property, a magnanimity towards a conquered foe with a callousness over sacrificial slaughter and the punishment of criminals. Characteristic also are both his superstitious nervousness over the sinister significance of dreams due, in reality, to disordered appetites, and also his shrewd politic care to be on good terms with all religious orders, whether he had testimonials to their genuineness or not." ²

The family life of the king had its bearing on affairs of the state. He married a Magadhan princess which fact must have cemented his friendship with Bimbisāra, who got a Kosalan wife in return. Another queen of Pasenadi (Prasenajit) was the famous Vāsabhakhkhatiyā, daughter of Mahānāman, the Sākyan, by a slave girl.³ The issues of this marriage were a son, Viḍūḍabha (Viduratha), who rose to be his father's senāpati (general)⁴ and

---

¹ Mahāvagga, SBE, XIII, pp. 230, 261. Among the marauders was the notorious Asgulimalla.
³ DPPN, II, 171; 857.
⁴ For the employment of princes as Senāpati, see Kauṭilya (Mysore edition), 1919, p. 31; cf. 346.
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afterwards his successor,¹ and a daughter Vajirā or Vajiri Kumari² who became the queen of Ajāṭhaśatru, the successor of Bimbisāra on the throne of Magadha. The careers of the prince and the princess are bound up with memorable events, viz., the war of the Kosalan king with Ajāṭhaśatru, the loss of his throne as a result of his son’s revolt, and the terrible vengeance that the latter wreaked on the Sākyas for sending the offspring of a slave woman to the Kosalan harem to become the mother of the prince.

When the Magadhan war brought disaster to the king’s arms he married Mallikā, daughter of the chief of garland-makers, who sweetened his days till her death, and made herself famous by her benefactions. Among these was a garden, the Mallikārama, which was set apart for religious discussions.³ She leaned towards the Buddha and his order, though her husband, with great insight, extended his patronage to Brāhmaṇas as well.⁴ Mallikā and Sumanā, the king’s sister,⁵ remind one of Kāruvāki and Rājyasri, famous for their charity and interest in Buddhist teaching in the days of Aśoka and Harsha respectively.

The internal organisation of the kingdom of Kosala presents some interesting features. There was a body of ministers at the centre, but they had little control over the

¹ Vidūṭabha’s name is generally omitted in Purānic manuscripts. The Purāṇas, however, mention a king named Suratha. Pargiter points out (D. K. A., 12, n 63) that one manuscript of the Vishū Purāṇa gives the name Viduratha instead of Suratha. But that prince is represented as the great-grandson of Praśenajit. Similarly, the Purāṇas represent Udāyin as the grandson of Ajāṭhaśatru. These instances emphasize the need for a critical handling of the Purānic lists.

² Majjhima. II, p. 110.

³ DPPN. II. 465-7. A more famous place, Jetavana, is said to derive its name from a son of Praśenajit.

⁴ Dialogues of the Buddha., I. pp. 108, 288. For Praśenadi’s benefactions to the Buddha and his followers see Gagga Jātaka, no. 155. For preparations for a great sacrifice, see Kindred saying, I. 102.

⁵ DPPN. II, 168 ff, 172, 1245.
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king's whims. Those specifically mentioned by tradition were Mrigadhara,¹ Ugga, Siri-Vaḍḍha, Kāla and Junha. The generals included the Crown Prince and some Malla chiefs. Police duties on roads were performed by soldiers. Portions of the royal domain were granted to Brāhmaṇas like Pokkharasādi, with power over them as if they were kings. The weakness of the system soon became apparent, and led to the downfall of the king. Ministers, who were lavish in their charity, were preferred to those who approved of a more economical policy, and one of the favourites is said to have actually been allowed to rule over the kingdom for seven days. The large powers granted to Brāhmaṇa donees must have promoted centrifugal tendencies, while the infidelity of some of the generals including the Crown Prince, and the cruel treatment by the latter, when he became king, of vassal clansmen contributed to the eventual downfall of the monarchy.

In the Vatsa kingdom which, probably at this time, extended along the southern frontier of Kosala, king Satānika Parantapa was succeeded by his son Udayana who rivals Śri Rāmachandra, Nala and the Pāṇḍavas in being the hero of many romantic legends.² The commentary on the Dhammapada gives the story of the way in which Vāsuladattā or Vāsavadattā, the daughter of Pradyota, king of Avanti, became his queen. It also mentions two other consorts of the

Vatsa king, *viz.*, Māgandiyā, daughter of a Kuru Brāhmaṇa, and Sāmāvatī, the adopted child of the treasurer Ghosaka. The *Milindapañho* refers to a peasant woman named Gopāla-mātā who also became his wife. The *Scapna-Vāsavadatta* attributed to Bhāsa, and some other works, mention another queen named Padmāvatī who is represented as sister to king Dārsaka of Magadha. The *Priyadarśikā* speaks of Udayana's marriage with Aranyakā, the daughter of Dridhavarmā, king of Āṅga. The *Ratnāvalī* tells the story of the love of the king of Vāsta and of Sāgarikā, an attendant of his chief queen Vāsavādattā. Stories about Udayana were widely current in Avanti in the time of Kaṭhidāsa as we learn from the *Meghadūta*: "prāpy-Āvantim Udayana-kathā-kovida grāmaeriddhān." The *Jātakas* throw some sidelight on the character of this king. In the preface to the *Mātaṅga Jātaka* it is related that in a fit of drunken rage he had Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja tortured by having a nest of ants tied to him. The *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* of Somadeva, a writer of the eleventh century A.D., contains a long account of Udayana's *Digvijaya*. The *Priyadarśikā* of Śrī Harsha speaks of the king's victory over the lord of Kaliṅga, and the restoration of his father-in-law Dridhavarmā to the throne of Āṅga. It is difficult to disentangle the kernal of historical truth from the husk of popular fables. It seems that Udayana was a great king who really made some conquests, and contracted matrimonial alliances with the royal houses of Avanti, Āṅga and Magadha. But his career was meteoric. He left no worthy successor. Bodhi, his son by the chief queen, preferred a quiet life amidst the sylvan surroundings of

---

2 IV. 8. 25; *DPPN*, I. 379-80.
4 *Act IV*.
Suśumārāgiri to the troubles of imperial adventure. The kingdom, harassed by various wars, was at last overcome by its ambitious neighbour on the south-west, viz., Avanti, and was governed by a prince of the royal line of Ujjain.1

The throne of Avanti was, in the days of Udayana, occupied by Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena whose daughter, Vasavadattā, became the chief queen of the lord of the Vatsas. Regarding the character of Pradyota the Muhāvagga says that he was cruel.2 The Purāṇas observe that he was "nayavarrjita", i.e., destitute of good policy and add that "he will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him—sa vai pranata-sāmantah". He bad at one time made the Vatsa king a captive and had a close relation on the throne of Mathurā. The terror that he struck among his neighbours is apparent from a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya3 that Ajātaśatru, son of Bimbisāra, fortified Rājagriha because he was afraid of an invasion of his territories by Pradyota. He also waged war on Pushkarasārin, the king of Taxila.4

---

1 Cf. story of Maniprabha from Ācāryaka-Kathānaka. Jacobs, parīśhāparceau, 2nd ed. xii, Tawney, Kathā-sarit-sāgara, II. p. 481. According to the Ācāryaka-Kathānaka IV, reproduced by Bhadreśvara in his Kahaṇvali, Maniprabha, great-grandson of Pradyota, ruled at Kauśambi, while his brother Avantisena exercised sway at Ujjain (Avanti).


3 III. 7.

4 Pradyota was unsuccessful in this war and wa saved from disaster by the outbreak of hostilities between Pushkarasārin and the Pāṇḍavas (Essay on Guptaḥya, 176).
SECTION IV. MAGADHA CRESCENT—BIMBISĀRA

According to Jaina legend Pradyota went forth to attack Rājagriha even during the lifetime of Bimbisāra. The last-mentioned prince, the real founder of Magadhan imperial power in the historic period, was the son of a petty chief of South Bibār, whose very name seems to have been forgotten. Tradition tried to fill the lacuna possibly by an imaginary nomenclature. An early authority describes the family to which the prince belonged as the Haryāṇka-kula. As we have already seen, there is no reason to discard this evidence in favour of the later tradition of the Purāṇas. Young Bimbisāra, who also bore the name or epithet of Sepiya (Śrenika), is said to have been anointed king by his own father when he was only fifteen years old. The momentous event cannot fail to recall a solemn ceremony that took place some nine hundred years later when another king of Magadha clasped his favourite son in arms in the presence of the princes royal and ministers, in council assembled, and exclaimed, “Protect the entire land”.

The new ruler had a clear perception of the political situation of his time. The military power of the Vṛiji Confederation was growing in the North. Aggressive monarchies under ambitious rulers were following a policy of expansion from their bases in Śrāvasti, and Ujjain. The cruel and unscrupulous ruler of the

1 He was foiled by the cunning of Prince Abbaya (Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1930-31, 3; cf. DPPN, I, 123).
2 Among the names given by various late writers we find the following: Bhatiya (Bhaṭṭiya, Bodhisa), Mahāpadma, Hemajit, Kshemajit, Kshetrajja or Khetrajja.
3 Supra, p. 115f.
4 Mahāvamsa (Geiger’s trans.), p. 12.
last-mentioned city engaged in hostilities with Pushkara-
sārin of Taxila. The king of Taxila harassed by numer-
ous enemies including the mysterious Pāṇḍavas who are
known to have been in possession of Śākala (in the
Punjab) in the days of Ptolemy, turned to the king of
Magadha for help. Though ready to oblige his Gandhārian
friend by receiving an embassy, Bimbisāra, who had to
liquidate the long-standing feud with his eastern neigh-
bour across the Champā, was in no mood to alienate
Pradyota or any of the other military chiefs of the age.

When the king of Avanti was suffering from jaundice
he sent the physician Jivaka. He also pursued a policy of
dynastic marriages like the Hapsburgs and Bourbons of
Europe and contracted alliances with the ruling families of
Madra,¹ Kosala² and Vaiśāli. These measures were of great
importance. They not only appeased the most formidable
militarists of the age, but eventually paved the way for
the expansion of the kingdom both westward and
northward. Bimbisāra’s Kosalan wife brought a Kāśi
village producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for
bath and perfume money.³ The Vaiśālian connection
produced momentous consequences in the next reign.

¹ Khemā, the princess of Śākala (Madra) is said to have been the chief
consort of Bimbisāra. Was she connected with the Pāṇḍavas who are found in
Śākala as late as the age of Ptolemy?
² According to the Dhammapada Commentary (Harvard, 29, 60; 30, 225)
Bimbisāra and Pasenadi were connected by marriage, each having married a
sister of the other.
³ Jātaka, Nos. 209, 258, 492. According to the Thusa Jātaka (333) and the
Mūdhika Jātaka (578) the Kosalan princess was the mother of Ajātāsātru. The
preface to the Jātakas says, "At the time of his (Ajātāsātru)’s conception there
arose in his mother, the daughter of the king of Kosala, a chronic longing to
drink blood from the right knee of king Bimbisāra". In the Sabhyakta Nikāya
(Book of Kindred Sayings, 110) Pasenadi of Kosala calls Ajātāsātru his nephew.
In Vol. I, page 38n of the Book of the Kindred Sayings, however, Maddā (Madrā)
appears as the name of Ajātāsātru’s mother. A Tibetan writer, calls her Vāsavi
(DFPN, I. 31.). The Jaina writers represent Chellaṇā, daughter of Chetaka of Vaiśāli
as the mother of Kūpika-Ajātāsātru. The Nikāyas call Ajātāsātru Vedhiputta
The shrewd policy of Bimbisāra enabled him to devote his undivided attention to the struggle with Aṅga which he annexed after defeating Brahmādatta. The annexation of Aṅga by Bimbisāra is proved by the evidence of the Mahāvagga and that of the Sonadanda Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya in which it is stated that the revenues of the town of Champā have been bestowed by King Bimbisāra on the Brāhmaṇa Sonadanda. We learn from Jaina sources that Aṅga was governed as a separate province under the Magadhan Crown Prince with Champā as its capital. The king himself resided in Rājagriha-Girivraja. Thus by war and policy Bimbisāra added Aṅga and a part of Kāśi to the Magadhan dominions, and launched Magadha to that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kaliṅga. We learn from the Mahāvagga that Bimbisāra’s dominions embraced 80,000 townships.

The victories of Bimbisāra’s reign were probably due in large measure to the vigour and efficiency of his administration. He exercised a rigid control over his (Vaidehiputra), i.e., son of the Videhan princess. This is taken to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaśālī was in Videha. Buddhaghosha, however, resolves “Vedehi” into Veda-iha, Vedema ihati or intellectual effort (BKS, Vol. I, 109n) and seems to suggest that “Vedehiputta” simply means “Son of the accomplished princess”. We should moreover remember that the Kosalan monarch Para Aṭānāra, had the epithet Vaideha and the name Kauśalyā was applied to several Kāśi princesses in the epic. The appellation Vaidehiputra, therefore, does not necessarily disprove the Kosalan parentage of the mother of Aṭānāstru. According to one authority “Chelā” (Chellanā) was styled “Vaidehi” as she was brought from Videha” (AIU, II. 20).

1 JASB, 1914, p. 331.
2 SBE, XVII, p. 1.
3 Hemachandra, the author of the Paññisṭaparvan VII. 22; cf. also the Bhagavati Sūtra and the Nirayāna Sūtra (ed. Warren, p. 3). King (rāgā) Kuniya, son of King Śeṣiya by Chellanādevi, ruled in Champā-nagari in Bhāratavarha, which is in Jambudvīpa.
4 Sutta Nipāta, SBE, X, ii. 67.
5 Apparently a stock number.
High Officers, dismissing those who advised him badly and rewarding those whose advice he approved of. The result of the 'purge' was the emergence of the type of official represented by Vassakāra and Sunītha. The High Officers (Rājabhāta) were divided into several classes, viz., (1) Sabbathaka (the officer in charge of general affairs), (2) Senā-nāyaka Mahāmattas (generals), and (3) Vohārika Mahāmattas (judges). The Vinaya texts afford us a glimpse of the activities of these Mahāmātras, and the rough and ready justice meted out to criminals. Thus we have reference not only to imprisonment in jails (kārā), but also to punishment by scourging (kaśā), branding, beheading, tearing out the tongue, breaking ribs, etc. There seems to have been a fourth class of mahāmātras who were responsible like the village syndic and headmen (grāmabhājaka or grāmakūṭa) for the levy of the tithe on produce.

In provincial administration a considerable degree of autonomy was allowed. We hear not only of a sub-king at Champā, but of mandalika rājas corresponding perhaps to the earls and counts of mediaeval European polity. But Bimbisāra, like William the Conqueror, sought to check the centrifugal tendencies of the system by a great gemote of village headmen (grāmikas) who are said to have assembled from the 80,000 townships of the realm.

Measures were taken for the improvement of communications and the foundation of a new royal residence. Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang) refers to Bimbisāra's road and causeway, and says that when Kuṣāgrapura

---

1 Chullavangga of the Vinayapiṭaka, VII. 3. 5. See also Vinaya, I. 73; 74f. 207, 240.
2 Another judicial officer mentioned in Pali texts (Kindred Sayings. II. 172) is the Viniekchāy-amachcha.
3 Camb. Hist., I. 199.
4 DPPN, III. 898.
(old Rājagrīha) was afflicted by fires, the king went to the cemetery and built a new city. Fa Hien, however, gives the credit for the foundation of New Rājagrīha to Ajāta-śatru. The patronage of Jivaka shows that medical arrangements were not neglected.

In one respect Bimbisāra was unfortunate. Like Prasenajit he was possibly the victim of the malevolence of the Crown Prince whom he had appointed to the vice-royalty of Champā, and had perhaps even admitted to royalty, following the precedent of his own father. The ungrateful son, who is variously called Ajātaśatru, Kūnika and Aśokachanda is said to have put his father to death. The crime seriously affected the relations of Magadha with Kosala. Dr. Smith regards the story of the murder as ‘the product of odium theologicum,’ and shows excessive scepticism in regard to the evidence of the Pāli canon and chronicles. But the general credibility of these works has been maintained by scholars like Rhys Davids and Geiger whose conclusions seem to be confirmed directly or indirectly by the testimony of independent classical and Jaina writers.

1 Bhagavan Sūtra, Nirayāvali Sūtra, Pariśishtaparvan IV. 1-9; VI 22. and the Kathākośa, p. 175.

2 Chullavagga, VII. 8. 5. Bimbisāra seems to have sought the assistance of other sons, too, in the work of government. One of these, Abhaya (son of Padmāvatī of Ujjain or of Nandā helped his father to foil the machinations of Pradyota. Other children, recorded by tradition were Vimala Kopiţūna by Ambapāli Halla and Vehalla by Chellanā, Kāla, Silavat, Jayasena and a girl Chundi by other wives.

3 Kathākośa. The Aupapatīa sūtra styles him Devānuśpiya (IA, 1881 108) a title possibly identical with Devānuśpiya of inscriptions of the third century B.C.

4 Cf. the Jaina attempt to whitewash Kūnika from the stain of intentional parricide (Jaciobii referring to the Nirayāvali Sūtra in his Kalpa Sūtra of Bhadra-vāhu, 1879, p. 5).
SECTION V. MAGADHA MILITANT—

KUNIKA-AJATA SATRU.

Whatever may have been the mode by which he acquired the throne, Kunika-Ajasthatri proved to be an energetic ruler. The defences of the realm were strengthened by fortifications at Rajagriha and the foundation of a new stronghold at Pataligrama near the junction of the Son and the Ganges. Like Frederick II of Prussia he carried out the policy of a father with whom his relations were by no means cordial. His reign was the highwater mark of the power of the Haryanka dynasty. He not only humbled Kosala and permanently annexed Kasí, or a part of it, but also absorbed the state of Vaiśālī. The traditional account of his duel with Kosala is given in Buddhist texts. It is said that when Ajata Satru murdered Bimbisāra, his father, the queen Kosala Devī died of love for him. Even after her death the Magadhan King continued to enjoy the revenues of the Kasí village which had been given to the lady for bath money. But Prasenajit, the sovereign of Kosala, determined that no parricide should have a village which was his by right of inheritance. War followed, sometimes the Kosalan monarch got the best of it, and sometimes the rival king. On one occasion Prasenajit fled away in defeat to his capital Sravasti; on another occasion he took Ajata Satru prisoner but spared his life as he was his nephew. He confiscated the army of the captive prince but sought to appease him by the offer of the hands of his daughter Vajirä. The princess was dismissed with the

Kāśi village in question, for her bath money. Her father could not enjoy the fruits of peace for more than three years. During his absence in a country town, Dīgha Chārāyāna, the Commander-in-Chief, raised prince Viḍūḍabha to the throne. The ex-king set out for Rājagriha, resolved to take Ajātaśatru with him and capture Viḍūḍabha. But he died from exposure outside the gates of the Magadhan metropolis.

The traditional account of the war with Vaiśāḷī is preserved in part by Jaina writers. King Seniya Bimbisāra is said to have given his famous elephant Seyanaga (Sechanaka, the sprinkler), together with a large necklace of eighteen strings of jewels, to his younger sons Halla and Vehalla born from his wife Chellaṇā, the daughter of Rājā Cheṭaka of Vaiśāḷī. His eldest son Kūṇiya (Ajātaśatru), after usurping his father’s throne, on the instigation of his wife Paūmāvaṭi (Padmāvati), demanded from his younger brothers the return of both gifts. On the latter refusing to give them up and flying with them to their grandfather Cheṭaka in Vaiśāḷī, Kūṇiya, having failed peacefully to obtain the extradition of the fugitives, commenced war with Cheṭaka. According to Buddhaghosha’s commentary the Sumaṅgala-vilāsini, the cause of the war was a breach of trust on the part of the Lichchhavis in connection with a mine of precious gems or some fragrant

1 DPPN, II, 172.
2 Bhaddasāla Jātaka.
3 The appellation Padmāvati is of so frequent occurrence in connection with Magadhan royalty that it seems to be an epithet rather than a personal name. The mother of prince Abhaya, a queen of Ajātaśatru, and a sister of Darśaka, all have this name according to tradition. Cf. the name Padmāli applied to the most commendable type of women in treatises on Erotics. It is also not improbable that the name belongs to the domain of mythology,
4 Uvāsaka-dāna, II. Appendix, p. 7; cf. Tawney, Kathākośa, pp. 176 ff.
material near a port on the Ganges over which a condominium was exercised by Ajātaśatru and his northern neighbours.

The preliminaries to the struggle between Magadha and Vaiśāli are described in several Pāli texts. In the Mahāvagga it is related that Sunīḍtha and Vassakāra, two ministers of Magadha, were building a fort at Pātaligrāma in order to repel the Vajjis (Vrijis). The Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta says: “The Blessed One was once dwelling in Rājagaha on the hill called the Vulture’s Peak. Now at that time Ajātasattu Vedehiputta, the king of Magadha, was desirous of attacking the Vajjians; and he said to himself, ‘I will root out these Vajjians, mighty and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjians, I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin’.”

“So he spake to the Brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, the prime minister of Magadha, and said, ‘Come now, Brāhmaṇa, do you go to the Blessed One, and... tell him that Ajātasattu... has resolved, ‘I will root out these Vajjians’. Vassakāra hearkened to the words of the king...’ (and delivered to the Buddha the message even as the king had commanded).

In the Nirayāvalī Sūtra (Nirayāvaliyā-Sutta) it is related that when Kūnika (Ajātaśatru) prepared to attack Chetaka of Vaiśāli the latter called together the eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāśi and Kosala, together with the Licchhavis and Mallakis, and asked them whether they would satisfy Kūnika’s demands, or go to war with him. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaiśāli are referred to in the Majjhima Nikāya. There is thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jaina statement regarding the alliance between Kāśi-Kosala on the one

---

1 SBE, XI, pp. 1-5; XVII. 101, Gradual Sayings IV. 14. etc.
2 Chiefs of republican clans. Cf. 125 ante.
hand and Vaiśāli on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātaśatru including the rulers of Kāśi-Kosala and Vaiśāli offered a combined resistance. The Kosalan war and the Vajjian war were probably not isolated events but parts of a common movement directed against the establishment of the hegemony of Magadha. The flames fused together into one big conflagration.\(^1\) We are reminded of the tussle of the Samnites, Etruscans and Gauls with the rising power of Rome.

In the war with Vaiśāli Kūniya-Ajātaśatru is said to have made use of the Mahāśilākaṅṭaṇa and ra(t)hamusala. The first seems to have been some engine of war of the nature of catapult which threw big stones. The second was a chariot to which a mace was attached and which, running about, effected a great execution of men.\(^2\) The ra(t)hamusala may be compared to the tanks used in the great world wars.

The war is said to have synchronised with the death of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta, the great teacher of the Ājīvika sect. Sixteen years later at the time of Mahāvīra's death the anti-Magadhan confederacy is said to have been still in existence. We learn from the Kalpa Sūtra that on the death of Mahāvīra the confederate kings mentioned in the Nirayavali Sūtra instituted a festival to be held in memory of that event.\(^3\) The struggle between the Magadhan king and the powers arrayed against him thus seems to have been protracted for more than sixteen years. The

---

1 We are told that even Pradyota of Avanti made preparations to avenge the death of his friend Bimbisāra (DPPN, I. 34).
3 S.B.E., xxii, 266 (para. 198). As pointed out by Jacobi (\textit{The Kalpasūtra of Bhadravāhu}, 6 ff.) the traditional date of Mahāvīra's Nirvāṇa is 470 years before Vikrama (58 B. C.) according to the \textit{Sectambaras}, and 605 according to the \textit{Digambaras}. It is suggested that Vikrama of the \textit{Digambaras} is intended for Salivahana (78 A. D.). A different tradition is, however, recorded by Hemachandra who says that 155 years after the liberation of Mahāvīra Chandragupta became king:—
Aṭṭhakathā gives an account of the Machiavellian tactics adopted by Magadhan statesmen headed by Vassakāra to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vaiśālians and thus bring about their downfall.²

The absorption of Vaiśāli and a part at least of Kāsi as a result of the Kosalan and Vajjian wars probably brought the aspiring ruler of Magadha face to face with the equally ambitious sovereign of Avanti. We have already referred to a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya that on one occasion

As Chandragupta's accession apparently took place between 396 and 312 B.C., the tradition recorded in Hemchandra's Parisīṣṭaparvan would place the date of Mahāvīra's death between 461 and 467 B.C. But early Buddhist texts (Dialogues, III, pp. 111. 203. Majjhima, II, 243) make the famous Jaina teacher predecease the Buddha, and the latest date assigned by reliable tradition to the Parinirvāṇa of the Śākyan sage is 486 B.C. (Cantonese tradition, Smith, EHI. 4th ed., 49). According to Ceylonese writers, Śākyamuni entered into nirvāṇa in the eighth year of Ajātassatru (Ajātassatrumasassvāthānavatvāthānus, muni nibbuta, Mahāvīravīha, Ch. II). This would place the accession of the son of Bimbisāra in 493 B.C., if the Cantonese date for the nirvāṇa of the Buddha is accepted. Jaina writers put the interval between Kūñika's accession and the death of their master at 16 and 'z' years. According to Buddhist chroniclers the interval would be less than 8 years as Mahāvīra predeceased the Buddha. The divergent data of the Jaina and Buddhist texts can only be reconciled if we assume that the former took as their starting point the date of the accession of Kūñika as the rājā of Champā, while the Buddhists begin their calculation from a later date when Ajātassatru mounted the throne of Rājagriha. According to Buddhist tradition Vassakāra's visit to the Buddha in connection with the Vrijjan incident took place a year before the parinirvāṇa. The destruction of the Vrijjan power took place some three years later on (DPPN, I. 33-34; i.e. c. 484 B.C. Too much reliance cannot, however, be placed on the traditional chronology.

1 Diplomacy (upalāpana) and disunion (mikhubheda). DPPN, II. 846; JRAS, 1931. Cf. Gradual Sayings, IV. 12. "The Vajjians cannot be overcome in battle, but only by cunning, by breaking up their alliance."

2 Cf. Modern Review, July, 1919, pp. 55-56. According to the Arya Mahāyāna-Mūla-Kalpa (Vol. I. ed. Ganapati Śāstrī pp. 603 ff), the dominions of Ajātassatru embraced, besides Magadha, Ánga, Vārāpaśi (Benares), and Vaiśāli in the north. In the opinion of Dr. Jayaswal the Parkham statue is a contemporary portrait of king Ajātassatru. But Kūñika of Parkham (Lüders List No. 150) is obviously not a king.
Ajātaśatru was fortifying his capital because he was afraid of an invasion of his dominions by Pradyota. We do not know whether the attack was ever made. Ajātaśatru does not appear to have succeeded in humbling Avanti. The conquest of that kingdom was reserved for his successors.

It was during the reign of Ajātaśatru that both Mahāvīra and Gautama, the great teachers of Jainism and Buddhism respectively, are said to have entered nirvāṇa. Shortly after the death of Gautama a Council is said to have been held by the monks of his Order for the recitation and collection of the Doctrine.
SECTION VI. AJATAŠATRU’S SUCCESSORS—THE TRANSFER OF CAPITAL AND THE FALL OF AVANTI

Ajātaśatru was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Darśaka. Geiger considers the insertion of Darśaka after Ajātaśatru to be an error, because the Pāli Canon indubitably asserts that Udāyi-bhadda was the son of Ajātaśatru and probably also his successor. Jaina tradition recorded in the Kathākosa¹ and the Parishtaparvan² also represents Udaya or Udāyin as the son of Kūnika by his wife Padmāvati,³ and his immediate successor.

Though the existence of Darśaka, as a ruler of Magadha and a contemporary of Udayana, is rendered probable by references in the Svapna-Vāsavadatta attributed to Bhasa, yet in the face of Buddhist and Jaina evidence it cannot be confidently asserted that he was the immediate successor of Ajātaśatru on the imperial throne of Magadha. He may have been one of the mandalika rājās like the father of Viśākha Pāñchāliputra. His inclusion among Magadhan suzerains is possibly paralleled by that of Suddhodana in the main list of the Ikshvākuids. Certain writers identify him with Nāga-Dāsaka who is represented by the Ceylonese Chornicles as the last king of Bimbisāra’s line.⁴ The Divyāvadāna,⁵ however,

¹ P. 177.
² P. 42.
³ Buddhist writers represent Vajirā, daughter of Prasenajit, as the mother of Udāyi.
⁴ Ex. g., Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar. In this connection mention was made, in earlier editions, of a passage in the Si-yu-ki, (Beal’s Trans., II.p.102) : “To the south-west of the old Sāṅghārāma about 100 li is the Sāṅghārāma of Ti-lo-shi-kia...It was built by the last descendant of Bimbisāra rāja.” The name of the second Sāṅghārāma was sought to be connected with that of Darśaka who was here represented as the last descendant of Bimbisāra. But I now think that the connection of the monastery with the name of Darśaka is extremely doubtful. See Watters II.p.106f.
⁵ P. 369.
omits this name altogether from the list of the Bimbisārīdhs. There was thus no unanimity even among Buddhists about the lineage and position of the king.

**Udyāin:** Before his accession to the throne Udyāin or Udyāyi-bhadda, the son of Ajātaśatru, seems to have acted as his father's Viceroy at Champa.¹ The *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* informs us that he founded a new capital on the banks of the Ganges which came to be known as Pāṭaliputra.² This part of the Jaina tradition is confirmed by the testimony of the *Gārgi Saṃhitā*³ and the *Vāyu Purāṇa* according to which Udyāin built the city of Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra) in the fourth year of his reign. The choice of the place was probably due to its position in the centre of the realm which now included North Bihār. Moreover, its situation at the confluence of two large rivers, the Ganges and the Son, and close to other streams, was important from the commercial as well as the strategic point of view. In this connection it is interesting to note that the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* recommends a site at the confluence of rivers for the capital of a kingdom.

The *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*⁴ refers to the king of Avanti as the enemy of Udyāin. This does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that his father had to fortify his capital in expectation of an attack about to be made by Pradyota, ruler of that country. The fall of Aṅga and Vaiśālī and the discomfiture of Kosala had left Avanti the only important rival of Magadha. This last kingdom had absorbed all the monarchies and republics of Eastern India. On the other hand, if the *Kathā-sarit-sūgara* and the *Āvaśyaka kathānāhas*⁵ are to be believed, the kingdom

---

¹ Jacobi, *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*, p. 42.
² VI. 34; 175-180.
⁵ See *Supra* sec. III. p. 204.
of Kausāmbī was at this time annexed to the realm of Pālaka of Avanti, the son of Pradyota and was governed by a prince belonging to his family. The two kingdoms, Magadha and Avanti, were brought face to face with each other. The war of nerves between the two for ascendancy probably began, as we have seen, in the reign of Ajātasatru. It must have continued during the reign of Udāyin. The issue was finally decided in the time of Śiśunāga, or of Nanda as Jaina tradition seems to suggest.\(^2\)

**Udāyin’s successors** in the *Purāṇas* are Nandivardhana and Mahānandin. According to the Jainas he left no heir.\(^3\) The Ceylonese chroniclers place after Udāyi the kings named Anuruddha, Ṭhoka and Nāga Dāsaka. This tradition is partially confirmed by the

---

\(^1\) For a traditional account of the conflict between Udāyin and the king of Avanti, see IHQ, 1929, 399.

In the opinion of Dr. Jayaswal one of the famous "Patna Statues" which at the time of the controversy stood in the Bhārhat Gallery of the Indian Museum (Ind. Ant., 1919, pp. 29ff.) is a portrait of Udāyin. According to him the statue bears the following words:

*Bhage ACHO chhonidhīde.*

He identifies ACHO with king Aja mentioned in the *Bhāgavata* list of Śaisunāga kings, and with Udāyin of the *Matsya, Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* lists. Dr. Jayaswal’s reading and interpretation of the inscription have not, however, been accepted by several scholars including Dr. Barnett, Mr. Chanda and Dr. R. C. Majumdar. Dr. Smith, however, while unwilling to dogmatize, was of opinion that the statue was pre-Maurya. In the third edition of his Asoka he considers Dr. Jayaswal’s theory as probable. The characters of the short inscription on the statue are so difficult to read that it is well-nigh impossible to come to a final decision. For the present the problem must be regarded as not yet definitely solved. Cunningham described the statue as that of a *Yaksha*. According to him the figure bore the words “Yakche Achusanīgika. Mr. Chanda’s reading is: *Bha(? ga Achačhā nisika* (the owner of inexhaustible capital. i.e., Vaśravasa). See *Indian Antiquary*, March, 1919. Dr. Majumdar reads: *Gate (Yakhe?) Lechohhai (et) 40. 4.* (Ind. Ant., 1919).

\(^2\) *Ind. Ant.,* II. 362.

\(^3\) *Pariśishṭāpavaran, VI.* 236.
Anguttara Nikāya which alludes to Munḍa,¹ King of Pāṭaliputra. The Divyāvadāna, too, mentions Munḍa but omits the names of Anuruddha and Nāga-Dāsaka. The Anguttara Nikāya by mentioning Pāṭaliputra as the capital of Munḍa indirectly confirms the tradition regarding the transfer of the Magadhan metropolis from Rājagriha to Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra before his reign.

The great Ceylonese chronicle avers that all the kings from Ajātaśatru to Nāga-Dāsaka were parricides.² The citizens drove out the family in anger and raised an amātya (official) to the throne.

**Susunāga or Śisunāga,** the new king³ seems to have been acting as the Magadhan Viceroy at Benares. The employment of amātyas as provincial governors or district officers need not cause surprise. The custom continued as late as the time of Gautamiputra Śātakarni and Rudradāman I. The Purānas tell us that “placing his son at Benares he will repair to (the stronghold of) Girivraja”. He had a second royal residence at Vaiśāli which ultimately became his capital.⁴ “That monarch (Śisunāga), not unmindful of his mother’s origin,⁵ re-established the city of Vesāli (Vaiśāli) and fixed in it the royal residence. From that

---

¹ Ang. III, 57. “The venerable Nārada dwelt near Pāṭaliputta in the Cook’s Park. Now at that time Bhaddā, the dear and beloved queen of king Munḍa died.” The king’s grief was intense. The queen’s body was placed in an oil vessel made of iron. A treasurer, Piyaka, is also mentioned. (Gradual sayings, III, 48).

² The violent death of Kūpika (Ajātaśatru) is known to Jain tradition (Jacobi, Parisīṭhaparan, 2nd ed. p. xiii).

³ The question of the relative merits of Purānic and Ceylonese accounts of this king and his place in early Magadhān lists of kings have been discussed in Part I, pp. supra. 115 ff.

⁴ SBE, XI, p. xvi. If the Drātrīṃśat puttalikā is to be believed Vesāli (Vaiśāli) continued to be a secondary capital till the time of the Nandas.

⁵ Śisunāga, according to the Mahāvaṃsaṭṭika (Turnour’s Mahāvaṃsa xxxviii), was the son of a Lichchhavi rāja of Vaiśāli. He was conceived by a nāgar-lobhini and born by an officer of State.
time Rājagaha (Rājagriha-Girivraja) lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered".

The most important achievement of Siśunāga seems to have been the destruction of the 'glory' of the Pradyota dynasty of Avanti. Pradyota the first king of the line, had been succeeded, according to tradition, by his sons Gopāla and Pālaka after whom came Viśākha and Āryaka. The name of Gopāla is omitted in the Purāṇas with the possible exception of the k Vishnū manuscript, where it finds mention instead of Pālaka. The accession of the latter synchronised, according to Jaina accounts, with the passing away of Mahāvīra. He is reputed to have been a tyrant. Viśākha-bhūpa (i.e., king Viśākha-called Viśākha-yūpa in most Purānic texts) may have been a son of Pālaka. The absence of any reference to this prince in non-Purānic accounts that have hitherto been available, may suggest that he ruled in some outlying district (Māhishmati), or was set aside in favour of Āryaka who occupied the throne, as a result of a popular outbreak, almost immediately after the fall of Pālaka. The Purāṇas place after Āryaka or Ajaka a king named Nandivardhana, or Vartivardhana, and add that Siśunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and be king. Dr. Jayaswal identifies Ajaka and Nandivardhana of the Avanti list with Aja-Udāyin and Nandivardhana of the Purānic list of Siśunāga kings. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, says that Āryaka or Ajaka was the

1 Essay en Guṇḍāśya, 115; Gopāla and Pālaka find mention in the Brīhat Kāthā, Scapna-Vāsavadatta, Pṛaṭyā-yaugunākharayānyā, Mṛcchhakatika etc. A prince named Kumārasena is known to the Harsha-charita. According to the Nepalese Brīhatkathā (cf. Kāthā-sarit-sūgara XIX, 57) Gopāla succeeds Mahāsena (Pradyota but abdicates in favour of his brother Pālaka. Pālaka renounces the crown in favour of Avantivardhana, son of Gopāla. In the Āndyaka Kathamaka (Pariśīṣṭa) parvan, 2nd ed. xii) Avantisena is mentioned as a grandson of Pālaka.

2 DKÅ, 19 n29. The Kelri Purāṇa (1. 3. 32f.) mentions a king named Viśākha-yūpa who ruled at Māhismatī near the southern frontier of ancient Avanti
son of Gopāla, the elder brother of Pālaka.¹ ‘Nandivardhana’ and ‘Vartivardhana’ are apparently corruptions of Avantivardhana, the name of a son of Pālaka according to the Kathā-sarit-sāgara,² of Gopāla according to the Nepalese Brihat-kathā,³ or possibly identical with Avantisena, a grandson of Pālaka according to the Āvaśyaka Kathānakas.⁴ The Pradyota dynasty must have been humbled by Śiśunāga in the time of king Avantivardhana. The Magadhan victory was doubtless facilitated by the revolution that placed Āryaka, a ruler about whose origin there is hardly any unanimity, on the throne of Ujjain.

Śiśunāga⁵ was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by his son Kākāvarṇa, and according to the Ceylonese chronicles by his son Kālāśoka. Jacobi, Geiger and Bhandarkar agree that Kālāśoka, “the black Aśoka” and Kākāvarṇa, “the crow-coloured” are one and the same.

---

¹ Carm. Lee, 1918, 64f. But J. Sen rightly points out (IHQ, 1930, 690) that in the Mrichchhakatika Āryaka is represented as a cow-boy who was raised to the throne after the overthrow of the tyrant Pālaka.
³ Essay on Guṇāḍhya, 115.
⁴ Pariśishtā pareṣan, 2nd ed. p. xii.

---

Traditional Genealogy of the Pradyotās
Puṣṭika (Anantanemi)

Chanda Pradyota Mahāsena

Gopāla

Pālaka

Āryaka (?) Avantivardhana (?)

(possibly only a cow-boy)

Vāsavadatta = Udayana

Vidākha (?) son

king of Māhiśmati

Avantisena

king of Ujjain

Maṉiprabha

King of Kauśāmbi

---

⁵ The Kāvyā Mimāṃsā (3rd ed., p. 50) contains an interesting notice of this king and says that he prohibited the use of cerebrals in his harem.
individual. The conclusion accords with the evidence of the Asokāvadāna which places Kākavarnin after Munḍa, and does not mention Kālāśoka. The new king already served his apprenticeship in the art of government possibly at Benares and in the district of Gayā. The two most important events of his reign are the meeting of the second Buddhist Council at Vaiśāli, and the final transfer of the capital to Pāṭaliputra.

Bāna in his Harsha-charita gives a curious legend concerning his death. It is stated that Kākavarna Sāiśunāgi had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The story about the tragic fate of this king is, as we shall see later on, confirmed by Greek evidence.

The traditional successors of Kālāśoka were his ten sons who are supposed to have ruled simultaneously. Their names according to the Mahābodhi vaṁśa were Bhadrasena, Korandavarna, Maṅgura, Sarvaṅjaha, Jālika, Udbhaka, Saṅjaya, Koravya, Nandivardhana and Pañchamaka.

Only one of these names, viz., that of Nandivardhana occurs in the Purānic lists. This prince attracted some attention in recent years. His name was read on a Patna statue and in the famous Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela. He was sought to be identified with Nandarāja of Khāravela's record on the strength of Kshemen-dra's reference to Pūrvananda (Nanda the Elder) who,

---

3. The *Diryāvadāna* (p. 369) gives a different list of the successors of Kākavarnin: Sahālin, Tulakuchi, Mahāmanḍala and Prasena-jit. After Prasena-jit the crown went to Nanda.
5. Dr. Jayaswal opined that the headless "Patna statue" which stood, at the time when he wrote, in the Bhārhat Gallery of the Indian Museum, was a portrait of this king. According to him the inscription on the statue runs as follows:—

Sapa (or Sava) khaṭa Vata Nandi.
we are told, should be distinguished from the *Navanandah* or New (Later) Nandas, and taken to answer to a ruler of the group represented by Nandivardhana and Mahānandin of the *Purāṇas*. In the works of Kshemendra and Somadeva, however, Pūravananda (singular) is distinguished, not from the *Navanandah*, but from Yogananda (Pseudo-Nanda), the re-animated corpse of

He regarded *Vaṭa Nāhdi* as an abbreviation of Vartivardhana (the name of Nandivardhana in the *Vāyu* list) and Nandivardhana. Mr. R. D. Banerji in the June number of the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 1919, said that there cannot be two opinions about the reading *Vaṭa Nāhdi*. Mr. Chanda, however, regarded the statue in question as an image of a *Yaksha* and read the inscription which it bore as follows:

\[ Yākha sa (?) rvaṭa nāhdi. \]

Dr. Majumdar said that the inscription might be read as follows:

\[ Yakhe saṁ vajñāh. 70. \]

He placed the inscription in the second century A. D., and supported the *Yaksha* theory propounded by Cunningham and upheld by Mr. Chanda. He did not agree with those scholars who concluded that the statue was a portrait of a Śaśuṇāga sovereign simply because there were some letters in the inscription under discussion which might be construed as a name of a Śaśuṇāga king. Referring to Dr. Jayaswal’s suggestion that the term *Vaṭa Nāhdi* was composed of two variant proper names (Vartivardhana and Nandivardhana)—he said that Chandragupta II was also known as Devagupta, and Vigrahapāla had a second name Sūrapāla; but who had ever heard of compound names like Chandra-Deva, or Deva-Chandra, and Sūrā-Vigrahā or Vigrahā-Sūra? (Ind. Ant., 1919).

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstrī took *Vaṭa Nāhdi* to mean *Vṛatya Nāhdi* and said that the statue had most of the articles of dress as given by Kātyāyana to the *Vṛatya Kṣatriyas*. In the *Purāṇas* the Śaśuṇāga kings are mentioned as Kṣattrabandhus, i.e., *Vṛatya Kṣatriyas*. The Mahāmahopādhyāya thus inclined to the view of Dr. Jayaswal that the statue in question was a portrait of a Śaśuṇāga king (*JBORS*, December, 1919).

Mr. Orindendu Coomar Ganguly, on the other hand, regarded the statue as a *Yaksha* image, and drew our attention to the catalogue of Yakshas in the *Mahāmāyūri* and the passage “Nandi cha Vardhanas chaiva nāgaraye Nandivardhane” (Modern Review, October, 1919). Dr. Barnett was also not satisfied that the four syllables which might be read as *Vaṭa Nāhdi* mentioned the name of a Śaśuṇāga king. Dr. Smith, however, in the third edition of his *Asoka* admitted the possibility of Dr. Jayaswal’s contention. We regard the problem as still unsolved. The data at our disposal are too scanty to warrant the conclusion that the inscription on the “Patna statue” mentions a Śaśuṇāga king. The script seems to be late.

1 Jayaswal (supported by R. D. Banerji); *The Oxford History of India*, Additions and Corrections; *JBORS*, 1918, 91.
king Nanda.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{Purānic} as well as the Ceylonese, chroniclers know of the existence of only one Nanda \textit{line} and agree with Jaina tradition in taking \textit{nava} to mean \textit{nine} (and not \textit{new}).\textsuperscript{2} They represent Nandivardhana as a king of the Śaiśunāga line—a dynasty which is sharply distinguished from the Nandaś. The \textit{Purānas} contain nothing to show that Nandivardhana had anything to do with Kalinga.\textsuperscript{3} On the contrary, we are distinctly told that when the Śaiśunāgas and their predecessors were reigning in Magadha 32 kings ruled in Kaliṅga synchronously. "It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought ‘all under his sole sway’ and ‘uprooted all Kshatriyas.’ So we should identify Nāmīdarāja of the Hāthigumpha inscription who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons."

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Kāthā-sārit-sāgara, Durgāpravāda and Parab’s edition, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Jacoby, \textit{Parāśīktraparca}, VIII. 3; App. p. 2; ‘Nāmīdavamśe Navamo’
\textsuperscript{3} Chanda, \textit{Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India}, No. I, p. 11.
SECTION VII. CHRONOLOGY OF THE HARYAÑKA-
SAIŠUNAGA KINGS.

There is considerable disagreement between the 
Purāṇas and the Ceylonese chronicles regarding the chron- 
ology of the kings of the Bimbisārian (or Haryaṅka) and 
Saiśunāga dynasties. Even Smith and Pargiter are not dis- 
posed to accept all the dates given in the Purāṇas.¹ Accord- 
ing to Ceylonese tradition Bimbisāra ruled for fifty-two 
years, Ajātaśatru for 32 years, Udāyī for 16 years, 
Anuruddha and Muṇḍa for 8 years, Nāga-Dāsaka for 
24 years, Saiśunāga for 18 years, Kālāśoka for 28 years 
and Kālāśoka’s sons for 22 years. Gautama Buddha died 
in the eighth year of Ajātaśatru,² i.e., in the (52+8=) 
60th year (i.e., a little more than 59 years) after the 
accession of Bimbisāra. The event happened in 544 B.C. 
according to a Ceylonese reckoning, and in 486 B.C. 
according to a Cantonese tradition of 489 A.D., based on 
a ‘dotted record’ brought to China by Saṅgha-bhadra. 
The date 544 B.C. can, however, hardly be reconciled 
with a gāthā transmitted in the Ceylonese chronicles 
which states that Priyadarśana (Aśoka Maurya) was con- 
secrated 218 years after the Buddha had passed into 
nirvāṇa.³ This fact and certain Chinese and Chola

¹ Pargiter (AIHT, pp. 286-7) reads the Matsya Purāṇa as assigning the 
Saiśunāgas 163 years, and further reduces the number to 145 allowing an average 
of about 14½ years for each reign. He places the beginning of the Saiśunāgas 
among whom he includes the Bimbiṣārida) in B.C. 567 and rejects (287n) the 
traditional figures for the reigns of Bimbisāra and his son. Cf. also Bhandarkar, 
Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 68. ‘A period of 263 years for ten consecutive reigns’ i.e., 
36. 3 years for each ‘is quite preposterous.’
² Mahāvaṃsa, Ch. 2 (p. 12 of translation).
³ Deva satāni cha vassāni cēṭhāraṇa vassāni cha 
Sambuddhe parinibbutte abhisitto Piyadassano.
Ibid., p. xxiii. (Cf. Dip. 6. 1).
synchronisms led Geiger and a few other scholars to think that the era of 544 B.C. is a comparatively modern fabrication and that the true date of the death of the Buddha is 483 B.C.—a result closely approaching that to which the Cantonese tradition leads us. The Chola synchronisms referred to by these scholars are, however, not free from difficulties, and it has been pointed out by Geiger himself that the account in Chinese annals of an embassy which Mahānāman, king of Ceylon, sent to the emperor of China in 428 A.D., does not speak in favour of his revised chronology. The traditional date of Menander which is C. 500 A.B., works out more satisfactorily with a Nirvāṇa era of 544 B.C., than with an era of 483 or 486 B.C. In regard to the Maurya period, however, calculations based on the traditional Ceylonese reckoning will place the accession of Chandragupta Maurya in 544—162 = 382 B.C., and the coronation of Aśoka Maurya in 544—218 = 326 B.C. These results are at variance with the evidence of Greek writers and the testimony of the inscriptions of Aśoka himself. Classical writers represent Chandragupta as a contemporary of Alexander (326 B.C.) and of Seleukos (312 B.C.). Aśoka in his thirteenth Rock Edict speaks of certain Hellenistic kings as alive. As one at least of these rulers died not later than 258 B.C. (250 B.C. according to some authorities) and as rescripts on morality began to be written when Aśoka was anointed twelve years, his consecration could not have taken place after 269 B.C. (261 B.C. according to some). The date cannot be pushed back beyond 277 B.C., because his grandfather Chandragupta must have ascended the throne after 326 B.C., as he met Alexander in that year as an ordinary individual and died after a reign of 24

1 Ibid., Geiger, trans. p. xxviii; JRAS, 1900, pp. 1-34.
years, and the next king Bindusāra, the father and immediate predecessor of Aśoka, ruled for at least 25 years. 326 B.C. – 49 = 277 B.C. Aśoka’s coronation, therefore, took place between 277 and 261 B.C., and as the event happened, according to the old Gāthā recorded by the Ceylonese Chroniclers, 218 years after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, the date of the Great Decease should be placed between 495 and 479 B.C. The result accords not with the Ceylonese date 544 B.C., but with the Cantonese date 486 B.C., and Geiger’s date 483 B.C., for the parinirvāṇa. The Chinese account of embassies which King Meghavarna sent to Samudra Gupta, and King Kia-Che (Kassapa) sent to China in 527 A.D., also speaks in favour of the date 486 B.C., or 483 B.C., for the Great Decease. Geiger’s date, however, is not recognised by reliable tradition. The same remark applies to the date (Tuesday, 1 April, 478 B.C.) preferred by L. D. Swami Kanna Pillai.¹ The Cantonese date may, therefore, be accepted as a working hypothesis for the determination of the chronology of the early dynasties of Magadha. The date of Bimbisāra’s accession, according to this reckoning, would fall in or about 486 + 59 = 545 B.C., which is very near to the starting point of the traditional Ceylonese Nirvāṇa era of 544 B.C.

¹ *An Indian Ephemeris*, I, Pt. 1, 1929, pp. 471 ff.

The current name of an era is no proof of origins. It is not altogether improbable that the Buddhist reckoning of Ceylon originally started from the coronation of Bimbisāra and was later on confounded with the era of the Great Decease.

In the time of Bimbisāra Gandhāra was an independent kingdom ruled by a king named Paushkarasārin (Pukkusāti). By B.C. 519 at the latest it had lost its independence and had become subject to Persia, as we
learn from the inscriptions of Darius. It is thus clear that Paushkarasārin and his contemporary Bimbisāra lived before B.C. 519. This accords with the chronology which places his accession and coronation in or about B.C. 545-44.

**SUGGESTED CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE**

**(APPROXIMATE DATES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth of the Buddha.</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Bimbisāra.</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession of Cyrus the Achaemenid.</td>
<td>c. 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession of Bimbisāra. Epoch of a Ceylonese Era.</td>
<td>545-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Renunciation (of the Buddha).</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment.</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Buddha’s visit to Bimbisāra.</td>
<td>530-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Epoch of the era of Mahāvīra’s Nirvāṇa</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession of Darius I.</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession of Ajātaśatru.</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese date of the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. The death of Darius I. Council of Rājagriha.</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession of Udāyidhadraka.</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation of Pāṭaliputra (Kusumapura).</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniruddha (Anuruddha) and Munda.</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāga-Dāsaka (omitted in the Divyāvadāna and Jaina texts)</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiśunāga.</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālāśoka (Kākavarna).</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Vaiśāli.</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Kālāśoka, and de facto rule of Mahāpadma Nanda.</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the Śiśunāga dynasty.</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION VIII. THE NANDAS.

The Śaśānaga dynasty was supplanted by the line of Nanda. With the new family we reach a stage of East Indian history when the indubitable evidence of inscriptions becomes available to supplement the information gleaned from traditional literary sources. The famous Hāthigumpha record of Khāravela, of the second or first century B.C., twice mentions Namda-rāja in connection with Kaliṅga.

Paṁchame cedāni vāse Naṁdarāja-ti-vasa-sata-oghaṭitam
Tanaśuliya-vātā panāḍi (ṁ) nagaram
pavesa (yatī)......

"And then, in the fifth year, (Khāravela) caused the canal opened out by King Nanda three hundred years\(^2\)"

---

1 According to Jaina tradition Nanda was proclaimed king after Udāyin's assassination, and sixty years after the Nirvāṇa of Vardhamāna (Pariśīva P. VI. 243). For Nanda history see now Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, pp. 9-26. N. Sastri, Raychaudhuri and others.

2 This interpretation of 'tivasasata' accords substantially with the Purānic tradition, regarding the interval between the Nandas and the dynasty to which Sātakargi, the contemporary of Khāravela in his second regnal year, belonged (137 years for the Mauryas + 112 for the 'Sūṅgas' + 46 for the Kāśyas = 294). If the expression is taken to mean 108 years (as is suggested by some scholars), Khāravela's accession must be placed 108−5=98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yuvarāja took place 9 years before that date i.e., 98−9=89 years after Nanda, i.e., not later than 324−89=235 B.C. Khāravela's senior partner in the royal office was on the throne at that time and he may have had his predecessor or predecessors. But we learn from Aśoka's inscriptions that Kaliṅga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kumāra, (and not by a Kaliṅga-adhipati or Chakravarti) under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore, tivasasata should be understood to mean 300 and not 108 years. S. Konow (Acta Orientalia, I.22-26) takes the figure to express not the interval between Nanda and Khāravela, but a date during the reign of Nanda which was reckoned from some pre-existing era. But the use of any such era in the particular country and epoch is not proved. Khāravela himself, like Aśoka, uses regnal years. The agreement with Purānic tradition speaks in favour of the view adopted in these pages.
back to be brought into the capital from the Tanasuliya road."

Again, in connection with the twelfth year of Khāravela's reign, we have a reference to Nādārāja-jīta Kaliṅga-jana-saṁ (n) i (ve) saṁ (or, according to another reading, Nāmanda-rājanītaṁ Kaliṅga Jina saṁnivesam), i.e., a station or encampment, or a Jainā shrine, in Kaliṅga acquired by king Nānda.

The epigraphs, though valuable as early notices of a line known mainly from literature, are not contemporaneous. For contemporary reports we must turn to Greek writers. There is an interesting reference, in the Cyropaedia of Xenophon, who died some time after 355 B.C., to "the Indian king, a very wealthy man". This cannot fail to remind one of the Nandas whom the unanimous testimony of Sanskrit, Tamil, Ceylonese and Chinese writers describe as the possessors of enormous wealth. Clearer information about the ruling family of Magadhā

Barna, Hāthigumpha Inscription of Khāravela (IHQ, XIV. 1938 pp. 250ff). Saṁnivesa is explained in the dictionaries as an assemblage, station, seat, open space near a town etc. (Monier Williams). A commentator takes it to mean 'a halting place of caravans or processions'. Kupāḍagrama was a saṁnivesa in Videha (SBE, XXII, Jainā Sūtras, pt. I, Intro.). The reference in the inscription to the conquest of a place, or removal of a sacred object from Kaliṅga by Nandarāja disposes of the view that he was a local chief (Camb. Hist. 538).

2 Dr. Barua (op. cit. p. 276n) objects to a Nanda conquest (or domination) of any part of Kaliṅga on the ground that the province "had remained unconquered (avijjita) till the 7th year of Adoka's reign". But the claim of the Mārya secretariat is on a par with Jahāngīr's boast that "not one of the Sultans of lofty dignity has obtained the victory over it" (i.e., Kangra, Rogers, Tāzuk, II. 184). Kaliṅgas appear in the Purāṇas among the contemporaries of the Sāisunāgas who were overpowered by Nānda, the Sārca-Kshatrāntaka.

3 III. ii. 25 (trans. by Walter Miller).

4 Cf. the names Mahāpadmapati and Dhanā Nanda. The Mudrārākshara refers to the Nandas as "nava-nāvada-yadavagotriṣṭacāraṁ" (Act III, verse 27), and "Ārtharuchi" (Act. I.)


Dr. Aiyangar points out that a Tamil poem contains an interesting statement regarding the wealth of the Nandas "which having accumulated first in Pāṭali
(c. 326 B.C.) is supplied by the contemporaries of Alexander whose writings form the bases of the accounts of Curtius, Diodoros and Plutarch. Unfortunately, the classical writers do not mention the family name ‘Nanda’. The reading ‘Nandrum’ in the place of ‘Alexandrum’ in the account of Justin is absolutely unjustifiable.

For a detailed account of the dynasty we have to rely on Indian tradition. Indian writers seem to be mainly interested in the Nanda age partly as marking an epoch in a social upsurge and the evolution of imperial unity, and partly as accessory to the life-sketch of Jaina patriarchs and to the Chandragupta-kathā of which we have fragments in the Milindapañho, Mahāvaṃsa, the Purānic chronicles, the Brihat-Kathā and its later versions together with the Mudrā-rākshasa and the Arthaśāstra compendiums.

The first Nanda was Mahāpadma or Mahāpadmapati according to the Purāṇas and Ugrasena according to the Mahābodhivāṃsa. The Purāṇas describe him as a son of the last Kshatrabandhu (so-called Kshatriya) king of the preceding line by a Śūdra mother. (Śūdra-garbha-odbhava). The Jaina Parishishṭaparvan, on the

bid itself in the floods of the Ganges." Beginning's of South Indian History, p. 89. For N. Sastri's views see ANM, pp. 253ff.

According to Ceylonese tradition "The youngest brother (among the sons of Ugrasena) was called Dhana Nanda, from his being addicted to hoarding treasure. He collected riches to the amount of eighty kōfis—in a rock in the bed of the river (Ganges) having caused a great excavation to be made, he buried the treasure there—levying taxes among other articles even on skins, guns, trees, and stones he amassed further treasures which he disposed of similarly." (Turneur, Mahāvaṃsa, p.xxxix).

Hsüen Tsang, the Chinese pilgrim, refers to "the five treasures of King Nanda's seven precious substances."

1 'Sovereign of an infinite host' or 'of immense wealth' according to the commentator (Wilson, Viṣṇu P. Vol. IX, 184n). A city on the Ganges, styled Mahāpadmapura, is mentioned in Mbh. XII. 353. 1.

P. 46. Text VI. 281-32,
other hand, represents Nanda as the son of a courtesan by a barber. The Jaina tradition is strikingly confirmed by the classical account of the pedigree of Alexander’s Magadhan contemporary who was the predecessor of Chandragupta Maurya. Referring to this prince (Agrammes) Curtius says, "His father was in fact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who from his being not uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered his sovereign, and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, usurped the supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death, begot the present king."

The barber ancestry of Agrammes, recorded by the classical writers is quite in keeping with the Jaina story of the extraction of the Nanda line. That the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander and of young Chandragupta was a Nanda king is not disputed. The real difficulty is about his identity. He could not possibly have been the first Nanda himself. The words used in reference to Agrammes, "the present king," i.e., Alexander’s contemporary in Curtius’ narrative, make this point clear. He (Agrammes) was born in purple to one who had already "usurped supreme authority" having secured the affections of a queen. That description is scarcely applicable to the founder of the dynasty who was, according to Jaina testimony, the son of an ordinary courtesan (ganikā) by a barber apparently without any pretensions to supreme power in the state.

The murdered sovereign seems to have been Kālāśoka-Kālavarna who had a tragic end as we learn from the

1 Criddle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 292,
Harsha-charita. Kākavarna Sāiśunāgi, says Bāṇa, had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The young princes referred to by Curtius were evidently the sons of Kālāśoka-Kākavarna. The Greek account of the rise of the family of Agrammes fits in well with the Ceylonese account of the end of the Sāiśunāga line and the rise of the Nandas, but not with the Purānic story which represents the first Nanda as a son of the last Sāiśunāga by a Śūdra woman, and makes no mention of the young princes. The name Agrammes is probably a distorted form of the Sanskrit Augrasainya, "son of Ugrasena". Ugrasena is, as we have seen, the name of the first Nanda according to the Mahābodhivamsa. His son may aptly be termed Augrasainya which the Greeks corrupted into Agrammes and later on into Xandrames.

The Purānas call Mahāpāmma, the first Nanda king, the destroyer of all the Kshatriyas (sāva Kshatrāntaka) and the sole monarch (ekarāt) of the earth which was under his undisputed sway, which terms imply that he finally overthrew all the dynasties which ruled contemporaneously with the Sāiśunāgas, viz., the Ikshvākus, Pañcālas, Kāśis, Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Aśmakas, Kurus,

1 "Augrasainya" as a royal patronymic is met with in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 21.

2 The identification of Xandrames (taken to answer to Sanskrit Chandramas), the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander, with Chandragupta, proposed by certain writers, is clearly untenable. Plutarch (Life of Alexander, Ch. 62) clearly distinguishes between the two, and his account receives confirmation from that of Justin (Watson's tr., p. 142). Xandrames or Agrammes was the son of a usurper born after his father had become king of the Prasit, while Chandragupta was himself the founder of a new sovereignty, the first king of his line. The father of Xandrames was a barber who could claim no royal ancestry. On the other hand, Brāhmapical and Buddhist writers are unanimous in representing Chandragupta as a descendant of a race of rulers, though they differ in regard to the identity of the family and its claim to be regarded as of pure Kshatriya stock. Jain evidence clearly suggests that the barber usurper is identical with the Nāpita-kumāra or Nāpitasu (Pariseshṭa, VI. 231 and 244) who founded the Nanda line.
Maithilas, Sūrasenas, Vitihotras, etc. The Jainas, too, allude to the wide dominion of Nanda. The Indian account of the unification of a considerable portion of India under Nanda's sceptre is corroborated by several classical writers who speak of the most powerful peoples who dwelt beyond the 'extensive deserts' (apparently of Rāpūtāna and some adjoining tracts) in the time of Alexander, viz., the Prasii (Prāchyas) and the Gangaridae (people of the lower Ganges Valley) as being under one sovereign who had his capital at Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra).

1 Conquest of some of the territories occupied by the tribes and clans named here by former kings of Magadha does not necessarily mean the total extinction of the old ruling families, but merely a deprivation of their glory (yastāh) and an extension of the suzerainty of the conqueror. Extermination cannot be meant unless it is definitely asserted as in the case of Mahāpāda Nanda's conquest, or that of Samudra Gupta in Aryavarta. It may also sometimes be implied by the appointment of a prince of the conquering family as viceroy. Allowance, however, must be made for a good deal of exaggeration. Even the Vajjians were not literally 'rooted out' by Ajātaśatrū, as the most important of the constituent clans, viz., the Lichchhavīs, survive till the Gupta Age. A branch of the Ikṣvākus may have been driven southwards as they are found in the third or fourth century A.D. in the lower valley of the Krīṣṇapā. The Kādaīs overthrown by Nanda may have been the descendants or successors of the prince whom Śiṣunāga had placed in Benares. The Haihayas occupied a part of the Narmada valley. Conquest of a part of Kaliṅga by Nanda is suggested by the Hāthiśūlpā record, that of Aśūnaka and part of the Godāvari valley by the city called 'Nau Nand Debra' (Nander, Macauliff, Sikh Religion, V, p. 236). Vitihotra sovereignty had terminated before the rise of the Pradyotasa of Avanti. But if the Purānic statement (DKA, 23, 69) ''Contemporaneously with the aforesaid kings (Śiṣṇunāgas, etc., there will be........Vitihotra' has any value, the Śiṣṇunāgas may have paved the way for a restoration of some action of the old line in Avanti. According to the evidence of the Purānas (Vāyu 94. 51-52) the Vitihotras were one of the five ganas of the Haihayas, and the survival of the latter is well attested by epigraphic evidence. The Maithilas apparently occupied a small district to the north of the Vajjian dominions annexed by Ajātaśatrū. The Pañchālas, Kuras, and the Sūrasenas occupied the Ganggetic Doab and Mathurā and the control of their territories by the king of Magadha c. 326 B.C., accords with Greek evidence.

2 Samudrasanamdebyam asamudramapi śīryān
upāya hastairākṛitya tatraśo' krita Nandaśat
Pariseshṭa Pārvan, VII. 81.

3 Inv. Alex., 231, 231; Megasthenes and Arrian by McCrindle (1326) pp. 67. 141, 161.
Pliny informs us¹ that the Prasii surpass in power and glory every other people in all India, their capital being Palibothra (Pātaliputra), after which some call the people itself Palibothri, nay, even the whole tract of the Ganges. The author is referring probably to conditions in the time of the Mauryas, and not in that of the Nandas. But the greatness that the Prasii (i.e. the Magadhans and some other eastern peoples) attained in the Maurya Age would hardly have been possible but for the achievements of their predecessors of which we have a record by the historians of Alexander. The inclusion of the Ikshvāku territory of Kosala within Nanda’s dominions seems to be implied by a passage of the Kathā-sarat-sāgara² which refers to the camp of king Nanda in Ayodhya. Several Mysore inscriptions state that Kuntala, a province which included the southern part of the Bombay presidency and the north of Mysore, was ruled by the Nandas.³ But these are of comparatively modern date, the twelfth century, and too much cannot be built upon their statements. More important is the evidence of the Hāthigumpha inscription which mentions the constructive activity of Nandarāja in Kaliṅga and his conquest (or removal) of some place (or sacred object) in that country. In view of Nanda’s control over parts of Kaliṅga, the conquest of Aśmaka and other regions lying further south does not seem to be altogether improbable. The existence on the Godāvari of a city called “Nau Nand Dehra” (Nander)⁴ also suggests that the Nanda dominions may have embraced a considerable portion of the Deccan.

¹ Megasthenes and Arrian (1936), p. 141.
² Tawney’s Translation, p. 91.
³ Roe, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 3; Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 284, n. 2.
⁴ Macauliffe’s Sikh Religion, V, p. 236.
The Matsya Purāṇa assigns 88 years to the reign of the first Nanda, but 88 (Ashtāśiti) is probably a mistake for 28 (Ashtārimāśati), as the Vāyu assigns only 28 years. According to Tāranāth Nanda reigned 29 years. The Ceylonese accounts inform us that the Nandas ruled only for 22 years. The Purānic figure 28 is probably to be taken to include the period when Nanda was the de facto ruler of Magadha before his final usurpation of the throne.

Mahāpadma-Ugrasena was succeeded by his eight sons who were possibly kings in succession. They ruled for twelve years according to the Purāṇas. The Ceylonese Chronicles, as we have already seen, give the total length of the reign-period of all the nine Nandas as 22 years. The Purāṇas specify the name of one son of Mahāpadma, viz., Sukalpa. The Mahābodhivamsa gives the following names: Pāṇḍuka, Pāṇḍugati, Bhūtapāla, Rāṣṭrapāla, Govishānaka, Daśāsiddhaka, Kaivarta and Dhana. The last king is possibly identical with the Agrammes or Xandrames of the classical writers. Agrammes is, as we have seen, probable a distortion by the Greeks of the Sanskrit patronymic Auvrasainya.

The first Nanda left to his sons not only a big empire but also a large army and, if tradition is to be believed, a full exchequer and an efficient system of civil government. Curtius tells us that Agrammes, king of the Gangaridæ and the Prasii, kept in the field for guarding the approaches to his country 20,000 cavalry and 200,000 infantry, besides 2,000 four-horsed chariots, and what was the most formidable force of all, a troop of elephants.

1 Ind. Ant., 1875, p. 362.

2 The name has variants. One of these is Sahalya. Dr. Barua makes the plausible suggestion that the prince in question may be identical with Sahalin of the Dipvavādāna (p. 369; Pargiter, DKA, 25 n 24; Baudhā Dharmā Koshe, 44). The evidence of that Buddhist work in regard to the relationship between Sahalin and Kakavarga can, however, hardly be accepted. The work often errs in this respect. It makes Pushyamitra a lineal descendant of Aśoka (p. 483).
which, he said, ran up to the number of 3,000. Diodoros
and Plutarch give similar accounts. But they raise the
number of elephants to 4,000 and 6,000 respectively.
The name of one of the generals, Bhaddasāla is preserved
by Buddhist tradition.³

The immense riches of the Nandas have already been
referred to. The family may also be credited with
irrigation projects in Kalinga and the invention of a
particular kind of measure (Nandopakramāni mānāni).²
The existence of a body of capable ministers is vouched
for both by Brāhmaṇical and Jaina tradition. But in
the end they proved no match for another traditional
figure whose name is indissolubly linked up with the fall
of the Nandas and the rise of a more illustrious race of
rulers.

No detailed account of this great dynastic revolution
has survived. The accumulation of an enormous amount
of wealth by the Nanda kings probably implies a good deal
of financial extortion. Moreover, we are told by the
classical writers that Agrammes (the Nanda contem-
porary of Alexander) "was detested and held cheap by
his subjects as he rather took after his father than con-
ducted himself as the occupant of a throne."³³

The Purānic passage about the revolution⁴ stands as
follows:

Uddharishyati tān sarvān
Kauṭilyo vai dvijarshabhah

¹ Milinda-Pañho, SBE, xxxvi, pp. 147-8.
² S. C. Vasu's trans. of the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini, rule illustrating sūtra
II. 4. 21.
³ McCrindle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 222. Cf. Ref. to
Nanda's avarice DKA 125, Jaina Pariśiṣṭha parvan, vi. 244.—
tataścha kucchī sūmantā madenāndhāh bhavishyatāḥ
Nandasya na natiṁ chakrūrasāvat nāpitaśūrīti.
⁴ The dynastic change is also referred to by the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra,
the Kāmandakiya Nītiśāra, the Mudrārakshasa, the Chaṇḍa Kauśika, the
Ceylonese Chronicles, etc.
The *Milinda-Pañha*\(^2\) refers to an episode of the great struggle between the Nandas and the Mauryas: "There was Bhaddasāla, the soldier in the service of the royal family of Nanda, and he waged war against king Chanda-gutta. Now in that war, Nāgasena, there were eighty Corpse dances. For they say that when one great Head Holocaust has taken place (by which is meant the slaughter of ten thousand elephants, and a lac of horses and five thousand charioteers, and a hundred *koṭis* of soldiers on foot), then the headless corpses arise and dance in frenzy over the battle-field." The passage contains a good deal of mythical embellishment. But we have here a reminiscence of the bloody encounter between the contending forces of the Nandas and the Mauryas.\(^3\)

1 Some Ms. read *dviraśṭabhik* in place of *dvijarshabhah*. Dr. Jayaswal (*Ind. Ant.*, 1914, 124) proposed to emend it to *Viraśṛabhik*. *Viraśṛṣṭas* he took to mean the *Araṭṭas* and added that Kauṭilya was helped by the *Araṭṭas* "the band of robbers" of Justin. Cf. Cunningham, *Bhilas Tepes*, pp. 88, 89. Pargiter, however, suggests, (*Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 26, 35) that *dvijarşabhah* (the best among the twice-born, *i.e.*, Brāhmaṇas) may be the correct reading instead of "dviraśṭabhik."


3 *Cf. Ind. Ant.*, 1914, p. 124n.
CHAPTER III. THE PERSIAN AND MACEDONIAN INVASIONS.

SECTION I. THE ADVANCE OF PERSIA TO THE INDUS.

While the kingdoms and republics of the Indian interior were gradually being merged in the Magadhan Empire, those of North-West India (including modern Western Pakistan) were passing through vicissitudes of a different kind. In the first half of the sixth century B.C., the Uttarapatha (northern region) beyond the Madhyadesa (Mid-India, roughly the Ganges-Jumna Doab, Oudh and some adjoining tracts), like the rest of India, was parcelled out into a number of small states the most important of which were Kamboja, Gandhara and Madra. No sovereign arose in this part of India capable of welding together the warring communities, as Ugrasena-Mahapadma had done in the East. The whole region was at once wealthy and disunited, and formed the natural prey of the strong Achaemenian monarchy which grew up in Persia (Iran).

Kurush or Cyrus (558-530 B.C.) the founder of the Persian Empire, is said to have led an expedition against India through Gedrosia, but had to abandon the enterprise, escaping with seven men only. But he was more successful in the Kabul valley. We learn from Pliny that he destroyed the famous city of Kapisi, at or near the confluence of the Ghurband and the Panjshir. Arrian informs us that "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Cophen (Kabol) is inhabited by the Astaceniens"

1 550-529 B. C. according to A Survey of Persian Art, p. 64.
2 H. and F., Strabo, III, p. 74.
3 Chinnock, Arrian's Anabasis, p. 390.
(Āṣṭakas)\(^1\) and the Assacenian (Aśvakas), *Indian* tribes. These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians, and paid tribute to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, as ruler of their land." Strabo tells us that on one occasion the Persians summoned the Hydrakes (the Kshudrakas) from India (i.e., the Pañjab) to attend them as mercenaries.

In the Behistun or Bahistān inscription of Dārayavaush or Darius I (c. 522-486 B.C.) the third sovereign of the Achaemenian dynasty, the people of Gandhāra (Gadāra) appear among the subject peoples of the Persian Empire. But no mention is there made of the Hidus (Hindus, people of Sindhu or the Indus Valley) who are explicitly referred to in the Hamadan Inscription, and are included with the Gandhārians in the lists of subject peoples given by the inscriptions on the terrace at Persepolis, and around the tomb of Darius at Naqsh-i- Rustum.\(^2\) From this it has been inferred that the "Indians" (Hidus) were conquered at some date between 519 B.C. (the probable date of the Behistun or Bahistān inscription),\(^3\) and 513 B.C.\(^4\) The preliminaries to this conquest are described by Herodotus:\(^5\)

"He (Darius, being desirous to know in what part the Indus,

---

\(^1\) Patañjali (IV. 2. 2) refers to "Āṣṭakam nāma dhanau;" (cf. Hāṣhtanagar, and Aṭhakanagara, Lüders, 390).

\(^2\) Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenian Inscriptions by H. C. Talman; Rapson, Ancient India; Herzfeld, MASI, 34, pp. I ff.

\(^3\) In the opinion of Jackson (Camb. Hist. India, I, 334) the Bahistān Rock Inscription is presumably to be assigned to a period between 520 and 518 B.C. with the exception of the fifth column, which was added later. Rapson regarded 516 B.C. as the probable date of the famous epigraph, while Herzfeld prefers the date 519 B.C. (MASI, No. 34, p. 2).

\(^4\) Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, 145. Herzfeld is, however, of the opinion that reference to the 'Thatagush' in early Persian epigraphs shows that (part of) the Pañjab, like Gandhāra, was Persian from the days of Cyrus the Great.

\(^5\) McCredle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 4-5.
which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could rely to make a true report and also Seylax of Caryanda. They accordingly setting out from the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Paktyike (Paktha ?) sailed down the river towards the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westwards, they arrived in the thirtieth month at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phoenicians, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the Sea.

Herodotus tells us that "India" constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian Empire, and that it paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest,—360 talents of gold dust, equivalent to £1,290,000 of the pre-war period. There is no reason to believe that all this gold came from Bactria or Siberia. Gold deposits are not unknown in several tracts of the North-West Frontier, and quantities of gold are recovered from the alluvium of rivers. A small quantity of the precious metal used to be imported by Bhotiya traders from the Tibetan Hills. Gandhāra was included in the seventh satrapy. The details regarding "India" left by Herodotus leave no room for doubt that it embraced the Indus Valley and was bounded on the east by the desert of Rājaputāna. "That part of India towards the rising sun is all sand; for of the people with whom we are acquainted, the Indians live the furthest towards the east and the sunrise, of all the inhabitants of Asia, for the Indians'
country towards the east is a desert by reason of the sands.” Curtius refers to extensive deserts beyond the Beas.

The organisation of the empire into Satrapies served as a model to several succeeding dynasties, and was given a wider extension in India by the Sakas and the Kushāns in the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. The Deśa-goptri of the Gupta Age was the lineal successor of the Satrap (Kshatra-pāvan) of earlier epochs.

The Persian conquerors did much to promote geographical exploration and commercial activity. At the same time they took from the country not only an enormous amount of gold and other commodities such as ivory and wood, but denuded it of a great portion of its man-power. Military service was exacted from several tribes. Contact between the East and the West became more intimate with important results in the domain of culture. If the Achaemenians brought the Indian bowmen and lancers to Hellenic soil, they also showed the way of conquest and cultural penetration to the peoples of Greece and Macedon.

Khshayāršā or Xerxes (486-465 B.C.), the son and successor of Darius I, maintained his hold on the Indian provinces. In the great army which he led against Hellas both Gandhāra and “India” were represented. The Gandhārians are described by Herodotus as bearing bows of reed and short spears, and the “Indians” as being clad in cotton garments and bearing cane bows with arrows tipped with iron. One of the newly discovered stone-tablets at Persepolis' records that Xerxes “by Ahuramazda’s will” sapped the foundations of certain temples of the Daivas and ordained that “the Daivas shall not be worshipped”.

Where the Daivas had been worshipped, the king worshipped Ahuramazda together with Ṛtam (divine world order). 'India' may have been among the lands which witnessed the outcome of the religious zeal of the Persian king.

The Persian Empire rapidly declined after the death of Xerxes. But if Ktesias who resided at the Court of Artaxerxes II, Mnemon 405-358 B.C., is to be believed, the Great King used to receive costly presents from India even in the fourth century B.C. ¹ The South Tomb Inscription at Persepolis,² usually assigned to Artaxerxes II, continues to mention the Sattagydiains, the Gandharians and the Hi(n)dus side by side with the Persians, the Medians, the Susians and others apparently as subjects of the Achaemenian King.

Among interesting relics of Persian dominion in India mention is sometimes made of a Taxila inscription in Aramaic characters of the fourth or fifth century B.C.³ But Herzfeld points out⁴ that the form Priyadarsana occurs in the record which should be referred to the reign of Aśoka, and not to the period of Persian rule. To the Persians is also attributed the introduction of the Kharoshṭhī alphabet, the "Persepolitan capital" and words like "dipi" (rescript) and "nipishta" ("written") occurring in the inscriptions of Aśoka. Persian influence has also been traced in the preamble of the Aśokan edicts.

² S. Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions*, 172f.
SECTION II. THE LAST OF THE ACHAEMENIDS AND ALEXANDER.

Artaxerxes II died in or about 358 B.C. After a period of weak rule and confusion, the crown went to Darius III Codomannus (335-330 B.C.). This was the king against whom Alexander, the great king of Macedon, led forth his famous phalanx. After several engagements in which the Persian forces suffered repeated defeats, the Macedonian conqueror rode on the tracks of his vanquished enemy and reached the plain watered by the river Bumodus.

Three distinct groups of Indians figured in the army which mustered under the banner of the Persian monarch in that region. "The Indians who were conterminous with the Bactrians as also the Bactrians themselves and the Sogdianians had come to the aid of Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the Viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject to Bessus but were in alliance with Darius... Barsaentes, the Viceroy of Arachotia, led the Arachotians and the men who were called Mountaineer Indians. There were a few elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the Indians who live this side of the Indus. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about 600 stades distant from the city of Arbela." 1 The hold of the Achaemenians on the Indians in the various provinces on the frontier had, however, grown very feeble about this time, and the whole of north-western India was parcelled out into innumerable kingdoms, hyparchies and

1 Chinnock, Arrian's Anabasis, pp. 142-143.
republics. A list of the more important among these is given below:

1. The **Aspasia**n territory (Alishang-Kūnar-Bajaur valley):

It lay in the difficult hill country north of the Kābul river watered by the Khoes, possibly the modern Alishang, and the Euasplā, apparently the Kūnar. The name of the people is derived from the Irānian "Aspā," i.e., the Sanskrit "Āśva" (horse) or Āśvaka. The Aspasians were thus the western branch of the Āsvakas (Assakenians). The chieftain, *hyparch*, of the tribe dwelt in a city on or near the river Euasplā, supposed to be identical with the Kūnar, a tributary of the Kābul. Other Aspasion cities were Andaka and Arigaeum.

2. The country of the **Guraean**s:

It was watered by the river Guraeus, Gaurī, or Pañjkora, and lay between the land of the Aspasians and the country of the Assakenians.

3. The Kingdom of **Assakenos** (part of Swat and Buner):

It stretched eastwards as far as the Indus and had its capital at Massaga, a "formidable fortress probably situated not very far to the north of the Malakand Pass but not yet precisely identified." The name of the Assakenians probably represents the Sanskrit Āśvaka 'land of horses,' not Āśmaka, 'land of stone.' The territory occupied by the tribe was also known in different ages as Suvāstu, Udyāna and, according to some, Oḍḍiyāna. The Āsvakas do not appear to be mentioned by Pañini unless we regard them as belonging to the same stock as the Āśmakas of the south.

---

for which there is no real ground. They are placed in the north-west by the authors of the Markandeya Purāṇa and the Brīhat Samhitā. The Assakenian king had a powerful army of 20,000 cavalry, more than 30,000 infantry and 30 elephants. The reigning king at the time of Alexander’s invasion is called by the Greeks Assakenos. His mother was Kleophis. Assakenos had a brother¹ who is called Eryx by Curtius and Aphrikēs by Diodoros.² There is no reason to believe that these personages had any relationship with king Sarabha, whose tragic fate is described by Bāņa and who belonged apparently to the southern realm of the Aśmakas in the valley of the Godāvari.

4. Nysa:

This was a small hill-state which lay at the foot of Mt. Meros between the Kophen or Kabul river and the Indus.³ It had a republican constitution. The city was alleged to have been founded by Greek colonists long before the invasion of Alexander.⁴ Arrian says,⁵ “The Nysaeans are not an Indian race, but descended from the men who came to India with Dionysus.” Curiously enough, a Yona or Greek state is mentioned along with Kamboja in the Majjhima Nikāya⁶ as flourishing in the time of Gautama Buddha and Assalāyana: “Yona Kambojesu dveva vaṃṇā Ayyo c’eva Dāsoca (there are only

¹ Invasion of Alexander, p. 378.
² He led the flying defenders of the famous fortress of Aornos against the Greeks (Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 356. Aornos is identified by Sir Aurel Stein with the height of Una between the Swat and the Indus (Alexander’s Campaign on the Frontier, Benares Hindu University Magazine, Jan., 1927). The southern side of the stronghold was washed by the Indus (Inv. Alex., 271).
³ Inv. Alex., 79, 193.
⁴ McCrindle, Invasion of Alexander, p. 79; Hamilton and Falconer, Strabo, Vol. III, p. 76. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal informed me that he referred to the Nysaean Indo-Greeks in a lecture delivered as early as 1919.
⁵ Chimnocks Arrian, p. 399.
⁶ II. 149.
two social grades among the Yonas and the Kambojas, *viz.*, Aryan and Dāsa).

According to Holdich the lower spurs and valleys of Kohi-Mor in the Swat country are where the ancient city of Nysa once stood. At the time of Alexander’s invasion the Nysaeans had Akouphis for their President. They had a Governing Body of 300 members.

5. **Peukelaotis** (in the Peshāwar District):

It lay on the road from Kābul to the Indus. Arrian tells us that the Kābul falls into the Indus in the land called Peukelaotis, taking with itself the Malantus, Soastus and Guraeus. Peukelaotis represents the Sanskrit Pushkarāvatī. It formed the western part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra. The people of the surrounding region are sometimes referred to as the “Astakenoi” by historians. The capital is represented by the modern Mir Ziyārat and Chārsadda, about 17 miles N. E. of Peshāwar, on the Swat river, the Soastus of Arrian, and the Suvāstu of the Vedic texts.

The reigning hyparch at the time of Alexander’s invasion was Astes identified with Hāsti or Ashtaka. He was defeated and killed by Hephaestion, a general of the Macedonian king.

6. **Taxila** or Takshaśilā (in the Rāwalpindi District):

Strabo says “between the Indus and the Hydaspes (Jhelum) was Taxila, a large city, and governed by good laws. The neighbouring country is crowded with inhabitants and very fertile.” The kingdom of Taxila formed the eastern part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra.

---

2 Invasion of Alexander, p. 81.
3 Chinnock’s Arrian’s Anabasis of Alexander and India, p. 403.
4 Chinnock, Arrian, p. 228.
5 H. and F’s tr., III, p. 90.
In B.C. 327 the Taxilian throne was occupied by a hyparch, or basileus, whom the Greeks called Taxiles. When Alexander of Macedon arrived in the Kābul valley he sent a herald to the king of Taxila to bid him come and meet him. Taxiles accordingly did come to meet the conqueror, bringing valuable gifts. When he died his son Mophis or Omphis (Sanskrit Āmbhi) succeeded to the government. Curiously enough, the reputed author of the Kautiliya Arthasastra, himself a native of Taxila according to the Mahāvamsa Tīkā, refers to a school of political philosophers called Āṃbhīyas, and Dr. F. W. Thomas connects them with Taxilā.1

7. The kingdom of Arsakes:

The name of the principality represents the Sanskrit Urašā which formed part of the modern Hazāra District. It adjoined the realm of Abisares, and was probably, like the latter, an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Urašā is mentioned in several Kharoshthi inscriptions, and, in the time of the geographer Ptolemy, absorbed the neighbouring realm of Taxilā.

8. Abhisāra:

Strabo observes2 that the kingdom was situated among the mountains above the Taxilā country. The position of this state was correctly defined by Stein who pointed out that Dārvābhisāra3 included the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Jhelum and the Chenāb. Roughly speaking, it corresponded to the Punch and some adjoining districts in Kaśmīra with a part at least of the Hazāra District of the North-West Frontier Province. It was probably an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Abisares, the contemporary of Alexander,

---

1 Bārhaspatya Arthasastra, Introduction, p. 16.
2 H. & F.’s tr., III, p. 90.
3 Cf. Mbh. VII. 21, 43.
was a shrewd politician of the type of Charles Emanuel III of Sardinia. When the Macedonian invader arrived in Taxila he informed him that he was ready to surrender himself and the land which he ruled. And yet before the battle which was fought between Alexander and the famous Poros, Abisares intended to join his forces with those of the latter.¹

9. The kingdom of the Elder Poros:

This territory lay between the Jhelum and the Chenāb and roughly corresponded to parts of the modern districts of Guzrāṭ and Shāhpur.² Strabo tells us³ that it was an extensive and fertile district containing nearly 300 cities. Diodoros informs us⁴ that Poros had an army of more than 50,000 foot, about 3,000 horse, above 1,000 chariots, and 130 elephants. He was in alliance with Embisaros, i.e., the king of Abhisāra.

Poros probably represents the Sanskrit Pūru or Paurava. In the Rig-Veda the Pūrus are expressly mentioned as on the Sarasvatī. In the time of Alexander, however, we find them on the Hydaspes (Jhelum). The Brihat Samhitā,⁵ too, associates the ‘Pauravas’ with ‘Madraka’ and ‘Mālava.’ The Mahābhārata,⁶ also, refers to a ‘Puram Paurava-rakshitam’, city protected by the Pauravas, which lay not far from Kaśmira. It is suggested in the Vedic Index⁷ that either the Hydaspes was the earlier home of the Pūrus, where some remained after the others had wandered east, or the later Pūrus represent a successful onslaught upon the west from the east.

¹ Chinnoch, Arran, p. 276. Inv. Alex., 112.
² It apparently included the old territory of Kekaya.
³ H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 91.
⁴ Invasion of Alexander, p. 274.
⁵ XIV. 27.
⁶ II. 27, 15-17.
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10. The country of the people called Glauganikai\(^1\) (Glauganicians) by Aristobulus, and Glausians by Ptolemy:

This tract lay to the west of the Chenab and was conterminous with the dominion of Poros.\(^2\) It included no less than seven and thirty cities, the smallest of which had not fewer than 5,000 inhabitants, while many contained upwards of 10,000.


This little kingdom lay between the Chenab and the Ravi and (if Strabo has given the correct name of the territory) probably represented the easternmost part of the old Mahajanapada of Gandhara.\(^3\) It was ruled by the Younger Poros, nephew of the monarch who ruled the country between the Jhelum and the Chenab.

12. The Adraistai (in the Bari Doab):\(^4\)

They dwelt on the eastern side of the Hydraotes or the Ravi, and their main stronghold was Pimprama.

13. Kathaioi or Cathaeans (probably also in the Bari Doab):

Strabo points out\(^5\) that "some writers place Cathaia and the country of Sopheithes, one of the nomarchs, in the tract between the rivers (Hydaspes and Acesines, i.e., the Jhelum and the Chenab); some on the other side of the Acesines and of the Hydrotis, i.e., of the Chenab and the Ravi, on the confines of the territory of the other Poros, the nephew of Poros who was taken prisoner

---

\(^1\) With the second part of the name anika, troop or army, may be compared that of the Sanskriticas of the Gupta period. Dr. Jsyaswal, who, doubtless following Weber in IA, ii (1973), p. 147, prefers the restoration of the name as Glauchu-kayanaka, does not apparently take note of this fact.

\(^2\) But see Camb. Hist. Ind., I, 370, n. 4; the actual name of the territory in olden times was, however, Madra.

\(^3\) Adrias? Mbh., VII. 169.3.

\(^4\) Yaudheyun Adrijan rajan Madrakun Malavun api.

\(^5\) H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 92.
by Alexander.\footnote{Jolly, SBE., VII. 16; Ep. Ind., III. 8.} The Kathaioi probably represent the Sanskrit Kaṭha, Kāṭhaka,\footnote{Cf., Pāṇini, II. 4. 20.} Kantha\footnote{Mbb., VIII. 85. 16.} or Krātha.\footnote{JRAS., 1903, p. 887.} They were the most eminent among the independent tribes dwelling in the area of which the principal centre was Sangala (Sāṅkala). This town was probably situated in the Gurudāspur district, not far from Fathgarh.\footnote{Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 871.} Anspach locates it at Jandiāla to the east of Amritsar.\footnote{McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 38.}

The Kathaians enjoyed the highest reputation for courage and skill in the art of war. Onesikritos tells us that in Kathaia the handsomest man was chosen as king.\footnote{H. & F. 's tr., III, p. 93; \textit{Invention of India by Alexander}, p. 219.}

14. The \textbf{kingdom of Sophytes} (Saubhūti), probably along the banks of the Jhelum:

In the opinion of Smith, the position of this kingdom is fixed by the remark of Strabo\footnote{Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 219.} that it included a mountain composed of fossil salt sufficient for the whole of India; Sophytes was, therefore, according to him, the ‘lord of the fastness of the Salt Range stretching from the Jhelum to the Indus.’\footnote{Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 219.} But we have already seen that the classical writers agree in placing Sophytes’ territory east of the Jhelum. Curtius tells us that the nation ruled by Sopeithes (Sophytes), in the opinion of the ‘barbarians,’ excelled in wisdom, and lived under good laws and customs. They did not acknowledge and rear children according to the will of the parents, but as the officers entrusted with the medical inspection of infants might direct, for if they
remarked anything deformed or defective in the limbs of a child they ordered it to be killed. In contracting marriages they did not seek an alliance with high birth but made their choice by the looks, for beauty in the children was highly appreciated. Strabo informs us that the dogs in the territory of Sopheithes (Sophytes) were said to possess remarkable courage. We have some coins of Sophytes bearing on the obverse the head of the king, and on the reverse the figure of a cock. According to Smith the style is suggested probably by the "owls" of Athens. Strabo calls Sophytes a nomarch which probably indicates that he was not an independent sovereign, but only a viceroy of some other king.

15. The kingdom of Phegelas or Phegeus (in the Bari Doab):

It lay between the Hydraotes (Ravi) and the Hyphasis (Bias). The name of the king, Phegelas, probably represents the Sanskrit Bhagula—the designation of a royal race of Kshatriyas mentioned in the Gaṇapāthā.

16. The Siboi (in the lower part of the Rehna Doab):

They were the inhabitants of the Shorkot region in Jhang district below the junction of the Jhelum.

1 H. & F., III, p. 93.
2 Whitehead (Num. Chron., 1943, pp. 60-72) rejects the identification of Sophytes with Saubhūti. He thinks that "Saubhūti is a philologist's creation. There is no historical evidence that Saubhūti existed" (p. 63). Subhūti (from which Saubhūti is apparently derived) is a fairly common name in Indian literature. (The Questions of King Milinda, Part II, SBE. XXXVI, pp. 315, 333; Geiger, the Mahāvaiṣeṣa, tr., 151 n. 275). It is by no means improbable that a Hindu Rajah should strike a piece bearing a Hellenized form of his name, as the Hinduised Scythian rulers did in later ages.
3 Was it the Great King of W. Asia or some Indian potentate? Among other nomarchs mention may be made of Spitaces, a nephew and apparently a vassal of the elder Poros (Camb. Hist. Ind, 36, 365, 367).
4 Inc. Alex. p. 281, 401.
and the Chenāb. They were probably identical with the Śiva people mentioned in a passage of the Ṛig-Veda where they share with the Alinas, Pakthaś, Bhalānas, and Viśāṇins the honour of being defeated by Sudās. The Jātakas mention a Sivi country and its cities Aritṭhapura and Jetuttara. It is probable that Śiva, Sivi, Sibi, and Siboi were one and the same people. A place called Śiva-pura is mentioned by the scholiast on Pāṇini as situated in the northern country. It is, doubtless, identical with Sibipura mentioned in a Shorkot inscription edited by Vogel. In the opinion of that scholar the mound of Shorkot marks the site of this city of the Sibis.

The Siboi dressed themselves with the skins of wild beasts, and had clubs for their weapons.

The Mahābhārata refers to a rāṣṭra or realm of the Śivis ruled by king Uśinara, which lay not far from the Yamunā. It is not altogether improbable that the Uśinara country was at one time the home of the Śivis. We find them also in Sind, in Madyamikā (Tambavati nagari ?) near Chitor in Rājputāna, and in the Daśa-kumāra-charita, on the banks of the Kāverī.

1 Inc. Alex., p. 232.
2 VII. 18. 7.
4 Ummadanti Jātaka, No. 527; cf. Pāṇini, VI. 2. 100.
5 Vessantara Jātaka, No. 547. See also ante, p. 198, n 6.
6 Patañjali, IV. 2. 2; Ved. Ind., II, p. 382. IHQ, 1926, 758.
7 Ep. Ind., 1921, p. 16.
8 III. 130-131.
10 Vide pp. 65, 66 ante.
12 The southern Sivis are probably to be identified with the Choia ruling family (Kielhorn, List of Southern Inscriptions, No. 685).
17. The Agalassoi:

This people lived near the Siboi, and could muster an army of 40,000 foot and 3,000 horse.

18. The Sudraca or Oxydrakai:

The accounts of Curtius and Diodorus leave the impression that they lived not far from the Siboi and the Agalassoi, and occupied part of the territory below the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenāb. At the confluence Alexander garrisoned a citadel and thence came into the dominions of the Sudraca and the Malli (Mālavā). The former may have occupied parts of the Jhang and Lyallpur districts. The name of the Sudraca or the Oxydrakai represents the Sanskrit Kshudraka. They were one of the most numerous and warlike of all the Indian tribes in the Pañjāb. Arrian in one passage refers to the "leading men of their cities and their provincial governors" besides other eminent men. These words afford us a glimpse into the internal condition of this and similar tribes.

19. The Malloi:

They seem to have occupied the right bank of the lower Hydraotes (Rāvi) and are mentioned as escaping across that river to a city of the Brāhmaṇas. The Akesines (Chenāb) is said to have joined the Indus in their territory. Their name represents the Sanskrit Mālava. According to Weber, Ṛpiśali (according to Jayaswal, Kātyāyana), speaks of the formation of the compound "Kshaudraka-Mālavā." Smith points out that the Mahābhārata couples the tribes in question as forming

1 *Inx. Alex. 233-4. 286-7.*
2 *Mbk., II. 59. 15; VII. 68.9.*
3 *Megasthenes and Arrian (2nd ed.), p. 198. The accuracy of this statement may be doubted. The Malloi territory seems to have included part of the Jhang district, besides a portion of South Lyallpur, West Montgomery, and perhaps North Multan.*
part of the Kaurava host in the Kurukshetra war. Curtius tells us that the Sudraeae and the Malli had an army consisting of 90,000 foot soldiers, 10,000 cavalry and 900 war chariots.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar informs us that Pāṇini refers to the Mālavas as living by the profession of arms. In later times they are found in Rājputāna, Avanti and the Mahī valley.

20. The Abastanoi:

Diodoros calls them the Sambastai, Arrian Abastanoi, Curtius Sabarcae, and Orosius Sabagrae. They were settled on the lower Akesines (Chenāb) apparently below the Mālava country, but above the confluence of the Chenāb and the Indus. Their name represents the Sanskrit Āmbashṭha or Ambashṭha. The Ambashṭhas are mentioned in several Sanskrit and Pāli works. An Āmbashṭha king is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa whose priest was Nārada. The Mahābhārata mentions the Ambashṭhas along with the Sīvis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas and other north-western tribes. The Purāṇas represent them as Anava Kshatriyas and kinsmen of the Sīvis. In the Bṛhaspatya Arthaśāstra, the Āmbashṭha country is mentioned in conjunction with Sind:

Kaśmīra-Hūn-Āmbashṭha-Sindhavah.

1 EHI., 1914. p. 94n.; Mbh., VI. 59. 135.
2 Invasion of Alexander, 234.
3 Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 200.
4 Invasion of Alexander, p. 293.
5 Dr. Surya Kānta draws a distinction between Āmbashṭha and Ambashṭha, regarding the former as a place-name, and the latter as the name of a particular class of people, 'an elephant-driver, a Kshatriya, a mixed caste'. (B. C. Law Vol. II, pp. 137ff). To us the distinction seems to be based upon philological conjectures.
6 VIII. 21.
7 It. 52. 14-15.
9 Ed. F. W. Thomas, p. 21.
In the Ambattha Sutta, an Ambattha is called a Brähmana. In the Suri literature, on the other hand, Ambashtha denotes a man of mixed Brähmana and Vaiśya parentage. According to Jataka IV. 363, the Ambatthas were farmers. It seems that the Ambashthas were a tribe or clan who were at first mainly a fighting race, but some of whom took to other occupations, viz., those of priests, farmers and, according to Suri writers, physicians (Ambashthanām chikitsitam).

In the time of Alexander, the Ambashthas were a powerful tribe having a democratic government. Their army consisted of 60,000 foot, 6,000 cavalry and 500 chariots.

In later times the Ambashthas are found in South-Eastern India near the Mekala range, and also in Bihār and possibly in Bengal.

1 Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, p. 199.
2 Manu. X. 47. Dr. Surya Kānta suggests the reading (Law Volume, II, 131) eka kārtinam. In his dissertation he speaks of the possibility of Ambashtha being a Sanskritized form of a Celtic word meaning 'husbandman, tiller of the ground'. It is also pointed out that the word may be an exact parallel to 'mahāmātra' inasmuch as 'ambhas' means 'of large measure', 'an elephant', so that Ambashtha would mean 'one sitting on the elephant', i.e., a driver, a keeper, a sāṁanta, or a Kshatriya. They lived on warfare, presumably as gajārōkas, and banner-bearers.

A distinction is drawn between Ambashtha and Ambashtha. The last-mentioned expression is considered to be a place-name, based on the plant name Amba. For other notes on the subject see Prabāṣi, 1351 B. S.; I, 206; JUPHS, July-Dec., 1945, pp. 145 ff.; History of Bengal (D. U.), pp. 568 ff.
3 Invasion of Alexander, p. 252.
4 Cf. Ptolemy, Ind. Ant., XIII, 361; Brihat Sāhhitā; XIV. 7; Mekhalamushtha of Mārkaṇḍeya P., LIVIII. 14, is a corruption of Mekal-Ambashtha. Cf. also the Ambashtha Kayastha of Bihār, the Gauda Ambashtha of the Surjan-Charita (DHNI, II. 1961 n) of the time of Akbar, and the Vaidyas of Bengal whom Bharata Mallika classes as Ambashtha. This is not the place to discuss the authenticity or otherwise of the tradition recorded by Bharata and some of the Parāṣas. The origin of the Vaidyas, or of any other caste in Bengal, is a thorny problem which requires separate treatment. What the author aims at in these pages is to put some available evidence, early or late, about the Abastānai. That some Ambashthas, and Brāhmaṇas too, took to the medical profession is clear from the evidence of Manu and
21-22. The Xathroi and the Ossadioi

The Xathroi are according to McCrindle the Kshatri of Sanskrit literature mentioned in the Laws of Manu as an impure tribe, being of mixed origin. V. de Saint-Martin suggests that in the Ossadioi we have the Vasāti of the Mahābhārata, a tribe associated with the Sibis and Sindhu-Sauvīras of the Lower Indus Valley. Like the Abastanoi, the Xathroi and the Ossadioi seem to have occupied parts of the territory drained by the lower Akesines (Chenāb) and situated between the confluence of that river with the Rāvi and the Indus respectively.

23-24. The Sodrai (sogdoi) and the Massanoi:

They occupied Northern Sind with contiguous portions of the Pañjāb (Mithan-koṭ area) and the Bahawalpur state, below the confluence of the Pañjāb rivers. The territories of these two tribes lay on opposite banks of the Indus. The Sodrai are the Südra tribe of Sanskrit literature, a people constantly associated with the Aḥhras who were settled near the Sarasvatī. Their royal seat (basileion) stood on the Indus. Here another Alexandria was founded by the Macedonian conqueror:

Atri (Samhītā, 378) and Bopadev. It is equally clear that the Vaidya problem cannot be solved in the way it has been sought to be done in some recent publications. One attention should be given to historical evidence bearing on the point like that of Megasthenes and of certain early Chalukya, Pāṇḍya, and other epigraphs, e.g. the Tālamṭāchi plates, Ep. Ind. IX 101; Bhandarker's List 1871, 2061, etc.

1 Invasion of Alexander, p. 156 n.
2 VII. 19. 11; VIII. 44 99.
3 "Abhishāhāḥ Sarasvānāḥ Sivayo’tha Vaśātayaḥ" (Mbh., VI. 106. 8).
"Vaśāti Sindhu-Sauvīrāḥ iti-prāyo’ tiktutsitaḥ."
"Gāndhārāḥ Sindhu-Sauvīrāḥ Sivayo’tha Vaśātayaḥ" (Mbh., VI. 51 14)
4 Pāṇḍājali, 1.2.3; Mbh., VII. 19.6; IX. 37.1.
25. The kingdom of Mousikanos:

This famous state included a large part of modern Sind. Its capital has been identified with Alor in the Sukkur district. The characteristics of the inhabitants of the realm of Mousikanos as noticed by Strabo are given below:

"The following are their peculiarities; to have a kind of Lacedaemonian common meal, where they eat in public. Their food consists of what is taken in the chase. They make no use of gold nor silver, although they have mines of these metals. Instead of slaves, they employed youths in the flower of their age, as the Cretans employ the Aphiomiotae, and the Lacedaemonians the Helots. They study no science with attention but that of medicine; for they consider the excessive pursuit of some arts, as that of war, and the like to be committing evil. There is no process at law but against murder and outrage, for it is not in a person’s own power to escape either one or the other; but as contracts are in the power of each individual, he must endure the wrong, if good faith is violated by another; for a man should be cautious whom he trusts, and not disturb the city with constant disputes in courts of justice."

From the account left by Arrian it appears that the "Brachmans," i.e., the Brāhmaṇas exercised considerable influence in the country. They were the instigators of a revolt against the Macedonian invader.


2 H. & P. III. p. 96.

3 This trait they shared with the Ambasājhas (cf. Manu, X. 47).

4 Chinnock, Arrian, p. 319. Cf. Strabo, xv. i. 66.—"Nearchoς says that the Brachmans engage in the affairs of the state and attend the king as councillors."
26. The principality of Oxykanos:

Curtius calls the subjects of Oxykanos the Praesti (Proshthas?). Oxykanos himself is styled both by Strabo and Diodoros Portikanos. Cunningham places his territory to the west of the Indus in the level country around Larkhana.

27. The principality of Sambos:

Sambos was the ruler of a mountainous country adjoining the kingdom of Mousikanos, with whom he was at feud. His capital, called Sindimana, has been identified, with little plausibility, with Sehwan, a city on the Indus. According to Diodoros 'a city of the Brähmaṇas' (Brähmaṇavāḍa?) had to be stormed whilst the operations against Sambos were going on.

28. Patalene:

It was the Indus delta, and took its name from the capital city, Patala probably near the site of Bahmanābād.

Diodoros tells us that Tauala (Patala) had a political constitution drawn on the same lines as the Spartan; for in this community the command in war was vested in two hereditary kings of different houses, while a Council of Elders ruled the whole state with paramount authority. One of the kings in the time of Alexander was called Moeres.

The states described above had little tendency to unity or combination. Curtius tells us that Āmbhi, ruler of

---

1 MBH., VI. 9. 61.
2 Invasion of Alexander, p. 188; AGI, Revised ed. 300.
3 Sambhu, according to Bevan (Camb. Hist. Ind., 377). Samba is a possible alternative.
5 Diod. XVII, 163. 1; cf. Alberuni (I. 316; II. 269).
6 Inv. Alex., p. 296.
7 Inv. Alex., p. 256. cf. Maurya.
Taxila, was at war with Abisares and Poros. Arrian informs us that Poros and Abisares were not only enemies of Taxila but also of the neighbouring autonomous tribes. On one occasion the two kings marched against the Kshudrakas and the Mālavas.¹ Arrian further tells us that the relations between Poros and his nephew were far from friendly. Sambos and Mousikanos were also on hostile terms. Owing to these feuds and strifes amongst the petty states, a foreign invader had no united resistance to fear; and he could be assured that many among the local chieftains would receive him with open arms out of hatred for their neighbours.

The Nandas of Magadha do not appear to have made any attempt to subjugate these states of the Uttarāpatha (North-West India). The task of reducing them was reserved for a foreign conqueror, viz., Alexander of Macedon. The tale of Alexander's conquest has been told by many historians including Arrian, Q. Curtius Rufus, Diodoros Siculus, Plutarch and Justin. We learn from Curtius that Scythians and Dahae served in the Macedonian army.² The expedition led by Alexander was thus a combined Saka-Yavana enterprise. The invader met with no such general confederacy of the native powers like the one formed by the East Indian states against Kūnika-Ajātaśatru. On the contrary he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Ambhi of Taxila, Sangaes (Sañjaya ?) of Pushkarāvatī, Kophaios or Cophaeus (of the Kābul region ?), Assagetes (Aśvajit ?), and Sisikottos (Saśīgupta) who got as his reward the satrapy of the Assakenians.³ The only princes or peoples who thought of combining against the invader were Poros and Abisares, and the Mālavas (Malloi), Kshudrakas

¹ Chinneck, Arrian, p. 279.
² Inv. Alex., p. 208.
³ Inv. Alex., p. 112.
(Oxydrakai), and the neighbouring autonomous tribes. Even in the latter case personal jealousies prevented any effective results. Alexander met with stubborn resistance from individual chiefs and clans, notably from Astes (Hastî or Ashtaka ?), the Aspasians, the Assakenians, the elder Poros, the Kathaians, the Malloi, the Oxydrakai, and the Brāhmaṇas of the kingdom of Mousikanos. Massaga, the stronghold of the Assakenians, was stormed with great difficulty, Poros was defeated on the banks of the Hydaspes (B.C. 326), the Malloi and the Oxydrakai were also no doubt crushed. But Alexander found that his Indian antagonists were different from the effete troops of Persia. Diodoros informs us that at Massaga, where Alexander treacherously massacred the mercenaries, "the women, taking the arms of the fallen, fought side by side with the men." Poros, when he saw most of his forces scattered, his elephants lying dead or straying riderless, did not flee—as Darius Codomannus had twice fled—but remained fighting, seated on an elephant of commanding height, and received nine wounds before he was taken prisoner. The Malloi almost succeeded in killing the Macedonian king. But all this was of no avail. A disunited people could not long resist the united forces of the Hellenic world led by the greatest captain of ancient Europe. Alexander succeeded in conquering the old Persian Provinces of Gandhāra and "India," but was unable to try conclusions with Agrammes king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, i.e., the last Nanda king of Magadha and the other Gangetic provinces in Eastern India. Plutarch informs us that the battle with Poros depressed the spirits of the Macedonians and made them very unwilling to advance further into India. Moreover, they were afraid of the "Gandaritai and the Praisaii" who

1 Ine. Alex., p. 270
were reported to be waiting for Alexander with an army of 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8,000 war-chariots and 6,000 fighting elephants. As a matter of fact when Alexander was retreating through Karmania he received a report that his satrap Philippos, governor of the Upper Indus Province, had been murdered (324 B.C.). Shortly afterwards the Macedonian garrison was overpowered. The Macedonian governor of the Lower Indus satrapy had to be transferred to the north-west borderland beyond the Indus and no new satrap was appointed in his place. The successors of Alexander at the time of the Triparadeisos agreement in 321 B.C., confessed their inability to remove the Indian Rājās of the Pañjāb without royal troops under the command of some distinguished general. One of the Rājās, possibly Poros, was treacherously slain by Eudemos, an officer stationed in the Upper Indus satrapy. The withdrawal of the latter (cir. 317 B.C.) marks the ultimate collapse of the first serious attempt of the Yavanas to establish an empire in India.

The only permanent effect of Alexander's raid seems to have been the establishment of a number of Yavana settlements in the Uttarāpatha. The most important of these settlements were:

1. The city of Alexandria (modern Charikar or Opian?) in the land of the Parapanisadæae, i.e., the Kābul region.
2. Boukephala, possibly on the east side of the Hydaspes (Jhelum).
3. Nikaia, where the battle with Poros took place,
4. Alexandria at or near the confluence of the Chenâb and the Indus, to the north-east of the countries of the Sodrai, or Sogdoi, and Massanoi, and

---

1 According to Tarn (The Greeks in Bactria and India, 1st ed., 462) Alexandria stood on the west bank of the united Panjshir-Ghorband rivers near the confluence facing Kāpiśa on the east bank. It is represented by the modern Bagram.
5. Sogdian Alexandria,\(^1\) below the confluence of the Pañjab rivers.

Āsoka recognised the existence of Yona (Yavana) settlers on the north-western fringe of his empire, and appointed some of them, \(e.g.,\) the Yavana-rāja Tushāśpha\(^2\) to high offices of state. Boukephala Alexandria flourished as late as the time of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.*\(^3\)

One of the Alexandrias (Alasanda) is mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa.*\(^4\)

Alexander’s invasion produced one indirect result. It helped the cause of Indian unity by destroying the power of the petty states of north-west India, just as the Danish invasion contributed to the union of England under Wessex by destroying the independence of Northumbria and Mercia. If Ugrasena-Mahāpadma was the precursor of Chandragupta Maurya in the east, Alexander was the forerunner of that emperor in the north-west.

---


\(^3\) Schoff’s tr., p. 41.

\(^4\) Giger’s tr., p. 194.
CHAPTER IV. THE MAURYA EMPIRE:
THE ERA OF DIGVIJAYA

SECTION I. THE REIGN OF CHANDRAGUPTA MAURYA.

*Mlechchhairudvejyamānā bhujayugamadhunā
samśritā rājamūrtteh
Sa śrīmadbandhubhṛtyaśchiramavatamahīṁ
pārthivās-Chandraguptah.*
—Mudrārākshasa.

In B.C. 326 the flood of Mecedonian invasion had overwhelmed the Indian states of the Pañjab, and was threatening to burst upon the Madhyadesa. Agrammes was confronted with a crisis not unlike that which Arminius had to face when Varus carried the Roman Eagle to the Teutoburg Forest, or which Charles Martel had to face when the Saracens carried the Crescent towards the field of Tours. The question whether India was, or was not, to be Hellenized awaited decision.

Agrammes was fortunate enough to escape the onslaught of Alexander. But it is doubtful whether he had the ability or perhaps the inclination to play the part of an Arminius or a Charles Martel, had the occasion arisen. But there was at this time another Indian who was made of different stuff. This was Chandragupta, the Sandrokoptos (Sandrokottos, etc.) of the classical writers. The rise of Chandragupta is thus described by Justin:¹

"India after the death of Alexander had shaken, as it were, the yoke of servitude from its neck and put his governors to death. The author of this liberation was

Watson's tr., p. 142 with slight emendations,
Sandrocottus. This man was of humble origin, but was stimulated to aspire to regal power by supernatural encouragement; for, having offended Alexander\(^1\) by his boldness of speech and orders being given to kill him, he saved himself by swiftness of foot; and while he was lying asleep, after his fatigue, a lion of great size having come up to him, licked off with his tongue the sweat that was running from him and after gently waking him, left him. Being first prompted by this prodigy to conceive hopes of royal dignity he drew together a band of robbers,\(^2\) and solicited the Indians to support his new sovereignty.\(^3\)

Sometime after, as he was going to war with the generals of Alexander, a wild elephant of great bulk presented itself before him of its own accord and, as if tamed down to gentleness, took him on its back and became his guide in the war and conspicuous in fields of battle. Sandrocottus thus acquired a throne when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness.\(^4\)

The above account, shorn of its marvellous element, amounts to this, that Chandragupta, a man of non-monarchical rank, placed himself at the head of the

---

\(^1\) Some modern scholars propose to read 'Nandrum' (Nanda) in place of 'Alexandrum.' Such conjectural emendations by modern editors often mislead students who have no access to original sources and make the confusion regarding the early career of Chandragupta worse confounded (cf. Indian Culture, Vol. II. No. 3, p. 558; for 'boldness of speech', cf. Grote XII. 141, case of Kleitus, and pp. 147 ff, case of Kallisthenes)

\(^2\) The original expression used by Justin has the sense of 'mercenary soldier' as well as that of 'robber'. And the former sense is in consonance with Indian tradition recorded by Hemachandra in the Parishishtapatra (VIII, 263-54):

\[\text{Dhātuvādopāṛjitaṁ draśiṇena Chaṇiprasāḥ}\]
\[\text{chakrapattyāyām sāmagraṁ Nandamuchkhetumudyaṭāḥ.}\]

i.e., Chaṇakya gathered for Chandragupta an army with wealth found underground, (lit. 'with the aid of mineralogy') for the purpose of uprooting Nanda.

\(^3\) According to the interpretation accepted by Hultzsch—'instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing government.'
Indians who chafed under the Macedonian yoke, and after Alexander's departure defeated his generals and "shook the yoke of servitude from the neck" of India. The verdict of the Hydaspes was thus reversed.¹

The ancestry of Chandragupta is not known for certain. Hindu literary tradition connects him with the Nanda dynasty of Magadha.² Tradition recorded in Mediaeval inscriptions, however, represents the Maurya family (from which he sprang) as belonging to the solar race.³ From Mândhâtri, a prince of that race, sprang the Maurya line."⁴ In the Rājputāna Gazetteer,⁴ the Moris (Mauryas) are described as a Rājput clan. Jaina tradition recorded in the Pariśishtaparvan⁵ represents Chandragupta as the son of a daughter of the chief of a village of peacock-tamers (Mayūra-

---

¹ The anti-Macedonian movement led by Chandragupta, and those who co-operated with him, probably began in Sind. The Macedonian Satrap of that province withdrew before 321 B.C. Ambhi and the Paurava remained in possession of portions of the Western and Central Pañjāb and some adjoining regions till sometime after the Triparadeisis agreement of 321 B.C.

² The Mudrārākheśa calls him not only Mauryaputra (Act II, verse 6) but also Nandānaya (Act IV). Keshendra and Somadeva refer to him as Pūrvananda-sūta, son of the genuine Nanda, as opposed to Yoga-Nanda. The commentator on the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (IV, 24—Wilson IX, 157) says that Chandragupta was the son of Nanda by a wife named Murā, whence he and his descendants were called Mauryas. Dhundirāja, the commentator on the Mudrārākheśa, informs us on the other hand that Chandragupta was the eldest son of Maurya who was the son of the Nanda king Sarvārthasiddhi by Murā, daughter of a Vraṣṭala (Śūdra?).

³ Ep. Ind., II. 222. The Mahāvamsaṭīkā also connects the Mauryas with the Sākyas who, as is well-known, claimed to belong to the race of Āditya (the Sun). Cf. also Avadānakapalata, No. 59.

⁴ II A, the Mewar Residency, compiled by Major K. D. Erskine (p. 14).

⁵ Page 56; VIII. 299f.
poshaka). The Mahāvaṁsa calls him a scion of the Khattiya clan styled Moriya (Maurya). In the Divyāvadāna Bindusāra, the son of Chandragupta, claims to be an anointed Kshatriya, Kshatriya Mārdhābhishiktā. In the same work Aśoka, the son of Bindusāra, calls himself a Kshatriya. In the Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta the Moriyas are represented as the ruling clan of Pipphalivana, and as belonging to the Kshatriya caste. As the Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta is the most ancient of the works referred to above, and forms part of the early Buddhist canon, its evidence should be preferred to that of later compositions. It is, therefore, practically certain that Chandragupta belonged to a Kshatriya community, viz., the Moriya (Maurya) clan.

In the sixth century B. C. the Moriyas were the ruling clan of the little republic of Pipphalivana which probably lay between Rummindei in the Nepalese Tarai and Kasia in the Gorakhpur district. They must have been absorbed into the Magadhan empire along with the other states of Eastern India. Tradition avers that they were reduced to great straits in the fourth century B. C., and young Chandragupta grew up among peacock-tamers, herdsmen and hunters in the Vindhyan forest. The classical notices of his encounter with a lion and an

1 Buddhist tradition also testifies to the supposed connection between the expressions Moriya (Maurya) and Mora or Mayira (peacock)—see Tourour, Mahāvaṁsa (Mahāwansa), xxxix f. Aelian informs us that tame peacocks were kept in the parks of the Maurya Palace at Pātaliputra. Sir John Marshall points out that figures of peacocks were employed to decorate some of the projecting ends of the architraves of the east gateway at Sāñchi (A Guide to Sāñchi, pp. 44, 62). Foucher (Monuments of Sāñchi, 231) does not regard these birds as a sort of canting baldge for the dynasty of the Mauryas. He apparently prefers to imagine in them a possible allusion to the Mora Jātaka.

2 Geiger’s Translation, p. 27. Moriyo’nam Khittip’nam vaśe jāta.

3 Cowell and Neil’s Ed., p. 370.

4 Page 409.

5 SBE. XI, pp. 124-135.
elephant accord well with his residence amidst the wild denizens of that sequestered region. During the inglorious reign of Agrammes, when there was general disaffection amongst his subjects, the Moriyas evidently came into prominence, probably under the leadership of Chandragupta. These clansmen were no longer rulers and were merely Magadhan subjects. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that Justin calls Chandragupta a man of humble origin. Plutarch, as well as Justin, informs us that Chandragupta paid a visit to Alexander. Plutarch says: "Androkottus himself, who was then a lad, saw Alexander himself and afterwards used to declare that Alexander might easily have conquered the whole country, as the then king was hated by his subjects on account of his mean and wicked disposition." From this passage it is not unreasonable to infer that Chandragupta visited Alexander with the intention of inducing the conqueror to put an end to the rule of the tyrant of Magadha. His conduct may be compared to that of Rāṇā Samgrāma Simha who invited Bābur to put an end to the regime of Ibrāhim Lūdī. Apparently Chandragupta found Alexander as stern a ruler as Agrammes, for we learn from Justin that the Macedonian king did not scruple to give orders to kill the intrepid Indian lad for his boldness of speech. The young Maurya apparently thought of ridding his country of both the oppressors, Macedonian as well as Indian. With the help of Kauṭilya, also called Chāṇakya or Vishnugupta, son of a Brāhmaṇa of Taxila, he is said to have over-

1 Life of Alexander Ixii.
3 As already stated the substitution of 'Nanda' for Alexander cannot be justified.
thrown the infamous Nanda. Traditional accounts of the conflict between Chandragupta and the last Nanda are preserved in the *Milindapañho*, the Purāṇas, the *Mudrārākshasa*, the *Mahāvaṁsa Tīkā* and the *Jaina Pariśisṭaparvan*. The *Milindapañho*¹ tells us that the Nanda army was commanded by Bhaddasāla. The Nanda troops were evidently defeated with great slaughter, an exaggerated account of which is preserved in the *Milindapañho*.

“Sometime after” his acquisition of sovereignty, Chandragupta went to war with the prefects or generals of Alexander ² and crushed their power.

**The overthrow of the Nandas, and the liberation of the Pañjab** were not the only achievements of the great Maurya. Plutarch tells us ³ that he overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men. Justin also informs us that he was “in possession of India.” In his *Beginnings of South Indian History*,⁴ Dr. S. Krishna-swami Aiyangar says that Māmulanār, an ancient Tamil author, makes frequent allusions to the Mauryas in the past having penetrated with a great army as far as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevelly district. The statements of this author are said to be supported by Paraṇar or Param Koṟṟanār and Kallil Āṭṭiraiyanār. The advanced party of the invasion was composed of a warlike people called Kośar. The invaders advanced from the Koṅkaṇ, passing the hills Elilmalai, about sixteen miles north of Cannanore, and entered the Kongu (Coimbatore) district, ultimately going as far as the Podiyil Hill (Malaya?).

---

¹ SBE., Vol. XXXVI, p. 147.
³ Alex. LXII.
Unfortunately the name of the Maurya leader is not given. But the expression *Vamba Moriyar*, or Maurya upstarts,⁠¹ would seem to suggest that the first Maurya, *i.e.*, Chandragupta, and his adherents were meant.⁠²

Certain Mysore inscriptions refer to Chandragupta's rule in North Mysore. Thus one epigraph says that Nāgarkhaṇḍa in the Shikārpur Taluq was protected by the wise Chandragupta, "an abode of the usages of eminent Kshatriyas."³ This is of the fourteenth century and little reliance can be placed upon it. But when the statements of Plutarch, Justin, Māmulanār, and the Mysore inscriptions referred to by Rice, are read together, they seem to suggest that the first Maurya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyan India.

Whatever we may think of Chandragupta's connection with Southern India, there can be no doubt that he pushed his *conquests as far as Surāśṭra* in Western India. The Junāgadh Rock inscription of the *Mahākshatrāpa* Rudradāman refers to his *Rāśtriya* or High

---

² Barnett suggests (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I, 598) that the 'Vamba Moriyar' or 'Bastard Mauryas' were possibly a branch of the Kūkāṇi Mauryas. But there is hardly any genuine historical record of the penetration of the Mauryas of the Kūkāṇ deep into the southern part of the Tamil country. For other suggestions, see *JRAS.*, 1928, pp. 93-96. Some Tamil scholars hold that "the Moriyar were not allowed to enter Tamilakam, and the last point they reached was the Venkāṭa hill" (*IHQ.*, 1933, p. 145). They also reject Dr. Aiyangar's statement about the Kōsar. But the view that the arms of Chandragupta possibly reached the Pādya country in the Far South of India which abounded in pearls and gems receives some confirmation from the *Mudrārākhasa*, Act, III, verse 19, which suggests that the supremacy of the first Maurya eventually extended "from the lord of mountains (the Himalayas), cooled by showers of the spray of the divine stream (Ganges) playing about among its rocks, to the shores of the southern ocean (Dakṣīṇāraṇa) marked by the brilliance of gems flashing with various colours". The description, however, may be purely conventional. Prof. N. Sastri is critical of the account in the Tamil texts (*ANM*, p. 283f).
³ Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 10. Fleet, however, is sceptic about the Jains tradition (*Ind. Ant.* 1893, 186 ff.). Cf. also *JRAS.*, 1911, 614-17.
Commissioner, Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya, who constructed the famous Sudarsana Lake.  

Reference has already been made to an Aramaic Inscription from Taxila which mentions the form Priya-

darśana, a well-known epithet of Aśoka Maurya. But it is well to remember that in the Mudrārākshasa Piadaṁsana is used as a designation of Chandasiri or Chandragupta himself. Further, in Rock Edict VIII of Aśoka, his ancestors, equally with himself, are styled Devānampiya. It is, therefore, not unreason-able to conclude that, like his famous grandson, Chandragupta, too, was known as ‘Devānampiya Piyadasi’ (or ‘Priya-
darśana’), and it is not always safe to ascribe all epigraphs that make mention of Priyadarśana, irrespective of their contents, to Aśoka the Great.

The Seleukidan War.

We learn from Justin that when Chandragupta acquired his throne in India Seleukos (Seleucus), a general of Alexander, was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleukos was the son of Antiochos, a distinguished general of Philip of Macedon, and his wife Laodike. After the division of the Macedonian Empire among the followers of Alexander he carried on several wars in the east. He first took Babylon, and then his

---

1 The subjugation of the whole of Northern India (Udicht) from the Himalayas to the sea is probably suggested by the following passage of the Kauṭūkṣyā Arthashastra (IX, 1): traditionally ascribed to a minister of Chandragupta’s: “Deśāh Prithivī; tasyām Himavat Samudrāntaram Udichinām yojanaśa-


2 Act VI.

3 Watson’s tr., p. 141.

4 Seleukos obtained the satrapy of Babylon first after the agreement of Triparádeisós (321 B.C.) and afterwards in 319 B.C. from which year his era is dated. In 306 B.C., he assumed the title of king (Camb. Anc. His., VII, 161; Camb. Hist. Ind., I, 433).
strength being increased by this success, subdued the Bactrians. He next made an expedition into India. Appianus says¹ that he crossed the Indus and waged war on Chandragupta, king of the Indians, who dwelt about it, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage² with him. Justin also observes that after making a league with Chandragupta, and settling his affairs in the east, Seleukos proceeded to join in the war against Antigonus (301 B.C.). Plutarch supplies us with the information that Chandragupta presented 500 elephants to Seleukos. More important details are given by Strabo who says:³

"The Indians occupy (in part) some of the countries situated along the Indus, which formerly belonged to the Persians: Alexander deprived the Ariani of them, and established there settlements (or provinces) of his own. But Seleucus Nicator gave them to Sandrocottus in consequence of a marriage contract, and received in turn 500 elephants." "The Indians occupied a larger portion of Ariana, which they had received from the Macedonians."⁴

It will be seen that the classical writers do not give us any detailed record of the actual conflict between Seleukos and Chandragupta. They merely speak of the results. There can be no doubt that the invader could not make much headway, and concluded an alliance which was cemented by a marriage contract. In his Aśoka⁵ Dr. Smith observes that the current notion that the Syrian

---

² Appianus uses the clear term *kedos* (connection by marriage), and Strabo (XV) only an *epigamia*. The cession of territory in consequence of the marriage contract clearly suggests that the wedding did take place.
³ H & F., III, p. 125.
⁴ Ibid, p. 78. Tarn. Greeks in Bactria and India, 100.
⁵ Third Ed., p. 15.
king 'gave his daughter in marriage' to Chandragupta is not warranted by the evidence, which testifies merely to a 'matrimonial alliance.' But the cession of territory "in consequence of the epigamia" may rightly be regarded as a dowry given to a bridegroom. The Indian Emperor obtained some of the provinces situated along the Indus which formerly belonged to the Persians. The ceded country comprised a large portion of Ariana itself, a fact ignored by Tarn. In exchange the Maurya monarch gave the "comparatively small recompense of 500 elephants". It is believed that the territory ceded by the Syrian king included the four satrapies: Aria, Arachosia, Gedrosia and the Paropanisadai, i.e., Herat, Kandahār, Makrān and Kābul. Doubts have been entertained about this by several scholars including Tarn. The inclusion of the Kābul valley within the Maurya Empire is, however, proved by the inscriptions of Aśoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, which speak of the Yonas and Gandhāras as vassals of the Empire. And the evidence of Strabo probably points to the cession by Seleukos of a large part of the Iranian Tableland besides the riparian provinces on the Indus.

**Megasthenes**

We learn from the classical writers that after the war the Syrian and Indian Emperors lived on friendly terms. Athenaios tells us that Chandragupta sent presents including certain powerful aphrodisiacs to the Syrian monarch.¹ Seleukos sent an envoy to the Maurya court, whose name was Megasthenes. Arrian tells

¹ *In. Alex.*, p. 405. Cf. Smith, *EHI*, 4th ed., p. 153. The treaty between Chandragupta and Seleukos ushered in a policy of philhellenism which bore fruit in the succeeding reigns. In the days of Bindusāra and Aśoka there was not only an exchange of embassies with the Hellenistic powers of the West, but the services of Greek philosophers and administrators were eagerly sought by the imperial government.
us1 that Megasthenes originally lived with Sibyrtios, the satrap of Arachosia. He was sent from thence to Pāṭaliputra where he often visited the Maurya Emperor, and wrote a history on Indian affairs. The work of Megasthenes has been lost. The fragments that survive in quotations by later authors like Strabo, Arrian, Diodoros and others, have been collected by Schwanbeck, and translated into English by McCrindle. As Professor Rhys Davids observes, Megasthenes possessed very little critical judgment, and was, therefore, often misled by wrong information received from others. But he is a truthful witness concerning matters which came under his personal observation. The most important piece of information supplied by him is, as Rhys Davids pointed out, the description of Pāṭaliputra which Arrian quotes in Chapter X of his Indica:

"The largest city in India, named Palimbothra, is in the land of the Prasians, where is the confluence of the river Erannobaos2 and the Ganges, which is the greatest of rivers. The Erannobaos would be third of the Indian rivers . . . . Megasthenes says that on the side where it is longest this city extends 80 stades (9½ miles) in length, and that its breadth is fifteen (1¾ miles); that the city has been surrounded with a ditch in breadth 6 plethra (606 feet), and in depth 30 cubits; and that its wall has 570 towers and 64 gates."

There were many other cities in the empire besides Pāṭaliputra. Arrian says, "It would not be possible to record with accuracy the number of the cities on account of their multiplicity. Those which are situated

1 Chinnock’s tr., p. 254.
3 Cf. Patañjali, IV, 3,2: "Pāṭaliputrakāh prāśadāḥ Pāṭaliputrakāh prākārā iti."
near the rivers or the sea are built of wood: for if they were built of brick they could not long endure on account of the rain and because the rivers overflowing their banks fill the plains with water. But those which have been founded in commanding places, lofty and raised above the adjacent country, are built of brick and mortar.” The most important cities of Chandragupta’s empire besides the metropolis, were Taxila, Ujjain, Kauśāmbi and possibly Puṇḍranagara.¹

Ælian gives the following account of the palace of Chandragupta. “In the Indian royal palace² where the greatest of all the kings of the country resides, besides much else which is calculated to excite admiration, and with which neither Susa, nor Ekbatana can vie (for, methinks, only the well-known vanity of the Persians could prompt such a comparison³), there are other wonders besides. In the parks tame peacocks are kept, and pheasants which have been domesticated; there are shady groves and pasture ground planted with trees, and branches of trees which the art of the woodsman has deftly interwoven; while some trees are native to the soil, others are brought from other parts, and with their beauty enhance the charms of the landscape. Parrots

¹ Puṇḍranagara has been identified with Mahāsthānagāth in the Bogra District of Bengal. The identification seems to be confirmed by an inscription, written in early Mauryan Brāhmī character, which has been discovered at Mahāsthāna. The record makes mention of Puṇḍranagala and its storehouse filled with coins styled Gaṇḍakas, Kākanikas, etc. and refers to a people called Saṇḍvargikas. (Barua, IHQ, 1934, March, 67 ff; D. R. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind., April, 1931, 83 ff; P. C. Sen, IHQ, 1933, 722 ff.) Dr. Bhandarkar reads Saṭṭha(ka)ṣṭha(ṣṭha) in the place of Saṇḍvargika which is more plausibly suggested by Dr. Barua. If the record really belongs to the early Maurya period the reference to coins is interesting. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal thinks that coins of the Maurya age bear certain symbols that can be recognized (cf. JRAS, 1936, 437 ff.).

² The "Saṇḍhaṅga" palace was the favourite resort of Chandragupta (JRAS., 1923, 587.)

³ The statement should be remembered by those modern writers who find traces of Persian influence in Maurya architecture.
are natives of the country, and keep hovering about the king and wheeling round him, and vast though their numbers be, no Indian ever eats a parrot. The Brachmans honour them highly above all other birds—because the parrot alone can imitate human speech. Within the palace grounds are artificial ponds in which they keep fish of enormous size but quite tame. No one has permission to fish for these except the king’s sons while yet in their boyhood. These youngsters amuse themselves while fishing in the unruffled sheet of water and learning how to sail their boats.”

The imperial palace probably stood close to the modern village of Kumrahâr. The unearthing of the ruins of the Maurya pillar-hall and palace near Kumrahâr, said to have been built on the model of the throne-room and palace of Darius at Persepolis, led Dr. Spooner to propound the theory that the Mauryas were Zoroastrians. Dr. Smith observed that the resemblance of the Maurya buildings with the Persian palace at Persepolis was not definitely established. Besides, as Professor Chanda observes, “Ethnologists do not recognize high class architecture as test of race, and in the opinion of experts the buildings of Darius and Xerxes at Persepolis are not Persian in style, but are mainly dependent on Babylonian models and bear traces of the influence of Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor.”

We learn from Strabo that the king usually remained within the palace under the protection of female guards.

---

1 McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, pp. 141-42.
5 The same writer tells us that these women were bought from their parents. In view of this statement it is rather surprising that Megasthenes is quoted as saying that none of the Indians employed slaves. Note also the story narrated by
(cf. śrī gānair dhanvidhiḥ of the Arthaśāstra) and appeared in public only on four occasions, viz., in time of war; to sit in his court as a judge; to offer sacrifice and to go on hunting expeditions.

Chandragupta's Government

Chandragupta was not only a great soldier and conqueror, he was a great administrator. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador at his court, has left detailed accounts of his system of government. The edict of his grandson Aśoka, and the Arthaśāstra attributed to his minister, Kauṭilya, confirm in many respects the particulars of the organisation of the empire given by the distinguished envoy. The Arthaśāstra certainly existed before Bāna (seventh century A.D.) and the Nandisūtra of the Jainas (not later than the fifth century A.D.). But it is doubtful if, in its present shape, it is as old as the time of the first Maurya. Reference to Chinapatṭa, China silk, which, be it remembered, occurs frequently in classical Sanskrit literature, points to a later date, as China was clearly outside the horizon of the early Mauryas, and is unknown to Indian epigraphy before the Nāgarjunikōṇḍa inscriptions. Equally noteworthy is the use of Sanskrit as the official language, a feature not characteristic of the Maurya epoch. A date as late as the Gupta period is, however, precluded by the absence of any reference to the Denarius in the sections dealing with weights and coins. Quite in keeping with this view is the reference to the Arthaśāstra contained in Jainà canonical works that were reduced to writing in the Gupta age. We have already adduced grounds for believing that Arthaśāstra probably existed before the second century A.D.¹

¹ Thucydides that Amintochates (i.e., Bindusāra) begged Antiochos Soter to buy and send him a professor (Menahan, The Early History of Bengal, pp. 164, 176, 179).
a comparatively late work, it may be used, like the Junāgadh Inscription of Rudradāman, to confirm and supplement the information gleaned from earlier sources.

The Supreme Government consisted of two main parts:

1. The Rājā and
2. The "Councillors" and "Assessors" (Mahāmātras, and Amātyas or Sachivas).

The Rājā or sovereign was the head of the state. He was considered to be a mere mortal, though a favoured mortal, the beloved of the deities.\(^1\) The possession of the material resources of a great empire and control over a vast standing army gave him real power. But there was a body of ancient rules, Porāṇā pakitī, which even the most masterful despot viewed with respect. The people were an important element of the state. They were looked upon as children for whose welfare the head of the state was responsible, and to whom he owed a debt which could only be discharged by good government. There was a certain amount of decentralisation, notably in the sphere of local government, and there was usually at the imperial headquarters, and also at the chief centres of provincial government, a body of ministers who had a right to be consulted specially in times of emergency. Nevertheless the powers of the king were extensive. He had military, judicial, legislative, as well as executive functions. We have already seen that one of the occasions when he left his palace was war.\(^2\) He considered plans of military operations with his Senāpati\(^3\) or Commander-in-Chief.

---

1. Cf. ante 196n 10.
2. Cf. Strabo, XV, i; and Kaṇṭilya Bk. X.
3. Kaṇṭil, p. 38. In the last days of the Maurya empire we find the Senāpati overshadowing the king and transferring to himself the allegiance of the troops.
He also sat in his court to administer justice. "He remains there all day thus occupied, not suffering himself to be interrupted even though the time arrives for attending to his person. This attention to his person consists of friction with pieces of wood, and he continues to listen to the cause, while the friction is performed by four attendants who surround him." The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra says, "when in the court, he (the king) shall never cause his petitioners to wait at the door, for when a king makes himself inaccessible to his people and entrusts his work to his immediate officers, he may be sure to engender confusion in business, and to cause thereby public disaffection, and himself a prey to his enemies. He shall, therefore, personally attend to the business of gods, of heretics, of Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas, of cattle, of sacred places, of minors, the aged, the afflicted, the helpless and of women;—all this in order (of enumeration) or according to the urgency or pressure of those works. All urgent calls he shall hear at once."

As to the king's legislative function we should note that the Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra calls him "dharmo-pravartaka," and includes Rājasāsana among the sources of law. As instances of royal "Śāsanas" or rescripts may be mentioned the Edicts of Aśoka, the famous grandson of Chandragupta.

Among executive functions of the king, our authorities mentions the posting of watchmen, attending to the accounts of receipts and expenditure, appointment of ministers, priests and superintendents, correspondence with the Mantriparishad or Council of Ministers, collection

---

of the secret information gathered by spies, reception of envoys, etc.\(^1\)

It was the king who laid down the broad lines of policy and issued rescripts for the guidance of his officers and the people. Control was maintained over the most distant officials by an army of secret reporters and overseers and, in the days of Chandragupta’s grandson, by itinerant judges. Communication with them was kept up by a network of roads, and garrisons were posted at strategic points.

Kauṭilya holds that Rājatva (sovereignty) is possible only with assistance.\(^2\) A single wheel can never move. Hence the king shall employ Sachivas and hear their opinion. The Sachivas or Amātyas of Kauṭilya correspond to the “seventh caste” of Megasthenes which assisted the king in deliberating on public affairs. This class was small in numbers, but in wisdom and justice excelled all the others.\(^3\)

The most important amongst the Sachivas or Amātyas were undoubtedly the Mantrins or High Ministers, probably corresponding to the Mahāmātras of Aśoka’s Rock Edict VI and the “advisers of the king” referred to by Diodoros.\(^4\) They were selected from those Amātyas whose character had been tested under all kinds of allurements.\(^5\) They were given the highest salary, viz., 48,000 paṇas per annum.\(^6\) They assisted the king in examining

---

1. Kauṭilya, Bk. I, Ch. xvi; xvi; Bk. VIII, Ch. i. Cf. Aśoka’s Rock Edicts III (regulation about alpa eyagatā and alpa bhāndatā), V (appointment of high officials), VI (relations with the Parishad, and collection of information from the Paṭivedakā), and XIII (diplomatic relations with foreign powers).
2. Cf. Manu, VII. 55.
3. Chinnock, Arrian, p. 413.
4. II. 41.
5. Sarvopadā śuddān Mantrināḥ kuryāt.—Arthaśāstra, 1919, p 17. For upadā see also the Junāgadh Rock Inscription of Skanda Gupta.
6. Kauṭilya, p. 247. According to Smith (EH1, 4th ed., p. 119) the value of a silver paṇa may be taken as not far from a shilling.
the character of the Amātyas who were employed in ordinary departments. All kinds of administrative measures were preceded by consultation with three or four of them. In works of emergency (ātyāyike kārye) they were summoned along with the Mantriparishad. They exercised a certain amount of control over the Imperial Princes. They accompanied the king to the battle-field, and gave encouragement to the troops. Kauṭilya was evidently one of those Mantrins. Another minister (or Pradesṭri?) was apparently Maniyatappo, a Jaṭilian, who helped the king to ‘‘confer the blessings of peace on the country by extirpating marauders who were like unto thorns.’’ That there were at times more than one Mantrin is proved by the use of the plural Mantrinah.

In addition to the Mantrins there was the Mantriparishad, i.e., Assembly of Counsellors or Council of Ministers. The existence of the Parishad as an important element of the Maurya constitution is proved by the third and sixth Rock Edicts of Aśoka. The members of the Mantriparishad were not identical with the Mantrins. In several passages of Kauṭilya’s Arthasastra the Mantrins are sharply distinguished from the Mantriparishad. The latter evidently occupied an inferior position. Their salary was only 12,000 paṇas, whereas the salary of a Mantrin was 48,000. They do not appear to have been consulted on ordinary occasions, but were summoned

1 Ibid., p. 16.
2 Ibid., pp. 26, 28.
3 Ibid., p. 29. Cf. Aśoka’s Rock Edict VI.
4 Ibid., p. 333.
5 Ibid., p. 363. Cf. the Udayagiri Inscription of Śāva.
6 Turnour’s Mahāvamsa, p. xiii. The evidence is late.
7 Note also Pliny’s reference to noble and rich Indians who sit in council with the king (Monahan, The Early History of Bengal, 148) ; cf. Mbh. iii, 127.
8 Amātyaparshad; xii, 320, 139 Amatya Samiti.
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along with the Mantrins when Ātyayika kārya,¹ i.e., works of emergency had to be transacted. The king was to be guided by the decision of the majority (Bhūyishṭhāḥ). They also attended the king at the time of the reception of envoys.² From the passage “Mantriparishadam dvadaśāmātyāyān kuruśta”—“the Council of Ministers should consist of twelve Amātyas,” it appears that the Parishad used to be recruited from all kinds of Amātyas (not necessarily from Mantrins alone). From Kauṭilya’s denunciation of a king with a “Kshudraparishad,” a small council, his rejection of the views of the Mānavas, Bārhaspatyas and the Auṣanasas, his preference for an “Akshudra-parishad,” a council that is not small, and his reference to Indra’s Parishad of a thousand Rishis, it may be presumed that he wanted to provide for the needs of a growing empire. Such an empire was undoubtedly that of Chandragupta who may have been prevailed upon by his advisers to constitute a fairly big assembly.⁴

Besides the Mantrins and the Mantriparishad, there was another class of Amātyas who filled the great administrative and judicial appointments.⁵ The Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra says⁶ that the “dharmopadhāśuddha” Amātyas, officers purified by religious test, should be employed in

² Arthaśāstra, p. 45.
³ P. 259.
⁴ The Divyāvadāna (p. 372) refers to the five hundred councillors (Panchāmātyāgadāṇi) of Bindusāra, son and successor of Chandragupta Maurya. Paṇṭāṇjali refers to Chandragupta Sahā. But we have no indication as to its constitution.
⁵ Cf. the Karma-Saṃhitās of the Junāgadhī Rock Inscription of Rudra-dāman I.
civil\textsuperscript{1} and criminal\textsuperscript{2} courts; the "arthopadhāśuddha" Amātyas, officers purified by money-test, should be employed as Samāhartri ("Chancellor of the Exchequer and Minister of the Interior") and Sannidhātṛi (High Treasurer and Keeper of Stores);\textsuperscript{3} the "kāmopadhāśuddha" Amātyas, officials purified by love-test, should be appointed to superintend the pleasure grounds, the "bhayopadhāśuddha" Amātyas, officers purified by fear-test, should be appointed to do work requiring immediate attention (āsanna kārya), while those who are proved to be impure should be employed in mines, timber and elephant forests,\textsuperscript{4} and manufactories. Untried Amātyas were to be employed in ordinary or insignificant departments (sāmānya adhikaraṇa). Persons endowed with the qualifications required in an Amātya (Amātyasampadopeta) were appointed Nisrīṣṭārthāh or Ministers Plenipotentiary, Lekhakas or Ministers of Correspondence, and Adhyakshas or Superintendents.

The statements of the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra regarding the employment of Amātyas as the chief executive and judicial officers of the realm, are confirmed by the classical writers. Strabo, for example, observes,\textsuperscript{5} "the seventh caste consists of counsellors and assessors (Συμβουλοί and Συνεδροί) of the king. To these persons belong the offices of state, tribunals of justice, and the whole

\textsuperscript{1} Civil (Dharmasthīṭya) Courts were established "in the cities of Saṅgrahāya (in the midst of a collection of ten villages), Dronamukha (in the centre of four hundred villages), Sthāniya (in the centre of eight hundred villages), and at places where districts met (Janapada-sandhi; union of districts)," and consisted of three Dharmasthas (judges versed in the sacred law) and three Amātyas.

\textsuperscript{2} A Criminal (Kauṭjakadodhana) Court consisted of 3 Amātyas, or 3 Pradesaṭris. The functions of the latter will be described later on.

\textsuperscript{3} For the duties of these officers see Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, Bk. II, 5-6, 35; Bk. IV, 4; Bk. V, 2. For the revenue system under the Mauryas, see Ghoshal, Hindu Revenue System, pp. 165 ff.

\textsuperscript{4} Cf. Nāgarāna of Pillar Edict V.

administration of affairs." Arrian also says, "from them are chosen their rulers, governors of provinces, deputies, treasurers, generals, admirals, controllers of expenditure, and superintendents of agriculture."

The adhyakshas who formed the pivot of the Kauṭiliya administration, are evidently referred to by Strabo's translators as "Magistrates" in the following passage:¹

"Of the Magistrates, some have the charges of the market,² others of the city, others of the soldiery.³ Some have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, and inspect the closed reservoirs from which water is distributed by canals, so that all may have an equal use of it. These persons have charge also of the hunters, and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either. They collect the taxes, and superintend the occupations connected with land, as wood-cutters, carpenters, workers in brass, and miners. They superintend the public roads, and place a pillar at every ten stadia to indicate the byways and distances. Those who have charge of the city (astynomoi) are divided into six bodies of five each.⁵ Next to the Magistrates of the city is a third body of governors, who have the care of military affairs. This class also consists of six divisions each composed of five persons.⁶

¹ One class of Adhyakshas, those in charge of women, are referred to in the Aśokan inscriptions as Mahāmātrās.
² "District" according to the Cambridge History of India, I. 417.
³ Cf. the Durgā-rāṣṭra-dauḍa-mahāīgas of Kauṭiliya, Bk. XIII, Chs. III and V.
⁴ i.e., the district officials (Agronomoi).
⁵ Each body was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., (1) the mechanical arts, (2) foreign residents, (3) registration of births and deaths, (4) trade, commerce, weights and measures, (5) supervision and sale of manufactured articles and (6) collection of tithes on sales. In their collective capacity they looked after public buildings, markets, harbours and temples. Prices were regulated by them.
⁶ Each division or Board was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., the navy, transport and commissariat (cf. Vaiṣhāti karmāṇi of
The Magistrates in charge of the city and those in charge of military affairs are evidently the same as the Nagarādhyakshas and Balādhyakshas of the Arthaśāstra. Dr. Smith remarks, "the Boards described by Megasthenes as in charge of the business of the capital and the army are unknown to the author (Kautūlya), who contemplated each such charge as the duty of a single officer. The creation of the Boards may have been an innovation effected by Chandragupta personally." But the historian overlooks the fact that Kautūlya distinctly says: "Bahumukhyam anityam chādhikaranam sthāpayet," "each department shall be officered by several temporary heads;" "Adhyakshāḥ Saṅkhyāyaka-Lekhaka-Rūpadarśaka-Nivigrāhak-Ottarādhyaksha-sakhā karmāni kuryah, "the Superintendents shall carry on their duties with the assistance of accountants, scribes, coin-exminers, stock-takers and additional secret overseers." Evidently Dr. Smith notices only the Adhyakshas but ignores the existence of the Uttarādhyakshas and others. As in regard to the Arthaśāstra Smith notices only the Adhyakshas, so in regard to the classical accounts he takes note only of the

Kautūlya, Bk. X, Ch. iv), the infantry, the cavalry, the chariots and the elephants.
In the Sāntipāra of the Mahābhārata the divisions are stated to be six (CIIL. 38) or eight (LIX. 41-42):
Rathā Nāgā Hāyāścaiva Pādātāścaiva Pāṇḍava
Vishṭir Nāvād Charāścaiva Desikā iti chāśṭamām
Āgāṇyelāni Kauraśya pракāśāni balasya tu

"Chariots, elephants, horses, infantry burden-carriers, ships, spics with local guides as the eighth—these are the open "limbs" of a fighting force, O descendant of Kuru."

The Raghunāthā IV, 26) refers to Shāvcedham bālam. Cf. Mbh. V. 96. 16.
1 Mysore Ed., 1919, p. 55. Nagara-Dhānya-Vyāchārika-Kārmāntika-
2 EHI, 1914, p. 141. Cf. Monahan, Early History of Bengal, pp. 157-61,
Stein, Megasthenes und Kautūlya, pp. 233 ff.
3 Arthaśāstra, 1919, p. 60. On page 57 we have the following passage—
Hasty-aśva-ratha-pādatām-aneka-mukhyam-aavasthāpayet, i.e., elephants, cavalry,
chariots, and infantry shall each be placed under many chiefs.
Boards, but ignores the **chiefs** who are expressly mentioned in two passages,¹ viz.—

"One division is associated with the Chief Naval Superintendent," "another (division) is associated with the person who has the charge of the bullock-teams."² The Chief Naval Superintendent and the Person in Charge of the Bullock-teams, doubtless, correspond to the Nāvadhyaksha and the Go’dhyaksha of the Arthaśāstra. It is a mistake to think that the Nāvadhyaksha of the early Hindu period was a purely civil official, for he was responsible for the destruction of Himsrikās (pirate ships?) and the Mahābhārata³ clearly refers to the navy as one of the aṅgas or limbs of the Royal Forces. The civil duties of the Nāvadhyaksha have their counterpart in those of Megasthenes' Admiral relating to the "letting out of ships on hire for the transport both of passengers and merchandise."

Central popular assemblies like those that existed among the Lichchhavis, Mallas, Sākyas and other Saṅghas had no place in the Maurya constitution. The custom of summoning a great assembly of Grāmikas or Village Headmen seems also to have fallen into disuse. The royal council gradually became an aristocratic body attended only by nobles and rich men.⁴

**Administration of Justice**

At the head of the judiciary stood the king himself. Besides the royal court there were special tribunals of justice both in cities (nagara) and country parts (janapada) presided over by Vyāvahārika Mahāmātras and Rajākās respectively. Greek writers refer to judges who listened

---

¹ H. & F., Strabo, III, p. 104.
² XII. lxi, 41-42.
³ Strabo, XV, 1, 46.
⁴ Pliny quoted in Mouhan’s *Early History of Bengal*, 148.
to cases of foreigners. Petty cases in villages were doubtless decided by the headmen and the village elders. All our authorities testify to the severity of the penal code. But the rigours of judicial administration were sought to be mitigated by Asoka, grandson of Chandragupta, who meted out equal justice to all and instituted the system of itinerant Mahāmātras to check maladministration in the outlying provinces. Considerable discretion was, however, allowed to the Rājukas. We are informed by Greek writers that “theft was a thing of very rare occurrence” among Indians. They express their surprise at this for they go on to observe that the people “have no written laws but are ignorant of writing, and conduct all matters by memory.” The assertion about the Indians’ ignorance of writing is hardly correct. Nearcirus and Curtius record that Indians use pieces of closely woven linen and the tender bark of trees for writing on. Strabo tells us that a philosopher who has any useful suggestion to offer, commits it to writing. Attention may also be invited to the marks on Mauryan pillars intended to show the by-roads and distances.1

**Provincial Government**

The Empire was divided into a number of provinces which were subdivided into āhāras or vishayas (districts), because “No single administration could support the Atlantean load.” The exact number of provinces in Chandragupta’s time is unknown. In the time of his grandson, Asoka, there were at least five, *viz.*:

1. Uttarāpatha a capital, Taxila
2. Avantirāṭha a Ujjyini

---

1 Monahan, Early History of Bengal, pp. 143, 157, 167 f.
2 Dieyācādāna, p. 407.
3 The Questions of King Milinda, pt. II, p. 250n. Mahārakṣa Ch. XIII; Mahābodhiūṃsa, p. 98.
3. Dakshiṇāpatha capital, Suvarṇagiri (?)
4. Kaliṅga Tosali
5. Prāchya, Prāchina (Prasii) Pāṭaliputra.

Of these only the first two and the last one can be said, with any amount of certainty, to have formed parts of Chandragupta’s Empire. But it is not altogether improbable that Dakshiṇāpatha, too, was one of Chandragupta’s provinces. The outlying provinces were ruled by princes of the blood royal who were usually styled Kumāras. We learn from the Kauṭīlīya Arthaśāstra that the salary of a Kumāra was 12,000 paṇas per annum.

The Home Provinces, i.e., Prāchya and the Madhyadeśa (Eastern India and Mid-India), were directly ruled by the Emperor himself with the assistance of Mahāmātras or High Officers stationed in important cities like Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbi, etc.

Besides the Imperial Provinces, Maurya India included a number of territories which enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy. Arrian refers to peoples who were autonomous and cities which enjoyed a democratic Government. The Kauṭīlīya Arthaśāstra refers to a number of Saṅghas i.e., economic, military or political corporations or confederations evidently enjoying autonomy in certain matters, e.g., Kamboja, Surāśṭra, etc. The Kambojas find prominent mention as a unit in the Thirteenth Rock Edict of Aśoka. R. E. V. alludes to various nations or peoples on the western border (Aparāṭā) in addition to those named specifically. It is not improbable that Surāśṭra was included among these nations which, judged by the title of its local rulers, enjoyed a

---

1 Cf. the Questions of Milinda, II. 250n.
2 P. 247.
3 Monahan, The Early History of Bengal, 160; Chinnoek, Arrian, 413.
4 P. 378.
5 I. H. Q. 1931, 631.
considerable amount of autonomy. The commentary on
the Petavatthu refers to one of the local Rājās named
Piṅgala, the contemporary of Aśoka. Another contempo-
rary, the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha finds mention in
Rudradāman’s inscription at Junāgadh. The Yavana-rāja
was probably a Greek chief of the North-West who
was appointed to look after the affairs of Surāśṭra by
Aśoka, just as Rājā Mān Singh of Amber was appointed
Subadār of Bengal by Akbar. His relations with Aśoka
may also be compared to that subsisting between the Rājā
of the Śākyas state and Pasenadi. In the time of the first
Maurya Surāśṭra had an officer named Pushyagupta,
the Vaiśya who is described as a Rāṣhṭriya of Chandrag-
gupta. In the Bombay Gazetteer, the word Rāṣhṭriya
was taken to mean a brother-in-law. Kiellhorn, however,
in the Epigraphia Indica, took the term to mean a
provincial Governor. This rendering does not seem to
be quite adequate because we have already seen that
Surāśṭra had possibly its group of Rājās in the Maurya Age
and could not be regarded as an Imperial Province under
a bureaucratic governor of the ordinary type. The
Rāṣhṭriya of the inscription seems to have been a sort of
Imperial High Commissioner, and the position of
Pushyagupta in Surāśṭra was probably like that of Lord

1 Law, Buddhist Conception of Spirits, 47 ff.
2 Attempts in recent times to assign Tushāspha to the post-Aśokan period
lack plausibility. In the Junāgadh epigraph the name of the suzerain invariably
accompanies that of the local ruler or officer. There is no reason to think that
the relationship between Aśoka and Tushāspha was different from that between
Chandragupta and Pushyagupta or between Rudradāman and Suviśākha.
4 Vol. VIII, p. 46.
5 Cf. the type met with in the Near East after the First World War. The High
Commissioner acted for the de facto paramount power. His office does not pre-
clude the possibility of the existence of a local potentate or potentates. Note also
Wendell Wilkie’s observation (One World, p. 13) on the British “ambassador”
to Egypt who is “for all practical purposes its actual ruler.”
Cromer in Egypt. Neither the *Arthashastra* nor the edicts of Aśoka mention clearly any class of officials called *Rāṣṭriya*. It is, however, probable, that the *Rāṣṭriya* was identical with the *Rāṣṭrapāla* whose salary was equal to that of a *Kumāra* or Prince.

A hereditary bureaucracy does not seem to have come to existence in the early Maurya period at least in the territory of Surāśṭra. The assumption of the title of Rājā by local rulers and the grant of autonomy to the Rājukas in the days of Aśoka ultimately let loose centrifugal forces which must have helped in the dismemberment of the empire.

**Overseers and Spies**

The classical writers refer to a class of men called Overseers (Episkopoì) who "overlook what is done throughout the country and in the cities, and make report to the king where the Indians are ruled by a king, or the magistrates where the people have a democratic Govern-

---

1 The Aśoka inscriptions, however, mention the *Rāṣṭhikas* and the Pāli *English Dictionary*, edited by Rhys Davids and Stede compares *Rāṣṭhika* with *Rāṣṭriya*.

2 *Arthashastra*, p. 247. For *Rāṣṭriya* see also *Mbh.*, XII. 85, 19; 87. 9. According to Amara (V, 14) a *Rāṣṭriya* is a *rājaśāla* (brother-in-law of the king). But Kabiravāmin says in his commentary that except in a play a *Rāṣṭriya* is a *Rāṣṭradhikṛita*, i.e., an officer appointed to look after or supervise the affairs of a *rāṣṭra*, state or province. Cf., the Macedonian episkopoì. Note the position of Eudamas in relation to the Indian Rājās of the Panjāb, and that of Pratihāra Tāttrapālas of the tenth century A.D. Dr. Bara draws attention (in *IC*, X, 1944, pp. 88 ff.) to several texts including Buddhaghoṣa’s statement that during a royal state-drive the place assigned to the *Rāṣṭriyas* was just between the Mahāmātras and Brahmīns shouting the joy of victory. They themselves were gorgeously dressed holding swords and the like in their hands. This may well be true. But the texts cited by him are not adequate enough to prove that in the days of Chandragupta Maurya the *Rāṣṭrika* or *Rāṣṭriya* was nothing more than the foremost among the bankers, business magnates, etc., who functioned as Mayors, Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace. The analogy of Tushāṣpaha and Savisākha mentioned in the same epigraph suggests that the *Rāṣṭriya* here was a more exalted functionary, and that the evidence of Kabiravāmin cannot be lightly brushed aside.
ment." Strabo calls this class of men the Ephori or Inspectors. "They are," says he, "intrusted with the superintendence of all that is going on, and it is their duty to report privately to the king...The best and the most faithful persons are appointed to the office of Inspectors." The Overseer of Arrian and the Inspector of Strabo may correspond to the Rāṣṭriya of the Junāgadh Inscription or to the Pradesṭri or the Gāḍhā-Purushas (secret emissaries) of the Arthaśāstra. Pradesṭri may be derived from Pradiś which means 'to point,' 'to communicate.'

Strabo speaks of different classes of Inspectors. He tells us that the City Inspectors employed as their co-adjutors the city courtesans; and the Inspectors of the Camp, the women who followed it. The employment of women of easy virtue as spies is also alluded to by the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra. According to that work there were two groups of spies, viz.:

1. Samsthāḥ, or stationary spies, consisting of secret agents styled Kāpatika, Udāsthita, Grihapatika, Vaidehaka and Tāpasa, i.e., fraudulent disciples, recluses, householders, merchants and ascetics.

2. Saṃchārāḥ or wandering spies, including emissaries termed Satri, Tikshna and Rashada, i.e., classmates, firebrands and poisoners and certain women described as Bhikshukis (mendicants), Parivrājikās (wandering nuns), Munḍas (shavelings) and Vṛishalis. It is to the last class, viz., the Vṛishalis that Strabo evidently refers. We

---

1 Chinneck, Arrian, p. 413.  
2 H. and F., Strabo, III, p. 103.  
3 cf., Thomas, JRAI., 1915, p. 97.  
4 cf., Lüders, Ins. No. 1900.  
5 A Vṛishali is taken to mean a gaṇikā or courtesan by the author of the Bhagavatamajjuśikam (p. 94).
have also explicit references to courtesan (puṁśchali, veśyā, rūpājivā) spies in the *Arthaśāstra.*

**Care of Foreigners**

It is clear from the accounts of Diodorus and Strabo that the Maurya government took special care of foreigners. Among the Indians officers are appointed even for foreigners, whose duty is to see that no foreigner is wronged. Should any one of them lose his health, they send physicians to attend him, and take care of him otherwise, and if he dies they bury him, and deliver over such property as he leaves to his relatives. The judges also decide cases in which foreigners are concerned with the greatest care and come down sharply on those who take unfair advantage of them.

**Village Administration**

The administrative and judicial business of villages was, in Ancient India, carried on by the *Grāmikas,* *Grāmabhojakas* or *Āyuktas* who were, no doubt, assisted by the village elders. The omission of the *Grāmika* from the list of salaried officials given in the *Arthaśāstra* is significant. It probably indicates that in the days of the author of the treatise the *Grāmika* was not a salaried official.

---

1 Pp. 324, 316 of the *Arthaśāstra* (1919).
2 II. 42.
3 XV. I. 50.
5 Fick, *Social Organisation,* 162; *Arthashastra,* pp. 157. 172. Cf. Lüders, Ins. Nos. 48, 69a. The Kāliṅga Edicts refer to *Āyuktas* who helped the princely viceroys and Mahāmātras in carrying out Imperial Policy. In the early Post-Mauryan and Soythian Age they are distinctly referred to as village officials (Lüders' *List,* No. 1347). In the Gupta Age the designation is applied to various functionaries including district officers.
7 Bk. V, Ch. III.
servant of the crown, but possibly an elected official of the villagers. The king's servant in the village was the Grāmabhṛitaka or Grāma-bhojaka. Above the Grāmiṣa the Arthaśāstra places the Gopa, who looked after 5 or 10 villages, and the Stānika who controlled one quarter of a janapada or district. The work of these officers was supervised, according to that treatise by the Samāhartri with the help of the Pradeshtris. Rural administration must have been highly efficient. We are told by Greek observers that the tillers of the soil received adequate protection from all injury and would devote the whole of their time to cultivation.

Revenue and Expenditure

The cost of civil and military administration even at the centre must have been enormous. The chief sources of revenue from villages were the Bhāga and the Bali. The Bhāga was the king's share of the produce of the soil which was normally fixed at one-sixth, though in special cases it was raised to one-fourth or reduced to one-eighth. Bali seems to have been an extra impost from the payment of which certain tracts were exempted. According to Greek writers husbandmen paid, in addition to a fourth part of the produce of the soil, a land tribute because, according to their

1 There is, however, evidence to show that in early times adhikṛitas were appointed for villages by the paramount ruler (Praśna Upanishad, III. 4).
2 Artha, pp. 175, 248.
3 The Grāma-bhojaka of the Jātakas was an āmātya of the king (Fick, Social Organization in N.-E. Ind. p. 160).
4 The Gopas proper do not find mention in early epigraphs but Lüders, Ins. No. 1266, mentions "Senā-gopas."
5 Artha, pp. 142, 217. We do not know how far the system described in the treatise on polity applies to the early Maurya period. In the days of Aśoka the work of supervision was done largely by special classes of Mahāmātrās (cf. R.E.V. and the Kaliṅga Edicts), Pulīsā (agents) and Rājukas (Pillar Edict. IV).
belief, "all India is the property of the crown and no private person is permitted to own land." Taxes on land were collected by the Agronomoi who measured the land and superintended the irrigation works. Other state dues included tribute and prescribed services from those who worked at trades, and cattle from herdsmen. In urban areas the main sources of revenue included birth and death taxes, fines and tithes on sales. The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali has an interesting reference to the Mauryas’ love of gold which led them to deal in images of deities. The distinction between taxes levied in rural and in fortified areas respectively is known to the Arthaśāstra which refers to certain high revenue functionaries styled the Samāhartri and the Sannidhātri. No such officials are, however, mentioned in Maurya inscriptions. Greek writers, on the other hand, refer to ‘treasurers of the state’ or ‘superintendents of the treasury’.

A considerable part of the revenue was spent on the army. The artisans, too, received maintenance from the Imperial exchequer. Herdsmen and hunters received an allowance of grain in return for clearing the land of wild beasts and fowls. Another class which benefited from royal bounty were the philosophers among whom were included Brāhmaṇas as well as Sramaṇas or ascetics. Vast sums were also spent for irrigation, construction of roads, erection of buildings and fortifications, and establishment of hospitals in the days of Chandragupta’s grandson.

The Last Days of Chandragupta

Jaina tradition recorded in the Rājāvalikathe\(^1\) avers that Chandragupta was a Jaina and that, when a great famine occurred, he abdicated in favour of his son

\(^1\) Ind. Ant., 1892, 157.
Simhasena and repaired to Mysore where he died. Two inscriptions on the north bank of the Kaveri near Seringapatam of about 900 A.D., describe the summit of the Kalbappu Hill, i.e., Chandragiri, as marked by the footprints of Bhadrabahu and Chandragupta Munipati.\footnote{Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, pp. 3-4.} Dr. Smith observes:\footnote{The Oxford History of India, p. 75. As already stated, Fleet is sceptical about the Jaina tradition (Ind. Ant., 1922, 153 f.). According to Greek evidence Chandragupta was a follower of the sacrificial religion (see p. 277 ante). The epithet Vīrāhālī applied to him in the Mūḍrādrakṣhara suggests that in regard to certain matters he did deviate from strict orthodoxy (Indian Culture, II, No. 3, pp. 558 ff. See also C. J. Shah, Jainism in Northern India, 135n, 138).} "The Jaina tradition holds the field, and no alternative account exists." Chandragupta died about 300 B.C., after a reign of 24 years.\footnote{For the date of Chandragupta Maurya see Indian Culture, Vol II, No. 3, pp. 560 ff. Buddhist tradition of Ceylon puts the date 162 years after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, i.e., in 382 B.C., if we take 544 B.C., to be the year of the Great Disease; and 324 B.C., if we prefer the Cantonese date 486 B.C., for the death of the Buddha. The earlier date is opposed to Greek evidence. The date 334 B.C. accords with the testimony of Greek writers. The Jaina date 313 B.C., for Chandragupta's accession if it is based on a correct tradition, may refer to his acquisition of Avanti in Malwa, as the chronological datum is found in a verse where the Maurya king finds mention in a list of successors of Pālaka, king of Avanti. Cf. I.H.Q., 1929, p. 403. Filliozat (Manuel des études indiennes, I, 212-219) and others who prefer the late Jaina evidence, ignore the much earlier Cantonese testimony, see Raychaudhuri, H.C.I.P., AIU, Vol II, 92 ff: ANM 136 ff; the date 313 B.C. moreover does not accord well with what is known about the synchronism of Aśoka with some of the Hellenistic kings mentioned in Edict XIII, notably Magas of Cyrene whom a contemporary poet, Callimachus seems to place long before the Syrian War of Ptolemy III (c. 247-6 B.C.).}"

If the Parīśīṭaparvan\footnote{VIII, 429-443, For another tradition see Bigandet, II, 198} of Hemachandra is to be believed Chandragupta had a queen named Durdharā who became the mother of Bindusāra, the son who succeeded him on the throne. In the absence of corroborative evidence, however, the name of the queen cannot be accepted as genuine.
Chandragupta Maurya was succeeded in or about the year 300 B.C. by his son Bindusāra Amitrāghāta. The name or title Amitrāghāta (slayer of foes) is a restoration in Sanskrit of the Amitrachates of Athenaios, and Allitrochades of Strabo, who is stated to have been the son of Sandrocottus. Fleet prefers the rendering Amitrakhāda or devourer of enemies, which is said to occur as an epithet of Indra. In the Rājāvalikathe the name of Chandragupta’s son and successor is given as Simhasena. From Aśoka’s Rock Edict VIII (e.g. the Kālsi Text) it appears probable that Bindusāra, as well as other predecessors of Aśoka, used the style Devināmpiya.

If the author of the Ārya-Manjuśrī Mūla Kalpa, Hemachandra and Tāranātha are to be believed, Kauṭilīya or Chāṇakya continued to serve as minister for some time after the accession of Bindusāra. “Chāṇakya says Tāranātha, “one of his (Bindusāra’s) great lords, procured the destruction of the nobles and kings of sixteen

---

1 Cf., Weber, IA, ii (1879), p. 148, Lassen, and Cunningham (Bhilas Topes, p. 92). The term Amitrāghāta occurs in Paññjali’s Mahābhāṣya III. 2. 2. Cf., also Mbh. 30. 19; 62. 8; VII.22.16, where Amitrāghātin occurs as an epithet of princes and warriors. Dr. Jari Charpentier observes (in Le Monde Oriental, quoted in Calcutta Review, May-June, 1926, p. 399), “that the Greek word Amitrachates as a synonym of Bindusāra, should be rendered Amitrāghāta seems clear not only from the Mahābhāṣya but also from the royal title amitrānāh hantā in Ait. Br., VIII. 17.” In JRAS., 1928, January, however, he prefers to restore Amitrachates as Amitrakhāda (p. 135). Cf. Rig-veda, X. 152. 1.


3 Jacobi, Parishīṣṭaparvan, p. 62; VIII. 446 ff; Ind. Ant., 1875, etc. For the alleged connection of Bindusāra and Chāṇakya with another minister named Subandhu, the author of the Vāsavadattā Nāṭypadhārā, see Proceedings of the Second Oriental Conference, pp. 206-11 and Parishīṣṭa, VIII. 447. The Dīvyāvaḍāna (p.372) mentions Khalāṭaka as Bindusāra’s agrāmātya or chief minister.
towards, and made the king master of all the territory between the eastern and western seas. The conquest of the territory between the eastern and western seas has been taken by some scholars to refer to the annexation of the Deccan. But we should not forget that already in the time of Chandragupta the Maurya Empire extended from Surāshṭra to Bengal (Gangaridae), i.e., from the western to the eastern sea. Tāranātha’s statement need mean nothing more than the suppression of a general revolt. No early tradition expressly connects the name of Bindusāra with the conquest of the Deccan. The story of the subjugation of sixteen towns may or may not be true, but we are told in the Divyāvadāna that at least one town of note, viz., Taxila, revolted during the reign of Bindusāra. The king is said to have despatched Aśoka there. While the prince was nearing Taxila with his troops, the people came out to meet him, and said, “We are not opposed to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra, but the wicked ministers (Dushtāmātyāh) insult us”. The high-handedness of the Maurya officials in the outlying provinces is alluded to by Aśoka himself in his Kaliṅga Edict. Addressing his Mahāmātras the Emperor says:

“All men are my children: and, just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. You, however, do

---

1 Were these the capitals of the sixteen maha-janapadas?
3 See, however, Subramaniam, JRAS., 1923, p. 96, “My Guru’s Guru had written in his commentary on a Sangam work that the Tulu-nāḍa was established by the son of Chandragupta,” perhaps Tuliyan (Tuli=Bindu).
4 Cowell and Neil’s Ed., p. 371.
not grasp this truth to its full extent.¹ Some individual, perchance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well established. Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture, and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, many other people are deeply grieved. In such a case you must desire to do justice² ...and for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons (Mahāmātras) as are of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life, who knowing this my purpose will comply with my instructions.³ From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out a similar body of officials and will not over-pass three years. In the same way from Taxila.'

Taxila made its submission to Aśoka. The Maurya prince is further represented as entering the ‘Svaśa rājya’ (Khaśa according to Burnouf).⁴

### Foreign Relations

In his relations with the Hellenistic powers Bindusāra pursued a pacific policy. We learn from the classical

---

¹ "You do not learn how far this (my) object reaches." (Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Aśoka, p. 95).

² "It happens in the administration (of justice) that a single person suffers either imprisonment or harsh treatment. In this case (an order) cancelling the imprisonment is (obtained) by him accidentally, while (many) other people continue to suffer. In this case you must strive to deal (with all of them) impartially." (Hultzsch, p. 96).

³ "I shall send out every five years (a Mahāmātra) who will be neither harsh nor fierce, (but) of gentle actions (cīr., in order to ascertain) whether (the judicial officers) paying attention to this object...are acting thus, as my instruction (implies)." (Hultzsch p. 97).

⁴ Dieyāvedāna, p. 379. The emendation Khaśa is supported by the testimony of Tārauṇātha (IHQ, 1930, 334). For the Khaśas see JASB, (Extra No. 2, 1899).
writers that the king of Syria despatched to his court an ambassador named Deimachos. Pliny tells us that (Ptolemy II) Philadelphos King of Egypt (B. C. 285-247), sent an envoy named Dionysios. Dr. Smith points out that it is uncertain whether Dionysios presented his credentials to Bindusāra or to his son and successor, Aśoka. It is, however, significant that while Greek and Latin writers refer to Chandragupta and Amitraghāta they do not mention Aśoka. This is rather inexplicable if an envoy whose writings were utilized by later authors, really visited the third of the great Mauryas, Patrokles, an officer who served under both Seleukos and his son, sailed in the Indian seas and collected much geographical information which Strabo and Pliny were glad to utilize. Athenaios tells an anecdote of private friendly correspondence between Antiochos (I, Soter), king of Syria, and Bindusāra which indicates that the Indian monarch communicated with his Hellenistic contemporaries on terms of equality and friendliness. We are told on the authority of Hagesander that Amitrochātes (Bindusāra), the king of the Indians, wrote to Antiochos asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs, and a sophist, and Antiochos replied: We shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold. In connection with the demand for a Greek sophist it is interesting to recall the statement of Diodoros that one Iamboulos was carried to the king of Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra) who had a great love for the Graecians. Dion Chrysostom asserts that the poetry of Homer is sung by the Indians

1 e. g., Strabo.
2 McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 108.
4 McCrindle, Inv. Alex., p. 400. Hultzsch, Aśoka, p. xxxv. Bindusāra’s interest in philosophy is also proved by his association with Ajiva-parivrājakas, (Divyāvacāda, 370 ff), Cf., also the first lines of Pillar Edict VII.
who had translated it into their own language and modes of expression. Garga and Varāhamihira in a later age testify to the honour that was paid to Greeks for their knowledge of astronomy.

Bindusāra's Family

Bindusāra had many children besides Aśoka, the son who succeeded him on the throne. We learn from a passage of the Fifth Rock Edict in which the duties of the Dharma-mahāmātras are described, that Aśoka had many brothers and sisters. The Divyāvadāna mentions two of these brothers, namely, Susīma and Vigataśoka. The Ceylonese Chronicles seem also to refer to these two princes though under different names, calling the former Sumana and the latter Tishya. Susīma-Sumana is said to have been the eldest son of Bindusāra and a stepbrother of Aśoka, while Vigataśoka-Tishya is reputed to have been the youngest son of Bindusāra and a co-uterine brother of Aśoka, born of a Brāhmaṇa girl from Champā.

Hüeun Tsang mentions a brother of Aśoka named Mahendra. Ceylonese tradition, however, represents the latter as a son of Aśoka. It is possible that the Chinese pilgrim has confounded the story of Vigataśoka with that of Mahendra.


2 *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, II, 14. Aristoxenus and Eusebius refer to the presence in Athens, as early as the fourth century B. C., of Indians who discussed philosophy with Socrates. (A note by Rawlinson quoted in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 22-11-36, p. 17).

3 "High Officers for the Establishment and Propagation of the Law of Duty."


5 According to B. L. Mitra (*Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, 8) and Smith the name of Aśoka’s mother was Subhadrāṇī. Bigandet II’ 128 mentions Dhammā as the mother of Aśoka and Tissa.

DEATH OF BINDUSĀRA

Bindusāra died after a reign of 25 years according to the Purāṇas, and 27 or 28 years according to Buddhist tradition. According to the chronology adopted in these pages his reign terminated about 273 B.C.

1 Hultzsch points out (p. xxxii) that Burmese tradition assigns 27 years to Bindusāra, while Buddhaghosha's Šamanta-pāsādikā agrees with the Mahāvaṃsa in allotting 28 years to that king.

2 Cf. Smith. Aśoka, p. 73.
SECTION III. THE EARLY YEARS OF AŚOKA

Both the Divyāvadāna and the Ceylonese Chronicles agree that there was a fratricidal struggle after the death of Bindusāra. Aśoka is said to have overthrown his eldest step-brother with the help of Rādhagupta whom he made his Agrāmatya (Chief Minister). Dr. Smith observes,1 "the fact that his formal consecration or coronation (abhisheka) was delayed for some four years" until 269 B.C., confirms the tradition that his succession was contested, and it may be true that his rival was an elder brother named Susīma." In his Aśoka published a few months later, he says, "it is possible that the long delay may have been due to a disputed succession involving much bloodshed, but there is no independent evidence of such a struggle." Dr. Jayaswal4 gave the following explanation for the delay in Aśoka's coronation: "it seems that in those days for obtaining royal abhisheka the age of 25 was a condition precedent. This seems to explain why Aśoka was not crowned for three or four years after accession." The contention can hardly be accepted. The Mahābhārata, for instance, informs us that the abhisheka of king Vichitravīrya took place when he was a mere child who had not yet reached the period of youth:

Vichitravīryaṇḍha tadā
bālam aprāptayauvanam

1 The Oxford History of India, p. 93.
2 Mahāvaṃsa, Geiger's translation, p. 28.
3 Third edition.
4 JBOBS., 1917, p. 438.
5 There were other kinds of abhisheka also, e.g., those of Yuvarāja, Kumāra, and Senāpati, as we learn from the epics and the Kaṭṭilīya (trans., 377, 391).
Kururājye mahābahir
abhyaśāśnachadananantaram.  

Dr. Smith characterises the Ceylonese tales which relate that Aśoka slew many of his brothers as silly because Aśoka certainly had brothers and sisters alive in the seventeenth and eighteenth years of his reign, whose households were objects of his anxious care. But we should remember that the Fifth Rock Edict refers only to the family establishments of his brothers (olodhanesu bhātinam) as existing. This does not necessarily imply that the brothers themselves were alive. We should however, admit that there is nothing to show, on the contrary, that the brothers were dead. The Fifth Rock Edict, in our opinion, proves nothing regarding the authenticity or untrustworthiness of the Ceylonese tradition. In the Forth Rock Edict Aśoka himself testifies to the growth of unseemly behaviour to kinsfolk and slaughter of living creatures.

The first four years of Aśoka’s reign is, to quote the words which Dr. Smith uses in another connection, “one of the dark spaces in the spectrum of Indian history; vague speculation, unchecked by the salutary limitations of verified fact, is at the best, unprofitable.”

Like his predecessors Aśoka assumed the title of Devānampiya. He generally described himself as Devānampiya Piyaḍasi. The name Aśoka is found only in literature, and in two ancient inscriptions, viz., the Māski Edict of Aśoka himself, and the Junāgadhi inscription.

1 Mbh., I. 101. 12. As the Adiparva refers to Dattāmitra and Yasana rule in the lower Indus valley its date cannot be far removed from that of Aśoka and Kharavela. Cf. also the cases of Samprati Pariśīkṣa paraśan, IX. 52, who was anointed king though a baby in arms, and of Amma II, Eastern Chalukya.
3 Cf. Rock Edict VIII, Kālai, Shāhābāzgarhi and Mänsabha Texts.
4 We have already seen that the epithet “Piyaḍasana” is sometimes applied to Chandragupta also (Bhandarkar, Aśoka, p. 5; Hultzsch, CII. Vol. I, p. xxx).
of the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman I. The name Dharmāsoka is found in one Mediaeval epigraph, viz., the Sārnāth inscription of Kumāradēvi.\footnote{Dharmāsoka-narādhikasya samaye Śrī Dharmachakro Jīno yuddhik tanaya raksitaḥ punarayaśchakrā tatopayadhutam.}

During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka seems to have carried on the traditional Maurya policy of expansion within India, and of friendly co-operation with the foreign powers, which was in vogue after the Seleukid war. Like Chandragupta and Bindusāra he was aggressive at home but pacific abroad. The friendly attitude towards non-Indian powers is proved by the exchange of embassies and the employment of Yavana officials like Tushāśpha.\footnote{Note also the part played by the Yona named Dhammarakkhita (Mahāvaṁsa, traes., p. 82).} In India, however, he played the part of a conqueror. The Divyāvadāna credits him, while yet a prince with the suppression of a revolt in Taxila and the conquest of the Svaśa (Khaśa?) country. In the thirteenth year of his reign (eight years after consecration), he effected the conquest of Kaliṅga. We do not know the exact limits of this kingdom in the days of Aśoka. But if the Sanskrit epics and Purāṇas are to be believed, it extended to the river Vaitaranī in the north,\footnote{Mbh., III. 114. 4.} the Amarakaṇṭaka Hills in the west\footnote{Kūrma Purāṇa, 11. 39, 9, Vāyu, 77, 4-13.} and Mahendragiri in the south.\footnote{Raghuvamanī IV, 33-43; VI. 53-54.}

An account of the Kaliṅga war and its effects is given in Rock Edict XIII. We have already seen that certain places in Kaliṅga formed parts of the Magadhan dominions in the time of the Nandas. Why was it necessary for Aśoka to reconquer the country? The question admits of only one answer, viz., that it
severed its connection with Magadha after the fall of the Nandas. If the story of a general revolt in the time of Bindusāra be correct then it is not unlikely that Kaliṅga, like Taxila, threw off the allegiance of Magadha during the reign of that monarch. It appears, however, from Pliny, who probably based his account on the Indika of Megasthenes, that Kaliṅga was already an independent kingdom in the time of Chandragupta. In that case there can be no question of a revolt in the time of Bindusāra. Pliny says, "the tribes called Calingae are nearest the sea...the royal city of the Calingae is called Parthalis. Over their king 60,000 foot soldiers, 1,000 horsemen, 700 elephants keep watch and ward in 'procinct of war'."

The Kaliṅga kings probably increased their army considerably during the period which elapsed from the time of Megasthenes to that of Aśoka, because during the war with Aśoka the casualties exceeded 2,50,000. It is, however, possible that the huge total included not only combatants but also non-combatants. The existence of a powerful kingdom so near their borders, with a big army 'in procinct of war,' could not be a matter of indifference to the kings of Magadha. Magadha learnt to

1 Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 338.
2 If, as is probable, Kaliṅga included at this time the neighbouring country of Aśmaka, then Parthalis may be the same as "Potalī". For an interesting account of Kaliṅga and its early capitals Dantakūra and Tosali, see Sylvaïn Lévi, "Pré-Aryan et Pré-Drauidien dans l'Inde," J. A., Juillet-Septembre, 1903; and Indian Antiquary, 1926 (May), pp. 91, 96. "The appellation of Kaliṅga, applied to Indians throughout the Malay world, attests the brilliant rôle of the men of Kaliṅga in the diffusion of Hindu civilisation." Not far from the earliest capital (Pālura-Dantapura-Dantakūra) lay the apheterion, "where vessels bound for the Golden Peninsula ceased to hug the shore and sailed for the open sea." Note, in this connection, the name Ho-ling (Po-ling, Kaliṅga) applied by the Chinese to Java (Takakau, Li-sing; p. xlvi) an island which was known by its Sanskrit name to Ptolemy (150 A. D.) and even to the Rāmāyaṇa (Kishk, 40, 30). For the connection of early Kaliṅga with Ceylon, see I. A., VIII, 2, 295,
her cost what a powerful Kalinga meant, in the time of Khāravela.

We learn from the Thirteenth Rock Edict that Aśoka made war on the Kalinga country and annexed it to his empire. "One hundred and fifty thousand persons were carried away captive, one hundred thousand were slain, and many times that number died." Violence, slaughter, and separation from their beloved ones befell not only to combatants, but also to the Brāhmaṇas, ascetics, and householders.

The conquered territory was constituted a viceroyalty under a prince of the royal family stationed at Tosali, apparently situated in the Puri district. The Emperor issued two special edicts prescribing the principles on which both the settled inhabitants and the border tribes should be treated. These two edicts are preserved at two sites, now called Dhauli and Jaugada. They are addressed to the Mahāmatras or High Officers at Tosali and Samāpā. In these documents the Emperor makes the famous declaration "all men are my children," and charges his officers to see that justice is done to the people.

The conquest of Kalinga was a great landmark in the history of Magadha, and of India. It marks the close of that career of conquest and aggrandisement which was ushered in by Bimbisāra's annexation of Anāga. It

1 Tosali (variant Tosala) was the name of a country as well as a city. Lévi points out that the Gāndavyūha refers to the country (Janapada) of Amita-Tosala" in the Dakshiṇapatha, "where stands a city named Tosala." In Brāhmaṇical literature Tosala is constantly associated with (South) Kosala and is sometimes distinguished from Kalinga. The form Tosalei occurs in the Geography of Ptolemy. Some mediaeval inscriptions (Ep. Ind., IX, 286; XV 3) refer to Dakshiṇa (South) Tosala and Uttar (North) Tosala.

2 In Puri.
3 In Gaṣjam.
4 For the identification of Samāpā, see Ind. Ant., 1923, pp. 66 ff.
MAURYA FRONTIER IN THE NORTH-WEST

opens a new era—an era of peace, of social progress, of religious propaganda and at the same time of political stagnation and, perhaps, of military inefficiency during which the martial spirit of imperial Magadha was dying out for want of exercise. The era of military conquest or Digvijaya¹ was over, the era of spiritual conquest or Dhamma-vijaya was about to begin.

We should pause here to give an account of the extent of Aśoka's dominions and the manner in which they were administered before the Emperor embarked on a new policy.

Aśoka mentions Magadha, Paṭaliputra, Khalatikapavata (Barābar Hills), Kosambī, Lumbini-gāma, Kaliṅga (including Tosali, Samāpā and Khepiṅgala-pavata or the Jaugadā Rock), Aṭāvī (the forest tract of Mid-India perhaps identical with Ālavī of the Buddhist texts), Suvarṇagiri, Isila, Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā expressly as being among those places which were under his rule.

Beyond Takshaśilā the empire stretched as far as the confines of the realm of "Amtiyako Yonarājā," usually identified with Antiochos II Theos of Syria (261-246 B.C.), and included the wide territory round Shāh-bāzgarhī² and Mānsahra³ inhabited by the Yonas, Kambojas and the Gandhāras. The exact situation of this Yona territory has not yet been determined. The Mahāvaṁsa evidently refers to it and its chief city Alasanda which Cunningham and Geiger identify with the town of Alexandria (Begram, west of Kāpiṣā)

¹ Cf. sarva-sahe vijaya (Bühler, cited in Hultsch's Inscriptions of Aśoka, p. 25).
² In the Peshawār District.
³ In the Hazāra District.
founded by the Macedonian conqueror near Kābul. Kamboja, as we have already seen, corresponds to Rājapura or Rajaur near Punch in Kaśmīra and some neighbouring tracts including Kāfrīstān. The tribal territory of the Gandhāras at this time probably lay to the west of the Indus, and did not apparently include Takshaśilā which was ruled by a princely Viceroy, and was the capital of the province of Uttarāpatha. The capital of Trans-Indian Gandhāra was Pushkaravatī, identified by Coomaraswamy with the site known as Mir Ziyārat or Balā Hisār at the junction of the Swāt and Kābul rivers.

The inclusion of Kaśmīra within Aśoka's empire is proved by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang's Records and Kalhaṇa's Rājātāraṅgini. Kalhaṇa says: "The faithful Aśoka reigned over the earth. This king who had freed himself from sins and had embraced the doctrine of the Jīna covered Sushkaletra and Vitastātra with numerous Stūpas. At the town of Vitastātra there stood within the precincts of the Dharmāraṇya Vihāra a Chaitya built by him, the height of which could not be reached by the eye. That illustrious king built the town of Srīnagari. This sinless prince after removing the old stuccoed enclosure of the shrine of Vijayeśvara built in its stead a new one of stone. He...erected within the enclosure of Vijayeśa, and near it, two temples which were called Aśokēśvara." The description of Aśoka as a follower of the Jīna, i.e., Buddha, and the builder of numerous stūpas leaves no room for doubt that the

1 Chau. AGI, 18. Geiger, Mahāvamsa, 194. The Yona territory probably corresponds to the whole or a part of the Province of the Paropamisadac.
2 Cf. Kalīgāḍa Edict; Dīrīyāvadāna, P. 407, Rājānōśokāśy-uttarāpathe Takshaśilā nagarōn, etc.
3 Cf. Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 54. Indian and Indonesian Art, 55
5 I. 102-06.
great Maurya monarch is meant. We are told by Kalhana himself that he is indebted for much of the above account to an earlier chronicler named Chhavillakara.

The inscriptions near Kālsī and those on the Rummindeī and the Nigāli Sāgar pillars prove the inclusion of the Dehra-Dūn District and the Tarāī within the limits of Aśoka’s Empire, while the monuments at Lalitapātan and Rāmpurwā attest his possession of the valley of Nepal and the district of Champārān. Further evidence of the inclusion of the Himalayan region within Aśoka’s empire is possibly furnished by Rock Edict XIII which refers to the Nabhapamīs of Nābhaka, probably identical with Na-pei-kea of Fa Hien,¹ the birthplace of Krakuchchhanda Buddha, about 10 miles south or south-west of Kapilavastu.²

According to Bühler, Rock Edict XIII also mentions two vassal tribes Viśa (Besatae of the Periplus?) and Vajri (Vrijikas?). More recent writers do not accept Bühler’s reading and substitute (Rāja) Visayamhi, ‘in the (king’s) territory,’ in its place. There is, thus, no indubitable reference either to the Vrijikas or the ‘Besatae’ in the inscriptions of Aśoka.

We learn from the classical writers that the country of the Ganganīdāc, i.e., Bengal,³ formed a part of

---

¹ Legge, 64.
² “The Brahma (vaiśa-cita?) Purāṇa assigns Nabhikapura to the territory of the Uttara-Kurus” (Hultzsch, CII, Vol. I, p. xxxix). Mr. M Govinda Pai (Aīyangar-Com. Vol. 36), however, invites attention to the Nabhakānandas, apparently a southern people, mentioned in the Mbh. vi. 9, 59. In connection with the northern limits of the Maurya empire attention may also be invited to the statement in the Dīgyavādāna (p 372) about Aśoka’s subjugation of the Svaśa (Khaśa?) country. According to a legend narrated by the Chinese pilgrims (Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, p. 295) exiles from Takshaśilā settled in the land to the east of Khoten in the days of Aśoka.

³ For early references to Vaṅga, see Lévi “Pré-Aryan et Pré-Dravidien dans l’Inde.” For its denotation, see Mānasī-c-Marmavāṇi, Srāvaṇa, 1336.
the dominions of the king of the Prasii, *i.e.*, Magadha, as early as the time of Agrammes, *i.e.*, the last Nanda king. A passage of Pliny clearly suggests that the "Palibothri," *i.e.*, the rulers of Pāṭaliputra, dominated the whole tract along the Ganges. That the Magadhan kings retained their hold on Bengal as late as the time of Aśoka is suggested by the testimony of the Divyāvadāna and of Hiuen Tsang who saw Stūpa of that monarch near Tāmralipti and Karnaṣuvarṇa (in West Bengal), in Samatāta (East Bengal) as well as in Puṇḍravardhana (North Bengal). Kāmarūpa (Assam) seems to have lain outside the empire. The Chinese pilgrim saw no monument of Aśoka in that country.

We have seen that in the south the Maurya power at one time, had probably penetrated as far as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevelly district. In the time of Aśoka the Maurya frontier had receded probably to the Pennār river near Nellore as the Tamil Kingdoms are referred to as "Prachaina" or border states and are clearly distinguished from the imperial dominions (Vijita or Rājayāvishaya), which stretched only as far south as the Chitaldrug District of Mysore. The major part of the

Several scholars find it mentioned in the Aittareya Āraṇyaka. But this is doubtful. Bodhāyana brands it as an impure country and even Patañjali excludes it from Āryāvarta. The country was, however, Aryanised before the Manusvāhiti which extends the eastern boundary of Āryāvarta to the sea, and the Jain Pravāhanā which ranks Aṅga and Vaṅga in the first group of Aryan peoples. The earliest epigraphic reference to Vaṅga is probably that contained in the Nāgarjunikonda Inscriptions.


4 Mr. S. S. Desikar thinks that the last point reached by the Mauryas was the Venkaṭa hill (*IHQ*, 1928, p. 145). Prof. N. Sastri lays stress (ANM, pp. 253ff) on the legendary features of the account in Tamil texts.
Deccan was ruled by the viceregal princes of Suvarṇagiri and Tosalī, the Mahāmātrās of Isila and Samāpā and the officers in charge of the Aṭavi or Forest Country. But in the belt of land on either side of the Nerudda, the Godāvari and the upper Mahānadi there were, in all probability, certain areas that were technically outside the limits of the empire proper. Aśoka evidently draws a distinction between the forests and the inhabiting tribes which are in the dominions (vijīta) and peoples on the border (antā avijīta) for whose benefit some of the special edicts were issued. Certain vassal tribes are specifically mentioned, e.g., the Andhras, Palidas (Pāladas, Pāriṇdās), Bhojas and Rāṣṭikas (Rīṣṭikas, Rāṣṭrīkās?). They enjoyed a status midway between the Provincials proper and the subdued borderers. The word Petenika or Pitinika mentioned in Rock Edicts V and XIII should not, according to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar and some other writers, be read as a separate name but as an adjective qualifying Risṭika (Edict V) and Bhoja (Edict XIII). They draw our attention to certain passages in the Aṅguttara Nikāya where the term Pettanika occurs in the sense of one who enjoys property given by his father. The view that Pitinika is merely

---

1 A clue to the location of this city is probably given by the inscriptions of the later Mauryas of the Kōṇkaṇ and Khaṇḍesha, apparently the descendants of the Southern Viceroy (Ep. Ind., III. 136). As these later Maurya inscriptions have been found at Vāda in the north of the Thāṇa district (Bomb. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, p. 14) and at Waghi in Khaṇḍesha (ibid., 234), it is not unlikely that Suvarṇagiri was situated in that neighbourhood. Curiously enough, there is actually in Khaṇḍesha a place called Songir. According to Hultsch, (CII. p. xxxviii) Suvarṇagiri is perhaps identical with Kanakagiri in the Hyderabadd State, south of Maski, and north of the ruins of Vijayanagara. Isila may have been the ancient name of Siddāpura.

2 Edict XIII.

3 III. 76, 78 and 80 (P.T.S.).

4 Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 80. Cf. Hultsch, Aśoka, 10; IHQ, 1925, 387. Other scholars, however, identify the Pitinikas with the Paḷiṭhānakas or natives of
an adjective of Raṭhika (Risṭika) or Bhoja is not, however, accepted by Dr. Barua who remarks that "it is clear from the Pali passage, as well as from Buddhaghosha's explanations, that Raṭṭika and Pettanika were two different designations.'"

The **Andhras** are, as we have already seen, mentioned in a passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. The **Bhojas** are also mentioned in that work as rulers of the south.\(^1\) Pliny, quoting probably from Megasthenes says that the Andarae (Andhras) possessed numerous villages, thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and supplied their king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants.\(^2\) The earliest Andhra capital (Andhapura) was situated on the Telavāha river which, according to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, is either the modern Tel or Telingiri, both flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. But the identification is by no means certain.\(^3\) The Palidas were identified by Bühler with the

\(^1\) For other meanings of Bhoja, see Mbh., Adi., 84, 22; IA, V. 177; VI. 25-28; VII. 36. 254.

\(^2\) Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 339.

\(^3\) P. 92 ante. In historical times the Andhras are found in possession of the Kṛṣṇa and Guṇṭūr districts as we learn from the Mayidavolu plates and other records. The earliest capital of the Andhra country or "Andhrāpatha" known from the inscriptions is apparently Dhaṅḍakāḍa at or near Amarāvati (or Bezvāḍa). Kubiraka of the Bhaṭṭiprola inscription (c. 200 B.C) is the earliest known ruler. One recension, in the Brāhma script, of the Rock Edicts of Āśoka, has recently been discovered in the Kurnool District (IHQ, 1923, 791; 1931, x17 ff; 1933, 113 ff.; IA, Feb., 1932, p. 39) which falls within the "Andhra" area of the Madras Presidency. Recent discoveries of the Āśokan epigraphs include, besides the Yeragadji inscriptions (Kurnool District) two new Rock Edicts at Kophal in the South-West corner of the Hyderabad State. The Kophal inscriptions are found on the Gavimāṭh and the Pālkigunḍa Hills. They belong to the class of Minor Rock Edicts,
Pulindas\(^1\) who are invariably associated with the Nerbudda (Revä) and the Vindhyān region:—

\textit{Pulinda-rāja sundarī nābhimaṇḍala nipita salilā (Revä).}\(^2\)

\textit{Pulindā Vindhya Pushikā(?) Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaih saha}\(^3\)
\textit{Pulindā Vindhya Mulikā Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaih saha}\(^4\)

Their capital Pulinda-nagara lay not far from Bhilā and may have been identical with Rūpnāth, the find-spot of one recension of Minor Rock Edict I.\(^5\)

Hultzsch, however, doubts the identification of the "Pulidas" of Shahbazgarhī with the Pulindas, for the Kālṣi and Girnār texts have the variants Pālada and Pārīmanda—names that remind us of the \textit{Pāradas} of the \textit{Vāyu Purāṇa}.\(^6\) the \textit{Harivamśa}\(^7\) and the \textit{Brihat Samhita}.\(^8\) In those texts the people in question are mentioned in a list of barbarous tribes along with the Śakas, Yavanas, Kambojas, Pahlavas, Khaśas, Māhishikas, Cholas, Keralas, etc. They are described as \textit{muktakesā} ("having dishevelled hair"). Some of the tribes mentioned in the list belong to the north, others to the south. The association with the Andhras in Aśokan inscriptions suggests that in the Maurya period they may have been in the Deccan. But the matter must be regarded as not definitely settled. It is interesting to note in this connection that a river Pārādā (identified

---

\(^1\) Hultzsch, \textit{Aśoka}, 48 (n. 14).
\(^2\) Subhandu's \textit{Vāsavodattā}.
\(^3\) \textit{Mastaga P. II} 14, 48.
\(^4\) \textit{Vāyu}, 56, 128.
\(^5\) The Navagraha grant of the \textit{Mahārāja Hastin} of the year 198 (A. D. 517) refers to a Pulinda-rāja-rājaśrī which lay in the territory of the Parirvājaśa's kings, i.e., in the Pabhāla region in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradesh (\textit{Ep. Ind.}, xxi, 126).
\(^7\) I, 14.
\(^8\) XIII, 9.
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with the Paradi or Par river in the Surat District) is mentioned in a Nāsik inscription.¹

The Bhojas and the Raṭhikas (Risṭikas) were evidently the ancestors of the Mahābhhojas and the Mahāraṭhis of the Sātavāhana period.² The Bhojas apparently dwelt in Berar,³ and the Raṭhikas or Risṭikas possibly in Mahārāṣṭra or certain adjoining tracts.⁴ The former were, in later ages, connected by matrimonial alliances with chieftains of the Kanarese country.

In the west Aśoka’s Empire extended to the Arabian Sea and embraced all the Aparāntas⁵ including no doubt the vassal state (or confederation of states) of Surāṣṭra the affairs of which were looked after by the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha with Giri-nagara (Girnar) as his capital. Dr. Smith says that the form of the name shows that the Yavana-rāja must have been a Persian. But according to this interpretation the Yavana Dhammadeva, the Saka Ushavadāta (Risahabha-datta), the Parthian Suvisākha and the Kushān Vāsudeva must have been all native Hindus of India. If Greeks and other foreigners adopted Hindu names there is no wonder that some of them assumed Irānic appellations. There is, then, no good ground for assuming that Tushāspha was not a Greek, but a Persian.⁶

² Smith, Aśoka, third ed... pp. 169-70.
³ Cf. Bhoja-kata, Bhāt kuli in Amrasti.
⁴ The Rāmāyana, IV. 41. 10, places the Rishṭikas between the Vidarbhas of (Berar) and the Mahishakas of the Nerbullada valley or of Mysore. Raṭhika is also used as an official designation and it is in that sense that the expression seems to be used in the Yerragudi inscription (Ind. Culture, I, 310; Aiyangar Com. Vol. 38; IHQ. 1938, 117).
⁵ Sūrpāraka, Nāsik, etc., according to the Mārkandeya P. 57, 49 52.
Rapson¹ seems to think that the Gandhāras, Kambojas, Yavanas, Rishṭikas, Bhojas, Petenikas, Pāladas and Andhras lay beyond Aśoka's dominions, and were not his subjects, though regarded as coming within his sphere of influence. But this surmise can hardly be accepted in view of the fact that Aśoka's Dharma-mahāmātras were employed amongst them "on the revision of (sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of) release" (Rock Edict V).² In the Rock Edict XIII, they seem to be included within the Rāja-Vishaya or the King's territory, and are distinguished from the real border peoples (Aṁta, Prachāṁta), viz., the Greeks of the realm of Antiocchos and the Tamil peoples of tī south (Nīcha). But while we are unable to accept the views of Rapson, we find it equally difficult to agree with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar³ who denies the existence of Yonas and others as feudatory chieftains in Aśoka's dominions. The case of the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha clearly establishes the existence of such vassal chiefs whose peoples undoubtedly enjoyed partial autonomy though subject to the jurisdiction of special Imperial officers like the Dharma-mahāmātras.

Having described the extent of Aśoka's empire we now proceed to give a brief account of its administration. Aśoka continued the Council government of his predecessors. There are references to the Emperor's dealings with the Parishā or Parisha in Rock Edicts III and VI. Senart took Parishad to mean Saṅgha and Bühler understood by it the Committee of caste or sect.

¹ CHI., pp. 614, 615.
² "They are occupied in supporting prisoners (with money), in causing (their) fetters to be taken off, and in setting (them) free" (Hultsch, Aśoka, p. 8).
³ Aśoka, 25.
But Dr. K. P. Jayaswal pointed out that the Parishā of the Edicts is Mantriparishad of the Arthashastra. The inscriptions prove that Aśoka retained also the system of Provincial Government existing under his forefathers. Tosalī, Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayini and Takshaśilā were each under a prince of the blood (Kumāla or Ayaputa).

The Empire and the Princes were helped by bodies (Nikāyā) of officials who fell under the following classes:

1. The Māhāmātras and other Mukhyas.
4. The Pradesikas or Prādesikas.
5. The Yutas.
6. Pulīsā.
7. Paṭivedakā.
8. Vachabhūmikā.
9. The Lipikaras.
10. The Dūtas.
11-12. The Ayuktas and Kāranakas.

1 Compare the references to the “Sarajikā Parishā” in the Mahāvastu., Senart, Vol. III, pp. 362, 392. For different kinds of Parishā, see Âṅguttara I. 70.
2 That Ayaputa or Åryaputra meant a member of a ruling house or clan appears probable from the evidence of the Bālacharita, attributed to Bhāsa, in which Vasudeva is addressed by a Bhāṭa as Åryaputra. Pandit T. Ganapatā Sāstri further points out that in the Saṇanaṭaka the term Åryaputra is employed as a word of respect by the chamberlain of Vasavadatta’s father in addressing King Udayana (Introduction to the Pratimā-nāṭaka, p. 32). An interesting feature of Åsoka’s administration was the employment of a Yavana governor or episkopos in one territory to which reference has already been made.
3 Cf. also Arthasastra, pp. 16, 20, 53, 64, 215, 237-39; Rājaśekhara, KM, XLV. 58.
4 The Yuktas of the Arthasastra, pp. 59, 65, 199. Rāmāyana, VI, 217, 31; Mahābhārata, II, 56, 18; Manus, VIII. 34; cf. the Rāja-yuktas of the Sāntiparśa, 52. 9-15.
There was a body of Mahāmātras in each great city and district of the empire. The inscriptions mention the Mahāmātras of Pātaliputra, Kauśambi, Tosali, Samśā, Suvarnāgiri and Isila. In the Kālinga Edicts we have certain Mahāmātras distinguished by the terms Nagalaka and Nagala-Viyohālaka. The Nagalaka and NagalaViyohālaka of the Edicts correspond to the Nāgaraka and Paura-vyāvahārika of the Arthasastra and no doubt administered justice in cities. In Pillar Edict I mention is made of the Anta Mahāmātras or the Wardens of the Marches, who correspond to the Antapālas of the Arthasastra and the Gopāris of the age of Skanda Gupta. The Kauṭiliya tells us that the salary of an Antapāla was equal to that of a Kumāra, a Paura-vyāvahārika, a member of the Mantriparishad or a Rāṣṭrapāla. In Edict XII mention is made of the Ithijhaka Mahāmātras who, doubtless, correspond to the Stry-adhyakshas (the Guards of the Ladies) of the epics.

1 The empire, as already stated, was divided into a number of provinces (dīka, deśa etc). Each province seems to have been further subdivided into anālas or districts under regular civil administration, and koṭṭa-vishayas or territories surrounding forts (Hultzsch, p. xi). Each civil administrative division had a pūra or nāgara (city) and a rural part called janapada which consisted of grāmas or villages. An important official in each janapada was the Rāja. The designations Prādeśika and Raṭhika possibly suggest the existence of territorial units styled pradeśa and raṭha or rāṣṭra.

2 Mahāmātras of Śrāvasti are according to certain scholars, mentioned in the Soghaura copperplate inscription found in a village on the Rāptī, not far from Gorakhpur. But the exact date of the record is not known (Hoernle, JASB, 1894, 84; Fleet, JRAS, 1907, 523 ff.; Barua, Ann. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst., xi, i (1930), 32ff.; IHQ, 1934, 54ff.; Jayaswal, Ep. Ind., xxii, 2).

3 P. 20, 143 if. Cf. the royal epistates or city governor in the Antigonid realm (Tarw, GBI, 24).

4 Cf. also Nāgarā-dhānya Vyāvahārika, p. 55. The Nugalaka may have had executive functions as well, as is suggested by the evidence of the Arthasastra (II. Ch. 36).

5 Pp. 20, 247.

6 P. 247.

7 Rām. II. 16. 3 Vṛddhān vṛctapānīṃ-stryadhyakṣāṃ; Mbh. IX, 29, 68, 90; XV. 22, 20; 23, 12. Cf. the Antarvamāśika of the Arthasastra.
As to the Rājūkas, Dr. Smith takes the word to mean a governor next below a Kumāra. Bühler identifies the Rājuka of the Aśokan inscriptions with the Rajjūka or the Rajjugāhaka Amachcha (Rope-holder, Field-measurer or Surveyor) of the Jātakas. Pillar Edict IV refers to the Rājūkas as officers "set over many hundred thousands of people," and charged with the duty of promoting the welfare of the Jānapadas to whom Aśoka granted independence in the award of honours and penalties. The reference to the award of penalties (Danda) probably indicates that the Rājūkas had judicial duties. In the Rock Edict III as well as in Pillar Edict IV they are associated with the Yutas, and in the Yerragudi inscriptions with the Raṭhikas. Strabo refers to a class of Magistrates (Agronomoi) who "have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, have charge also of hunters and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either." The measuring of the land connects those Magistrates with the Rajjugāhaka Amachcha of the Jātakas, while the power of rewarding and punishing people connects them with the Rājūkas of Aśoka. It is probable, therefore, that the Agronomoi referred to by Strabo were identical with the Rājūkas and the Rajjugāhaka Amachchas. The Arthaśāstra refers to a class of officials called "Chora Rajjukas," but there

1 Aśoka, 3rd ed., p. 94.
3 I.H.Q. 1933, 117; Barna takes the expressions Jānapada and Raṭhika of the Yerragudi copy of the Minor Rock Edict to mean 'people of the districts' and 'citizens of the hereditary tribal states' respectively. But Raṭhika of the record probably corresponds to Rāṣṭriya of the Junāgaḍh inscription of Kudrādāman as that the expressions Jānapadas and Raṭhikas mean 'people of the country parts,' and 'officials of the district.' Cf. Raṭhika Mahāmātra of Brāhat Saṁhitā, XV. 11.
P. 234.
is no reference to the Rajjukas proper although on p. 60 "Rajju" is mentioned in conjunction with "Chora Rajju."

As regards the Pradeśikas or Pradeśikas, Senart, Kern and Bühler understood the term to denote local governors or local chiefs. Smith took it to mean District Officers. Hultsch compares it with Pradeśikeśvara of Kalhana's Rājatarangini. The word occurs only in the Third Rock Edict where the functionaries in question are included with the Rājukas and the Yutas in the ordinance of the Anusamya or circuit. Thomas derives the word from pradeśa which means report and identifies the Pradeśikas or Pradeśikas of the Edict with the Pradesṛis of the Arthaśāstra. The most important functions of the Pradesṛis were Bali-pragraha (collection of taxes or suppression of recalcitrant chiefs), Kanṭakaśodhana (administration of criminal justice), Choramārgaṇa, (tracking of thieves) and Adhyaksha purushānāṁ cha niyamanam (checking superintendents and their men). They acted as intermediaries between the Samahartṛi on the one hand and the Gopas, Sihānikas and Adhyakshas on the other. It is, however, doubtful if the Pradeśikas can really be equated with Reporters. The more probable view is that they correspond to the subordinate governors, the nomarchs, hyparches and meridarchs of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

As to the Yutas or Yuktas, they are described by Manu as the custodians of Praṇaśṭādhigata dravya

1 IV. 126.
2 JRAS, 1915, p. 97, Arthaśāstra, p. 111. In the Vishṇu Purāṇa, V, 26 3. Pradeśa has apparently the sense of counsel, instruction. S. Mitra suggests, (Indian Culture, I, p. 310) that the Pradeśikas were Mahāmātras of the Provincial governments, while the Rājukas were Mahāmātras of the central government.
3 Cf. The Irda grant where Pradesriśis find mention along with Sanghamukhyas and others.
4 Cf. Arthaśāstra, pp. 142, 200, 217, 222. as stated above Pradesṛis also occur in the Irda grant, Ep. Ind., XXII, 150 ff.
5 VIII. 31.
(lost property which was recovered). In the *Arthaśāstra* too, they are mentioned in connection with *Samudaya* or state funds¹ which they are represented as misappropriating. Hultsch suggests that they were ‘secretaries’ employed for codifying royal orders in the office of the *Mahāmātras*. The *Pulisā* or Agents are apparently identical with the *Purushas* or *Rāja Purushas* of the *Arthaśāstra*.² Hultsch prefers to equate them with the *Gūḍha-purushas* and points out that they were graded into high ones, low ones, and those of middle rank.³ They were placed in charge of many people⁴ and controlled the *Rājukas*. The *Paṭivedakā* or Reporters are doubtless the *Chāras* mentioned in Chapter 16 of the *Arthaśāstra*,⁵ while the *Vachabhūmikas* or “Inspectors of cowpens” were evidently charged with the superintendence of “*Vraja*” referred to in Chapter 24.⁶ The *Lipikaras* are the royal scribes one of whom, *Chapaḍa*, is mentioned by name in Minor Rock Edict II. *Dūtas* or envoys are referred to in Rock Edict XIII. If the *Kauṭiliya* is to be believed, they were divided into three classes, *viz.*, *Nisrishtārthāḥ* or Plenipotentiaries, *Parimitarthaḥ* or Charges d’Affaires and *Sāsanaharas* or conveyers of royal writ.⁷ The *Āyuktaḥ* possibly find mention in the Kāliṅga Edicts. In the early Post-Mauryan and Scythian Age *Āyuttas* appear as village officials.⁸ In the Gupta Age they figure as officers in charge of

¹ *Cf.* also *Mbh.*, ii. 5. 72. *Kachchichchāya* vyāge yuktaḥ sare gaṇaka lekhakāḥ.

² Pp. 69, 75.

³ The three classes of *Purushas* are also known to the Great epic (*Mbh.*, ii. 5. 74).

⁴ Pillar Edict VII.

⁵ P. 33.

⁶ Pp. 59-60.

⁷ With the *Sāsanaharas* may be compared the *Lekha-hārakas* of the *Harshacharita, Uchchhāsa* II, p. 69.

⁸ Lüders’ List, No. 1347.
SUNDARY OFFICIALS

Vishayas or districts,¹ and also as functionaries employed in restoring the wealth of conquered kings. The full designation of the officers in question was Ayukta-Purusha.² They may have been included under the generic name of Pulisā referred to above. The Kāranakas who appear to be mentioned in the Yerragudi copy of Asoka’s Minor Rock Edict, probably refer to judicial officers, teachers, or scribes.³

¹ Ep. Ind., XV, No 7, 188
² Fleet, CII, pp. 8, 14.
³ Cf. Karanika, Officer-in-Charge of Documents or Accounts (IHQ, 1935, 586). In inscriptions of the seventh century A.D. the word karaṇa stood for Adhikaraṇa (Departmental or District Secretariat). Prabāsi, 1860 B.S. Srāvana, 294. In Mbh. ii. 5, 34, Kāranika has, according to the commentary, the sense of a teacher. In the text itself the officers in question instruct the Kumāras and have to be dharme sarvaśāstreshu kovidāḥ, implying that their duties included among other things, those relating to Dharma (law, justice?).
CHAPTER V. THE MAURYA EMPIRE:

THE ERA OF DHAMMAVIJAYA AND DECLINE.

SECTION 1. AŚOKA AFTER THE KALIŃGA WAR.

Chakka-vatti abhūr rājā Jambu-sanḍassā issaro muddha-bhisitlo khattiyo manussādhipati abhūm adandena asatthena vijeyya pathavim imam asaḥasena dhannena samena maḥusāsiyā dhannena rajjam kāretya asmim pathavimandale

—Aṅguttara Nikāya.

We have already seen that the Kaliṅga war opened a new epoch in the history of Magadha and of India. During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka was a typical Magadhan sovereign—the inheritor of the policy of Bimbisāra, of Mahāpadma and of Chandragupta—conquering peoples, suppressing revolt, annexing territory. After the Kaliṅga war all this is changed. The older political philosophy which tradition associates with the names of Vassakāra and Kauṭilya gave way to a new statecraft inspired by the teaching of the sage of the Sākyas. Before proceeding to give an account of the remarkable change we should say a few words about the religious denominations of India and the condition of society during the reign of the great innovator.

In the days of Aśoka the people of India were divided into many sects of which the following were the most important:

1. The orthodox Deva-worshippers.¹
2. The Aṃīvīkas or the followers of Gosāla Maṅkhali-putta.²

¹ Among the Devas worshipped in the Maurya period, Patañjali makes special mention of Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha.
² This teacher was born in Saravat, probably near Sāvatthī or Srāvasti. Jain writers represent him as a person of low parentage and of contemptible
3. The Nirgranthas or Jainas, i.e., the followers of Nigantha Nåtaputta who is commonly called Mahåvîra or Vardhamanå.

4. The followers of Gautama Buddha Såkyamuni.

5. Other sects alluded to in Pillar Edict VII.

In Edict IV we have the following account of the prevailing state of society: "for a long period past, even for many hundred years, have increased the sacrificial slaughter of living creatures, the killing of animate beings, unseemly behaviour to relatives, unseemly behaviour to Bråhmañås and ascetics (Såmaññås)." Kings used to go out on so-called Vihåra yåtås in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. The people performed various ceremonies (mañgala) on occasions of sickness, weddings of sons, the weddings of daughters, the birth of children, and...
departure on journeys. The womankind performed many, manifold, trivial and worthless ceremonies.¹

From the references in the Edicts to Brähmanas, Kaivartas (of Kevaṭa bhoga) and Śramaṇas, Bhikshu and Bhikshuni-Samghas it may be concluded that Varna (social gradation) and Āśrama (stages of socio-religious discipline) were established institutions. The position of the slaves and labouring poor in general (dāsa, bhalaka) was, in some cases at any rate, not enviable. Women had to tolerate the purdah as well as polygamy. Ladies of the harem were under special guards (stry-adhyaksha). As will be seen in the following pages, the policy of Aśoka in regard to social matters was, in the main, one of mitigation and not, except in respect of certain kinds of Samāja and sundry obnoxious practices, of radical reform.

The Change of Aśoka’s Religion

Aśoka had doubtless inherited the traditional devotion of Hindu kings to the gods (devas) and the Brähmanas and, if the Kāśmīra chronicle of Kalhaṇa is to be believed, his favourite deity was Śiva. He had no scruples about the slaughter of men and animals: “formerly, in the kitchen of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King each day many hundred thousands of living creatures were slaughtered to make curries.” The hecatombs of thousands of men and women sent to their doom during the Kaliṅga war have already been mentioned. The sight of the misery and bloodshed in that sanguinary campaign made a deep impression on him and awakened in his breast feelings of anusochana, “remorse, profound sorrow, and regret”. About this time he came under the influence of Buddhist teaching. We read in Rock Edict XIII “after that, now that the Kaliṅgas had been annexed, began His Sacred Majesty’s zealous practice of the Law

¹ R. Edict IX.
of Piety (*dhramaśīlana*), his love of that Law (*dhramakamaṭa*), and his inculcation of that Law (*dhramanuṣastī*).""'}

Although Aśoka became a Buddhist\(^2\) he was not an enemy either of the *Devas* or of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Up to

---

\(^1\) The view held by some well-known writers that the conversion of Aśoka took place *before* the Kaliṅga war rests on the evidence of the *Mahāvaṃsa* (Ch. V) and on certain assumptions, viz., that Aśoka’s *dhramakamaṭa* became *tiṭa* (intense) immediately after the Kaliṅga war (there being no interval) and that Aśoka was indifferent during the period of *Upāśakata* (when he was only a lay disciple) which, therefore, must have preceded the Kaliṅga war, immediately after which his devotion became *tiṭa*. But the so-called indifference or want of activity is only relative. On the other hand, the supporters of the new theory have to explain why a recent convert to Buddhism should engage in a sanguinary conflict involving the death of countless *Śramaṇas*. Why again do the Minor Rock Edicts refer to contact with the *Saṅgha*, and not the Kaliṅga war, as the prelude and cause of more intense activity? It is to be noted that activity in the period of *Upāśakata* is also described as *paraśrama*, though it was surpassed by the greater energy of the period after contact with the Holy Order. Note also the explicit reference to *dhramakamaṭa* as the result of the annexation of Kaliṅga sometime after (*tato pachhā adhunā*) the war. The use of the expressions *tato pachhā* and *adhunā* suggests that an interval intervened between the war and the intensity of Aśoka’s *dhramaśīlana* and *dhramakamaṭa*. Moreover, we learn from the Minor Edicts and Pillar Edict VI that pious proclamations began to be issued a little more than 2½ years after Aśoka became an *Upāśaka* and 12 years after his coronation. This would place his conversion a little less than 9½ years after his *Abhiseka*, i.e., a little less than 1½ years after the Kaliṅga war.

\(^2\) Sākya (Rūpāṇi), *Buddha Sākya* (Māski), *Upāśaka* (Sahāsram); see Hultzsch, CII, p. xlv. Cf. also Kaliṅga, *Rājatarāṅgini*, 1. 102ff. That Aśoka did become a Buddhist admits of no doubt. In the Bhābrū Edict he makes an open confession of his faith in the Buddha, the *Dharma* (Doctrine) and the *Saṅgha* (Order of Monks). He called the Buddha *Bhagavat*. He went on pilgrimage to the places of the Blessed One’s nativity and enlightenment and worshipped at the former place. He declared that whatsoever had been spoken by the Buddha, all that was quite well spoken. He also believed in the cult of the “former” Buddhas. He took much interest in the exposition of the Buddhist Doctrine so that it might endure long. As to the *Saṅgha* he kept in close touch with it since his memorable visit to the Fraternity a year or so after his conversion. He impressed on the clergy the need of a correct exposition of the true doctrine and appointed special officers to busy themselves with the affairs of the Brotherhood. He also laid emphasis on *Vinaya-samutkarśa* and took steps to maintain the integrity of the Church and prevent schism within its fold.
the last he took pride in calling himself Devānampiya, beloved of the gods. He found fault with unseemly behaviour towards Brāhmaṇas and inculcated liberality to the same class. He was perfectly tolerant. "The king does reverence to men of all sects." He reprobated ātmapāsamā-pūjā, honour to one's own sect, when coupled with para-pāsamā-garaha, disparagement of other sects. That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar Cave Dedications to the Ājīvīka monks. His hostility was chiefly directed not towards the Devas and the Brāhmaṇas, not even towards Varnāśrama, but the killing of men in war and Samajās (festive gatherings), ill-treatment of friends and acquaintances, comrades and relatives, slaves and servants, the slaughter of animals in sacrifice, and the performance of vulgar, useless and offensive ceremonies.

The Change of Foreign Policy

The effect of the change of religion was at once felt in foreign policy. The Emperor declared that "of all the people who were slain, done to death, or carried away captive in Kaliṅga, if the hundredth part or the thousandth part were now to suffer the same fate, it would be a matter of regret to His Sacred Majesty. Moreover, should any one do him wrong, that too must be borne with by His Sacred Majesty, so far as it can possibly be borne with." In Kaliṅga Edict I, the Emperor expressed his desire that the unsubdued peoples in the frontiers of the imperial dominions (Āṃtā avijī.ā) "should not be afraid of him, that they should trust him, and should receive from him happiness not sorrow." The chiefest

2 Edict IV.
3 Edict XII.
conquest in the Emperor’s opinion was the conquest by righteousness (Dhamma-vijaya). In Edict IV he exultingly says, “the reverberation of the kettle-drums (Bherighoso) has become the reverberation of the Law of Piety (Dhammaghoso).” Not content with what he himself did he called upon his sons and even his great grandsons to eschew new conquests—putra papotra me asu navam vijayam ma vijetaviyam. Here we have a complete renunciation of the old policy of military conquest or Digvijaya and the enunciation of a new policy, viz., that of Dhammavijaya. The full political effects of this change of policy became manifest only after the death of Aśoka, perhaps even after the 27th year of his consecration. From the time of Bimbisāra to the Kalinga war the history of India was the story of the expansion of Magadha from a tiny state in South Bihār to a gigantic Empire extending from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. After the Kalinga war ensued a period of stagnation at the end of which the process is reversed. The empire gradually dwindled down in extent till it sank to the position from which Bimbisāra and his successors had raised it.

1 The Aśoka conception of Dhammavijaya was similar to that described in the Chakkavatti Sihanāda Sutta, “conquest not by the sword, not by the sword, but by righteousness.” (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part III, p. 59). It was different from the Hindu conception explained and illustrated by the Mahābhārata (XII, 59, 38-39), the Harivānśa (I, 14,21), the Kautilya (p. 382), and the Raghuvamśa (IV, 43). Attention may be invited in this connexion to a Statement of Arrian that “a sense of justice prevented any Indian king from attempting conquest beyond the limits of India” (Camb. Hist. Ind. I, 341); M’erindle, Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, 209. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the discourse entitled the Chakkavatti Sihanāda (Lion Roar of the Chakravarti or emperor who conquerers by righteousness) possibly affords a clue to a proper appreciation of the famous Sarnath Capital with its Chakra and crowning lions. Cf. also Rāmāyaṇa II, 10.35: Yazadāvartate chakram tāvati me vasundhāra, IC, XV, 1-4, p. 179f.
True to his principle Asoka made no attempt to annex the frontier (Pracham̐ta, aṅta, sāmanta, sāmīpa), kingdoms, viz., Chola, Pāṇḍya, Satiyaputra, Keralaaputra Taṁbapārṇī (Ceylon) and the realm of Aṁtiyako Yonarāja, who is usually identified with Antiochos II Theos, King of Syria and Western Asia. On the contrary, he maintained friendly relations with them.

The Chola country was drained by the river Kāverī and comprised the districts of Trichinopoly and Tanjore. We learn from a South Indian inscription1 that Hara, i.e., the god Śiva, asked Guṇabhara (Mahendravarman I, Pallava), “How could I, standing in a temple on earth, view the great power of the Cholas or the river Kāverī?” When Pulakesin II Chalukya strove to conquer the Cholas “the Kāverī had her current obstructed by the causeway formed by his elephants.” The Chola capital was Uraiyyūr (Sanskrit Uragapura) or Old Trichinopoly.2 The principal port was at Kāviripaṭṭinam or Pugār on the northern bank of the Kāverī.3

The Pāṇḍya country corresponded to the Madurā, and Tinnevally districts with perhaps the southern portions of Rāmnad and the Travancore Cochin state. It had its capitals at Kolkai and Madurā (Dakṣiṇa Mathurā). The rivers Tāmraparṇī and Kṛitamālā or Vaigai flowed through it. Kātyāyana derives Pāṇḍya from Pāṇḍu. The Pāṇḍus are

1 Hultsch, SII, Vol. I, p. 34.
2 Aelian, however, has the following reference to the realm of Soraś (Chola?) and its chief city: “There is a city which a man of royal extraction called Soraś governed at the time when Eukratides governed the Bactrians, and the name of that city is Perinnda (city of Perunma?). It is inhabited by a race of fish-eaters who go off with nets and catch oysters.” For Uragapura in Cholika Vihaṇya, see Ep. Ind., X. 109.
3 For the early history of the Chola Kingdom and other Tamil states see CHI, Vol. I, Ch. 24; Smith, EHI, Ch. XVI; Kanakasabhin Pillay, Tamil Eighteen Hundred Years Ago; Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Beginnings of South Indian History and Ancient India; K. A. Nilakantha Sastri, The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, The Cola, etc.
mentioned as the ruling race of Indraprastha in the *Mahābhārata* as well as in several *Jātakas*. Ptolemy (cir. 150 A. D.) speaks of the country of the Pandooouoi in the Pañjab. There can be no doubt that Pāṇḍu was the name of a real tribe or clan in northern India. Katyāyana’s statement regarding the connection of the Pāṇḍyas with the Pāṇḍus receives some support from the fact that the name of the Pāṇḍya capital (Madurā) was identical with the famous city of Mathurā in the Sūrasena country which, according to Epic tradition, was the seat of a family intimately associated by ties of friendship and marriage with the Pāṇḍus of Indraprastha. The connection between the Pāṇḍus, the Sūrasenas and the Pāṇḍyas seems to be alluded to in the confused stories narrated by Megasthenes regarding Herakles and Pandaia.

Satiyaputra is identified by Mr. Venkatesvaraiyar with *Satya-vrata-kshetra* or Kañchipura. But Dr. Aiyangar points out that the term *Satya-vrata-kshetra* is applied to the town of Kañchi or a part of it, not to the country dependent upon it. There is besides the point whether *vrata* could become *puta*. Dr. Aiyangar supports Bhandarkar’s identification with Satpute. He takes Satiyaputra to be a collective name of the various matriarchal communities like the Tulus and the Nāyars of Malabar. According to Dr. Smith Satiyaputra is represented by the Satyamangalam Taluk of Coimbatore. Mr. T. N. Subramaniam prefers Koṅgunāḍu ruled by the

---

1 I find it difficult to agree with Dr. Barua, *Inscriptions of Adoka*, Part II (1943), p. 232, that the “line of Yudhishthira” ... that ruled at Indraprastha in the Kuru country “has nothing to do with Pāṇḍu’s eldest son.”


3 *JRAS*, 1918, pp. 541-42

4 *JRAS*, 1919, pp. 581-84.

5 *Adoka*, Third Ed., p. 161

6 *JRAS*, 1922, 86.
Kosar people famous for their truthfulness. Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar takes Satiyaputra to be the equivalent of Atiyamân, chief of Kutiraimalai with his headquarters at Takaḍür, now in Mysore. Mr. P. J. Thoma, however, gives reasons for identifying it with “Satyabhûmi” of the Keralolpatti, a territory which corresponds roughly to “North Malabar including a portion of Kasergode Taluk, South Canara.”

Keralaputra (Ketalaputo or Chera) is “the country south of Kúpaka (or Satya), extending down to Kanneñi in Central Travancore (Karunagapalli Taluk). South of it lay the political division of Mûshika.” It was watered by the river Periyar, perhaps identical with the Churñî of the Arthaśāstra on the banks of which stood its capital Vañji (near Cochin) and at its mouth the seaport of Muziris (Kranganur).

Ceylon was known in ancient times as Párasamudra as well as Tâmarparñî (Greek Taprobane). Tambaparnî,
i.e., Tāmrabarṇī is mentioned in Rock Edicts II and XIII of Aśoka. Dr. Smith lately\(^1\) took the word to mean not Ceylon but the river Tāmrabarṇī in Tinnevally. He referred to the Girnar text "‘a Tāmbapāṇi’" which according to him indicated that the river was meant, not the island. Now, in Edict II the phrase "‘a Tāmbapāṇi’" comes after Ketalaputo and not after Pāda. The expression "Ketalaputo as far as the (river) Tāmrabarṇī" is hardly appropriate because the Tāmrabarṇī is a Pāṇḍyan river.\(^2\) We, therefore, prefer to take Tāmrabarṇī to mean Ceylon. Aśoka’s Ceylonese contemporary was Devānampiya Tissa whose accession may be dated about 250 or 247 B.C.

Aśoka maintained friendly relations not only with the Tamil powers of the south, but also with his Hellenistic frontager, Antiochos II Theos, king of Syria and Western Asia (B.C. 261-246); and even with the kings the neighbours of Antiochos, namely, Ptolemy II, Philadelphos, king of Egypt (B.C. 285-247); Magas, king of Cyrene in North Africa (who probably died not later than B.C. 258)\(^3\); Antigonus Gonatas, king of Macedonia (B.C. 277 or 276-239); and Alexander who ruled over Epirus (B.C. 272-c.255) according to Norris, Westergaard, Lassen, Senart, Smith and Marshall.\(^4\) Beloch and Hultsch, however,

---


2. Even those who prefer to see in the passage a reference to a kingdom in the Valley of the Tamraparni river, have to prove that such a kingdom did exist in the Maurya age apart from "Pāda" and Taprobane, and to explain the particular way in which it is mentioned in Edict II.


suggest that Alikasudara of Edict XIII is the comparatively insignificant ruler, Alexander of Corinth, the son of Craterus (B.C. 252—cir. 244) and not Alexander of Epirus (272—cir. 255), the son of Pyrrhus.

Though Aśoka did not covet the territories of his neighbours, there is evidence that he gave them advice on occasions, and established philanthropic institutions in their dominions. In other words, he regarded them as objects of spiritual conquest (Dhamma-vijaya).

"My neighbours, too, should learn this lesson."

"Among his frontagers the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Satyaputra, the Ketalaputra as far as Tāmraparṇi, Antiochos, the Greek king, and even the kings the neighbours of that Antiochos, everywhere have been made healing arrangements of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King."

In Edict XIII Aśoka declares that the "conquest of the Law of Piety,......has been won by His Sacred Majesty......among all his neighbours as far as six hundred leagues, where the king of the Greeks named Antiochos dwells, and beyond (the realm) of that Antiochos (where dwell) the four kings (rājāno) severally Ptolemy (Turamāya), Antigonos (Amītakina), Magas (Maga or Maka), and Alexander (Alikasudaro)—(likewise) in the south (mīcha), the Cholas and the Pāṇḍyas as far as Tambapāṇini,......Even where the envoys (dutā) of His Sacred Majesty do not penetrate, those people, too, hearing His Sacred Majesty’s ordinance based upon the Law of Piety and his instruction in the Law, practise

---

1 JRAS, 1914, pp. 943 f. Ins. of Aśoka, xxxi.
2 M. R. Edict I.
3 Have we here a reference to countries like Suvāṇṇabhumi named in the list of territories to which missionaries were sent according to the Mahāvamsa?
and will practise the Law." Buddhism doubtless made some progress in Western Asia and influenced later sects like the Manichaeans. But Greeks apparently were not much impressed by lessons on non-violence. When the strong arm of Aśoka, "who possessed the power to punish inspite of his repentance," was withdrawn, the Yavanas poured once more into the Kābul valley, the Pañjab and the Madhya-deśa and threw all the province into confusion. The southern missions were more successful. Curiously enough, the Ceylonese chronicles do not seem to refer to the envoys sent to the independent Tamil and Hellenistic kingdoms but name the missionaries sent to Ceylon and Suvaṇṇabhūmi (Lower Burma and Sumatra). The Ceylonese mission was headed by prince Mahendra who secured the conversion of Devanaṁpiya Tissa and many of his people. No direct reference to Suvaṇṇabhūmi occurs in the Edicts hitherto discovered.

The Change in Internal Policy

The effects of Aśoka’s change of religion after Kalinga war were felt not only in foreign policy but also in internal affairs. The principal objects of his complaint according to Rock Edict IV and the Kalinga Edicts were:

1 From Buddhism in Western Asia, see Beal, Si-yu-ki, II. 378; and Alberūni, p. 21; JHAS, 1918, 76; McCrindle, Ancient India as Described in Classical Literatura, p. 195; Ellicott, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. III, pp. 3, 450 1; cf. Smith, EHI, 4th ed., 197; Burlingame, trans., Dhammapada Commentary, Introduction.

2 Mention is however made of the Yona country along with Kasmīra, Gandhāra and Himālaya (Geiger, 82). This Yona territory is perhaps to be identified with the homonymous land in the Kābul valley associated with Kamboja and Gandhāra in the Aśokan Inscriptions. But reference in a vague way to the Levantine world is not completely ruled out. The Deccan lands mentioned in connection with the traditional missionary activity of the Aśokan age include Mahishamapālā, Vanavāsa (in the Kanarese area), Aparādātaka (on the west coast), and Mahārāṣṭra (Mahārāṣṭra) in the upper valley of the Godāvari.
1. The sacrificial slaughter (ārambho) of living creatures.
2. Violence (vilimśā) to animate beings.
3. Unseemly behaviour to (asampratipati) to kinsmen (jñātī)
4. Unseemly behaviour to Brāhmaṇas and Sramaṇas.
5. Maladministration in the Provinces.

According to Rock Edict I, Aśoka saw much offence not only in the sacrificial slaughter of animals, but also in certain Samājas or festive gatherings which, as we learn from the Kauṭiliya,1 were often witnessed by kings and emperors.2 The Samāja, says Smith, was of two kinds. The popular festival kind accompanied by animal fights, heavy drinking and feasting, including much consumption of meat, was necessarily condemned by Aśoka, as being inconsistent with his principles. The other kind, the semi-religious theatrical performance, sometimes given in the temples of Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning, was apparently not included among offensive Samājas. Dr. Thomas3 describes the disapproved Samāja as "a celebration of games or contests taking place in an arena or amphitheatre surrounded by platforms (mañcha) for spectators (prekshā)." This kind of (Samāja) is apparently referred to in the following lines of the Virāṭa parva of the Mahābhārata:

Ye cha kechinniyotsyanti Samājeshu niyodhakāḥ.4

"Those combatants who will take part in wrestling in the Samājas."

1 p. 46.
2 For the holding of Samājas in Magadha and in neighbouring countries see Vinaya, IV. 267; Mahāvastu, III. 57 and 263.
3 JRAS., 1914, pp. 392 ff
4 Virāṭa, 2, 7.
Tatra Mallāh samāpetur digbhyo rājan sahasrasah
Samāje Brahmano rājan tathā Paśupater api
Mahākāyāḥ Mahāvīryāḥ Kālakanjā ivāsurāḥ.¹

"O king, there arrived, by thousands, boxers from all
quarters, in that festive gathering in honour of Brahman as
well as Paśupati (Siva). They possessed gigantic bodies
and immense strength like the Titans styled Kālakaṇja."

The harmless Samāja is well illustrated by the gather-
ing in the temple of the goddess of learning referred to in
Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra (Pakshasya māsasya vā prajñāte’
hani Sarasvatyā bhavane niyuktānāṁ nityāṁ Samājaḥ).
According to Hultzsch the harmless Samāja refers to
edifying shows.²

Aśoka determined to put a stop to the practices,
referred to above, which he did not approve. At the same
time he sought to improve the moral and material condi-
tion of the people to such an extent as to effect the
"association of gods with men".³ He did all this "in order
that he might discharge the debt (which he owed) to living
beings (that) he might make them happy in this (world)
and (that) they might attain heaven in the other (world)."
The means employed to achieve this object may be classed
under four heads :

1. Administrative reforms.
2. Dissemination of instructions in the Dhamma
(Law of Piety or Duty).
3. Benevolent activity; promotion of the welfare of
man and beast.

¹ Virāṭa, 13, 15-16.
² See also IHQ, 1928, March. 112 ff.
³ Cf. Minor Rock Edict I. Cf. The description in the Harivāmaḥa of a
prosperous realm where (rāje mahodaye) gods and men dwelt together
(Bhavishyaparva, Ch. 32.1) "Devatānāṁ manushyānāṁ sahasāso
bhavattadā." Hultzsch, however, compares (xlv) Deva with Divyāṇi rūpāṇi
of Rock Edict IV,

Administrative Reforms

In the first place, Asoka instituted the Quinquennial and Triennial Anusaṃyāna or Circuit of the Yutas, Rājukas Prādeśikas, and Mahāmātras. Jayaswal and Smith\(^1\) were of opinion that the whole administrative staff from the Rājukas and the Prādeśikas down to the Yutas could not possibly have gone on circuit at once every five years. They interpreted the term as signifying a regular system of transfers from one station to another. But there is nothing in the text to show that all the officers were required to go on circuit at once. The anusaṃyāna of the Yutas, Rājukas and Prādeśikas was quinquennial and was mainly intended for propaganda work. The anusaṃyāna of the Mahāmātras was specially instituted for the purpose of checking miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment and torture in the outlying provinces (Kaliṅga, and the Ujjayini and Takshaśilā regions).

Secondly, Asoka created a number of new posts, e.g., Dharmamahāmātras and possibly Dharmam- Yutas.\(^2\) The Dharmamahāmātras were given a protective mission among people of all sects including the Brāhmaṇas and the Nirgranthas or Jainas, and among the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras, Rūṣṭikas and all the Aparāntas. "Among

---

\(^1\) Asoka, 3rd edition, p. 164; Mr. A. K. Bose (IHQ, 1933, 811) takes anusaṃyāna in the sense of ‘a court-house or a citadel.’ But the epic reference to paṇyaśatāraṇaṃsaṃyānam (Mbh. i. 2, 123), ‘going forth to holy places of pilgrimage,’ suggests that the interpretation proposed by Kern and Bühler is the one least open to objection. See also Barua, Asoka Edicts in New Light, 83 ff.

\(^2\) Dharmayuta may not be an official designation. It may mean simply ‘one devoted to Dhamma’ (morality, righteousness). Cf. Bhandarkar, Asoka, 2nd ed., pp. 311, 343.
servants and masters, Brāhmaṇas and the wealthy (Ibhyas), among the helpless and the aged, they are employed in freeing from worldly cares their subordinates (in the department) of the Law of Piety. They are also employed on the revision (of sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of) release, on the grounds of motive, having children, instigation, or advanced years...At Pāṭaliputra and in all provincial (bāhira) towns, in the family establishments of the king’s brothers and sisters, as well as of other relatives, they are everywhere employed.” The Dharma-mahāmatras were further engaged everywhere in the imperial dominions (vijita) or indeed in the whole world (Prithivī) as known to the Mauryas, among the Dharma-yutas with regard to “the concerns of the Law, the establishment of the Law, and the business of almsgiving.” The border countries (deśa) were placed under the special care of the Āvutikas.2

The emperor was naturally anxious to keep himself fully informed without delay about all public affairs, specially about the doings of the Mahāmatras on whom the success of his mission mainly depended. He, therefore, gave special directions to the Paṭivedakas or Reporters that when a matter of urgency committed to the Mahāmatras and discussed in the Parishad or Council occasioned a division of opinion or nijhati (adjournment?)3 he must be informed without delay.

1 We have here a reference probably to the fourfold division of society into Brāhmaṇas, Kshatriyas or nobles (Ibhyas), Vaiśyas (Arjas), and Śudras (Bhaṭa).
2 Cf. Hultzsch, Aśoka, 100 n 7.
3 For procedure in cases of disputations in an Assembly see also Jaim. Up. Br. III. 7.6. Can Nijhati imply reference to the Upadrashṭris hinted at in the Brāhmaṇa passage? The help of Upadrashṭris was invoked by the Kuru-Paṇḍhalas to arrive at a satisfactory agreement or understanding in case of dispute. (Cf. also Barna, Aśoka Edicts in New Light p. 78.)
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It is apparent from the Kaliṅga Edicts and Rock Edict VI that Aśoka kept a watchful eye on the Mahāmātras especially on those who administered justice in cities. But he was more indulgent towards the Rājukas for whose intelligence he apparently entertained great respect. To the Rājukas “set over many hundred thousands of people” the emperor granted independence in the award of honours and penalties in order that those officials might perform their duties confidently and fearlessly. He wanted, however, to maintain some uniformity in penalties as well as in procedure. For this reason he issued the following rule:

“To condemned men lying in prison under sentence of death a respite of three days is granted.”

Lastly, Aśoka issued certain regulations restricting slaughter and mutilation of animals, and up to the twenty-seventh year of his coronation effected twenty-five jail deliveries. This suggests, as has been pointed out by Hultsch, that the emperor used to proclaim an amnesty to criminals at almost every anniversary of his coronation.

**Measures adopted to disseminate Instructions in the Law of Piety.**

Though himself convinced of the truth of the Buddha’s teaching, of the efficacy of worship at Buddhist holy places, of the necessity of making a confession of faith in the Buddhist Trinity, of keeping in close touch with the Buddhist Order of monks and maintaining its discipline and solidarity, Aśoka probably never sought to impose his purely sectarian belief on others. He attempted, however, to put an end to practices and institutions that he considered to be opposed to the fundamental principles of morality which, according to him, constituted the essence of all religious. The prospect that he held
before the people at large is not that of *sambodhi* (or of *nirvāṇa*) but of *svarga* (heaven) and of mingling with the *devas*. *Svarga* could be attained and the gods could be approached by all people, high or low, if only they showed *parākrama*, zeal, not in adherence to a sectarian dogma or the performance of barren ritual (*mamgala*) but in following the ancient rule (*porāṇā pakiti*), the common heritage of Indians of all denominations, *viz.*, “obedience must be rendered to parents and elders; firmness (of compassion) must be shown towards living creatures; truth must be spoken; these same moral virtues must be practised. In the same way the teacher must be reverenced by the pupil, and fitting courtesy should be shown to the relatives.” In Edict XIII we have the following: “hearkening to superiors, hearkening to father and mother, hearkening to teachers (or elders), and proper treatment of friends, acquaintances, comrades, relatives, slaves and servants, with steadfastness of devotion.” Edict VII lays stress on “mastery over the senses, purity of mind, gratitude, and steady devotion”. In the Second Pillar Edict it is declared that the Law of Piety consisted in *Apāsinave, bahukayāne, dayā, dāne, sache sochaye*, “little impiety, many good deeds, compassion, liberality, truthfulness, purity”.

In the Pillar Edicts again prominence is given to self-examination and spiritual insight. Towards the end of his career Aśoka seems to have been convinced that reflection and meditation were of greater efficacy than moral regulations. But the need for such

---

1 For the question of slavery in Maurya India, see Monahan, *Early History of Bengal*, pp. 164-65. It is to be noted that Aśoka did not abolish slavery, just as he did not do away with caste or *pardah*. He simply wanted to mitigate the rigours of the existing social policy.
regulations was keenly felt by him in the early years of his reign.

We learn from Minor Rock Edict I that for more than two-and-a-half years Aśoka was a lay disciple (Upāsaka). During the first year he did not exert himself strenuously. Later on he seems to have entered the Sāṅgha and begun to exert himself strenuously. He issued the famous proclamation, “Let small and great exert themselves,” and caused to be engraved the imperishable record of his purpose on the rocks and upon stone pillars wherever there were stone pillars in his dominions.

1 “Approached,” according to Hultsch, in whose opinion the two-and-a-half years of Upāsakata pa include the period which followed his “Visit” (not “entry”) to the Sāṅgha. The view that Aśoka actually joined the Holy Order is, however, supported by I-tsing who mentions an image of Aśoka dressed in the garb of a Buddhist monk (Takakusu, I-tsing, 73). That rulers and statesmen could be monks as well, even in early times, appears probable from Lüders Ins. No. 1144 which refers to a Sramaṇa mahāmātra of Nālak in the days of the early Satavahana king Kṛishṇa, Cfr. Milinda, IV.6. 49 (ref. to a Sramaṇa King): Gaiger, trans., Mahāvamsa, 240 (Kuṭakaṇṇa Tissa).

2 Rock Edict IV has been interpreted by scholars to mean that Aśoka sought to promote the observance of the Buddhist doctrine by exhibiting spectacles of aerial chariots (Vimānasaṅga), of elephants (Hasti-saṅga), masses of fire (Aghika-dhāni) and other representations of a dieya, i.e., divine (not terrestrial) nature. Dr. Bhandarkar (Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 26), refers to the Pāli Vimānasaṅgatthu which describes the splendour of the various celestial abodes (Vimūnās) in order to induce listeners and spectators to live good and unblemished lives, and thereby attain to these. Aśoka is said to have made representations of these Vimūnās and paraded them in various places. Hasti, according to Dr. Bhandarkar, is Āveto hasti, i.e., Buddha himself who is also described as “Gajatama,” i.e., Gajottama, the most excellent elephant. As regards Aghika-dhāna (Agnika-dhāna) Dr. Bhandarkar draws our attention to Jātaka No. 46 which refers to a blazing fire-pit created by Mara on the surface of which the Bodhisattva strode and gave a bowl to a hungry Pācchheka Buddha and extolled alms-giving. Hultsch suggests that Hasti may refer to the vehicles of the four “Mahārājas” (lokāpalas or guardians of quarters). He takes Aghika-dhāna to refer to ‘radiant beings of another world’ while Jari Charpentier (IHQ, 1933, 87) understands it to mean piles of (bell-)fire. The interpretation of Hultsch accords better with the testimony of the commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 68. 16) which explains dieyaṁ as vāsitaṁ deroṣṭādhikṣhitam. The celestial elephant figures prominently in the Tārāvaloka story of the Kathā-sarit-sāgara (Peizer, VIII. 131), and
Asoka at first utilised the existing administrative machinery for religious propaganda. He commanded his Council (Parishad) to inculcate the Dharma on the subordinate officials styled Yutas and ordered the latter as well as the higher officials styled Rājūkas, and Prādesikas to inculcate the same while they set out for tour (anusaṁyāna). The Dharma which they were to preach was explained thus: "An excellent thing is the hearkening to father and mother; an excellent thing is liberality to friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brāhmaṇas and ascetics; excellent is abstention from the slaughter of living creatures; excellent is small expense with small accumulation."

Mountain of fire, ibid 50, 51: III. 6, 17; Cf. also aggi-khando in Jataka, VI 330, Coomaraswamy in B. C. Law. vol. I. 469; Note the Sutta referred to in Geiger, Mahāvamsa, trans. pp. 85, 110.

The passage containing the words Vimānasana, Hastidasana, etc. has been explained differently in A Volume of Indian Studies presented to Professor E. J. Rapson, p. 546 f. According to the interpretation that finds favour with some writers, the spectacles in question were exhibited not by Asoka but by previous rulers to the accompaniment of the sound of drums. But thanks to Asoka "the sound of the bheri had become the sound of dharma," that is to say instruction in dharma took the place of martial music that used to be heard on the occasion of pompous shows of edifying subjects in bygone times. What former kings could not accomplish by gaudy spectacles, was achieved by Asoka by the simple unostentations teaching of the true Doctrine. The bheri was now used to announce the king's rescripts on morality, cf. the Yerragudi copy of the Minor Rock Edict—Rājuka ānapitaviye bherinā jānapadaṁ ānāpayisati rāthikānam cha (Ind. Culture, I, p. 310; IHQ, 1933, 117).

1 According to one view Asoka sent special missionaries styled Vyūtha to expound his teaching. The interpretation of Vyūtha as missionary was suggested by Senart and accepted by Smith (Asoka, Third Ed., p. 153). Dr. Bhandarkar takes Vyūtha or Viśvatha to mean "officials on tour." Hultsch thinks that Vyūtha refers to Asoka himself while he was on tour (p. 169, note 8). The word has also the sense of dawn, day-break, day, in other words, it has a chronological significance. Other interpretations are also suggested by scholars. The least plausible is the one offered by Dr. Barua (D. R. Bhandarkar volume, 369) who finds in the expression reference to the copies of the particular proclamation sent forth from the capital.

When he had been consecrated thirteen years, Aśoka created the new officials called *Dharma-mahāmātrās* who were specially entrusted with the work of "dharmādhdi-thāna" and "dhammavadhi", i.e., the establishment and increase of Piety.

While his officers were busy preaching the new Gospel, the emperor himself did not remain idle. Already in his eleventh regnal year he had "started on the path" leading to *Saṁbodhi* (*ayāya Saṁbodhim*) and commenced the tours of Piety (*Dhamma-yātā*) in the place of the old tours of pleasure (*Vihāra yātā*). In the tours of Piety this was the practice—visiting ascetics and Brāhmaṇas, with liberality to them; visiting elders, with largess of gold; visiting the people of the country or perhaps rural areas (*Janapada*) with instruction in the Law of Piety, and discussion of that law. The memory of a pious tour in Aśokas twenty-first regnal year (B. C. 249 according to Smith) is preserved by the Rummindī and Nigāli Sāgar epigraphs in the Nepalese Tarai. These records prove that Aśoka visited the birthplace of Gautama and paid reverence to the *stupa* of Konākamana, one of the former Buddhas.

In 242 B.C., according to Dr. Smith, Aśoka issued the Seven Pillar Edicts which contain, among other things, a review of the measures taken during his reign for the "promotion of religion, the teaching of moral duty".

1 Some scholars take *Saṁbodhi* to mean 'supreme knowledge'. But Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar contends that *Saṁbodhi* is equivalent to the Bodhi Tree or the Mahābodhi Temple at Bodh Gayā. According to the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 393) Aśoka visited Bodhi in the company of the *Sthavira* or Elder Upagupta (Hultszch, CII, xliii).
2 *Were these tours decennial?*
3 He had enlarged the *stupa* of Konākamana six years earlier, but the personal presence on that occasion is by no means clear.
Benevolent Activity, Promotion of the Welfare of Man and Beast

Asoka abolished the sacrificial slaughter of animals, offensive Samajás and the massacre of living creatures to make curries in the imperial kitchen. Rock Edict VIII refers to the abolition of the vihāra-yātrās or tours of pleasure in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. Pillar Edict V contains a code of regulations restricting the slaughter and mutilation of animals. Dr. Smith points out that the prohibitions against animal slaughter in this edict coincide to a considerable extent with those recorded in the Arthaśāstra.

The emperor established healing arrangements in two kinds, namely, healing arrangements for men and healing arrangements for beasts. Medicinal herbs also both for men and for beasts, wheresoever lacking, were imported and planted. Roots also and fruits, wheresoever lacking, were imported and planted. On the roads wells were dug probably at intervals of 8 kos, flights of steps built for descending into the water, and banyan trees and mango groves planted for the enjoyment of man and beast.

Pillar Edict VII refers to the employment of superior officers (Mukhyas) in the distribution of alms, both the emperor’s own and those of the queens and princes. One of the Minor Pillar Edicts refers to the donations of the second Queen Kāruvāki, mother of Tivara: “whatever gift has been given here by the second Queen—be it a mango-garden, or pleasure-grove (ārāma) or alms-house

1 Dhamma-nigama, cf. Patanjali I, I, I.
2 Cf. reference to 666 in Bindusāra’s correspondence with Antiochos.
3 Dr. Barua suggests the identification of this lady with Asandhimita of the Mahāvamsa and the Sumangalarājasini (Indian Culture, 1, 123). The suggestion, though ingenious, is hardly convincing.
(dānagriha) or aught else—is reckoned as proceeding from that queen. 22

Mention may also be made of remission of taxes by the emperor himself, e.g., in Lummintigāma, and money-grants (hirannapatividhāna) to old men. The people of janapadas (districts), doubtless including the grāmas1 (villages), were also sought to be benefited by the grant of autonomy and the establishment of uniformity of punishment and procedure (dāṇḍasamatā and vyāvahārasamatā) as well as diffusion of moral instruction (dhramanuṣasti).

Religious Toleration and the Prevention of Schism in the Buddhist Church.

In Rock Edict XII the emperor declares that he "does reverence (Pūjā) to men of all sects (Pāsamāṇī) whether ascetics (Pavajitāni) or householders (Gharastāni) by gifts and various forms of reverence". That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar cave dedications in favour of the Ājīvika ascetics, who were more closely connected with the Jainas than with the Buddhists.

The emperor only cared for the "growth of the essence (Sāra-Vaḍhi) of the matter in sects". He says that "he who does reverence to his own sect while disparaging the sects of others wholly from attachment to his own, with intent to enhance the splendour of his own sect, in reality by such conduct inflicts the severest injury on his own sect." Concord (or concourse, Samavāyo) is praised by him as meritorious (Samavāyo eva sādhu).

Just as Aśoka tried to secure concord among the various sects, so he wanted to prevent schism within the

1 References to grāmas are found in the compounds Lumminti-gāma and āma-kapota (Pillar Edict V).
CHARACTER OF ĀŚOKA

Buddhist church. Tradition affirms that a Buddhist Council was convened at Pāṭaliputra in the seventeenth year of his reign for the purpose of suppressing heresy and making a compilation of the true Buddhist doctrine (Saddhammasamgaha). The Sārnāth Edict and its variants may perhaps be regarded as embodying the resolution of this Council.¹

Āśoka as a Builder

The gift of cave dwellings to the Ājivika monks affords us a glimpse into another side of Āśoka’s activity. As late as the fifth century A.D., sojourners in Pāṭaliputra were struck with wonder at the magnificence of the emperor’s architectural achievements. Tradition credits him with the construction of a splendid palace besides numerous relic mounds, monasteries and temples. He is actually known to have enlarged the stūpa of Konākamana, a ‘former Buddha’ and a predecessor of Śākyamuni. He also set up ‘pillars of morality’ Dharma-stambhas. Modern critics are eloquent in their praise of the polished surface of his columns and the fine workmanship of their crowning sculptures.²

Character of Āśoka. His Success and Failure

Āśoka is one of the most interesting personalities in the history of India. He had the energy of a Chandra-gupta, the versatility of a Samudragupta and the catholicity of an Akbar. He was tireless in his exertion and unflagging in his zeal—all directed to the promotion of the spiritual and material welfare of his people whom he looked upon as his children. His illustrious grandfather

¹ Smith, Āśoka, third, ed., p. 55.
² For Āśoka’s achievements in the domain of art, see Smith, HFAIC, 13, 57 ff.; Āśoka, pp. 107 ff.; CHĪ, 618 ff.; Havell, ARl, 104 ff., etc.
was accustomed to dispose of cases even when indulging in the luxury of a massage of the limbs. Similarly, Asoka used to listen to reports about the affairs of his people even while 'he was eating, in the harem, in the inner apartment, at the cowpen, in the palanquin and in the parks'. The great soldier who had brought under subjection a huge territory unconquered even by his ever victorious grandfather, could, at the same time, argue points of doctrine and discipline with a fraternity of erudite monks. The statesman who could pilot an empire through the storm and stress of a war that involved the death and deportation of hundreds of thousands of men was, at the same time, capable of organizing religious missions the sphere of whose activities embraced three continents, and transforming a local sect in the Ganges Valley into one of the great religions of the world. The man who penetrated into the jungles of the Nepalese Tarai to pay homage to the birth-place of the Buddhhas, bore no ill-will towards the descendants of their Brāhmaṇa and Jaina opponents, and granted cave-dwellings to the adherents of a rival sect. The king who undertook tours with the object of granting largesses of gold to Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas, admitted to office Yavanas in whose country there were neither Brāhmaṇas nor Śramaṇas. He preached the virtues of concord and toleration in an age when religious feeling ran high and disruptive influences were at work within the fold of the Jaina and Buddhist churches. He preached non-violence when violence in war, religious ritual, royal pastime and festive gatherings was the order of the day. He eschewed military conquest not after defeat but after victory and pursued a policy of patience and gentleness while still possessed of the resources of a mighty empire. The forbearance of this strong man was only matched by his truthfulness, and he describes in burning words
THE GREATNESS AND PIETY OF ASOKA

which no Kaliṅga patriot could have improved upon, the terrible misery that he had inflicted on a hapless province. The example of Dharmāsoka, the pious king, exercised an ennobling influence on posterity. In the second century A.D. Queen Gautamī Balaśrī takes pride in the fact that her son was “alien to hurting life even towards an offending enemy” (Kitāparādhe pī satujane apānahisāruchi). Even in the fifth century A.D., the rest-houses and free hospitals of Magadha excited the wonder and admiration of foreigners. The benefactions of Dharmāsoka were a source of inspiration to royal personages as late as the time of Govindachandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty.

We have already seen that the political record of the great Maurya’s early years was brilliant. His reign saw the final triumph of those centripetal forces that had been at work since the days of Bimbisāra. The conquest of Kaliṅga completed the unification of non-Tamil India under the hegemony of Magadha. The dream of a United Jambudvipa was nearly realised.

But the policy of Dhamma-vijaya which he formulated after the Kaliṅga War was not likely to promote the cause for which a long line of able sovereigns from Bimbisāra to Bindusāra had lived and struggled. The statesman who turned civil administrators into religious propagandists, abolished hunting and jousts of arms, entrusted the fierce tribesmen on the North-West Frontier and in the wilds of the Deccan to the tender care of “superintendents of piety” and did not rest till the sound of the kettle-drum was completely hushed and the only sound that was heard was that of moral teaching, certainly pursued a policy at which Chandragupta Maurya would have looked askance. Dark clouds were looming in the north-western horizon. India needed men of the calibre of Puru and Chandragupta to ensure her protection.
against the Yavana menace. She got a dreamer. Magadha after the Kaliṅga War frittered away her conquering energy in attempting a religious revolution, as Egypt did under the guidance of Ikhnaton. The result was politically disastrous as will be shown in the next section. Ašoka's attempt to end war met with the same fate as the similar endeavour of President Wilson.

According to Dr. Smith's chronology Ašoka died in 232 B.C., after a reign of about 40 years. A Tibetan tradition is said to affirm that the great Emperor breathed his last at Taxila.¹

¹ The Oxford History of India, p. 116. I cannot vouch for the authenticity of this tradition.
SECTION II. THE LATER MAURYAS AND THE DECLINE OF THEIR POWER.

The Magadha Empire under Aśoka extended from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. But the withdrawal of the strong arm of Piyadasi was perhaps the signal for the disintegration of this mighty monarchy. "His sceptre was the bow of Ulysses which could not be drawn by any weaker hand." The provinces fell off one by one. Foreign barbarians began to pour across the north-western gates of the empire, and a time came when the proud monarchs of Paṭaliputra and Rājagriha (and Malwa) had to bend their knees before the despised provincials of 'Andhra' and Kaliṅga.

Unfortunately, no Megasthenes or Kauṭilya has left any account of the later Mauryas. It is impossible to reconstruct a detailed history of Aśoka's successors from the scanty data furnished by one or two inscriptions and a few Brāhmanical, Jaina and Buddhist works.

Aśoka had many children. In Pillar Edict VII, he pays attention to the distribution of alms made by all his children, and in particular to those made by the "Princes, sons of the Queens". It is to this last category that belonged some of the Kumāras who represented the Imperial authority at Takshaśilā, Ujjayinī and Tosali. Tīvara, the son of queen Kāruvāki, the only prince actually named in the inscriptions, does not appear to have mounted the imperial throne. Three other sons, namely, Mahendra, Kunāla (Dharma-vivardhana, Suyaśas?), and Jalauka are mentioned in literature. It is, however, uncertain whether Mahendra was a son of Aśoka or his brother.

1 For Tīvara as a Magadhan name see the Book of Kindred Sayings., II, pp. 128-30.
The *Vāyu Purāṇa* says that after Asoka’s death his son Kunāla reigned for eight years. Kunāla’s son and successor was Bandhupālīta, and Bandhupālīta’s *dāyāda* or heir was Indrapālīta. After Indrapālīta came Devavarman, Satadhanus and Bṛihadratha.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* gives the following list of Asoka’s successor:—Daśaratha, Samprati, Satadhanvan and Bṛihadratha.

The *Vishnu Purāṇa* furnishes the following names:—Suyaśas, Daśaratha, Saṅgata, Śāliśūka, Somaśarman Satadhanvan and Bṛihadratha.

The *Divyāvadāna* has the following list:—Saṃpadī, Vṛihaspati, Vṛishasena, Pushyadharman and Pushyamitra.

Jaina writers refer to a Maurya king of Rājakriha, named Balabhadra.

The *Rājataraṅginī* mentions Jalauka as the successor of Asoka in Kaśmīra, while Tāranātha mentions another successor Vīrasena who ruled in Gandhāra and was, as Dr. Thomas suggests, probably the predecessor of Subhāgasena of Polybius.

It is not an easy task to reconcile the divergent versions of the different authorities. The reality of the existence of Kunāla is established by the combined testimony of the Purānic and Buddhist works (which represent him as the father of Saṃpadī) as well as the evidence of Hemchandra and Jinaprabhasuri, the well-known Jaina writers. The names Dharma-vivardhana occurring in the *Divyāvadāna* and the Records of Fa Hien and Suyaśas found in the *Vishnu* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* were probably birudas or epithets of this prince. Tradition is not unanimous regarding the accession of Kunāla to the imperial

---

1 P. 438.
throne. He is reputed to have been blind. His position was, therefore, probably like that of Dhṛtarāṣṭra of the Great Epic and, though nominally regarded as the sovereign, he was physically unfit to carry on the work of government which was presumably entrusted to his favourite son Samprati, who is described by Jaina and Buddhist writers as the immediate successor of Aśoka.

Kunāla's son was Bandhupālita according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, Saṃpādi (Samprati) according to the Dīvya-vadāṇa and the Paṭaliputra-kalpa of Jinaprabhasuri, and Vigataśoka according to Tāranātha. Either these princes were identical or they were brothers. If the latter view be correct then Bandhupālita may have been identical with Daśaratha whose reality is established by the brief dedicatory inscriptions on the walls of cave-dwellings at the Nāgarjuni Hills which he bestowed upon the Ājīvikas. Daśaratha, who receives the epithet "devānampiya" in the inscriptions, was a grandson of Aśoka according to the Matsya and Viṣṇu Purāṇas, and the predecessor of Samprati (variant Saṅgata) according to the same authorities.

Indrapālita must be identified with Samprati or Śāliśūka according as we identify Bandhupālita with Daśaratha or Samprati. "In the matter of the propagation of the Jain faith, Jaina records speak as highly of Samprati as Buddhist records do of Aśoka." The Paṭaliputra-kalpa of Jinaprabhasuri says, "in Paṭaliputra flourished the great king Samprati; son of Kunāla, lord of Bhārata with its three continents (trikhaṇḍaṁ Bhārata-kshetram Jinayatanamanḍitam), the great Arhanta who established Vihāras for Śramaṇas even in non-Aryan countries."

1 See also Pariṇīṣṭo-parvan, IX, 51-53.
2 Ind. Ant., 1857, 362.
Dr. Smith shows good grounds for believing that the dominions of Samprati included Avanti and Western India. In his Aśoka he admits that the hypothesis that Aśoka left two grandsons, of whom one (Dasaratha) succeeded him in his eastern and the other (Samprati) in his western dominions, is little more than a guess. The Jain writers represent Samprati as ruling over Pātaliputra as well as Ujjayinī. His name is mentioned in the Purānic list of Aśoka's Magadhan successors.

The existence of Sāliśūka is proved not only by the testimony of the Vishnū Purāṇa but also by that of the Gārgi Samhitā and the e Vāyu manuscript referred to by Pargiter. He may have been identical with Vṛhaspati, son of Samprati, according to the Divyāvadāna, unless Vṛhaspati represented a different branch of the imperial family.

Devavarman and Somaśarman are variant readings of the same name. The same is the case with Satadhanus and Satadhanavan. It is not easy to identify Vṛishasena and Pushyadharmarṇa; they may be merely birudas or secondary names of Devavarman and Satadhanvan. But the possibility that they represent a distinct branch of the Maurya line is not entirely excluded.

1 Parīśīṭapārva, xi. 23. itādeka Samprati uṇīpo ṣaṃhitā Ujjayinīḥ purim.
2 Third ed., p. 70.
3 Curiously enough, Prof. Dhrvva maintains in spite of this and the clear evidence of Jain literature that ‘historians say that on the death of Kunāla there was a partition of the Maurya Empire between his two sons Dasaratha and Samprati (JBOBS, 1980, 30).’ Prof. Dhrvva’s emendations of the text of the Yugapūrṇa are largely conjectural and of little probative value.
4 Kern’s Brahmaśāhita, p. 37. The Gārgi Samhitā says, “There will be Sāliśūka, a wicked quarrelsome king. Unrighteous, although theorising on righteousness, dharmavādā adharmikāḥ (sic) he cruelly oppresses his country.”
5 For an interesting account of a King named Satadhanu see Visnu Purāṇa III. 18. 51; Bhāg., II. 8. 44. His identity is, however, uncertain.
The last of the Imperial Mauryas of Magadha, Bhra- 
A-dratha, is mentioned not only in the Purāṇas but also 
in Bāna’s Harsha-charita. He was crushed by his general 
Pushyamitra who is perhaps wrongly described by the 
Divyavādāna as of Maurya descent. A Maurya minister 
is said to have been imprisoned by the rigicide family.

Petty Maurya kings continued to rule in Western 
India as well as Magadha long after the extinction of 
the Imperial line. King Dhavala of the Maurya dynasty 
is referred to in the Kañaswa inscription of A. D. 738.1 
Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar identifies him with Dhavalappadeva, 
the overlord of Dhanika, mentioned in the Dabok (Mewar) 
inscription of cir. A. D. 725.2 Maurya chiefs of the 
Koṅkaṅ and Khāndesh are referred to in Early Chalukya 
and Yādava epigraphs.3 A Maurya ruler of Magadha 
named Pūrṇavarman is mentioned by Hiuen Tsang.

There can be no doubt that during the sovereignty 
of the later Mauryas the Magadha Empire experienced a 
gradual decay. Aśoka died in or about the year 232 
B. C. Within a quarter of a century after his death a 
Greek army crossed the Hindukush which was the 
Maurya frontier in the days of Chandragupta and his 
grandson. The Yuga Purāṇa section of the Gārgi Samhitā 
bears testimony to the decline of the Maurya power 
in the Madhyadeśa after the reign of Śāliṣūka:

1 Ind. Ant., XIII, 163; Bomb. Gaz., I. Part 2, p. 284. Kañaswa is in 
the Kotah State, Rājputāna. It is not unlikely that Dhavala was a descendant of 
some princely Viceroy of Ujjain. See also reference to the Mauryas in the 
Navasārika grant Fleet, DKG, 375.
2 Ep. Ind., XII, p. 11. But see Ep. XX. 122. The date A. D. 725 is not 
accepted by other scholars who prefer A. D. 813.
3 Bomb. Gaz., I. Part 2, pp. 283, 284. Bühler suggests (Ep. Ind., III, 
p. 136) that these Maurya chieftains of the Koṅkaṅ were probably descendants of the 
princely Viceroy of the Deccan. He also draws our attention to the family 
name ‘Moro’ which is met with in the Mahratta country, and is apparently a 
corruption of ‘Maurya.’

45—1892B.
Then the viciously valiant Greeks, after reducing Sāketa (in Oudh), the Pañchāla country and Mathurā, will reach (or take) Kusumadhvaja. Pushpapura (Pātaliputra) being reached....all provinces will undoubtedly be in disorder."

Where was now the power that had expelled the prefects of Alexander and hurled back the battalions of Seleukos?

According to Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śastrī a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇas had sapped the foundations of the Maurya authority and dismembered the empire.

Among the causes of the alienation of the Brāhmaṇas the foremost place is given to Aśoka's Edict against animal sacrifices. The Edict, in Pañḍit Śastrī's opinion, was certainly directed against the Brāhmaṇas as a class and was specially offensive because it was promulgated by a Sudra ruler. As to the first point we should remember that prohibition of animal sacrifices did not necessarily imply hostility towards Brāhmaṇas. Long before Aśoka Brāhmaṇa sages whose teachings have found a place in the Holy Śruti, the most sacred literature of the Brāhmaṇas, declared themselves in no uncertain terms against sacrifices, and in favour of Āhimsā (non-violence).

1 Kern. Zfihāt Sāhāhitā, p. 37.
2 JASB, 1920, pp. 259 ff.
In the *Mundaka Upanishad*¹ we have the following Sloka:

\[
\text{Plavā hyete adṛṣṭā yajñarūpā}
\text{ashtādāsoktam avarāṁ yeshu karma}
\text{etachchhreyo ye'bhinandanti mūḍhā}
\text{jarāmrityum tē punarevāpi yanti.}
\]

"Frail, in truth are those boats, the sacrifices, the eighteen in which this lower ceremonial has been told. Fools, who praise this as the highest good, are subject again and again to old age and death." In the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*² Ghora Āṅgirasa lays great stress on Ahimsā.

As to the second statement we should remember that tradition is not unanimous in representing the Mauryas as of Śūdra extraction. Certain Purānic texts assert no doubt, that after Mahāpadma there will be kings of Śūdra origin.³ But this statement cannot be taken to mean that all the post-Mahāpadman kings were Śūdras, as in that case the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas also will have to be classed as Śūdras.⁴ The *Mudrārakshasa*, the evidence of which is cited to prove that Chandragupta was a Śūdra,⁵ is a late work, and its evidence is contradicted by

---

¹ I. 2, 7; S. B. E. *The Upanishads*, pt. II, p. 31.
² III. 17. 4.
³ Tatoḥ prabhūtirājāna bhacishyāḥ Śūdrayonayāḥ. The reading in other texts is, however, Tato uṣpāḥ bhacishyanti Śūdraprāyaśteadharmikāḥ (DKA, 26).
⁴ Among real Śūdra (or partially Śūdra) kings may be included the Nandas, a few rulers mentioned in the *Garuda Purāṇa* (Ch. 145. 4) and the Si-yū-ki of Huien Tsang (Watters, I. 392; II. 392), and certain princes of Western India and the Indus Valley mentioned on pp. 54-55 of Pargiter’s *Dynasties of the Kali Age*.
⁵ In the play Chandragupta is styled ‘Nandārayaṇa’ and *Vrishala*. As to the former appellation we should note that the play describes Nanda as abhijana. Further it calls Chandragupta *Mauryaputra*, and though commentators try to reconcile the epithets *Nandārayaṇa* and *Mauryaputra*, we learn from early Buddhist writers that Maurya is not a metronymic of Chandragupta or of his father, but the designation of an old clan. The Greeks, too, refer to a tribe called Moriska (Weber IA. ii. (1873) p. 148; Max Muller, *Sansk. Lit.*, 280; Cunn. *JASS*, XXIII, 680). As to the epithet *Vrishala* it should be remembered...
earlier authorities. As already pointed out above, the Mahāparinibbāna sutta represents the Moriyas (Mauryas) as belonging to the Kshatriya caste. The Mahāvaṁśa refers to the Moriyas as a noble (kshatriya) clan and represents Chandragupta as a scion of this clan. In the Divyacakāna, Bindusāra, son of Chandragupta, said to a girl, "Tvam Nāpinī aham Rāja Kshatriyo Mūrdhābhishiktaḥ katham mayā sārdham samāgamo bhavīshyatī?" Thou art a barber girl, I am a consecrated kshatriya (king). How can I unite myself with thee?" In the same work Asoka says to one of his queens (Tishyarakshitā), "Devi aham Kshatriyoh katham palāṇḍum paribhakṣhayāmi?" 'Queen, I am a kshatriya, how can I take onion?' In a Mysore inscription Chandragupta is described as an abode of the usages of eminent kshatriyas. The Kautūlīya's preference of an "abhijāta" king seems also to suggest that the sovereign of the reputed author was born of a noble family.

Having referred to the prohibition of animal sacrifices Pāṇḍit Sāstrī goes on to say: "this was followed by

that a Purānic text applies it even to the founder of the so-called Andhra dynasty (Pargiter, DKA, 38). But we learn from contemporary epigraphs that the dynasty regarded itself as 'Bamhaṇa.' According to Manu (X. 43) the epithet Vṛshaka could be applied to degraded Kshatriyas (cf. IHQ, 1930, 271 ff. Cf. also Mbh. XII. 90, 15 ff., "The Blessed Dharma is Vṛṣa. He who deals with it in such a way that it ceases to be of any use, i.e., transgresses it, is called a Vṛṣaka, Vṛṣaksi Bhagavān Dharma yastasya kurute hyclam). The Mauryas by their Greek connection and Jaina and Buddhist leanings certainly deviated from the Dharma as understood by the great Brāhmaṇa law-givers. Attention may be invited in this connection to the epithet Vasalaka (Vṛṣhaka) applied by Brāhmaṇas to the Buddha himself (Mookerji, Hindu Civilization, 264).

1 P. 267 supra.
2 Geiger's Translation, p. 27.
3 P. 370.
4 P. 409.
5 Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 10.
6 Cf. Arthasastra, p. 396. See also supra, 266 f. (the reign of Chandragupta)
another edict in which Aśoka boasted that those who were regarded as gods on earth have been reduced by him into false gods. If it means anything it means that the Brāhmaṇas who were regarded as Bhūdevas or gods on earth had been shown up by him."

The original passage referred to above runs thus:—

\[ Y (i) - imāya kālāya Jambudīpiṣā amīṣā devā hūṣa te dānī m (i) s-kaṭā. \]

Paṇḍit Śāstri followed the interpretation of Senart. But Sylvain Lévi \(^1\) has shown that the word amīṣā cannot stand for Sanskrit amṛishā, for in the Bhābrū edict we find Musā and not Misā for Sanskrit mrīshā (falsely or false). The recently discovered Māski version reads misiḥūṭā for misamkaṭā, showing that the original form was misirbhūṭā. It will be grammatically incorrect to form misiḥūṭā from Sanskrit mrīshā. The word misra means mixed. And misirbhūṭā means "made to mix" or made to associate. The meaning of the entire passage is "during that time the men in India who had been unassociated with the gods became associated with them." \(^2\) There is thus no question of "showing up" anybody.\(^3\)

Paṇḍit Śāstri adds that the appointment by Aśoka of Dharma-mahāmātras, i.e., of superintendents of morals,

---

\(^1\) Hultzsch, Aśoka, 168.

\(^2\) Cf. Ipastamba Dharmasūtra, II. 7. 16. 1: "Formerly men and gods lived together in this world. Then the gods in reward of their sacrifices went to heaven, but men were left behind. Those men who perform sacrifices in the same manner as the gods did, dwell with the gods and Brahma in heaven." My attention was first drawn to this passage by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar. Cf. also Harivaṃśa (III. 32. 1): "Devatānāṁ manuṣhyānāṁ sahaevāsobhavattadā" and SBE, XXXIV, p. 222-3 (Śaṅkara's Com. on the Vedāntasūtras): "The men of ancient times, in consequence of their eminent religious merit, conversed with the gods face to face. Smṛiti also declares that 'from the reading of the Veda there results intercourse with the favourite divinity.'"

\(^3\) The true import of the passage was pointed out by Dr. Bhandarkar in the Indian Antiquary, 1912, p. 170.
was a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. It is hardly correct to represent the Dharma-mahāmātrās as mere superintendents of morals when their duties consisted in the establishment of the Law of Piety (which included liberality to Brāhmaṇas), the promotion of the welfare of the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras, Ristikas, Brāhmaṇas and others, revision of sentences of imprisonment or execution, the supervision of the family establishments of the Emperor’s brothers and other relatives, and the administration of alms-giving.¹ These duties were not essentially those of a mere superintendent of morals, and were not a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. Moreover, there is nothing to show that the Dharma-mahāmātrās were wholly recruited from non-Brāhmaṇas.

Our attention is next drawn to the passage where Aśoka insists upon his officers strictly observing the principles of Daṇḍa-samatā and Vyavahāra-samatā. Paṇḍit Śāstrī takes the expressions to mean ‘equality of punishment’ and ‘equality in lawsuits’ irrespective of caste, colour and creed, and adds that this order was very offensive to the Brāhmaṇas who claimed many privileges including immunity from capital punishment.

The passage containing the expressions Daṇḍa-samatā and Vyavahāra-samatā should not be divorced from its context and interpreted as if it were an isolated ukase. We quote the passage with the context below:

"To my Rājūkas set over many hundred thousands of people I have granted independence (or discretion) in the award of honours and penalties. But as it is desirable that there should be uniformity in judicial procedure

¹ Aśoka, third ed., pp. 166-69.
(Vyavahāra-samatā) and uniformity in penalties (Daṇḍa-samatā), from this time forward my rule is this—""To condemned men lying in prison under sentence of death a respite of three days is granted by me."

It is clear from the extract quoted above that the order regarding Vyavahāra-samatā and Daṇḍa-samatā is to be understood in connection with the general policy of decentralisation which the Emperor introduced. Aśoka allowed discretion to the Rājukas in the award of penalties, but he did not like that the Daṇḍa and Vyavahāra prevalent within the jurisdiction of one Rājuka should be entirely different from those prevailing within the jurisdiction of others. He wanted to maintain some uniformity (samatā) both in Daṇḍa (penalties) as well as in Vyavahāra (legal procedure). As an instance he refers to the rule about the granting of a respite of three days to condemned men. The Samatā which he enforced involved a curtailment of the autonomy of the Rājukas and did not necessarily infringe on the alleged immunity of the Brāhmaṇas from capital punishment.

But were the Brāhmaṇas really immune under all circumstances from capital punishment in ancient India? We learn from the Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa that a Purohita (priest) might be punished with death for treachery to his master. The Kauṭiliya, tells us that a Brāhmaṇa guilty of treason was to be drowned. Readers of the Mahābhārata are familiar with the stories of the punishments inflicted on Māṇḍavya and Līkhitā. The life of a Brāhmaṇa was not so sacrosanct in ancient as in mediaeval and modern India. We learn from the

1 I am indebted for this suggestion to Mr. S. N. Majumdar.
3 P. 229.
4 Ādi. 107 and Sānti, 23, 36.
Aitareya Brähmana that king Hariśchandra of the Ikshvāku family did not scruple to offer a Brähmana boy as a victim in a sacrifice.

Against the surmises regarding the anti-Brāhmaṇical policy of Aśoka we have the positive evidence of some of his inscriptions which proves the Emperor’s solicitude for the well-being of the Brāhmaṇas. Thus in Rock Edict III he inculcates liberality to Brāhmaṇas. In Edict IV he speaks with disapproval of unseemly behaviour towards the same class. In Edict V he refers to the employment of Dharmamahāmātras to promote the welfare and happiness of the Brāhmaṇas.

Pāṇḍit Śastraī says further that as soon as the strong hand of Aśoka was removed the Brāhmaṇas seemed to have stood against his successors. We have no evidence of any such conflict between the children of Aśoka and the Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand, if the Brāhmaṇa historian of Kaśmira is to be believed, the relations between Jalauka, one of the sons and successors of Aśoka, and the Brāhmaṇical Hindus were entirely friendly.¹

In conclusion Pāṇḍit Śastraī refers to the assassination of the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha by Pushyamitra Suna and says, “We clearly see the hands of the

¹ Note also the employment of Brāhmaṇa officers, e.g., Pushyamitra, by the later Mauryas. Kalhaṇa has nothing but praise for Aśoka. Another Brāhmaṇa writer, Bāṇa, applies the epithet śvārya (ignoble) not to the Maurya kings, but to the Brāhmaṇa general who overthrew the last of them. Viśākhadatta compares Chandragupta with the Bear Incarnation of Vīshṇu. Certain epic and Purāṇic writers, it is true, refer to the Mauryas as asūras, and the Gārgi-Saṁhitā draws pointed attention to the oppressive rule of some of the later members of the family. But there is little to suggest that the Brāhmaṇas were special victims of Maurya tyranny. On the contrary, members of the class were freely admitted to high office as evidenced by the case of Pushyamitra. The epithet asura or asura-devih was applied not only to the Mauryas but to all persons ‘beguiled by the Buddha.’ The testimony of the Purāṇas in this respect is contradicted by that of contemporary epigraphs which refer to Aśoka and the only one among his imperial descendants who has left any epigraphic record as devānahāpiya, that is, the beloved (and not the enemy) of the gods.
Brāhmaṇas in the great revolution." But the Buddhist remains at Bhārhat erected "during the sovereignty of the Suṅgas" do not bear out the theory which represents them as the leaders of a militant Brāhmaṇism. Are inferences deduced from uncorroborated writings of late authors like the compiler of the Divyācadāna and perhaps Tāranātha, to be preferred to the clear testimony of contemporary monuments? Even admitting that Pushyamitra was a militant Brāhmaṇist we fail to see how the decay and dismemberment of the Maurya empire can be attributed primarily to him or to his Brāhmaṇist followers. The empire was a shrivelled and attenuated carcass long before Pushyamitra's coup d'état of c. 187 B.C. We learn from the Rājatarāṅgini that immediately after the death of Aśoka one of his own sons, Jalauka, made himself independent in Kaśmīra and conquered the plains including Kanauj. If Tāranātha is to be believed another prince, Virasena, apparently wrested Gandhāra from the hands of the feeble successor of the great Maurya at Pātaliputra. The virtual secession of Vidarbha or Berar is vouched for by the Mālavikāgnimitram of Kālidāsa. The loss of the northern provinces is confirmed by Greek evidence. We learn from Polybius that about 206 B.C., there ruled over them a king named Sophagasenus, Subhāgasena, probably a successor of Virasena). We quote the passage referring to the king below:—

"He (Antiochus the Great) crossed the Caucasus (Hindukush) and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasenus, the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, and having once more provisioned his troops, set out again personally with his army, leaving Androstenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him."
It will be seen that Subhāgasena was a king and not a petty chief of the Kabul valley as Dr. Smith would have us believe. He is called "king of the Indians," a title which was applied by the classical writers to great kings like Chandragupta and Demetrios. There is nothing in the account of Polybius to show that he was vanquished by the Syrian king in war or was regarded by the latter as a subordinate ruler. On the contrary, the statement that Antiochos "renewed his friendship (or alliance) with Sophagasenous, king of the Indians" proves that the two monarchs met on equal terms and friendly relations were established between them. The renewal of friendship on the part of the Greek king, and the surrender of elephants on the part of his Indian brother, only remind us of the relations subsisting between Chandragupta and Seleukos. Further the expression "renewal of friendship" seems to suggest that Subhāgasena had had previous dealings with Antiochos. Consequently he must have come to the throne sometime before 206 B.C. The existence of an independent kingdom in the north-west before 206 B.C. shows that the Maurya Empire must have begun to break up nearly a quarter of a century before the usurpation of Pushyamitra.

We have seen that the theory which ascribes the decline and dismemberment of the Maurya Empire to a Brāhmaṇical revolution led by Pushyamitra does not bear scrutiny. Was the Maurya disruption due primarily to the Greek invasion? The earliest Greek invasion after Aśoka, that of Antiochos the Great, took place about 206 B.C., and we have seen that the combined testimony of Kalhana and Polybius leaves no room for doubt that the dissolution of the empire began long before the raid of the Hellenistic monarch.

What then were the primary causes of the disintegration of the mighty empire? There are good grounds
for believing that the government of the outlying provinces by the imperial officials was oppressive. Already in the time of Bindusāra ministerial oppression had goaded the people of Taxila to open rebellion. The Divyāvadāna says

"Atha Rājñō Vindusārasya Takhaśilā nama nagaram viruddham. Tatra Rājñā Vindusāren Āsoko visarjitaḥ... yāvat Kumāraschaturaṅgena balakāyena Takhaśilāṁ gataḥ, śrutvā Takhaśilā nivāsinah paurāḥ . . . pratyudgamyā cha kathayanti 'na vayam Kumārasya viruddhāḥ nāpi Rājñō Vindusārasya api tu dushtāmātyā asmākām paribhavām kurvanti.'"  

"Now Taxila, a city of king Bindusāra's, revolted. The king Bindusāra despatched Āsoka there... while the prince was nearing Taxila with the fourfold army, the resident Pauras (citizens of Taxila), on hearing of it... came out to meet him and said:—'We are not opposed to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra. But these wicked ministers insult us.'"

Taxila again revolted during the reign of Āsoka and the cause was again the tyranny of the ministers. Rājñ-ośokasya-ottarāpathe Takhaśilā nagaram viruddham . . ."  

Prince Kunāla was deputed to the government of the city. When the prince went there the people said "na vayam Kumārasya viruddhā na rājñō-śokasya-āpi tu dushtātmāno' mātyā āgatyāsmākam apamānām kurvanti.'"

The Divyāvadāna is no doubt a late work, but the reality of ministerial oppression to which it refers, is affirmed by Āsoka himself in the Kaliṅga Edicts. Addressing the High officers (Mahāmatras) in charge of Tosali he says: "All men are my children; and just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind

---

1 P. 371.  
2 Divyāvadāna, 407f.
of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. You, however, do not grasp this truth to its full extent. Some individual, perchance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well-established. Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, many other people are deeply grieved...Ill performance of duty can never gain my regard... The restraint or torture of the townsman may not take place without due cause. And for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons as are of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life. ...From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out a similar body of officials, and will not over-pass three years. In the same way—from Taxila."

From the concluding words of the Edict it appears that official maladministration was not confined to the province of Kaliṅga. The state of affairs at Ujjain and Taxila was similar. It is thus clear that the loyalty of the provincials was being slowly undermined by ministerial oppression long before Pushyamitra's *coup d'état* of c. 187 B.C.⁴ and the Greek invasion of c. 206 B.C. Aśoka no doubt did his best to check the evil, but he was ill served by his officers. It is significant that the provincials of the north-west—the very people who complained of the oppression of the *dushtāmātyas* as early as the reign of Bindusāra, were among the first to break away from the Maurya empire.

---


2 The Jaina date 313–108 = 205 B.C. for Pushyamitra's accession may refer to the assumption of power by Pushyamitra in Avanti, while the date c. 187 B.C refers to the dynastic revolution in Magadha.
The Magadhan successors of Aśoka had neither the strength nor perhaps the will to arrest the process of disruption. The martial ardour of imperial Magadha had vanished with the last cries of agony uttered in the battlefields of Kaliṅga. Aśoka had given up the aggressive militarism of his forefathers and had evolved a policy of Dhamma-vijaya which must have seriously impaired the military efficiency of his empire. He had called upon his sons and even great-grandsons to eschew new conquests, avoid the shedding of blood and take pleasure in patience and forbearance as far as possible. These latter had heard more of Dhamma-ghosha than of Bheri-ghosha. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the rois faineants who succeeded to the imperial throne of Pāṭaliputra proved unequal to the task of maintaining the integrity of the mighty fabric reared by the genius of Chandragupta and his Chancellor.

On the contrary, if the Gārgi Saṁhitā is to be believed, one of his successors, namely Śāliśūka, actually quickened the pace by his tyranny—
Sarāṣṭra mandate ghorah dharmavādī adhārmikāḥ (sic). Some of Aśoka's descendants (e.g., Jalauka) set up independent sovereignties, and were thus directly responsible for the dismemberment of the empire.

2 Cf. the events narrated on page 363 f. ante, and "Garga's" attack on the policy of so-called Dharma-vijaya, "conquest conformable to Dharma" attributed to Śāliśūka, which, in the opinion of the present writer, is hard to dissociate from Dhamma-Vijaya as promulgated by Aśoka himself and recommended for adoption by his "sons and even great-grandsons." Attention to the passage in the Gārgi Saṁhitā was also drawn by Jayaswal (JBORS, IV, 261)—sthāpa-
yahyai mohātmā viṣayaḥ nāma dhāmikam, "the fool will establish the so-
called conquest of Dharma." The expression mohātmā reminds one of the later meaning of 'Devānāpiya' (fool, idiot like a brute, beast, Apte, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 510). An eminent writer takes Vijaya to be a proper name, the appellation of the elder brother of Śāliśūka, whom the latter established on the throne. But it is not clear why the enthronement of a righteous (dhārmika) man should earn for the person responsible for the action the opprobrious epithet mohātmā. Besides, Vijaya does not occur as a royal name in any of the lists of later Mauryas known to tradition. (For reference to divergent views see Cal. Rev., Feb., 1943, p. 123 ff; Feb., 1946, p. 79 ff). As pointed out by Dr. Sircar, conjectural emendations of the text of the Gārgi Saṁhitā in support of a particular theory do not carry conviction (Cal. Rev. 1943, April, 39ff).

(Contd. on the next page.)
The disintegration which set in before 206 B.C. was accelerated by the invasions led by the Yavanas referred to in the Gārgi Samhitā and the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The final coup de grace was given by Pushyamitra the Baimbika.

The royal hunt and jousts of arms in Samajas were abolished. The army seems to have been practically inactive during the last 29 years of Aśoka's reign as the emperor himself declares with a feeling of exultation that 'the sound of the bheri had become the sound of the True Law, Dharma.' The Chinese Hou Hanshu (quoted by S. Konow, CII, Vol. II, p. lxvii) testifies to the fact that people of India "practise the religion of the Buddha; it has become a habit with them not to kill and to fight." The case with which general Pushyamitra overthrew his king, in the very sight of the army, shows that unlike the earlier kings of the dynasty who took the field in person, the last of the Mārryas lost touch with his fighting forces, and ceased to command their affection. The lassages of gold lavished on the religieux must also have crippled the financial resources of the empire. The system of autonomous Rājūkas instituted by Aśoka must have let loose centrifugal forces that his successors were unable to check.
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CHAPTER VI. THE BAIMBIKA-SUNGA EMPIRE AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS.

SECTION I. THE REIGN OF PUSHYAMITRA.

Satataṁ kampayāmāsa Yavanāneka eva yah balapaurushasampannan kriitāstrānmitaujasah yathāsurān Kālakeyān devo vajradharastathā.

—Mahābhārata.¹

Audbhijjo bhavitā kaśchit senānīh Kāsyapo dvijah asvamedham Kaliyuge punah pratyaharishyati.

—Harivamsa²

The Mauryas had done much for Indian unity by bringing the greater part of the country under "one umbrella," by defending it against the generals of Alexander and Seleukos, by establishing a uniform system of administration, by using Prākrit for official purposes throughout the length and breadth of the empire and attempting to knit together the different sections of its composite population by the strong tie of a common Dharma. With the fall of the dynasty Indian history for the time being loses its unity. The command of one single political authority is no longer obeyed from the snowy heights of the Hindukush to the verdant plains of Bengal and the Upper Carnatic. Hordes of outlanders pour through the northwestern gates of the country and establish aggressive monarchies in Gandhāra, Western Mālwa and neighbouring regions. The Pañjab is seized by foreigners and the Deccan by local dynasts. The political connection of the Madhya- deco with the valleys of the Indus and the Godāvari is

¹ II. 4. 23.
² III. 2. 40.
temporarily snapped, and the splendour of the Magadhan metropolis is dimmed by the rising glory of Sākala, Vidiśā, Prathishtāna and other cities. Brāhmaṇism gains ground in the Ganges valley and the Deccan, while Jainism flourishes in Orissa. The sects of the Māheśvaras and the Bhāgavatas become powers to reckon with. The study of Sanskrit receives an impetus at the hands of the grammarians of the Madhyadeśa, while Prākrit literature enjoys the patronage of the courts of Pratishṭāna and Kuntala in Southern India.

Bṛihadratha, the last Maurya Emperor of Magadh, was, according to the Purāṇas and the Harsha-charita, assassinated by his general, Pushyamitra, who usurped the throne, and founded a new line of kings.

The origin of the usurping family is wrapped up in obscurity. According to the Divyāvadāna Pushyamitra was lineally descended from the Mauryas. The Mālavikāgni-mitram, on the other hand, makes Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra, a scion of the Baimbika family, while the Purāṇas, and apparently the Harsha-Charita represent

1 In the Mālavikāgnimitram (Act IV. Verse 14; Tawney’s translation, p. 69) Agnimitra claims to belong to the Baimbika-kula. A king named Bimbaki is mentioned in The Ocean of Story, Penzer I, 112, 119. Mr. H. A. Shah suggests (Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, Madras, p. 379) that the Baimbikas were connected with the family of Bimbisa. It is more probable that the epithet ‘Baimbika’ (in the passage dākshīnyāṁ nāma bimbos̄thi Baimbikānām kulavratam) is connected with bimbikā, a kind of plant (IC, 1938, Jan. 865) and also perhaps with the river Bimbikā mentioned in the Bharhut Inscriptions (Barua and Sinha, p. 8). Cf. Pādma, Bhāmikhaṇḍa 90, 24; Baimbaki in Patañjali, IV, 1. 97. In the Harivamśa (Bhavishya, II. 40) the Brāhmaṇa Senāni who is to restore the Aśvamedha in the Kali yuga is represented as an Audhūhija, ‘Plant-born’, and a Kaśyapa. Jayaswal identifies him with Pushyamitra. Curiously enough, the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (ed. Caland, Vol. III, p. 449) represents the Baimbakāyaḥ as Kaśyapas.

2 It is, however, to be noted that the Harsha-charita never applies the designation Suṅga to Pushyamitra himself, but only to one of the latest kings in the Purāṇic list. The Purāṇas may have combined the Baimbikas and Suṅgas under the common name of Suṅga.
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these kings as Śuṅgas. One writer suggests that the Śuṅgas whose names ended in Mitra were Irānians, worshippers of Mithra (the Sun).1 Others, regard them as Indian Brāhmaṇas. Curiously enough, Pāṇini2 connects the Śuṅgas with the well-known Brāhmaṇa family of the Bhāradvājas. Śauṅgiputra, "son of a female descendant of Śuṅga," is the name of a teacher in the Brīhadāraṇyaka Upanishad.3 Śauṅgayani, "descendant of Śauṅga" is the name of a teacher in the Vaiṣṇava Brāhmaṇa. Macdonell and Keith point out that the Śuṅgas are known as teachers in the Āsvalayana Śrauta Sūtra.4 In view of the conflicting statements in the Mālavikāgñimitram, the Purāṇas, etc., it is difficult to say whether Pushyamitra and his known descendants (down to Vasumitra) were Śuṅgas of the Bhāradvāja Gotra or Baimbikas of Kaśyapa lineage. The historic "Śuṅgas" of the time of Dhanabhūti are assigned by competent scholars to the period B.C. 100-75. This accords with the testimony of the Harsha-charita which, while denying this dynastic epithet to Pushyamitra, applies it to the latest kings of the Purānic list, the immediate predecessors of Vasudeva Kāṇva.

It is not known for certain when and why the family of Pushyamitra, like the Kadambas of a later date, exchanged the quill for the sword. There is no reason to think that Aśoka tyrannised over the Brāhmaṇas and that his oppression forced them to engage in non-priestly pursuits. Brāhmaṇa

2 In Sūtra IV, 1, 117. Also Kramadāśvara, 763.
3 VI, 4. 31.
4 XII. 13. 5, etc. The Vaiṣṇava Brāhmaṇa seems to associate the Śuṅgas with the Madra country. Ved. Index, II, p. 123. For Tāranātha’s reference to Pushyamitra, see JBORS, IV, pt. 3, 258. For Bhāradvājas as champions of autocracy and of ministerial usurpation, see Kautulīya, 31, 316.
Senāpatis were by no means rare in ancient India.¹ The fact that officers of this class found employment under the Later Mauryas proves conclusively that the latter could not have pursued an anti-Brāhmaṇic policy.

The Dominions of Pushyamitra extended to the river Narmadā, and included the cities of Pātaliputra, Ayodhyā, Vidiśā, and, if the author of the Divyāvadāna and Tāranātha are to be believed, Jālandhara and Sākala.² It appears from the Divyāvadāna,³ that the Emperor himself continued to reside in Pātaliputra. The Mālavikāgnimitram tells us that Vidiśā (Besnagar in Eastern Mālwa) was governed by Prince Agnimitra, probably as his father’s viceroy (Goptri).⁴ Another viceroy, also a relation of the emperor, may have governed Kosala.⁵ Agnimitra’s queen had a brother of inferior caste, named Virasena. He was placed in command of a frontier fortress on the banks of the Narmadā (Atthi devie vaṇṇāvaro

¹ Cf. the cases of Droga, Kṛipa and Aśvatthāman in the Mahābhārata in ancient times, of Ravideva in the Indian Antiquity, VIII, 20, of Kholeśvara, the commander of Yādava kings, and of Someśvara, the Brāhmaṇā general of the Pāla kings.
² Jain writers, e.g., Merutunga, include Avanti within the dominions of Pushyamitra. This province was lost to the Sātavāhanas, and Sākala to the Greeks.
³ P. 434.
⁵ The possible existence of this viceroyalty is disclosed by an inscription discovered at the door of a temple at Ayodhyā, which records the erection of a ‘ketana’ (abode) by a Kosalādhipa who was the sixth (brother or descendant?) of Senāpati Pushyamitra, the performer of two horse-sacrifices (Nāgari Pracāriṇī Patrikā, Vaiśākhā, Sam. 1981; JBORS, X (1924) 203; XIII (1927) facing 247. Mod. Review, 1924; October, p. 431; IHQ, 1929, 602f.; Ep. Ind. XX. 54ff.). It is interesting to note that the title, ‘Senāpati’ clung to the deva (king) Pushyamitra even after the performance of the Aśvamedha. Cf. the epithet Vāhinīpati applied to king Virāja in the Mahābhārata and the title Yavuga applied to Kushan emperors besides other epithets. Cf. also the style Mahārāja Mahāsenāpati in CII., Vol. 3, p. 252, and the title Mahāmāndaleśvara applied to Bijjala and others even after the assumption of the full royal style (Bomb., Gaz., II, ii. 47ff).
bhāda Viraseno nāma, so bhaṭṭinā antar (p) āladugge Nammadātire 1 ṭhāvido).

Affairs in the Deccan

It appears from the Mālavikāgnimitram that the foundation of the dynasty of Pushyamitra almost synchronised with the establishment of a new kingdom in the Deccan, viz., Vidarbha or Berar. Agnimitra’s Amātya (Minister) refers to the kingdom as “achirādhishṭhita” (established not long ago) and compares its king to a tree which is newly planted and, therefore, not firm (navasamropana-śīthiḷas-taruh). The king of Vidharbha is represented as a relation (sister’s husband) of the Maurya minister (Sachiva) and a natural enemy (Prakrityamitra) of the family of Pushyamitra. It appears that during the reign of Bṛhadratha Maurya there were two parties or factions in the Magadha Empire, one headed by the king’s Sachiva or minister, the other headed by his Senāpati or general. The minister’s partisan Yajñasena got the rulership of Vidarbha, while the general’s son Agnimitra obtained the viceroyalty of Vidiśā. When the general organised his coup d’etat, killed the king, and imprisoned the minister, Yajñasena apparently declared his independence and commenced hostilities against the usurping family. This is why he is called achirādhishṭhita-rājya and prakrity-amitra by Agnimitra and his Amātya.

1 Act I. Some manuscripts mention Mandākinī as the name of the river (cf. IHQ, 1925, 214). A stream called Mandākinī lies 5 miles south of the Tāpti (Ind. Ant., 1902, 254). Another Mandākinī flowed near Chitrakūta (Rām. 92. 10-11). Lüders’ Inscriptions, Nos. 637-638, seem to suggest that Bharhut (in Baghelkhand) was governed by a Śunga feudatory. If Pushyamitra was a Suāga Baghelkhand must have formed part of the empire of his family. In the Monuments of Sānci, I. iv. 271, the author does not agree with Bühler in assigning the ins. to the middle of the second century B.C. He prefers B.C. 100-75. Palaeographically the epigraphs are classed with the ins. of Indrāgnimitra, Brahmamitra and Vishṇumitra.
The Mālavikāgnimitram says that when Kumāra Mādhavasena, a cousin of Yajñasena and a partisan of Agnimitra, was secretly on his way to Vidiśā, he was captured by an Antapāla (Warden of the Marches) of Yajñasena and kept in custody. Agnimitra demanded his surrender. The Vidarbha king promised to give him up on condition that his brother-in-law, the Maurya minister, should be released. This enraged the ruler of Vidiśā who ordered Vīrasena to march against Vidarbha. Yajñasena was defeated. Mādhavasena was released and the kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two cousins, the river Varadā (Wardha) forming the boundary between the two states. Both the rulers seem to have accepted the suzerainty of the House of Pushyamitra.

In the opinion of several scholars an enemy more formidable than Yajñasena threatened Pushyamitra’s dominions from Kalinga (Orissa). In his Oxford History of India Dr. Smith accepts the view that Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga, defeated Pushyamitra who is identified with Bahapatimita or Bahasatimita, a prince supposed to be mentioned in the Hāthīgumpha Inscription of the Kaliṅga monarch. Prof. Dubreuil also seems to endorse the view that Khāravela was an antagonist of Pushyamitra, and that the Hāthīgumpha Inscription is dated the 165th year of Rāja-Muriya-kāla (era of king Maurya) which corresponds to the 13th year of the reign of Khāravela.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar, however, points out that of the six letters of the Hāthīgumpha Inscription which have been read as Bahasati-mitam, the second letter seems to have a clear u sign attached to it, and the third and fourth letters look like pa and sa. Even if the reading Bahasati-mitam,

---


or Bahapati-mitam, be accepted as correct, the identification of Bahasati (Brihaspati-mitra) with Pushyamitra merely on the ground that Brihaspati (Jiva) is the regent, nakshatrā-dhipa, of the nakshatra or zodiacal asterism Pushya, also named Tishya, in the constellation Cancer or the Crab, cannot be regarded as final in the absence of more convincing evidence.¹ In this connection we should note that the Divyāvacāna² distinguishes between a king named "Vrihaspati" and king Pushyamitra,³ and represents Pāṭaliputra as the residence of the latter whereas the Magadhan antagonist of Kharavela is possibly called "Rājagahanapa"⁴ and apparently resided in the city of Rājagriha.

The date "165th year of the Muriyakāla" was deduced from a passage of the Hāthigumpha Inscription which was read as follows:⁵—"Pānmitariya-sāthi-vasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kālē vochchhine...". There is another passage in the same inscription which runs thus:—"Paṁchame cha (or che) dānī vaise Naṁda-rāja ti-vasa-sata (m ?)—oghāṭitam Tanasuliya-vāṭa-pañḍīṁ nagaram pavesayati".⁶ If Pānmitariya-sāthi-vasa-sate be taken to mean "in the 165th year";

¹ Cf. Chanda in IHQ, 1929, p. 59ff.
² Pp. 433-34.
³ It is not suggested that Vrihaspati of the Divyāvacāna is necessarily to be identified with any king named Brihaspatimitra mentioned in inscriptions, though the possibility is not entirely excluded. What we mean to point out is that the name "Brihaspati" is not to be equated with Pushyamitra, simply because Brihaspati is the "regent" of the asterism Pushya, because in literature 'Vrihaspati,' 'Pushyadharman' and 'Pushyamitra' occur as names of distinct individuals. Regarding the proposed identification of Pushyamitra with Brihaspatimitra, see also IHQ, 1930, p. 23.
⁶ Ibid, p. 455. For the interpretation of the passage, see p. 220 supra. S. Konow translates it differently:—"And now in the fifth year he has the
ti-vasa-sata should be taken to mean 103 years, and we shall have to conclude that Khāravela flourished some 165 years after a Maurya king, and only 103 years after Nandarāja, which is impossible as the Nandas preceded the Mauryas. If, on the other hand, ti-vasa-sata be taken to mean 300 years, pānāmātriya-sāthi-vasa-sata should be taken to mean not 165 but 6,500 years. In other words Khāravela will have to be placed 6,500 years after a Maurya which is also impossible. Jayaswal himself subsequently gave up the reading "... Pānāmātriya-sāthi-vasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kālē vucchhine cha chhe-yāthi Argasi ti kāmrāriyām upādiyati" in line 16, and proposed to read "Paṭāliko chatare cha veduriyāgabhe thambhe patiṭhāpayati pānātarīya sata-sahasehi. Muriya kālām vochhimnam cha choyaṭhi agasatikāmrāriyām upādiyati." He translated the passage thus:—"on the lower-roofed terrace (i.e., in the verandah) he establishes columns inlaid with beryl at the cost of 75,00,000 (Paṇas), he (the king) completes the Muriya time (era), counted and being of an interval of 64 with a century." With regard to this new reading and translation Mr. R. P. Chanda observed "the rendering of vochhine as 'counted' is even more far-fetched than 'expired'. The particle cha after vochhine makes it difficult to read it as vochhinam qualifying the substantive Muriyakālām. Even if we overlook vochhine, the passage appears to be a very unusual way of stating a date. Still more unusual is the statement of a date as an

"aqueduct which was shut (or opened) in the year 103 (during the reign of) the Nanda king, conducted into the town from Tanasuliya Vaṭa."


2 M. A. S. I., No. 1, p. 10. Cf. also S. Konow in Acta Orientalia, I. 14-21. Like Fleet S. Konow finds no date in the passage but regards the reading Rāja Muriya kāla as certain. According to him Khāravela restored some texts missing in the time of the Maurya king Chandragupta. Dr. Barua does not regard the reading Muriya as certain.
independent achievement in a *prasasti.*' According to Fleet the use of the term "*vochchhina*" which is applied to sacred texts which have been 'cut off,' 'interrupted'—quite prohibits the existence of a date. It may be added that there is no reliable evidence of the existence of a *Rāja-Muriya-kāla* in the sense of an era founded by the first Maurya. The use of regnal years by Asoka points to the same conclusion.¹ Jayaswal himself admits in the *Epigraphia Indica,*² that "there is no date in a Maurya era in the 16th line," of the *Hāthigumpha* inscription.³

Dr. Jayaswal at one time took *ti-vasa-sata* to mean 300 years and placed Khāravela and Pushyamitra three centuries after Nandarāja whom he identified with Nandavardhana.

¹ An era of Samprati, grandson of Asoka, is however, mentioned in an ancient Jain MS. (EHI 4, p. 202n). If we refer the year 164 to this era, the date of Khāravela must be brought down to (cir 224—164 =) 60 B.C. In "A note on the *Hāthigumpha* Inscription of Khāravela" Barnett suggests the following rendering of the passage which is supposed to contain the words Muriya-kāla:

"And when the Mauryan (?) time-reckoning . . . . which consisted of lustres (antara) of five (years) each, had broken down, he found (a new time-reckoning) consisting of lustres of 7 years each (saptakāntariyam) and mounting up to the 64th year (chatush shashtyagram)." To reform the calendar Khāravela introduced a new cycle of 64 years consisting of 9 Yugas of 7 years each. According to Dr. F. W. Thomas (JRAS, 1922, 84) *antara = antargriha = cell.* The passage means that cells which had been left unfinished during the time of the Maurya kings were constructed by Khāravela.

² XX. 74.

³ His latest reading of the inscriptionsal passage is as follows:

"Pañjalako chaturro cha veṭuriya-gabhe thamibhe patithāpayati, pāṇātiyā ratasaḥase(h)ī; Muriya-kāla-vochchinān cha choyath śi(i) Aṅga satika(vu) turiyān upādayati."

"Pañjalaka(?) . . . . (he) sets up four columns inlaid with beryl at the cost of seventy-five hundred thousands; . . . (he) causes to be compiled expeditiously the (text) of the sevenfold *Aṅgas* of the sixty-four (letters)." *Ep. Ind., XX, pp. 80, 89,*
But we have already seen that Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana was a Śaisunāga king and that the Śaisunāgas do not appear to have had anything to do with Kāliṅga. "It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought 'all under his sole sway' and 'uprooted all Kshatriyas' or the old reigning families. So we should identify 'Namdarāja' of the Hāthīgumpha inscription, who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons."" Professor Barua objects to the identification of ""Namdarāja,"" the conqueror of Kaliṅga, with a king of the pre-Aśokan Nanda line on the ground that in the Aśokan inscriptions it is claimed that Kaliṅga was not conquered (avijita) before Aśoka. But such claims are on a par with the Gupta boast that Samudra Gupta was ajita-rājajetā, conqueror of unconquered kings, and that the Aśvamedha sacrifice had been revived, after a long period of abeyance, by him. We know that as a matter of fact the claims, if taken too literally, had very little substance in them. The suggestion in the Cambridge History of Ancient India that Nandarāja may have been a local ruler of Kaliṅga is negatived by the internal evidence of the Hāthīgumpha Inscription. A post-Aśokan ""neo-Nanda"" line of Magadha is also unknown to sober history.4

2 Allan, Gupta Coins, p. ex. Cf. Jahāngir's boast that "not one of the mighty emperors has conquered" Kangra, (ASI, AR, 1905-6, p. 11). Avijita may simply refer to the fact that Kaliṅga was not included within the limits of Aśoka's Vijjata (empire) or Rāja-vishya (Royal Dominions).
3 Cf. the passage—"Namdarāja nītām cha Kaliṅga Jinasamnīvesam" which proves clearly that Nanda was an outsider.
4 A late Nanda or Nandodbhava line is known to epigraphy. But it ruled in Orissa. See R. D. Banerji. Orissa, I. 202; Kumar Bidyādhara Singh Deo, Nandapur, I. 46; Ep. Ind. xxi, App. Ins. No. 2043.
As Mahāpadma Nanda and his sons ruled in the fourth century B.C., Khāravela is to be assigned either to the third century B.C., (taking ti-vasa-sata to mean 103)\(^1\) or to the first century B.C. (taking ti-vasa-sata to mean 300). In neither case could he be regarded as a contemporary of Pushyamitra who ruled from about 187 to 151 B.C.

**The Yavana Invasion**

The only undoubted historical events of Pushyamitra’s time, besides the *coup d’ etat* of c. 187 B.C., and the Vidarbhā war, are the Greek invasion from the North-West referred to by Patañjali or a Predecessor and Kālidāsa, and the celebration of two horse-sacrifices.

Patañjali is usually regarded as a contemporary of Pushyamitra. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar draws our attention to the passage in the *Mahābhāṣya*—*iha Pushyamîtraṁ yājayāmah*: “here we perform the sacrifices for Pushyamitra”—which is cited as an illustration of the Vārttika teaching the use of the present tense to denote an action which has been begun but not finished.\(^2\) The instances given by Patañjali of the use of the imperfect to indicate an action well-known to people, but not witnessed by the speaker, and still possible to have been seen by him, are, “*arunad Yavanah Sāketam: arunad Yavano Madhyamikām.*” This, says Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, shows that a certain Yavana or Greek chief had besieged Sāketa or Ayodhyā.

---

1. Konow (*Acta Orientalia*, Vol. I, pp. 22-26) accepts the date 103, but refers it (along with another date, 113, which he, with Fleet, finds in line 11) to a Jaina era. This era he is inclined to identify with that of Mahāvira’s *Nirvāṇa*. Apparently he is not aware of the existence of another Jaina reckoning, viz., the era of Samprati. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal (*Ep. Ind.*, XX. 75) now assigns the date 103 to a Nanda era and says that the date refers to the time when the Tanausuliya Canal, which Khāravela extended to the capital in the 5th year of his reign, was originally excavated.

and another place called Madhyamikā¹ when Patañjali wrote this. It is, however, possible that the instances cited by the great grammarian are stock illustrations (mūrdhābhishikta udāharaṇa) which are simply quoted by him from earlier authorities. But a war with Greeks in the days of Pushyamitra is vouched for by Kālidāsa. In his Mālavikāgnimitram the poet refers to a conflict between prince Vasumitra, grandson and general of Pushyamitra, and a Yavana on the southern (or right) bank of the Sindhu.² Unfortunately the name of the leader of the invaders is not given either in the Mahābhāshya or in the Mālavikāgnimitram. There is considerable divergence of opinion with regard to his identity. But all agree that he was a Bactrian Greek.

The Bactrian Greeks were originally subjects of the Seleukidian Empire of Syria (and Western Asia). We learn from Strabo, Trogus and Justin that "about the middle of the third century B.C. when the Seleukid rulers were pre-occupied in the west" Diodotos, "Governor of the thousand cities of Bactria" (Balkh region to the south of the Oxus), revolted and assumed the title of king. He was succeeded, according to Justin, by his son Diodotos II who entered into an alliance with Arsakes who about this time (c. 247 B.C.) tore Parthia in Northern Irān from the Seleukidian Empire.

The successor of Diodotos II was Euthydemos. We learn from Strabo³ that Euthydemos and his party occasioned the revolt of all the country near the province of Bactriana. We are told by Polybius that Antiochos III (223-187 B.C.) of Syria made an attempt to recover the lost provinces but afterwards made peace with Euthydemos.

¹ Nāgari near Chitor; cf. Mbh., II. 32.8; Ind. Ant., VII, 297.
² The Indus or possibly a stream of the same name in Central India (Cf. IQH, 1925, 315).
The historian says, "Antiochos the Great received the young prince (Demetrios; son of Euthydemos) and judging from his appearance, conversation and the dignity of his manners that he was worthy of royal honour he first promised to give him one of his daughters, and secondly conceded the royal title to his father. And having on the other points caused a written treaty to be drawn up and the terms of the treaty to be confirmed on oath, he marched away, after liberally provisioning his troops, and accepting the elephants belonging to Euthydemos. He crossed Caucrasus (Hindukush) and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasenos, the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, having once more provisioned his troops set out again personally with his army, leaving Androsthenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him."

Not long after the expedition of Antiochos the Great, the Bactrian Greeks themselves formed the design of extending their kingdom by the conquest of the territories lying to the south of the Hindukush. Strabo says, "the Greeks who occasioned its (Bactria's) revolt became so powerful that they became masters of Ariana and India, according to Apollodoros of Artemita. Their chiefs, particularly Menander (if he really crossed the Hypanis to the east and reached the Isamus) conquered more nations than Alexander. These conquests

---

1 Tarn's scepticism (Greeks in Bactria and India, 82, 201) about the marriage is not warranted by cogent evidence. His arguments are in part of a negative character. He seems to prefer his own interpretation of certain coins of Agathokles to the clear testimony of Polybius.

2 Artemita lay to the east of the Tigris. The books of Apollodoros are assigned to a date between C. 150 B.C. and 87 B.C. (Tarn, Greeks, 44ff.).

3 i.e., the Hyphasis or Vipasā (the Beas).

4 The Trisāmā? In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (V. 19, 17) a river of this name is mentioned in conjunction with the Kaušāki, Mandākini, Yamunā, etc. Sircar prefers the Ikāhumāt.
were achieved partly by Menander, partly by Demetrios, son of Euthydemos, king of the Bactrians. They got possession not only of Patalene (the Indus Delta), but of the kingdoms of Saraostos (Surāśhṭra or Kāthiāwār), and Sigerdis (probably Sāgaradvipa) which constitute the remainder of the coast. Apollodoros in short says that Bactriana is the ornament of all Ariana. They extended their empire even as far as the Seres and Phryni."

Strabo gives the credit for spreading the Greek dominion furthest to the east into India partly to Menander and partly to Demetrios, son of Euthydemos and son-in-law of Antiochos the Great.

**Menander** has been identified with the king Milinda who is mentioned in the *Mālinda-pañho* as a contemporary of the Buddhist *Thera* (Elder) Nāgasena, and also in the *Avadāna-kalpalatā* of Kshemendra. This monarch was born at Kalsigrāma in the "Island" of Alasanda or Alexandria and had his capital at Sāgala or Sākala, modern Siālkot, in the Pāñjab, and not at Kābul as Dr. Smith seemed to think. The extent of his conquests is indicated by the great variety and wide diffusion of his coins which have been found over a very wide extent of country as far west as Begram near Kābul and as far east as Mathurā. The author of the *Periplus* states

---

3 *Stūpa avadāna* (No. 57); Smith, *Catalogue of Coins, Indian Museum*, p. 3; SBE, 36, xvii.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 82 (CHI, 550). The identity of this "Alexandria" is uncertain. Tarn (p. 141) seems to prefer Alexandria in the Kābul Valley. The *Mālinda*, VI. 21, seems to suggest location on the sea unless a different Alexandria is meant.
6 *Mālinda*, pp. 3, 14.
7 *EHL.*, 1914, p. 226.
that small silver coins, inscribed with Greek characters and bearing the name of Menander were still current in his time (cir. 60-80 A.D.) at the port of Barygaza (Broach). Plutarch tells us that Menander was noted for justice, and enjoyed such popularity with his subjects that upon his death, which took place in camp, diverse cities contended for the possession of his ashes. The statement of Plutarch is important as showing that Menander’s dominions included many cities. The recently discovered Bajaur Relic Casket Inscription confirms the numismatic evidence regarding the westward extension of his empire.

Demetrios has been identified by some with king Dattāmitra mentioned in the Mahābhārata, the “great Emetreus, the king of Inde” of Chaucer’s Knightes Tale and Timitra of a Besnagar seal. The wide extent of his conquests is proved by the existence of several cities named after him or his father in Afghanistān as well as India. Thus in the work of Isidore of Charax we have a reference to a city named Demetriaspolis in Arachosia. The Vākaraṇa (grammar) of Kramadīśvara mentions a city in Sauvāra called Dattāmitri. Ptolemy the Geographer

1 Ep. Ind. XXIV, 7 ff, XXVI, 318 f, XXVII, ii, 52f. The King’s name is given as Mina-edra.
2 I, 139, 23. Krimisa, the Yaksha (AIU, p. 107) with whom he is identified by Dr. Bagchi belongs to the domain of folklore.
3 EHI4, p. 255n.
5 Ind. Arch., 1911. Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population; Bomb. Gaz., I. ii, 1176, Kramadiśvara, p. 706. The reference is probably to a Demetrias in the lower Indus Valley. Johnston differs from the view (JRAS, April, 1930; IHQ, 1939). We should, however, not ignore the evidence of Mbh. I. 189, verses 21-23, which clearly refer to a Yavanādhīsa and Dattāmitra in connection with Sauvāra. If Dattāmitra is not Demetrios and Dattāmitri not a city founded by him, it will be interesting to know with whom Dattāmitra and the Yavanādhīsa of the epic are proposed to be identified. A Nāsik (Deccan) Inscription (No. 1140 Lüders’ List) makes mention of a Yopaka from the north (Otarāha), a native of Dattāmitri. Thus epic and epigraphic evidence together with that of Sanskrit grammarians clearly establishes the connection between the Yonas or Yavanas (Greeks), Dattāmitri and Sauvāra,
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mentions the city of Euthymedia (♀ Euthydemia') which was identical with Sākala, and was, according to the Milinda-pañho, the capital of an Indo-Greek kingdom in the time of Menander.

It is permissible to conjecture that one of the two conquering kings, viz., Menander and Demetrios, was identical with the Yavana leader who penetrated to Sāketa in Oudh, Madhyamikā near Chitor, and the river Sindhu possibly in Central India, in the time of Pushyamitra. Goldstücker, Smith and many other scholars identified the invader with Menander who crossed the Hypanis (Beas) and penetrated as far as the Isamus (Trisāmā♀?). On the other hand, Dr. Bhandarkar suggested, in his Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population, the identification of the invader with Demetrios. We learn from Polybius that Demetrios was a young man at the time of Antiochos III's invasion (between 211 and 206 B.C.). Justin says that Demetrios was "king of the Indians" when Eukratides was king of the Bactrians and Mithradates was the king of the Parthians. "Almost at the same time that Mithradates ascended the throne among the Parthians, Eukratides began to reign among the Bactrians; both of them being great men...Eukratides carried on several wars with great spirit, and though much reduced by his losses in them, yet, when he was besieged by Demetrios, king of the Indians, with a garrison of only 300 soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies, a force of 60,000 enemies."

1 We are hardly justified in rejecting the reading 'Euthyde' (Tarn, p. 486) simply on the grounds urged by Tarn (p. 247) which do not appear to be convincing, and accept a reading which is "meaningless and wrongly accentuated." See also Keith in D. R. Bhandarkar Volume, 231f.

2 Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 349-50.

3 As already stated, Trisāmā is a river mentioned in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. Note the absence of any reference to the Ganges in Strabo's account of Menander's conquests.
Dr. Smith assigns Mithradates to the period from 171 to 136 B.C. (to 138/37 B.C. according to Debevoise). Eukratides and Demetrios must also be assigned to that period, that is the middle of the second century B.C.¹

We have seen that Demetrios was a young man and a prince in or about 206 B.C. We now find that he ruled as king of the Indians about the middle of the second century B.C. He was, therefore, the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra who ruled from c. 187 to 151 B.C. Menander, on the other hand, must have ruled over the Indo-Greek kingdom much later, as will be apparent from the facts noted below. Justin tells us that Demetrios was deprived of his Indian possessions by Eukratides.² Eukratides was killed by his son with whom he had shared his throne.³ The identity of the parricide is uncertain but no one says that he was Menander.⁴

Justin furnishes the important information that the prince who murdered Eukratides was a colleague of his father. We know that Greek rulers who reigned conjointly sometimes issued joint coins. Thus we have joint coins of Lysias and Antialkidas, Agathokleia and Strato, of Strato I and Strato II, and of Hermaios and Kalliope. The only Greeks whose names and portraits appear on a

¹ The activity of Mithradates I began after the death of Antiochus IV in 163 B.C. See Tarn, pp. 197 ff. According to Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, p. 20 ff. Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, crossed the Euphrates in 165 B.C. Mithradates I died in 138/37 B.C., the first Parthian date fixed by numismatic and cuneiform evidence. Eukratides assumed the title "Great" before 162 B.C. (date of Timarchus) (The Cambridge Shorter History of India, p. 64). His coins are copied by Plato (165 B.C.) as well as Timarchus.

² Watson’s tr., p. 277.

³ Ibid., p. 277.

⁴ According to Cunningham and Smith the parricide was Apollodotos. But Rapson shows good reasons for believing that Apollodotos did not belong to the family of Eukratides, but was, on the other hand, a ruler of Kapiša who was ousted by Eukratides (JRAS, 1905, pp. 784-85). Rawlinson points out (Intercourse between India and the Western World, p. 73) that Apollodotos uses the epithet
coin or medallion together with those of Eukratides are Heliokles and his wife Laodike. Cunningham and Gardner suggested that Heliokles and Laodike were the father and mother of Eukratides. But Von Sallet proposed an entirely different interpretation of the coins in question. He thought that they were issued by Eukratides, not in honour of his parents, but on the occasion of the marriage of his son Heliokles with a Laodike whom Von Sallet conjectured to have been daughter of Demetrios by the daughter of Antiochus III. If Von Sallet's conjecture be accepted then it is permissible to think that Heliokles was the colleague of Eukratides referred to by Justin, and the murderer of his father.

It is clear from what has been stated above that Demetrios was succeeded by Eukratides, who, in his turn, was probably followed by Heliokles. Menander could not in that case have reigned earlier than Heliokles. It may, however, be argued that after Demetrios the Indo-Greek kingdom split up into two parts: one part which included the Trans-Jhelum territories was ruled by Eukratides and his son, the other part which included "Euthymedia" (Euthydemia?) or Sakala was ruled by Menander who thus might have been a younger contemporary of Eukratides (cir. 171-165 B.C.) and consequently of Pushyamitra (cir. 187-151 B.C.).

Now, the disruption of the Indo-Greek kingdom after Demetrios may be accepted as an historical fact. The existence of two rival Greek kingdoms in India and their

Philopator, and the title would be somewhat incongruous if he were a parricide. It may be argued that the parricide was Apollodotos Soter and not Apollodotos Philopator, but we should remember that the titles Soter and Philopator sometimes occur on the same coin (Whitehead, Catalogue of Coins, p. 48) and therefore it is impossible to justify the separation of Apollodotos Soter and Apollodotos Philopator as two entities.

1 Ind. Ant., 1880, p. 256.
mutual dissensions are proved by literary and numismatic evidence. The Purāṇas say:

Bhavishyantīha Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato’rthatah
naiva Mārdhābhishiktās te bhavishyanti narūdīhpaḥ
yuga-dosha-durāchārā bhavishyanti nṛpās tu te
strinām bāla-vadhenaiva hatvā chaiva parasparam.

"There will be Yavanas here by reason of religious feeling or ambition or plunder; they will not be kings solemnly anointed but will follow evil customs by reason of the corruptions of the age. Massacring women and children and killing one another, kings will enjoy the earth at the end of the Kali age."

The Gārgī Saṃhitā informs us:

Madhyadeśe na sthāsyanti Yanvanā yuddha durmadāḥ
teshām anyonya saṁbhāvā (?) bhavishyanti na saṁśāyaḥ
ātma-chakrotthilaṁ ghoram yuddham parama-dārṇaṁ.

"The fiercely fighting Greeks will not stay in the Madhyadeśa (Mid-India); there will be a cruel, dreadful war in their own kingdom, caused between themselves."

Coins bear testimony to struggles between kings of the house of Eukratides and rulers of the family of Euthydemos. But the evidence which we possess clearly indicates that the contemporaries and rivals of Eukratides and Heliokles were Apollodotos, Agathokleia and Strato I, and not Menander. A square copper coin of Eukratides has on the obverse a bust of the king and the legend "Basilēus Megalou Eukratidon." On the reverse there is the figure of Zeus and the legend "Kavisiye nagara-

1 Cf. Cunn. AGI. Revised Ed. 274; Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 376. "The Macedonians... gave away to a fury of blood-lust, sparing neither woman nor child."

2 Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 56, 74.

3 Kern, Brihat Saṃhitā, p. 38.

4 CHI, 553, 690; Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 26.
devatā." They are often coins (?) of Apollodotos restruck.¹ From this it is probable that Apollodotos was a rival of Eukratides, and was superseded in the rule of Kāpiśa, which lay in the district identified with Kāfīristān and the valleys of Ghōrband and Panjshir, by the latter. Rapson further points out ² that Heliokles restruck the coins of Agathokleia and Strato I ruling conjointly and also of Strato I reigning alone. Further, the restricking is always by Heliokles, never by Agathokleia and Strato I. From this it is clear that Agathokleia and Strato I ruled over an Indo-Greek principality either before, or in the time of Heliokles, but probably not after him.

We have seen that according to the evidence of Justin and the Kāpiśa coins Eukratides probably fought against two rivals, namely, Demetrios and Apollodotos; his son Heliokles also fought against two rivals, namely, Agathokleia and Strato I. As Demetrios and Apollodotos were both antagonists of Eukratides and used similar coin-types, the inevitable inference is that they were very near in time as well as in relationship to one another, in fact that one immediately followed the other. Now Demetrios was beyond doubt the son and successor of Euthydemos, consequently Apollodotos must have been his successor.

As Heliokles was in all probability a son of Eukratides, the rival of Apollodotos, he must have been a younger contemporary of Apollodotos. Consequently, Heliokles' antagonists, Agathokleia and Strato I, whose coins he restruck, were very near in time to Apollodotos. Strato I later on ruled conjointly with his grandson Strato II. There is no room for the long and prosperous reign of Menander in the period which elapsed from Demetrios to Strato II. According

¹ Rapson, JRAS, 1905, p. 785. According to some 'overstriking in itself is no evidence of conquest' but simply of commercial relationship (JAOS, 1950, p. 210).
² JRAS, 1905, pp. 166 ff. CHI, p. 553.
to the Buddhist tradition recorded in the *Milinda-pañha*, Milinda or Menander flourished “500 years,” i.e., not earlier than the fifth century 1 after the *Parinirvāṇa, parinibbānato paṇḍavassa sate atikkante ete upajjissanti.* This tradition points to a date not earlier than the period 144-44 B.C. according to Ceylonese reckoning, or 86 B.C.-14 A.D. according to Cantonese tradition, for Menander. Thus both according to numismatic evidence and literary tradition Menander could not have been the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra. 2 It is Demetrios who should, therefore, be identified with the Yavana invader referred to by Patañjali and Kālidāsa, one of whose armies was defeated by Prince Vasumitra. 3

The Āśvamedha Sacrifices

After the victorious wars with Vidarbha (Berar) and the Yavanas Pushyamitra completed the performance of two horse-sacrifices. These sacrifices are regarded by some scholars as marking an early stage in the Brahmanical reaction which was fully developed five centuries later in the time of Samudra Gupta and his successors. Buddhist writers are

1 Cf. the interpretation of somewhat similar chronological data by Franke and Fleet (JRAS, 1914, pp. 400-1); and Smith EHI, 3rd Edition, p. 328.

2 Trenckner, the *Milinda-pañha*, p. 3. Tarn is not quite right in saying (134 n) that Apollodorus makes Menander contemporary with Demetrios, Trogus with Apollodotos, and some coin indications (CHI, p. 551) with Eukratides. Strabo following Apollodorus and possibly other authorities simply says that extensive Bactrian conquests in the Indian interior were achieved partly by Menander and partly by Demetrios. It is nowhere clearly stated that the two conquerors were contemporaries. The book of Trogus on which another conclusion is based, is lost. Coin indications are not clear enough. E.g., the imitation of certain coins of Demetrios by Maues does not prove chronological proximity.

3 Cf. 445n infra.

4 S. Konow (Acta Orientalia, 1, 35) points out that there is no evidence that Menander transgressed the river Yamuna, and that Demetrios was the ruler who besieged Sāketa and Madhyamikā. In IHQ, 1929, p. 406, Mr. R. F. Chanda
alleged to represent Pushyamitra as a cruel persecutor of the religion of Sākyamuni. But the probative value of the Diṇyāçadāṇa, on which some modern writers place their chief reliance in regard to the matter, is seriously impaired by the representation of the "persecuting" monarch as a Maurya, a descendant of Aśoka himself. Moreover, the prime motive which is said to have inclined the king to a vicious policy is, according to this Buddhist work, personal glory and not religious fanaticism. Pushyamitra did not dispense with the services of pro-Buddhist ministers, and the court of his son was graced by Paṇḍita-Kauśikī. The Mahāvainśa admits the presence, in Bihar, Oudh, Mālwa and adjacent provinces, of numerous monasteries with thousands of monks in the age of Duṭṭhagāmana of Ceylon (C. 101-77 B.C.) which is partly synchronous with the Baimbika-Śuṅga period. The Buddhist monuments at Bhārhut erected "during the sovereignty of the Śuṅgas" do not also bear out the theory that the Śuṅgas, among whom Pushyamitra is included by the Purāṇas, were the leaders of a militant Brāhmanism. Though staunch adherents of orthodox Hinduism, kings of the line of Pushyamitra do not appear to have been as intolerant as some writers represent them to be.

The Mantri-parishad in the days of Pushyamitra.

Patañjali refers to the Sabhā of Pushyamitra. But it is uncertain as to whether the term refers to a Royal Durbar, a tribunal of justice, or a Council of Magnates. The existence of Councils or Assemblies of Ministers (Mantri-Parishad) is, however, vouched for by Kālidāsa. If the poet is to be believed the Council continued to be

regards Strabo's attribution of the Indian conquests to Demetrios as doubtful. But the cities in the Pañjāb and the Lower Indus Valley, named after Demetrios and possibly his father leave no room for doubt that Strabo is right.

1 IHQ, Vol. V, p. 397; Diṇyāçadāṇa, 433-34.
2 Mālācikāgnimitrom, Act I.
3 Geiger, trans., p. 193.
an important element of the governmental machinery. He gives us the valuable information that even viceregal princes were assisted by Parishads. The Mālavikāgnimitra refers in clear terms to the dealings of Prince Agnimitra, the Viceroy of Vidiśā (in Eastern Mālwa), with his Parishad:

"Deva evam Amātya-parishado vijñāpayāmi""
"Mantri-prishado' pyetad-eva darsanam dvidhā vibhaktām śriyam-udcahantau dhuraṁ rathāśvācinā samgrahītāh tau sthāsyata-te nṛpater nideśe paraspar-āvagraha-nirvikārau""3

Rājā : tena hi Mantri-parishadān brāhi senānye Vira-senāya likhyatām evaṁ kriyatām iti.""4

It seems that the Amātya-parishad or Mantri-parishad was duly consulted whenever an important matter of foreign policy had to be decided upon.

---

1 Bühler (Ep. Ind. III. 137) points out that Aśoka's Kumāras were also each assisted by a body of Mahāmātras. These may have corresponded to the Kumārāṃśyas of the Gupta period.

2 "King! I will announce this decision to the Council of Ministers."

3 "This is also the view of the (Council of Ministers). Those two kings, upbearing the fortune of their superior lord divided between them, as the horses upbear the yoke of the charioteer, will remain firm in their allegiance to thee, not being distracted by mutual attacks." Act V, verse 14.

4 "King: Tell the Council then to send to the General VīraSenā written instructions to this effect." (Tawney, Mālavikāgnimitra, pp. 89-90.)
SECTION II. AGNIMITRA AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

Pushyamitra died in or about 151 B.C., probably after a reign of 36 years, and was succeeded by his son Agnimitra. The name of a prince named Agnimitra has been found on several copper coins discovered in Rohilkhand. Cunningham was of opinion that this prince was probably not to be identified with the son of Pushyamitra, but belonged to a local dynasty of North Pañchāla (Rohilkhand). He gave two reasons for this conclusion:

1. Agnimitra’s is the only coin-name found in the Purānic lists. The names of the other “Mitra” kings occurring on coins of the so-called “Pañchāla series,” do not agree with those found in the Purāṇas.

2. The coins are very rarely found beyond the limits of North Pañchāla.

As to the first point Rivett-Carnac and Jayaswal have shown that several coin-names besides that of Agnimitra can be indentified with those found in the

---

1 Only thirty years according to a Jaina tradition—“ṇaṇāṣayaḥ Mūrīyāṇaṁ tīra chehiya Pāsamittassu” (IA. 1914. 118 f. Merutudga).

2 The commentary on the Amarakosā seems to suggest that Agnimitra is the original of king Sūdraka of tradition (Oka, p. 192; Ann. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst., 1931, 300). On the other hand Keith refers to a tradition recorded in the Vīra charita and by the younger Rājaśekhara which represents Sūdraka as a minister of a Sātavāhana king. We are further told by another writer that Sūdraka defeated prince Svāti and ruled for a long time. A tale alluded to in the Harsha- charita represents him as an enemy of Chandraketu, lord of Chakora, apparently in South India (Keith, The Sanskrit Drama, p. 199; Sanskrit Literature, p. 292; Goshi, History of Central and Western India, pp. 141 f.). The story of Sūdraka is essentially legendary and it is difficult to extract any historical truth out of it. The abeyance of Sātavāhana power in the Upper Deccan for a long period is a fact. But it is due to the irruption of foreign tribes from the north. Diao loyal ministers may have helped to bring in the invader.

4 JASB, 1880, 21 ff.; 87 ff.; Ind. Ant., 1880, 311.
Purānic lists of Śuṅga and Kāṇva kings; for example, Bhadra-ghosha may be identified with Ghosha, the seventh king of the Purānic list of Śuṅga kings. Bhāmimitra may be identified with the Kāṇva king of that name. Jethamitra, who is identified with the successor of Agnimitra, viz., Vasu-
Jyesṭha or Su-Jyesṭha, who is called simply Jyesṭha in the \( k \) Vishnu manuscript,\(^1\) no doubt left coins that belong to a different series. But even he is closely connected with an Agnimitra. Several names indeed cannot be identified, but they may have been names of those Śuṅgas who survived the usurpation of Vasudeva Kāṇva and the remnant of whose power was destroyed by the so-called Andhras and Śiśunandis.\(^2\)

As to the second point we should remember that “Mitra” coins, even those which undoubtedly belong to the so-called Pañcāla series, have been found in Oudh, the Basti district, and even Pātaliputra, as well as in Pañcāla. Names of two “Mitra” kings, Brahmamitra and Indramitra, of whom the latter undoubtedly belonged to the Pañcāla group, are found engraved on two rail pillars at Bodh Gayā as well as on coins discovered at Mathurā, Pañcāla and Kumrahār.\(^3\) In the face of these facts it is difficult to say that the “Mitra” in question were a local dynasty of North Pañcāla. The matter, however, must be regarded as sub judice.

---

\(^1\) *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 31, n. 12. Pace Allan, *CICA*.i, p. xcvii.

\(^2\) *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 49.

\(^3\) Cunningham, *Coins of Ancient India*, pp. 84, 88; Allan, *CICA*, pp. cxix, cxx; Marshall, *Archaeological Survey Report for 1907-8*, p. 40; Bloch *ASR*, 1908-9, p. 147; IHQ, 1900, pp. 1ff. The name *Im......tra* occurs in a mutilated inscription on a rail pillar at Bodh Gayā with the title Rāṣṭo added before it. Marshall, Bloch and Rapseon agree in identifying king *Im......tra* with Indramitra of coins. Bloch further identifies him with Kauśikiputra Indrāgņimitra, husband of Aryā Kuruṅgi, whose name occurs on certain pieces of coping. The epithet Kauśikiputra reminds one of Paṇḍjīta-Kauśiki of the Mālavikāgnimitram (Act 1). The Kuśika family was apparently intimately associated with the rulers of the age. Kuśikī mentioned in the Mālavikāgnimitram was sister to the minister of a prince of Berar. The sister of the prince herself was one of the queens of
Agnimitra's successor, as we have already seen, was Jyesṭha (of the k Viśnu manuscript), who is very probably identical with Jethamitra of the coins.¹

The next king Vasumitra was a son of Agnimitra. During the life-time of his grandfather he had led the imperial army against the Yavanas and defeated them on the Sindhu (possibly in Central India) which probably formed the boundary between the empire of Pushyamitra and the Indo-Greek territories in Malwa.

Vasumitra's successor is called Bhadraka in the Bhāga-vata Purāṇa, Ardraka and Odruka in the Viśnu, Āndhraka in the Vāyu, and Antaka in the Matsya Purāṇa. Jayaswal identified him with Udāka, a name occurring in a Pabhosā inscription. The epigraph has been translated thus: "By Āśādhasena, the son of Gopāli Vaihidari and maternal uncle of king Bahasatimitra, son of Gopāli, a cave was caused to be made in the tenth year of Udāka for the use of the Kassapiya Arbats." We learn from another Pabhosā inscription that Āśādhasena belonged to the royal family of Adhichhatrā (Ahichhatrā), the capital of North Pañchāla. Jayaswal maintained that Odraka (identified with Udāka) was the paramount Śungra sovereign, while the family of Āśādhasena was either gubernatorial or feudatory to the Magadha throne. Marshall,² on the other hand, identified the fifth "Śunga" with king Kāsiputra Bhāgabhadra mentioned in a Garuḍa Pillar Inscription found in the old city of Vidiśā, now Besnagar. Jayaswal identified Bhāgabhadra with Bhāga Śungra, i.e., Bhāgavata

Agnimitra. King Brahmamitra is the husband of Nāgadevi, another prominent donor mentioned in the epigraphs.

¹ Coins of Ancient India, p. 74. Allan. CIGAI, xxvi. Note the connection of Jethamitra with Agnimitra. The name of a Jyesṭhamitra is said to occur also in a Brāhmi inscription on certain stone fragments recently discovered at Kosam (Amrita Bazar Patrika, July 11, 1936, p. 9).
³ Sirear suggests Kāsiputra.
of the Purāṇas. This theory has to be given up in view of the discovery of another Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar Inscription (of the twelfth year after the installation of Mahārāja Bhāgavata) which proves that there was at Vidiśā a king named Bhāgavata apart from king Kāśīputra Bhāgabhadra. In the absence of clear evidence connecting "Udāka" with Vidiśā it cannot be confidently asserted that he belonged to the house of Agnimitra and Bhāgavata. The view of Marshall seems to be more probable.¹

It appears that the successors of Agnimitra at Vidiśā cultivated friendly relations with the Greek sovereigns of the Western Pañjāb. The policy of the Bactrian Greeks in this respect resembled that of their Seleukid predecessors. Seleukos, we know, first tried to conquer the Magadha Empire, but, frustrated in his attempts, thought it prudent to make friends with the Mauryas. The Bactrians, too, after the reverses they sustained at the hands of Pusbyamitra’s general, and weakened moreover by internal dissensions, apparently gave up, for a time at least, their hostile attitude towards the imperial power in the Ganges valley. We learn from the Besnagar Inscription of the reign of Bhāgabhadra that Heliodora (Heliodoros), the son of Diya (Dion), a native of Taxila, came as an ambassador from Mahārāja Anītalikita (Antialkidas) to Rājan Kāśīputra Bhāgabhadra the Saviour (Trātāra) who was prospering in the fourteenth year of his reign. The ambassador, though a Greek, professed the Bhāgavata religion and set up a Garuḍadheva in honour of Vāsudeva (Krishṇa), the god of gods.

¹ Dr. Barua points cut (IHQ, 1930, 23) that "in the absence of the word rāja preceding Udāka, it is difficult to say at once whether Udāka is the personal name of a king or the local name of the place where the cave was excavated."
He was apparently well-versed in the Mahābhārata which he might have heard recited in his native city of Taxila.

Nothing in particular is known regarding the three immediate successors of Bhadraka. The ninth king Bhāgavata had a long reign which extended over 32 years. Dr. Bhandarkar identifies him with the Mahārāja Bhāgavata mentioned in one of the Besnagar Inscriptions referred to above. Bhāgavata's successor Devabhūti or Devabhūmi was a young and dissolute prince. The Purāṇas state that he was overthrown after a reign of 10 years by his Amātya or minister Vasudeva. Bāṇa in his Harshacharita says that the over-libidinous Śuṅga was bereft of his life by his Amātya Vasudeva with the help of a daughter of Devabhūti's slave woman (Dāst), disguised as his queen. Bāṇa's statement does not necessarily imply that Devabhūti was identical with the murdered Śuṅga. His statement may be construed to mean that Vasudeva entered into a conspiracy with the emissaries of Devabhūti to bring about the downfall of the reigning Śuṅga. (Bhāgavata), and to raise Devabhūti to the throne. But in view of the unanimous testimony of the Purāṇas this interpretation of the statement of Bāṇa cannot be upheld.

The Śuṅga power was not altogether extinguished after the tragic end of Devabhūti. It probably survived in Central India till the rise of the so-called Andhras, Andhrabṛṛtyas or Śātavāhanas who 'swept away the remains of the Śuṅga power' and probably appointed

---

1 The three immortal precepts, lit. steps to immortality, dama, chāga and apramāda, self-control, self-denial and watchfulness, mentioned in the second part of Heliodora's inscription, occur in the Mahābhārata (V. 43. 22; XI. 7. 28; Damas-tyggo pramādaśca te trayo Brahmaṇo hayāḥ. Cf. also Gīṭā, XVI. 1.2). See JASB, 1922, No. 19, pp. 269-271; ASI, 1908-1909, p. 126; JRAS, 1909, 1055, 1087ff; 1910, 1031ff; 1914, 1031ff; IHQ, 1932, 610; Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1918-19, p. 59.

2 Cf. Dynasties of the Kali Age, p 49.
Siṣunandi to govern the Vidiśā region. Siṣunandi’s younger brother had a grandson (dauhitra) named Siṣuka who became the ruler of Purikā.  

1 Ibid, 49.  
2 For the location of purikā see JRAS, 1916, 446; cf Ep. Ind, xxvi, 151.
Section III. Importance of the Baimbika-Suṅga Period of Indian History.

The rule of the emperors of the "house" of Pushyamitra marks an important epoch in the history of India in general and of Central India in particular. The renewed incursions of the Yavanas, which once threatened to submerge the whole of the Madhyadesa, received a check, and the Greek dynasts of the borderland reverted to the prudent policy of their Seleukidan precursors. There was an outburst of activity in the domains of religion, literature and art, comparable to that of the glorious epoch of the Guptas. In the history of these activities the names of three Central Indian localities stand pre-eminent: Vidiśā (Besnagar), Gonarda and Bhārhut. As Foucher points out "it was the ivory-workers of Vidiśā who carved, in the immediate vicinity of their town, one of the monumental gates of Sāñchī." Inscriptions at or near Vidiśā (and Ghosunḍī) testify to the growing importance and wide prevalence of the Bhāgavata religion. Though no Aśoka arose to champion this faith, the missionary propaganda of its votaries must have been effective even in the realms of Yavana princes, and a Yavana dūta or ambassador was one of its most notable converts. Gonarda¹ was the traditional birth-place of the celebrated Patañjali, the greatest literary genius of the period, Bhārhut saw the construction of the famous railing which has made the sovereignty of the Suṅgas (Suganam raja) immortal.

CHAPTER VII. THE FALL OF THE MAGADHAN AND INDO-GREEK POWERS.

SECTION I. THE KĀNVAS, THE LATER SUṆGAS AND THE LATER MITRAS.

Vasudeva at whose instance the "over-libidinous SuṆga" was "reft of his life" founded about 75 B.C. a new line of kings known as the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty. The Purāṇas give the following account of this family. "He (Vasudeva), the Kāṇvāyana, will be king 9 years. His son Bhūmitra will reign 14 years. His son Nārāyana will reign 12 years. His son Sūjarman will reign 10 years. These are remembered as the SuṆga-bhritya Kāṇvāyana kings. These four Kāṇva Brāhmaṇas will enjoy the earth. They will be righteous. In succession to them the "earth" will pass to the Andhras." Bhūmitra may have been identical with the king of that name known from coins.1

---

1 Possibly only Eastern Mālwa where stood the later "SuṆga" capital Vidiśā or Besanagar, and some adjoining tracts.

2 Mr. J. C. Ghosh is inclined to include among the Kāṇva kings a ruler named Sarvatāta who is known from the Ghosundī Inscription, Ind. Ant. 1932, Nov., 203 ff.; Ep. Ind., xxii, 198ff.) to have been a devotee of Saṁkarṣhaṇa and Vāsudeva and a performer of the horse-sacrifice. But the identification of the Gājāyana family, to which the king belonged, with the Gāḍāyanas or Gudāyanas (cf. IHQ, 1933, 797ff) does not seem to be plausible. There seems to be no more reason to identify the Gājāyanas with the Gāḍāyanas than with the Gāḍāyanas or Gāḍāyanas of the Sunaka or Kāśyapa group (Caland, Baudh. Srauta sūtra III, 423-454). It is important to remember the fact that the Harivaṁśa refers to a Kāśyapa devī as the reviver of the Aśvamedha in the Kali Age. The Gāḍāyanas no doubt also recall the Gaṅgas of Mysore who claimed to belong to the Kāṇvāyana gotra (A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI, p 248). But the equation Gājāyana = Gāṅgāyana is not proved.
The period of the Kāṇva rule

The chronology of the Kāṇva dynasty is a matter of controversy. In his Early History of the Deccan, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes, "the founder of the Andhra-bhrityas is said to have uprooted not only the Kāṇvas, but 'whatever was left of the power of the Śuṅgas.' And the Kāṇvas are pointedly spoken of as Śuṅga-bhrityas or servants of the Śuṅgas. It, therefore, appears likely that when the princes of the Śuṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śuṅgas include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas.

Now, the Purānic evidence only proves that certain princes belonging to the Śuṅga stock continued to rule till the so-called "Andhra-bhritya" conquest and were the contemporaries of the Kāṇvas. But there is nothing to show that these rois faineants of the "Śuṅga" stock were identical with any of the ten "Śuṅga" kings mentioned by name in the Purānic lists, who reigned 112 years. On the contrary, the distinct testimony of the Purāṇas that Devadhūti, the tenth and last "Śuṅga" of the Purānic lists, was the person slain by Vasudeva, the first Kāṇva, probably shows that the rois faineants, who ruled contemporaneously with Vasudeva and his successors, were later than Devadhūti, and were not considered to be important enough to be mentioned by name. Consequently the 112 years that tradition assigns to the ten "Śuṅga" kings from Pushyamitra to Devabhūti do not include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to accept with slight modifications the views of Dr. Smith regarding the date of the family. According to the system of chronology adopted
in these pages, the period of Kāṇva rule extended from cir. B.C. 75 to cir. B.C. 30.

Very little is known about the history of Magadha proper after the Kāṇvas. To reconstruct the history of the province from the fall of the Kāṇvas to the rise of the Gupta dynasty is a difficult task. The so-called Andhras or Śātavāhanas who are represented as destroying the Kāṇva sovereignty, apparently in Eastern Mālwa, do not appear to have ruled in Magadha proper.¹ The greatest among them are called ‘Sovereigns of the Deccan’ (Dakṣiṇāpathapati) and an accurate idea of the field of their political and military activities may be obtained from the epithets ‘tisamuda-toyapitavāhana,’ ‘whose chargers had drunk the water of the three oceans,’ and ‘trisamudrādhipati,’ ‘overlord of the three seas’ occurring in epigraphic and literary records. The sway of rulers like the Guptas, on the other hand, is said to have extended as far as the four seas.

The discovery of a clay seal with the legend Mokhalinām² suggests that at one time the Gayā region was under the sway of Maukhari chiefs. But the precise date of the record is not known. Equally uncertain is the date of Mahārājā Trikamala who ruled in the same

¹ There is no valid reason for connecting the Nūrruvar Kannar (Silappadikāram, xxvi, Dikshitār’s trans. 299 f.) either with the Śātakarnīs or with Magadha. The expression “Kannar” sometimes stands alone proving that Nūrruvar is only a qualifying adjective, not a part of the name. The Ganges, even if it be the Bhāgirathi, and not Gantāmi Gaṅgā or the Godāvari, with which the family is associated, flows through other territories besides Magadha, showing that there is no necessary connection between that province and the kings in question.

² Fleet, CII, 14. The legend is written in Mauryan Brāhmī. The Maukhari in question may have exercised sway over some little principality under the suzerainty of the Mauryas or the Suṅgas. Three inscriptions have recently been discovered at Bādvā in the Kolah State in Rajputāna recording the erection of sacrificial pillars by Maukhari Mahāsenāpatis (generals or military governors) in the third century A. D. (Ep. Ind. XXIII, 52).
region in the year 64 of an unspecified era. Epigraphic evidence of a late date points to some connection between the Lichchhavis and Pushpapura (Pāṭaliputra). But it is difficult to say how far the tradition is genuine. The only rulers of note in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, whom we know from epigraphic evidence to have ruled in Magadha and the neighbouring provinces, are the so-called 'Mitrās'. The prevalence of 'Mitra' rule is also hinted at by references in Jaina literature to Balamitra and Bhānumitra among the successors of Pushyamitra. From a study of available epigraphs Dr. Barua has compiled a list of 'Mitra kings'. It includes the names of Bṛihatsvātimitra, Indrāgnimitra, Brahmamitra, Bṛihaspatimitra (Dhar)amitra and Vishṇumitra. To these should perhaps be added the names of Varuṇamitra and Gomitra. Of these only Indrāgnimitra, Brahmamitra and possibly Bṛihaspatimitra are definitely associated with Magadha in addition to other territories. The rest are connected with Kauśāmbī and Mathurā.

It is not known in what relationship most of these 'Mira' kings stood to one another or to the celebrated families of the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas.

In Pāṭaliputra as well as in Mathurā the 'Mitrās' seem to have been replaced eventually by the Scythian 'Muruṇḍas' and Satraps who, in their turn, were supplanted by the Nāgas and the Guptas. Some scholars place

---

1 Allan refers to kings Brahmamitra, Dridhamitra, Suryamitra and Vishṇumitra who issued coins identical in type with those of Gomitra. They were followed by rulers whose names ended in -datta, -bhāti and -ghoṣha.

O. P. 90–51.
immediately before the Guptas a family called Kota which may have ruled in Pātaliputra.¹

¹ For statements in this section see Ep. Ind. VIII, 60ff; Harshacharita VIII, (p. 251); Cunn., Mahābodhi; ASI., 1908-9, 141; IHQ 1926, 441; 1929, 393, 595; 1930, 1ff, 1933, 419; Kielhorn, N. I. Inscriptions. No. 541; Indian Culture, 1, 695; EHI. 3rd ed. 227n; JRAS., 1912, 122; Smith Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, 185, 190, 194; Allan, CICAI. p. xvi-xviii, cx, 150ff, 169ff, 173ff, 195ff, 292ff.
SECTION II. THE SATAVAHANAS AND THE CHETAS.

While the Sunyas and Kanyas were engaged in their petty feuds, new powers were rising in trans-Vindhyan India. These were the Satavahana\(^1\) (the so-called Andhra or Andhra-bhritya\(^2\)) kingdom of Dakshinapatha and the Cheta or Cheti kingdom of Kaliuga.

The founder of the Satavahana dynasty was Simuka whose name is misspelt as Siuka, Sindhuka and Sipraka in the Puranas. Those works state that the "Andhra" Simuka will assail the Kanyayanas and Susarman, and destroy the remains of the Sungas' power and will obtain this "earth". If this statement be true then it cannot be denied that Simuka was for some years a contemporary of Susarman (40-30 B.C.) and flourished in the first century B.C. Rapson, Smith and many other scholars, however, reject the unanimous testimony of the Puranas. They attach more importance to a statement about which there is not the same unanimity, that the "Andhras" ruled for four centuries and a half. Accordingly, they place Simuka towards the close of the third century B.C., and say that the dynasty came to an end in the third century A.D.

A discussion of Simuka's date involves the consideration of the following questions:—

---

\(^1\) The form Sativahana is found in the Bhagalpur Grant of Narayanapala and the form Salivahana in literature. See also Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *EHD*, Section VII.

\(^2\) The designation 'Andhra-jatiya' or 'Andhra' is found in the Puranas which represent the founder as a bhritya or servant of the last Kanya king. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, following apparently the Vishnu Purana, styles the dynasty founded by Simuka, Andhra-bhritya, i.e., Andhras who were once
1. What is the age of the script of the Nāṇāghāṭ record of Nāyanikā, daughter-in-law of Simuka (or of his brother and successor, Krishna)?

2. What is the actual date of Khāravela’s Hāthigumpha Inscription which refers to a Śatakarni, who was apparently a successor of Simuka?

3. What is the exact number of the so-called Andhra kings and what is the duration of their rule?

As to the first point we should note that according to Mr. R. P. Chanda the inscription of Nāyanikā is later than the Besnagar Inscription of Bhāgavata, possibly the penultimate king of the “line” of Pushyamitra mentioned in the Purāṇas. Consequently Simuka servants. But that designation should properly be applied to the seven Abhiras who are considered as the successors of the line of Simuka on page 45 of Pargiter’s Dynasties of the Kali Age (cf. Vishnu, P. IV. 24. 13).

1 MASII., No. 1, pp. 14-15. In IHQ, 1929 (p. 601) Mr. Chanda points to the agreement of the Nāṇāghāṭ script with the Besnagar Inscription of the time of Antialkidas. But the exact date of Antialkidas is uncertain. He may have belonged to the latter half of the second century B.C. or the first half of the next century.

Mr. R. D. Banerji, while disagreeing with the views of Mr. Chanda in regard to certain points, admits, after a detailed examination of certain epigraphs, that “the Nāṇāghāṭ inscriptions show the use of a very large number of Ksatrapa or early Kusāna forms side by side with older ones” (Mem. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 145). According to Rapson (Andhra Coins. Lxxvii) the form of the akṣara-da’ found in the Nāṇāghāṭ record resembles that of a coin-legend which is assignable to the first or second century B.C.

It is not suggested that either Banerji or Rapson placed the Nāṇāghāṭ record in the first century B.C. But some of the facts they have placed before us do not preclude the possibility of a date in the first century B.C. The theory that the record belongs to the second century B.C. rests in some measure on the assumption tacitly accepted by the older generation of scholars, that Khāravela’s thirteenth year corresponds to the year 165 of the time of the Maurya kings (Bühler, Indian Palaeography, 93; Rapson xvii).
may be placed in the Kānva period, i.e., in the first century B.C.—a date which accords with Purānic evidence.¹

As to the second point Mr. R. D. Banerji gives good grounds for believing that the expression Ti-vasa-sata occurring in the passage “Paṁchame che dāni vase Namdarāja ti-vasa-sata....” of the Ḥāḍīgumpha Inscription means not 103 but 300.² This was also the view of Mr. Chanda and, at one time, of Dr. Jayaswal.³

¹ Bühler also observes (ASWI., Vol. V, 65) that the characters of the Nāgāghāṭ inscriptions belong to a period anterior by about 100 years to that of the edicts of Gantamputra Sātakarni and his son Pulumāyi. Scholars who place the Nāgāghāṭ record in the first half of the second century B.C., and the epigraphs of the time of Gantamputra Sātakarni in the second century A.D., will have to account for the paucity of Sātavāhana records during a period of about three hundred years (if then the actual length of the interval between the age of the husband of Nāgānīkā and the reign of the son of Balaśri). Mr. N. G. Majumdar (The Monuments of Sānchi, Vol. I, pt. iv, p. 277) places the Nāgāghāṭ record during the period 100-75 B.C.

² JBORS, 1917, 495-497.

³ JBORS, 1917, 432; cf. 1918, 377, 385. The older view was changed in 1927, 293, 244. According to the usually accepted interpretation of a passage in the Ḥāḍīgumpha record Khāravela, in his fifth year, extended an aqueduct that had not been used for “ti-vasa-sata” since Nandarāja. If “ti-vasa-sata” is taken to mean 103 years, Khāravela’s accession must be placed 103 – 9 = 94 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yuvārāja took place 9 years before the date, i.e., 98 – 9 = 89 years after Nandarāja (i.e., not later than 324 B.C. – 89 = 235 B.C.). Khāravela’s father was apparently on the throne at that time, and he seems to have been preceded by his father. But we learn from Aśoka’s inscriptions that Kaliṅga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kumāra under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore “ti-vasa-sata” should be taken to mean 300, and not 103 years. The figure ‘three hundred’ (a round number) is in substantial agreement with the Purānic tradition about the interval between the Nandas and Śatākarni I, 137 (period of the Mauryas) + 112 (of the Sûñas) + 45 (of the Kâervas) + 23 (of Simuka) + 10 (of Kṛishṇa) = 327.
If Ti-vasa-sata means 300, Khāravela and his contemporary Sātakarnī may have flourished 300 years after Nandarāja, i.e., in or about 24 B.C. This agrees with the Purānic evidence according to which Sātakarnī’s father (or uncle) Simuka assailed the last Kānya king Suśarman (c. 40-30 B.C.).

We now come to the third point, viz., the determination of the exact number of Sātavāhana kings, and the duration of their rule.

Regarding each of these matters we have got in the Purāṇas quite a number of different traditions. As to the first the Matsya Purāṇa says—

“Ekona-vimśatir2 hyete Andhrā bhokshyanti vai mahīm,”

but it gives thirty names.3

The Vāyu Purāṇa, with the exception of the ‘M’ manuscript, says—

Ityete vai nripās trimśad Andhrā bhokshyanti ye mahīm’ (these thirty Andhras will enjoy the earth); but most of the Vāyu manuscripts name only seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen kings.

As to the duration of the Andhra rule several Matsya manuscripts assign to them a period of 460 years.

“Teshāṁ varsha śatāni syuś chatvāri shastīr eva-cha.”

Another Matsya manuscript puts it slightly differently:—

“Dvādaśadhikam eteshāṁ rājyam sata-chatushtayam” i.e., the period of their sovereignty is 412 years;

---

1 Simuka may have ascended the throne (in the Deccan) several years before the date 40-30 B.C. when he assailed the Kāṇyānas possibly in Central India. The period of his rule after the defeat of the Kāṇyas may have been less than 23 years. Thus the actual interval between the Nandas and Sātakarnī may well have been a little less than 337 years.

2 Variant ekona-navaṭim (DKA, 43).

3 Pargiter points out (p. 36) that 3 Matsya Msr. name 30, and the others vary the number from 28 to 21.
while the reigns of kings mentioned in certain Vāyu Mss. amount, according to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, to only 272 years and a half.

Obviously according to one tradition there were about seventeen, eighteen or nineteen kings, whose rule lasted some three centuries, while according to another tradition there were thirty kings, the length of whose reigns covered a period of more than 400 years. In the opinion of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the longer list includes the names of princes belonging to all the branches of the so-called Andhra-bhritya dynasty, and that the longer period represents the total duration of all the princes belonging to the several branches. The period of about three centuries, and the seventeen, eighteen or nineteen names given in the Vāyu Purāṇa, and hinted at in the Matsya, refer to the main branch. That there were several families of Śatavāhanas or Śatakārnis, distinct from the main line that had its principal seat in the upper Valley of the Godāvari, cannot be denied. The Kāvya Mīmāṁsā of Rājaśekhara and several other works as well as epigraphs in the Kanarese country and elsewhere testify to the existence of Śatavāhanas and Śatakārnis who ruled over Kuntala¹ (the Kanarese districts) before the Kadambas. The fullest Matsya list includes a group of kings (Nos. 10-14), including one named “Kuntala” Śatakarni, who are (generally speaking) passed over in silence by the Vāyu.² Skanda-svāti, No. 11 of the full list, reminds one of Skandānāga-Sātaka, a prince of a Kanarese line of Śatakarnis.

¹ A Śatavāhana of Kuntala is referred to by the Kāvya-Mīmāṁsā (1934, Ch. X, p. 50) as having ordered the exclusive use of Prākrit in his harem. He may have been identical with the famous king Hāla (cf. Kunta'ja-janavaya-śīna Hālena, ibid., Notes, p. 197).

² Even Hāla (No. 17) is omitted in the Vāyu Mss. (DKA, p. 36) and the Brahmānda P. (Rapson, Andhra Coins, lxvii).
mentioned in a Kanheri inscription.¹ As to Kuntala Sātakarnī (No. 13), the commentary on Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra takes the word “Kuntala” in the name Kuntala Sātakarnī Sātavāhana to mean “Kuntala-vishaye jātavat tat-samākhyaḥ.”² It is, therefore, fair to conclude that the Matsya MSS., which mention 30 Sātavāhana kings include not only the main group of kings but also those who were closely associated with Kuntala.

On the other hand, the Vāyu, Brahmadā and certain Matsya MSS., generally speaking, show a tendency to omit the Sātavāhanas of Kuntala and the rulers of the period of Saka revival under Rudra-dāman I, and mention only about 19 kings most of whom belonged to the main line whose rule may have lasted for about three centuries. If the main line of Sātavāhana kings consisted only of about nineteen princes, and if the duration of their rule be approximately three centuries, there is no difficulty in accepting the Purānic statement that Simuka flourished in the time of the later Kaṇvas, that is to say, in the first century B.C., and that his dynasty ceased to rule in the Northern Deccan in the third century A.D. The sovereignty of the Sātavāhanas and Sātakarnīs of Kuntala lasted longer and did not come to an end probably before the fourth century A.D., when it was ended by the Kadambas. Thus the total duration of the rule of all the lines of

¹ Rapson, Andhra Coins, liii. The fact that he was a prince at the time of the record need not prove that he never came to the throne. The Purānic lists themselves often include names of princes (e.g., Arjuna, Abhimanyu, Skīḍhārtha) who never ruled as kings. Certain Matsya Ms. insert the group to which Skandavatī belongs after no. 29, i.e., Chaṇḍāśri (DKA, p. 36).

² He was so named because he was born in the Kuntala country. Cf. names like Uruvela-Nadi- and Gayā Kassapa (Dialogues of the Buddha, I. 194).
Sātakarnīs is really more than 400 years. The kings of the Kuntala group (Nos. 10-14 of the DKA list) are no doubt usually placed before the great Gautamīputra and his successors. But Pargiter points out that in certain Matsya MSS. Nos. 10-15 are placed after the penultimate king of the line (No. 29). As to Hāla (No. 17) if he is really the author of the Gāthāsaptasati, he could hardly have flourished before the fourth century A.D. The references to Vikramāditya-charita, Aṅgāraka-vāra and Rādhikā make it difficult to assign to him a date before the Great Gautamīputra. We have many other instances of the inversion of the order of kings in the Purāṇas. The fact that the extant Purānic texts do misplace kings appears abundantly clear from the important discovery of a coin of Siva Sṛi Ānilaka whom Mr. Dikshit connects with the later Sātavāhanas though the Purāṇas place him early in the list.

Regarding the original home of the Sātavāhana family there is also a good deal of controversy. Some scholars

---

1 The period '300 years' (Vāyu P.) may refer to the rule of the Sripurusvatiya Andhras (DKA, 46). Even then it is important to remember that the cessatio of 'Andhra' rule in the upper Deccan in the third century A.D. is not incompatible with a date for the founder in the first century B.C. For the rule of the Sātakarnīs survived in Kuntala till the rise of the Kadambas. Thus the Purāṇas are right in assigning to the entire line of 30 kings a period of about four centuries and a half.

2 DKA, p. 36. On pp. 20, 35, Pargiter gives other instances of 'misplacement' of kings by the Purānic MSS.

3 See pp. 104, 118f ante.

4 See Advance, March 10, 1935, p. 9. The coin belongs to the Mahākosal society of Raipur (C.P.). It bears the figure of an elephant with Brāhma legend on the obverse. The reverse is blank. On numismatic grounds the place of this ruler is according to Mr. K. N. Dikshit, more with the later kings of the dynasty than with the earlier ones as indicated in the Purāṇas. For the late date of Hāla of the Kuntala country see R.G. Bhand, Com. Vol., 189. Cf. Reference to Rādhā in the Saptasātakam (Ind. Ant., III 25n.).

Mr. K. P. Chattopadhyāya deduces from the discrepant lists of the Matsya, and Vāyu Purāṇas and from epigraphic and numismatic evidence, certain
think that the Sātavāhanas were not Andhras (Telugus) theories about (1) the existence of two contemporary Sātavāhana kingdoms ruled by son and father respectively, (2) cross-cousin marriages and (3) matrilineal succession, which he discusses in JASB, 1927, 503ff and 1939, 317-339. In his opinion the discrepancies in the Purānic lists cannot be due to any oversight or slip on the part of the editors (1927, p. 504). They are to be explained by the theory of an original version (that contained in the Matsya) which gives the full list of Gautamiputras as well as Vāsiṣṭhiputras, and a “revised text” (contained in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa) which retains the Gautamiputras but from which certain names were deliberately expunged as the rulers in question were not considered by the revising authorities to possess the privilege of having the names preserved in the purānas (ibid p. 505). Kings (e.g., Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi), whose names are “expunged” from the “revised text” of the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa Purānas, belong to a “set” which is genealogically connected with the other, viz., the Gautamiputra group, whose names are retained in the revised versions, but “the succession did not coincide with the mode of descent.” For instance, Gautamiputra Sātakarni, according to the revised list, was succeeded not by his son Pulumāvi, but by another Gautamiputra, viz., Yajña Śri (p. 509). It is further added that “on the coins of the Sātavāhanas the royal prefix and the mother’s clan-name are associated together and also disappear together except in the case of the third king of the line.” In the inscriptions also the association is invariable (excluding the doubtful case of Sivamakasada), except in the case of the third king, Śri Sātakarni of the Nānāghāṭ Cave Inscriptions. It is, therefore, to be concluded that, except for the third king of the line, the royal titles and relationship to the mother went together. In other words, the succession was matrilineal (p. 515): “The son succeeded to the conquered realm, and the sister’s son to the inherited kingdom” (p. 537).

This footnote cannot afford space for an exhaustive review of the dissertation of Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. Nor is it concerned with theories and speculations about social organisation based on ‘mother right or father right’, cross-cousin marriage in general, and royal successes, that are not germane to the discussion about the Sātavāhana dynasty. We shall try to confine ourselves to the points that are really relevant to an enquiry about that illustrious line itself. A study of the Purānic lists analysed by Pargiter (Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 36ff.) would show that the discrepancies in the Purānic lists are not capable of as simple a solution as that proposed by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. It cannot be said, for example, that Gautamiputra (No. 23) is mentioned in all Matsya texts and retained in all Vāyu MSS., and that his son Pulumāvi (No. 24) of the so-called “Vāsiṣṭhiputra group” is always mentioned in the Matsya and omitted only in “later revised versions” of the Vāyu, etc. Gautamiputra is omitted in Matsya MSS., styled e, k and l by Pargiter (p. 36), and also in the e Vāyu MSS., while his son Pulumāvi is omitted in Matsya e, f and l MSS. But mentioned in the Vishyus and Bhāgavata lists, notwithstanding the activities of the so-called revisers. The theory of succession of sisters’ sons in the so-called revised list of the Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, etc., is clearly negated by numerous passages where a
but merely Andhra-bhrityas, servants of the Andhras,

successor is distinctly referred to even in these Purāṇas as the son of a predecessor (cf. the cases not only of the first Sri Sātakarṇi but also of Sātakarṇi II, Lambodara, and even Yaśa Śri—(DKA, p. 39, fn. 40, 44; p. 42, fn. 12). The use of the expression tato (DKA, 39) in the Mātasya Purāṇa to indicate the relationship between Sātakarṇi I and Pūrṇotṣaṅga when taken along with the words tasyāpya Pūrṇotṣaṅgah (Vishnū IV. 24, 12), and Paurnamāṣatū tāt sātah (Bhāg, XII. 1, 21) leaves no room for doubt that Purāṇic evidence represents Pūrṇotṣaṅga—Paurnamāṣa, as the son and immediate successor of Sātakarṇi I and not a 'distant' offspring or a remote offshoot of a 'cross-cousin marriage', who got the throne by the rule of matrilineal succession. There may be no valid reason as asserted by Mr. Chaṭṭipādhyāya for identifying him with Vediśīrī of the Nānāghāt record. But the reading Vediśīrī as pointed out by K. Śāstri is wrong. The proper reading is Khandaśīrī—Skandaśīrī. This prince has been plausibly identified with Pūrṇotṣaṅga's successor, the fifth king of the Purānic list. It is, therefore, difficult to agree to the view (JASB, 1930, 325) that the prince in question (the so-called Vediśīrī) 'never came to the throne'. Pūrṇotṣaṅga may have been some other 'kumāra'. Cf., the nameless prince (kumāra) 'Sātavāhana' of the Nānāghāt record who is mentioned along with 'Hakusirī' (Saktiśīrī). It is also to be noted that even the so-called older version of the Mātasya speaks of only 19 kings in one passage.

The Gauṭamiputra and the Vaisāshātiputra did not rule over distinct regions. Gauṭamiputra Sātakarṇi is represented as the Rāja of Mūlaka, i.e., the district round Paithān, along with other territories. Pulumāvī, too, ruled over Paithān as we learn from the Geography of Ptolemy. The epithet 'Vijā. ......... Malaiya-Mahida.......parata patī' and "tīsamudatayopita-vāhāna" applied to Gauṭamiputra suggest that he was as much entitled to the designation Dakaśātipatapathapati as his son.

The statement that, except for the third king, the royal title and relationship to the mother went together, is not borne out by recorded facts. In the Myākodoni Inscription, for example (Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 153 ff.) We have the passage—Ṛaṇa Sātavāhānaḥ a (i) ri-Pulom (a) veda without any mention of the metronymic Cf. also the passage Ṛaṇa Śrīchaḍa-vātīr (Rapson, Andhra Ceins, p. 33). As to cross-cousin marriages, several recorded cases, e.g., those of the wives of Śrī Sātakarṇi I and Vaisāshātiputra Śrī-Sātakarṇi of the Kanheri Inscription, do not support the theory propounded by Mr. Chaṭṭipādhyāya. The kings in question may, doubtless, have been polygamists. But that the extra queens, if any, included cousins is only a guess. The marriages actually hinted at in the epigraphic records of the Sātavāhanas (unlike those of the Ikhāvākus) are not of the 'cross-cousin' type. Indian history knows of cases where a queen or other royal personage takes as much pride in the mother's family as in that of the father (cf. ubhagakulaśaṅkārabhūtā Prabhāvatī. JASB, 1934. 58). Does Nāyanka lay any claim to a Sātavāhana origin? The table of cross-cousin marriage on p. 325 of JASB, 1930 would make Sātakarṇi (No. 6 of the list) a brother of
of Kanarese origin. Mr. O. C. Gangoly points out\(^1\) that in some class of literature a distinction is suggested between the Andhras and the Sātavāhanas. In the Epigraphia Indica,\(^2\) Dr. Sukṭhankar edited an inscription of Siri-Pulumāvi, "king of the Sātavāhanas," which refers to a place called Sātavahanihāra.\(^3\) The place finds mention also in the Hirlahadagallī copper-plate inscription of the Pallava king Siva-skandavarman in the slightly altered form of Sātāhani-raṭṭha. Dr. Sukṭhankar suggests that the territorial division Sātavahani-Sātāhani must have comprised a good portion of the modern Bellary district of the Madras Presidency, and that it was the original home of the Sātavāhana family.\(^4\) Other indications point to the territory immediately south of the Madhya-deśa as the original home of the Sātavāhana-Sātakarṇis. The Vinaya Texts\(^4\) mention a town called "Setakanniḥa" which lay on the southern frontier of the Māljhima-deśa. It is significant that the earliest records of the Sātakarṇis are found in the Northern Deccan and Central India; and the Hāthīgumpha Inscription of Khāravela, king of Orissa, refers to the family as, ‘protecting the West.’ The name ‘Andhra’ probably came to be

Nāyanikā and a brother-in-law of Sātakarṇi (No. 3 of the list) and a son of Mahāraṭhi Transkayiro. This is negatived by the Nānaghāṭ epigraph which refers to the Mahāraṭhi as Amgiya (or Ambiya) kulavardhana, whereas both the Sātakarṇis belong to the family of Simuka Sātavāhana according to Purāṇic evidence. Gautami-Balaśri who is turned into a sister or clan-sister of Sivasvāti (JASB, 1927, 500) refers merely to her position as a badhā, mātā, and pitāmahī, but never for once suggests that she herself sprang from the family the restoration of whose glory is referred to in exulting terms.

\(^1\) JAHRS, XI, pp. 1 and 2, pp. 14-15. The Andhras contributed one melody which is recognized in the musical literature of India as Andhri, while the Sātavāhanas contributed another named after them as Sātavāhani according to the text of the Brihad-Deśi.

\(^2\) Vol. XIV (1917).

\(^3\) See also Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1918-19, p. 21, ‘On the Home of the so-called Andhra Kings.’—V. S. Sukṭhankar Cj. JASBS, 1923, 89 f.

\(^4\) S.B.E., XVII, 38.
applied to the kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and became a purely Andhra power, governing the territory at the mouth of the river Krishnā. The Sātavāhanas themselves never claim an ‘Andhra’ ancestry.

There is reason to believe that the so-called ‘Andhra,’ ‘Andhra-bhritya’ or Sātavāhana kings were Brāhmaṇas with a little admixture of Nāga blood. The Īyatiṃśat-puttalikā represents Sālivāhana (Prakrit form of Sātavāhana) as of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Nāga origin. The Nāga connection is suggested by names like Nāga-nikā and Skanda-nāga-Sātaka, while the claim to the rank of Brāhmaṇa is actually put forward in an inscription. In the Nāsik praśasti of Gautamiputra Sātakarni the king is called ‘Eka Bāmhaṇa,’ i.e., the unique Brāhmaṇa. Some scholars, however, are inclined to take Bāmhaṇa to mean merely a Brāhmanical Hindu, but this interpretation cannot be accepted in view of the fact that Gautamiputra is also called ‘Khātiya-dapa-māṇa-madana,’ i.e., the destroyer of the pride and conceit of Kshatriyas. The expression ‘Eka-bāmhaṇa’ when read along with the passage ‘Khātiya-dapa-māṇa-madana’ leaves no room for doubt that Gautamiputra of the Sātavāhana family not only claimed to be a Brāhmaṇa, but a Brāhmaṇa

1 Cf. the transformation of the Eastern Chālukyas into Chulas from the time when Kulaṇa I mounted the Chola throne. For the origin and meaning of the names Sātavāhana and Sātakarni see also Camb. Hist. Ind., Vol. I, p. 599; JBORS., 1917, December, p. 442n; IHQ, 1929, 1933, 1938, 256 and JRAS., 1929, April; also Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London, 1938, IX, 2, 327f. Both Barnett and Jayaswal connect them with the Sātiya-putas. Przybilski thinks that the names may have been Sanskritised from Austro-Asiatic terms signifying ‘Son of horse.’ For other interpretations see Aravamudhan, the Kaveri, the Maukharis, p. 51n (karni=ship; Vāhana=Oar or SAIL); Diksātār, Indian Culture, II, 549ff.

2 Cf. E. H. D., Sec. VII.

3 Bühler, ASWI, vol. v, p. 64 n4.

4 In Indian Culture, I, pp. 513ff. and Ep. Ind., XXII. 93ff. Miss Bhrāmar Ghosh and Dr. Bhandarkar seem to reject the interpretation of the expressions “Eka Bāmhaṇa” and “Khātiya-dapa-māṇa-madana” proposed by
like Parasurama who humbled the pride of the Kshatriyas. As a matter of fact in the prasasti the king is described as "the unique Brahmaṇa in prowess equal to Rama."\footnote{A pun is here intended as Rāma seems to refer to Bala Deva as well. The use of the name of Rāma instead of Bala (cf. Bala-Kesa in Hariv, Vīshṇuparva, 53, 20) is significant. Taken in conjunction with ekabhaktah it undoubtedly implies comparison with Bhṛigu-Rāma or Paraśu-Rāma as well.}

According to the Purāṇas Simuka (c. 60-37 B.C.) gave the final coup de grâce to the Śunga-Kāraṇa power. He was succeeded by his brother Koṭhā (c. 37-27 B.C.). This king has been identified with Kaṭhaa "Rājā of the Sādvāhana-kula" mentioned in a Nāsik inscription.

Senart and Buhlcr. It is suggested that the word bāmhasa may stand for Brahmaṇa, that Khatiṣya may refer to the Khatroī or Khatrisai tribe mentioned by classical writers, and that the expression Rājariṣi-rādha used in reference to Gautami Balaśī is enough to show that the Śātvāhana rulers never claimed themselves to be Brahmaṇa or Brahmaṇa sages. It is nobody's case that the Śātvāhana claimed to be mere "Bāmhaṇa sages." But is it not a bit too ingenious to imagine that the well-known terms Brahmaṇa and Khatriya are not to be taken in their ordinary sense, and that they really stand for non-Brahmaṇas and non-Khatriyas? As to the use of the expression Rājariṣi-rādhu, would not Brahmaṇa be a singularly inappropriate description of a family of kings even though they were Brahmaṇas? The term Rājarshi is not used exclusively to denote non-Brahmaṇa rulers. In the Padma Purāṇa (Pāṭalā-kaṇḍam, 61, 73), for instance, Dadhichi is styled a Rājarshi. In the Vāyu Purāṇa (57, 12ff.) the epithets "Rājarṣhayo mahāśatiteśaḥ" are used in reference to Brahma-Khatrīmaṇya nṛpīṇā, "Brahma-khatrīdage nṛpiṇā, according to the reading of the Matsya text, 143, 37: 10) In the Matsya Purāṇa (50, 5-7) the epithet Rājarṣi is applied to a king who sprang from the family of the Mandagaya who are called Khatropetā dvijātayah and one of whom is styled Brahmāshthāh. The Amaṇḍāmaṇāgala refers to Koṭhā Chandra as Rāja-Rājarṣhayakriṁdi Rīkhi-Rīkhirāja.

Attention may no doubt be invited to the Purānic statement that the founder of the "Andhra" dynasty was a vrishula (DRA, 38). But the explanation will be found in the Mahābhārata. The great epic (XII, 63, 1ff.) informs us that "drawing the bowstring, destruction of enemies... are not proper (akāraṇam paramam) for a Brahmaṇa. A Brahmaṇa should avoid royal service (rzą-pṛchha). A Brahmaṇa who marries a Vṛshāli and takes to royal service (vably-preśhaya) and other work not legitimate for him is ekāraṇa, a Brahmaṇa so-called (Brahma-bandhaḥ). He becomes a Sādru. The Śāsāvāhanas actually drew the bowstring and intermarried with Dravidians and Sakas as the Mauryas had intermarried with Yavanas.
The record tells us that a certain cave was caused to be made by a high official (Śramaṇa Mahāmaṭra) of Nāsik in the time of King Kaṇha.

Kaṇha-Krishṇa was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Sātakarni (c. 27-17 B.C.). This Sātakarni has been identified with—

(1) King Sātakarni Dakshināpatha-pati (lord of the Deccan), son (or nephew) of Simuka Sātavāhana, mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ Inscription of Nāyānikā;  
(2) Sātakarni, lord of the west, who was denied (or rescued?) by Khárvála, king of Kaliṅga;  
(3) Rājan Śrī Sātakarni of a Sānchi Inscription;  
(4) The elder Saraganus mentioned in the Periplus;  
(5) Sātakarni, lord of Pratishṭhāna, father of Sakti-kumāra, mentioned in Indian literature; and  
(6) Sīrī-Sāta of coins.

The first, fifth and sixth identifications are usually accepted by all scholars. The second identification is also probable because the Purāṇas place Sātakarni, the successor of Krishṇa, after the Kaṇvas, i.e., in the first century B.C., while the Hāthigumpha Inscription seems to place Khárvála 300 years after Nanda-rāja, i.e., possibly in the first century B.C.

Marshall objects to the third identification on the ground that Śrī Sātakarni who is mentioned in the

The comparison of a militant ruler claiming Brāhmaṇahood and fighting against Kshatriyas, with Pāraśu-Rāma is a favourite theme of writers of Prākṣastis—cf. Bhīghu-patīrīva dṛipta kṣatrasaṅhāra-kārin which is applied to Aṃbāprasada in the Chitor-gaḍh ins. of 1274 A.D.

1 The usual view among scholars is that Sātakarni I is a son of Simuka. If he is a nephew (son of Krishṇa, brother of Simuka) as the Purāṇas assert, it is difficult to explain why Krishṇa's name should be omitted from the family group, mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ records, while the name of Simuka as well as that of the father of Sātakarni's queen should find prominent mention. The final decision must await future discoveries.

2 Andhra Coins (Rapson), p. xcviii. CHI, 531.
Nānāghāṭ and Hāthīgumpha Inscriptions reigned in the middle of the second century B.C.; his dominions, therefore, could not, in his opinion, have included Eastern Mālwa (the Sāñchī region) which, in the second century B.C., was ruled by the Śuṅgas and not by the “Andhras”.¹ But we have seen that the date of the Hāthīgumpha Inscription is possibly the first century B.C. (300 years after Nanda-rāja). The Purāṇas, too, as is well-known, place the kings mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ Inscription not earlier than the Kāñvās, i.e., in the first century B.C. As Śuṅga rule had terminated about this time the identification of the successor of Krishna of the Sātavāhana family with Sātakarnī of the Sāñchī Inscription, therefore, does not conflict with what is known of the history of Eastern Mālwa in the second century B.C. Lastly, it would be natural for the first Sātakarnī to be styled simply Sātakarnī or the elder Sātakarnī (Saraganus, from a Prākrit form like Sāḍaganna), while it would be equally natural for the later Sātakarnis to be distinguished from him by the addition of a geographical designation like Kuntala, or a metronymic like Gautamiputra or Vāsishṭhiputra.

We learn from the Nānāghāṭ Inscriptions that Sātakarnī, son(?) of Simuka, entered into a matrimonial alliance with the powerful Aṃgiya or Ambhiya² family, the scions of which were called Mahāraṭhi, and became sovereign of the whole of Dakshināpatha. He seems also to have controlled Eastern Mālwa and undoubtedly performed the Āsvamedha sacrifice. The conquest of Eastern Mālwa by his family is possibly implied by coins and the Sāñchī Inscription when read along with the Purānic statement that in succession to the Śuṅgabhṛitya Kāñvāyana kings,

² ASI, 1928-24, p. 88.
the 'earth' will pass to the 'Andhras'. The inscription records the gift of a certain Ānandā, the son of Vasiṣṭhī, the foreman of the artisans of Rājan Siri-Śatakaṇi. Śatakaṇi seems to have been the first prince to raise the Śātavāhanas to the position of paramount sovereigns of Trans-Vindhyān India. Thus arose the first great empire in the Godāvāri valley which rivalled in extent and power the Suṅga empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers. According to the evidence of Indian as well as classical writers, the principal capital of the Śātavāhana Empire was at Pratishṭhāṇa, 'the modern Paithan on the north bank of the Godāvāri in the Aurāngabad District of Hyderabad.'

After the death of Śatakaṇi his wife Nāganiṅgī or Nāganiṅka, daughter of the Mahāraṭhi Trānakayi Kaḷakalāya, the scion of the Amgiya (?) family, was proclaimed regent during the minority of the princes Vedaśrī (? Khandasirī or Skandaśrī) and Śaktī-Śrī (Sati Sirimat) or Haku-Śrī. The last-mentioned prince is probably identical with Śakti-kumāra, son of Śālīvāhana, mentioned in Jaina literature.4

---

1 I.e., the Vidiśā region, etc., in Eastern Mālwa. For the connection of the Suṅgas with Vidiśā, see Pargiter, DKA, 49. The Kāvyāyanas had become King among the Sungas' (Suṅgeshu, DKA, 34), apparently in the Vidiśā territory. Cf. also Tewar Coins, IHQ, XXVIII, 1952, 68f.

2 The conquest of West Mālwa is probably suggested by round coins of Sri Śāla (Rapson, Andhra Coins, xcii-cccii).

3 Cf. Jina-prabhavasuri, Tirthakaḷpa, JBBRAS, X, 123; and Ptolemēus Geography, vii, 1, 82. See also śāṣṭaṅka Śātra, JBORS, 1930, 290; Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, EHD, Sec. VII.

4 Viracaritra, Ind. Ant., VIII, 301, ASWI, V, 62n.
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The Sātavāhanas were not the only enemies of the decadent Magadha empire in the first century B.C. We learn from the Hāthigumphā Inscription that when Sātakarṇi was ruling in the west, Khāravela of Kaliṅga carried his arms to Northern India and humbled the king of Rājagriha.

Khāravela belonged to the Cheta dynasty. Mr. R. P. Chanda points out that Cheta princes are mentioned in the Vessantara Jātaka. The Milinda-pañho contains a statement which seems to indicate that the Chetas were connected with the Chetis or Chedis. The particulars given in that work regarding the Cheta king Sura Parichara agree with what we know about the Chedi king Uparichara.

Very little is known regarding the history of Kaliṅga from the death of Aśoka to the rise of the Cheta or Cheti dynasty probably in the first century B.C. (three

1 On page 57 of Rapseon’s Andhra Coins Kalalāya Mahārathī bears the name “Sadakana” (=Sātakarṇi). His other name or epithet “Transakayiro” reminds us of “Tanaka” which occurs as a variant of the name of the 18th “Andhra” king of Pargiter’s list (DKA, 36, 41).

2 ASI. AR, 1923-24, p. 88: A. Ghosh, History of Central and Western India, 140. Mr. Ghosh identifies him with the fifth king of the Pūrānic list.

3 No. 547.

hundred years after the Nandas). The names of the first two kings of the Cheta line are not clearly indicated in the Hāthīgumpha inscription. Lüders Ins. No. 1347 mentions a king named Vakradeva (Vakadepasiri or Kūdepasiri?) But we do not know for certain whether he was a predecessor or successor of Khāravela.

During the rule of the second king, who must have reigned for at least 9 years (c. 37-28 B.C.), Khāravela occupied the position of Crown Prince (Yuvarāja). When he had completed his 24th year, he was anointed Mahārāja of Kaliṅga (c. 28 B.C.). His chief queen was the daughter of a prince named Lalāka, the great-grandson (according to some) of Hathisimha. In the first year of his reign he repaired the gates and ramparts of his capital, Kaliṅga-nagara. In the next year (c. 27 B.C.), without taking heed of Sātakarnī, he sent a large army to the west and with its aid, having reached the Krishṇavenā, struck terror into the hearts of the people (or city) of Musika (Asika?)-nagara. According to another interpretation, “he went to the rescue of Sātakarnī and having returned with his purpose accomplished, he with his allies made gay the city.” He followed up his success by further operations in the west and, in his fourth year, compelled the Raṭhikas and Bhōjakas to do him homage. In the fifth year (c. 24 B.C.) he had an aqueduct, that had been opened out 300 years back by Nandarāja, conducted into his capital.

Emboldened by his successes in the Deccan the Kaliṅga king turned his attention to the North. In

---

1 For Purusha-Yuga (generation) see Hemachandra, Parīśishta-parvan, VIII. 326 gāmi purusha-yugāni nava yāsatjavāncayāḥ.

the eighth year he stormed Gorathagiri (Barābar Hills near Gaya) and harassed (the king of?) Rājagriha.¹ If Dr. Jayaswal is right in identifying this king with Brihaspatimitra, then king Brihaspati must have ruled over Magadha after the Kānya dynasty.

The attack on Northern India was repeated possibly in the tenth and certainly in the twelfth year. In the tenth year the Kaliṅga king, in the opinion of some scholars, overran countries in Bhārat-varsha, which are surmised to refer to those in Upper India. In the twelfth year he claims to have terrified or harassed the kings of Uttarāpatha and watered his elephants in the Gaṅgā (Ganges).² The north-western expeditions apparently led to no permanent result. But in north-eastern India the Kaliṅga king was more successful; the repeated blows certainly "struck terror into the Magadhas," and compelled the Magadha king (Brihaspatimitra?) to bow at his feet.

Having subjugated Magadha, and despoiled Āṅga, the invader once more turned his attention to Southern India. Already in his eleventh year "he had had Pithuḍa ploughed with a plough drawn by an ass."³ Levi⁴ identified this city with Pihunda of the Uttarādyayana (21), and "Pitundra metropolis" of Ptolemy in the interior

¹ Some scholars find in line 8 of the Hāthigumpha Ins., a reference to the Yasavā-rama (Di) ma (to), i.e., Demetrios who "went off to Mathūra in order to relieve his generals who were in trouble" (Acta Orientalia, I. 27; Cal. Rev., July, 1926, 183). But the reading is doubtful (cf. Barua, Old Brāhmi inscriptions in the Udāgiri and Khaṇḍagiri Caves, pp. 17-18; IHQ., 1920, 564). Even if the reading Dimata be correct, the reference may be to Dīyumeta or Dīomedes (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, p. 36) and not necessarily to Demetrios.

² Some scholars find here a reference to the Sugaṅgītya palace (Ep. Ind., xx. 88).


⁴ Ind. Ant., 1926. 145. Sea-faring merchants are represented as going by boat from Champā to Pihunda in the days of Mahāvira, the Jina. Cf. Mbb. l. 66. 67, 186, VII. 50.
of the country of Masulipatam (Maisoloi). The conqueror seems to have pushed further to the south and made his power felt even in the Tamil country by princes amongst whom the most eminent was the king of the Pāṇḍyas. In the thirteenth year Khāravela erected pillars on the Kumāri Hill (Udayagiri in Orissa) in the vicinity of the dwelling of the Arhats (Khandagiri?).
Section III. The End of Greek Rule in North-West India.

While the remnant of the Magadhan monarchy was falling before the onslaughts of the Sātavāhanas and the Chetas, the Greek power in the North-West was also hastening towards dissolution. We have already referred to the feuds of Demetrios and Eukratides. The dissensions of these two princes led to a double succession, one derived from Demetrios holding for a time Kāpiṣā and then Śākala (Śiālkoṭ) with a considerable portion of the Indian interior, the other derived from Eukratides holding Nicaea,¹ Takshaśilā and Pushkaraṇāvatī as well as Kāpiṣā (which was conquered from Apollodotos) and Bactria. According to Gardner and Rapson, Apollodotos, Antimachos, Pantaleon, Agathokles, Agathokleia,² the Stratos, Menander, Dionysios, Zoilos,³ Hippostratos and Apollophanes⁴ probably belonged to the house of Euthydemos and Demetrios. Most of

¹ It lay on the Jhelum between that river and the Chenāb and was probably conquered by Helioskles in the reign of Strato I (CHI, 553, 699).
² According to some numismatics (CHI, 552) she was probably Menander's queen. But the theory has to explain why the 'evidence' regarding the supposed relationship is so vague (contra Helioskles and Laodike, Hermias and Kalliopa). Cf. Whitehead in Numismatic Chronicle, Vol. XX (1940), p. 97, 1950, 216.
³ "Apollodotos Philopator, Dionysios and Zoilos show a common and peculiar monogram struck probably by the same moneyer in one mint." Hoards of coins of these three princes have been found on the upper Sutlej. Coins of Zoilos have also been found at Pathankot and near Śākala (JRAS, 1913, 546n1; JASB 1897, 8; Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, 316 f).
⁴ Apollophanes shares a monogram with Zoilos and Strato (Tarn, Greeks, 317). Polyzenes, too, belongs to this group (p. 318). Whitehead considers him a close relation of Strato I (Indo-Greek Coins, 54n). The later kings of this group are connected with the Eastern Pañjab (EHI, 4th ed., pp. 257-58). Tarn infers from a statement of Plutarch that after the death of Menander the eastern capital was shifted from Śākala to Bukephala (on the east bank of the Jhelum, Tarn, Alexander the Great, Sources and Studies, 236).
these sovereigns used similar coin-types, specially the figure of the goddess Athene hurling the thunderbolt, which is characteristic of the Euthydemian line. Pantaleon and Agathokles strike coins with almost identical types. They both adopt the metal nickel for their coins, and they alone use in their legends the Brāhmi alphabet. They seem, therefore, to have been closely connected probably as brothers. It is not improbable that Agathokleia was their sister. Agathokles (and possibly Antimachos) issued a series of coins in commemoration of Alexander, Antiochos Nikator (Antiochos III Megas according to Malalas), Diodotos Soter, Euthydemos and Demetrios Aniketos (the Invincible).

Apollodotos, the Stratos, Menander and some later kings used the Athene type of coins. Apollodotos and Menander are mentioned together in literature. The author of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea says that "to the present day ancient drachmae are current in Barygaza (Broach) bearing inscriptions in Greek letters, and the devices of those who reigned after Alexander, Apollodotos and Menander." Again, in the title of the lost forty-first book of Justin's work, Menander and Apollodotos are mentioned as Indian kings. It appears from the Milinda-pañho that the capital of the dynasty to which Menander belonged was Śākala or Sagala.

1 For an interesting account of Indo-Greek coin-types see H. K. Deb, IHQ, 1934, 509 ff.
2 Dancing girl in oriental costume according to Whitehead; Māyā, mother of the Buddha, in the nativity scene according to Foucher (JRAS, 1919, p. 90).
3 Agathokleia is also closely connected with the Stratos, being probably mother or queen of Strato I, and great (?) grandmother of Strato II of the JRNS, 1950, 216.
4 According to Tarn (447 f) the fictitious Seleukid pedigree is the key to the (pedigree) coin series of Agathokles, the Just.
6 "Atthi Yonakānam nānāputhbadanam Sāgalañāma nagaram," Jambudipe Sāgala nagare Milindo nāma Rājā ahoni." "Atthi kho
We learn from Ptolemy, the Geographer, that the city had another name Euthymedia or Euthydemia, a designation which was probably derived from the Euthydemian line. An inscription on a steatite casket which comes from Shinkot in Bajaur territory refers to the 5th regnal year of Māhārāja Minandra (Menander). The record proves that in the 5th year of his reign the dominions of Menander probably included a considerable portion of the Trans-Indus territory. The Kāpiśa and Nīcāea coins indicate how some of the rulers of the Euthydemian group were gradually pushed to the Indian interior. They had to remove their capital to Sākala.

To the rival family of Eukratides belonged Heliokles and probably Antialkidas who ruled conjointly with Lysias. A common type of Antialkidas is the Pilei of the Dioscuri, which seems to connect him with Eukratides; his portrait according to Gardner resembles that of Heliokles. It is not improbable that he was an immediate successor of Heliokles.¹ A Besnagar Inscription makes him a contemporary of Kāśi (Kośī = Kautṣī?) putra Bhāgabhadrā of Vidiśā who ruled some time after Agnimitra probably in or about the latter half of the second century B.C. The capital of Antialkidas was probably at Takṣhaśilā or Taxila, the place from which his ambassador Heliodoros went to the kingdom of Bhāgabhadrā. But his dominions seem also to have included Kāpiśa or Kāpiśa.² After his death the western Greek kingdom probably split up into three parts, viz.,

¹ Gardner, Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum, p. xxxiv.
² Camb. Hist., 558.
Takshaśilā (ruled by the line represented by Archebios ¹), Pushkalāvatī (governed by Diomedes, Epander,² Philoxenos, Artemidoros, and Peukolaos), and Kāpīṣa with the Kābul region held successively by Amyntas and Hermæus (Hermaios). With Hermaios was associated his queen, Kalliope. Kāpīṣa was, according to Chinese evidence, probably occupied by the Sai-wang (Sāka lord) some time in the latter part of the second century B.C. But the barbarian chieftain, like the Kushān Yavuga of later times, may have acknowledged the nominal suzerainty of the Greek Basileas, as Teutonic chieftains in Europe were, during the fifth century A.D., sometimes content with the rank of 'patrician' and 'consul,' under the nominal authority of the titular Roman emperor.

The Greek power must have been greatly weakened by the feuds of the rival lines of Demetrios and Eukratides. The evils of internal dissension were aggravated by foreign inroads. We learn from Strabo ³ that the Parthians deprived Eukratides (and the Scythians) by force of arms of a part of Bactriana, which embraced the satrapies of Aspionus and Turiva (possibly Aria and Arachosia according to Macdonald). There is reason to believe that the Parthian king Mithradates I penetrated even into India. Orosius, a Roman historian, who flourished about 400 A.D., makes a definite statement to the effect that Mithradates (c. B.C. 171-138)

¹ A copper piece of this king is restruck, probably on a coin of Helioles (Whitehead, p. 30).

² The 'Pallas and thunderbolt' type of his silver coins, probably connects him with the Sākala group, ibid., 64. Among the rulers of the Gandhāra region we should perhaps also include Telephos whose coinage resembles that of Manes, ibid., 80. A prince named Nikias apparently ruled in the Jhelum District (EHL, 4th ed., 238), and perhaps other tracts (Num. Chron., 1940, p. 109). But the story of his naval victory over Manes is based on inadequate evidence.

subdued the natives between the Hydaspes and the Indus. His conquest thus appears to have driven a wedge between the kingdom of Eukratides and that of his rival of the house of Euthydemos.

The causes of the final downfall of the Bactrian Greeks are thus stated by Justin: "the Bactrians harassed by various wars lost not only their dominions but their liberty; for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Drangians and the Indians (?) they were at last overcome as if exhausted by the weaker Parthians." 1

The Sogdians were the people of the region now known as Samarkand and Bukhārā. They were separated from Bactriana by the Oxus and from the Šakas by the Jaxartes or the Syr Daria. 2 By the term Sogdian Justin probably refers not only to the Sogdian proper but also to the well-known tribes which, according to Strabo, 3 deprived the Greeks of Bactriana, viz., the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, Sacarauli and the Sacae or Šakas. The story of the Šaka occupation of the Indo-Greek possessions will be told in the next chapter. The Latin historian Pompeius Trogus describes how Diodotos had to fight Scythian tribes, the Sarancae (Saraucae) and Asiani, who finally conquered Sogdiana and Bactria. The occupation of Sogdiana probably entitled them to the designation Sogdian used by Justin. Sten Konow 4

---

1 In the Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, p. 568, however, this river has been identified with a Persian stream, the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil.
2 Sten Konow translates the passage from Justin thus: The Bactrians lost both their empire and their freedom, being harassed by the Sogdians (beyond the Oxus), the Arachoti (of the Argandāb valley of S. Afghanistan), the Drangae (lake-dwellers, near the Hamun Lake) and the Arei (of Herat), and finally oppressed by the Parthians (Corpus, ii. 1, xxi-xxii).
3 Strabo, XI. 8. 8-9.
5 Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 464. Corpus, II. 1, xxi, lvii f,
suggests the identification of the Tochari of the Classical writers with the Ta-hia of the Chinese historians. He further identifies the Asii, Asioi or Asiani with the Yüe-chi. We are inclined to identify the Tochari with the Tukhāras who formed an important element of the Bactrian population in the time of Ptolemy and are described by that author as a great people. They are apparently "the war-like nation of the Bactrians" of the time of the *Periplus*.

The *Drangians*, literally 'lake-dwellers', referred to by Justin, inhabited the country about the Hamun lake (*Zareh*) between Areia (Herat), Gedrosia (Baluchistān) and Arachosia (Kandahār) and the desert of Eastern Persia, close to and perhaps including at times within its political boundaries the neighbouring province now called Sistān or Seistan (Sakasthāna). Numismatic evidence indicates that a family whose territory lay mainly in southern Afghanistan, viz., the so-called *dynasty of Vonones*, supplanted Greek rule in a considerable part of the Helmund valley, Ghazni and Kandahār (Arachosia). Vonones is a Parthian (Imperial) name. Hence many scholars call his dynasty a Parthian family, and some go so far as to assert that this Vonones is the Arsakid king of that name who reigned from A.D. 8 to 14. But names are not sure proofs of nationality. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar calls the dynasty Saka. The best name for the family would be Drangian, because the chief centre of their power probably

2 Schoff, *Parthian Stations*, 32.
3 *Corpus*, xi; Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 92; MASI, 34. 7. Isidore, places Drangiana (Zarangiana) beyond Phra (Farah), and locates Sakasthāna beyond this territory, (Schoff, 9). But Herzfeld points out that Sistān is the Achaemenian 'Zrang'.
4 *Camb. Short Hist.*, 69.
5 Isidore of Charax who mentions the revolt of Tiridates against Phraates (26 B.C.) and is quoted by Pliny (Schoff, *Parthian Stations*, pp. 5, 18 ff, 17;
lay in the Helmund valley, Arachosia being ruled by a viceroy.\textsuperscript{1} On coins Vonones is associated with two princes, \textit{viz.},

(i) \textit{\textsuperscript{[Text not clear]}} Spalahora (Spalyris) who is called \textit{Mahārāja-bhrātā} (the king's brother).

(ii) Spalaga-dama, son of Spalahora.

There is one coin which Edward Thomas and Cunningham attributed to Vonones and Azes I. But the coin really belongs to Mauес.\textsuperscript{2} There is a silver coin of a prince named Spalirises which bears on the obverse the legend \textit{Basileus Adelphoy Spalirisoy}, and on the reverse "\textit{Mahārāja bhrātā dhramiūsa Spalirisasa}" \textit{i.e.}, of Spalirises the Just, brother of the king. This king has been identified by some with Vonones and by others with Mauес.\textsuperscript{3} Vonones was succeeded as supreme ruler by Spalirises.\textsuperscript{4} The coins of Spalirises present two varieties, \textit{viz.},

1. Coins which bear his name alone in both the legends:

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Corpus}, xlii.


\textsuperscript{3} Herz'eld identifies the royal brother of Spalirises with Maues (\textit{Camb. Short Hist.}, 60).

\textsuperscript{4} It should be noted that certain coin-types of Spalirises are found restruck on coins of Vonones (CHI, 574) and on a copper coin of Spalyris and Spalagadama (\textit{Corpus}, II. 1. xlii). This proves that Spalirises was later than Vonones, Spalyris and Spalagadama. The square Omicron on a coin of Spalyris probably points to a date not earlier than Orodes II (55 to 38/7 B.C.). Tarn, \textit{Greeks}, 326.
2. Coins on which his name occurs on the obverse in the Greek legend, and those of Azes on the reverse in the Kharoshthi legend.

The second variety proves that Spalirises had a colleague named Azes who governed a territory where the prevailing script was Kharoshthi. This Azes has been identified with king Azes of the Pañjab about whom we shall speak in the next chapter.

As regards the Indian enemies of the Bactrian Greeks we must refer in the first place to the prince of the house of Pushyamitra who is represented in Kālidāsa’s Mālavikāgnimitram as defeating the Yavanás on the Sindhu. An Indian named Bhadrāyasas seems to have had some share in the destruction of the Greek kingdom of the Eastern Pañjab. The Nāsik prāśasti of Goutamiputra Śātakarnī represents that king as the destroyer of the Yavanás, apparently of Western India.

The final destruction of Greek rule was, as Justin says, the work of the Parthians. Marshall tells us¹ that the last surviving Greek principality,² that of Hermaios in the Kābul valley, was overthrown by the Parthian king Gondophrernes.³ The Chinese historian Fan-ye also refers to the Parthian occupation of Kābul.⁴ "Whenever any of the three kingdoms of Tien-tchou (India Proper), Ki-pin (Kāpisa) or Ngansi (Parthia),

---

² Among the latest Greek rulers of the Kābul Valley we have to include Theodamas whose existence is disclosed by a Bajaur Seal Inscription (Corpus, II, i. xv, 6).
³ In ASI, AR, 1929-30, pp. 56 ff., however, Marshall modifies his earlier views in regard to the conquest of the Greek kingdom of Kābul by the Parthians. He suggests that the Kābul Valley became a bone of contention between Parthians and Kushāns and changed hands more than once before the final eclipse of the Parthian power.
became powerful, it brought Kābul into subjection. When it grew weak it lost Kābul. . . . Later, Kābul fell under the rule of Parthia." The real conquest of Kābul by the Parthians could hardly have taken place till after the time of Isidore (last quarter of the first century B.C.) because the writings of that geographer do not include the Kābul valley in the list of the eastern provinces of the Parthian Empire. By A.D. 43-44, however, Parthian rule had extended to this region as we learn from Philostratos.


CHAPTER VIII. SCYTHIAN RULE IN NORTHERN INDIA

SECTION I. THE ŠAKAS.

In the second and first centuries B.C., Greek rule in parts of Kāfristān, Gandhāra and possibly the Hazāra country, was supplanted by that of the Šakas. In the days of Darius, the Achaemenid king of Persia (B.C. 522-486), the Šakas lived beyond Sogdiana (para-Sugdam) in "the vast plains of the Syr Darya, of which the modern capital is the town of Turkestan."

But already towards the end of the first century B.C. they were established at Sigal in modern Sīstān. The story of their migration from central Asia has been recorded by Chinese historians. The History of the First Han Dynasty (Ts'ien Han-Shu) states "formerly when the Hiung-nû conquered the Ta-Yüe-chi the latter emigrated to the west," and subjugated the Tahia; whereupon the Sai-wang went to the south, and ruled over Kipin." Sten Konow points out that the Sai-wang refer to the same people which are known in Indian tradition under the designation Saka-muruṇḍa, Muruṇḍa being a later form of a Šaka word which has the same meaning as Chinese "wang," i.e., king, master, lord. In

1 E. Herzfeld, MASI, 34, 3.
2 Schoff, Isidore, Stathmoi Parthikoi, 17.
3 C. 174-160 B.C. according to some scholars.
4 JRAI., 1903, p. 22; 1932, 958; Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 464. The Šaka occupation of Kipin must be posterior to the reign of Eukratides and his immediate (Greek) successors.
5 Professor Hermann identifies the Sai-wang with the Sakarauloi or Sakarasukoi of Strabo and other classical authors. Corpus. II. 1, xx. For Muruṇḍa, see pp. xx.
Indian inscriptions and coins it has frequently been translated with the Indian word Svāmin.

The name of the Saka king who occupied Kipin is not known. The earliest ruler of that region mentioned in Chinese records is Wu-t'ou-lao whose son was ousted by Yin-mo-fu, the son of the prince of Yung-k'ū, with Chinese help. Yin-mo-fu established himself as king of Kipin during the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-ti, which lasted from 73 to 48 B.C., and killed the attendants of an envoy sent in the reign of the Emperor Yüan-ti (B.C. 48-33). In the reign of Chéng-ti (32-7 B.C.) the support of China was sought without success by the king of Kipin, probably the successor of Yin-mo-fu, who was in danger from some powerful adversary, apparently a king of the Yue-chi, who had relations with China about this time as is proved by the communication of certain Buddhist books to a Chinese official in 2 B.C.²

S. Lévi at first identified Kipin with Kaśmīra. But his view has been ably controverted by Sten Konow, who accepts the identification with Kāpiśā.² Gandhāra was at one time the eastern part of the realm of Kipin. A passage of Hemachandra's Abhidhāna-Chintāmani

---

1 The identification of Yung-k'ū with Yonaka (Tarn, 297) and that of Yin-mo-fu with Hermiaos (Tarn, 346) are purely conjectural. Mention may be made in this connection of Zonkah in Tibbat (JASB, 1896, 97). But the problem of identification must await future discoveries.


4 The country drained by the northern tributaries of the river Kābul, ibid., p. 290; cf. Watters, Yuan Chwang, Vol. I, pp. 259-60. The city of Kāpiśā probably stood at the junction of the Ghurband and the Panjshir (Foucher, Indian Studies presented to Prof. Rapson, 343). Kipin according to the Taien Han-shu joins Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia and Persia according to Schoff, Parthian Stations, 41) on the south-west. Corpus, II, 1, xxiv; JRAS., 1912, 684n. Cf. Dr. Hermann (JRAS., 1913, 1058n.) who holds that Ki-pin was Gandhāra. The reference to a gold as well as a silver currency in Ki-pin is worthy of note (Corpus, II, 1, xxiv). Cf. the gold coin of the city of Pushkalavatī (CHI, 587, and the coin of Athama (443 infra).
seems to suggest that the capital of the Sai-wang (Saka-Muranda) was Lampaka or Laghman (Lampakastu Murandah syuh). Sten Konow says that according to the Ts’ien Han-shu, or Annals of the First Han Dynasty, the Sai, i.e., the Sakas, passed the Hientu (the hanging passage), i.e., the gorge west of Skardu on their way to Kipin. Though the Sakas wrested parts of Kipin (Kapiya-Gandhara) from the hands of Greek meridarchs (governors) they could not permanently subjugate Kabul, where the Basileus (king) maintained a precarious existence. They were more successful in India. Inscriptions at Mathura and Nasik prove that the Sakas extended their sway as far as the Jumna in the east and the Godavari in the south, and destroyed the power of the ‘Miras’ of Mathura and the Satavahanas of Paithan.

No connected or detailed account of the Saka potentates of Kipin is possible. Sakas are mentioned along with the Yavanas in the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, the Manusamhita and the Mahabhishya. The Harivamsa informs us that they shaved one-half of their heads. The Jaina work Kālakāchārya-kathānaka states that their kings were called Sāhi. Some of these ‘Sāhis’ are said to have been induced by a Jaina teacher

---

1 Lampaka (Laghman) is 100 miles to the east of Kapisea (AGI, 49).
4 Some of the Sakas seem to have penetrated to the far south of India. A Nāgārjunikopāda Inscription refers to a Saka named Moda and his sister Budhi. Ep. Ind., xx. 37.
5 I, 54, 22; IV, 43, 12.
6 II, 32, 17.
7 X. 44.
8 Ind. Ant., 1875, 244.
to proceed to Suraṭṭha (Surāshṭra) Vishaya (country) and Ujjain in Hindukadeśa (India) where they overthrew some local chiefs and ruled for four years till they were themselves ousted by the founder of the era of 58 B.C.

The Sakas are also mentioned in the Prāśastis of Gautamiputra Śatakarnī and Samudra Gupta. Their kingdom or empire "Sakasthāna" is probably mentioned in the Mahāmāyūrī (95), in the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscription and in the Chandravalli Stone Inscription of the Kadamba Mayūraśarman. The passage in the Mathurā inscription containing the word Sakasthāna runs thus:—

Sarvasa Sakastanaso puyae.

Cunningham and Bühler interpreted the passage as meaning "for the merit, or in honour, (of the people) of the whole of Sakasthāna." Dr. Fleet, however, maintained that "there are no real grounds for thinking that the Sakas ever figured as invaders of any part of northern India above Kāthiawād and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa." He took Sarva to be a proper name and translated the insessional passage referred to above as "a gift of Sarva in honour of his home."

Fleet's objection is ineffective. Chinese evidence clearly establishes the presence of Sakas in Kipin, i.e., Kāpīśa-Gandhāra. As regards the presence of the tribe at Mathurā, the site of the inscription, we should note that the Mārkandeya Purāṇa refers to a Saka settlement in the Madhyadeśa. Dr. Thomas points out that the

1 JRAS., 1904, 703f.; 1905, 155, 643f.; Mr. N. G. Majumdar (JASB., 1934, 11) takes Sakastana, to mean Sakrasthāna, i.e., "the place of Indra." Cf. Fleet in JRAS., 1904, 705.

2 Note also the Kāpīśa types of the coins of Manes and Spālarises (CHI, 560n, 562, 591) and the foundation of a Kāpīśa satrapy Corpus, ii, 1, 150f.).

3 Chapter 58.

epigraphs on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Śaka and Persian nomenclature. The name Mevaki for instance, which occurs in the inscription, is a variant of the Scythian name Mauakes.\(^1\) The termination ""-ās"" in Komūsā and ō Samūśo seems to be Scythic. Dr. Thomas further points out that there is no difficulty in the expression of honour to the ""whole realm of the Śakas"" since we find in the Wardak, Sui Vihār and other inscriptions even more comprehensive expressions, e.g., Sarvā sattvanam—"’of all living creatures.’ As regards Fleet’s renderings ""svaka"" and ""sakaṭhāna,"" one’s own place, Dr. Thomas says that it does not seem natural to inscribe on the stone, honour to somebody’s own home. A pūjā addressed to a country is unusual, but inscription G of the Lion Capital contains a similar pūjā addressed to the chief representatives of the Śaka dominions.

Śakasthāna, doubtless, included the district of Scythia mentioned in the Periplus, ""from which flows down the river Sinthus (Indus) the greatest of all the rivers that flow into the Erythraean Sea (Indian Ocean)."" The metropolis of ""Scythia"" in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara; and its market town was Barbaricum on the seashore.

Princes bearing Śaka names are mentioned in several inscriptions discovered in Taxila, Mathurā and Western India. According to Dr. Thomas ""whatever Śaka dynasties may have existed in the Pañjāb or India, reached India neither through Afghānistān nor through Kaśmīra but, as Cunningham contended, by way of Sindh and the valley of the Indus.""\(^2\) This theory cannot be accepted

\(^1\) Cf. Mauza, Moga, and Mavaces, the commander of the Śakas who went to the aid of Darius Codomannus (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 142). Cf. also the coin-name Mevaku (S. Konow, Corpus, xxxiii n.). In the period 106 to 101 B.C. the king of Ferghana bore the Śaka name of Mu-ku’a (Tarn, Greeks, 306f.).

\(^2\) JRAS., 1906, p. 216.
in its entirety in view of the inadequate representation of Sind by Saka coins, the Chinese account of the Saka occupation of Kipin and the epigraphic evidence regarding the existence of a Scythian Satrapy at Kāpiśi and a Saka principality in the Hazāra country. We cannot also overlook the fact that some of the Saka names hitherto discovered are those of the Northern Sakas who lived near the Sogdianoi. The names Maues, Moga and Mevaki, for instance, are variants of the Saka name Mauakes. We learn from Arrian that a chief named Mauakes or Movaces led the "Sacians (Sakas), a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwelt in Asia," who lived outside the jurisdiction of the Persian governor of the Bactrians and the Sogdianians, but were in alliance with the Persian king. Chhaharata, Khakharāta or Kshaharāta, the family designation of several satrapal houses of Taxila, Mathurā, Western India and the Deccan, is perhaps equivalent to Karatai the name of a Saka tribe of the North.

The Conquest of the Lower Indus Valley, Cutch and parts of Western India may, however, have been effected by the Sakas of Western Sakasthāna (Sistān) who are mentioned by Isidore of Charax. The name of the capitals

1 CHI, 560n, JASB, 1924, p. 14; S. Konow, Corpus, II. i. 13f. The Saka conquest of Ki-pin did not mean the total extinction of the Greek principality in the Kābul region. The History of the Later Han Dynasty (A.D. 25-220) refers to the existence, side by side, of the kingdoms of Ki-pin and Kābul before the conquest of the latter state by the Parthians. Like the Sātavāhanas, the Greeks of the Kābul territory may have restored their fallen fortunes to a certain extent after the first rush of barbarian invasion had spent its force. It is also possible that Scythian chiefs for a time acknowledged the nominal suzerainty of the Greek Basileus.

2 Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 399-400.
3 Taxila plate.
4 Mathurā Lion Capital.
5 Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400; cf. Corpus, II. I. xxxvi: "Kharaosta and Maues would belong to the north-western Sakas of Ki-pin and not to the branch which went to India from Seistān." Cf. xxxiiii (case of Liakā).
of "Scythia" (which embraced the Lower Indus Valley) and of the kingdom of Mambarus (Nambanus?) in the time of the *Periplus* was Minnagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Sakasthāna mentioned by Isidore.\(^1\) Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the names of the Western Ksattrapas of Chashtāna's line, *viz.*, "Dāman" (-dama) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the Kārddamaka family from which, according to a Kanheri Inscription, the daughter of the Mahākshatraca Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Kārddama river in the realm of the Persians.\(^2\)

The earliest Saka kings mentioned in Indian inscriptions are, perhaps, Damijada\(^3\) and Maues. The latter is usually identified with Moga of the Taxila plate. He is possibly mentioned also in the Maira Inscription.\(^4\) Maues-Moga was a mighty sovereign (Maharaya). His dominions included Chuksha near Taxila which was ruled by a satrapal, *i.e.*, a viceregal, family. Numismatic evidence points to his sway over Kāpiṣi\(^5\) and Pushkarāvatī as well as Taxila.\(^6\) His satrapas probably put an end to Greek and Indian rule in the country round Mathurā. In parts of the Eastern Pañjāb and certain adjacent

\(^1\) JRAS, 1915, p. 890.

\(^2\) Shāmasastry's trans. of the *Arthaśāstra*, p. 86, n. 6. cf. Artemis (Ptolemy, 324), Gordomaris, Loeb, Marcellinus (ii, 380).

For another view see Ind. Ant., XII. 273 n. The word Kārdamika occurs in the *Mahābhārata* (IV. 2. 1. Word Index, p. 275); Kramadiśvara, 747; and Kardamila in Mbh. III. 135. 1. The Kārddama river may be identified with the Zarafshan which flowed through the old Achemenian Satrapy of Bactria or Balkh.

The *Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa* (Chs. 100 and 102) connects a line of Kārddama kings with Bāhli or Bāhlika (IHQ., 1933, pp. 37 ff.).

\(^3\) Or Namijada, Shahdaur Ins., Corpus, II. 1. 14, 15.

\(^4\) At Maira in the Salt Range, a Kharoshṭhi Inscription has been found in a well which seems to be dated in the year 58 and possibly contains the word *Moasa,* of Moa or Moga.

\(^5\) Camb. Hist., Ind. I. 590 f.

\(^6\) Ibid., 701.
tracts indigenous tribes like the Audumbaras, Trigartas, Kunindas, Yaudheyas, Ārjunāyanas had begun to assert their independence probably after the collapse of the Euthydemian monarchy. Maues struck coins with the types of Eukratides and Demetrios. But the absence of the Athena Alkis type leads Tarn to surmise that he did not annex Menander's home kingdom (i.e., the district round Śākala).

The dates assigned to Maues by various scholars range from B.C. 135 to A.D. 154. His coins are found ordinarily in the Pañjāb, and chiefly in the western portion of the province of which Taxila was the ancient capital. There can thus be no doubt that Maues was the king of Gandhāra. Now, it is impossible to find for Maues a place in the history of the Pañjāb before the Greek king Antialkidas who was reigning at Taxila when king Bhāgabhadra was on the throne of Vidiśa in Central India for fourteen years. The date of Bhāgabhadra is uncertain but he must be placed later than Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra, who ruled from cir. B.C. 151 to 143. The fourteenth year of Bhāgabhadra, therefore, could not have fallen before c. 129 B.C. Consequently Antialkidas could not have been ruling earlier than the second half of the second century B.C., and his reign could not have ended before 129 B.C. The Saka occupation of Gandhāra must, therefore, be later than 129 B.C. All scholars except Fleet identify Maues with Maharaya Moga of the so-called Sirsukh or Taxila plate, dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Śaka institution. As

---

1 Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, 322-330. The conquest of this kingdom may have been effected by Azes I. Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 113; Tarn, GHI, 349; or by Rājuvula, Allan, CICA1, 185.

2 Cf., now Marshall, Monuments of Śānci, I, 268n.
the era is used only in Northern India and the border-
land, it is permissible to conjecture that it came into
existence after the Saka occupation of those regions.
We have already seen that this occupation could not have
taken place before 129 B.C. The era used in the Taxila
plate could not, therefore, have originated before 129
B.C. The year 78 of the era could not have fallen before
B.C. (129 – 78 =) 51. Consequently the rule of Maues-
Moga cannot have ended before B.C. 51. He must be
placed even later, because we learn from Chinese records that
Yin-mo-fu was in possession of Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra
about 48-33 B.C., and he was preceded by Wu-tou-lao
and his son. As there is no real ground for identifying
Maues-Moga with any of these rulers he will have to
be placed after 33 B.C. He cannot perhaps be placed
later than the middle of the first century A.D., because
we learn from Philostratos and the author of the
Periplus that about the time or a little later both Taxila
and Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e. the
Saka kingdom in the Indus valley, had passed into the
hands of the Parthians. It seems, therefore, that
Maues-Moga ruled after 33 B.C., but before the latter
half of the first century A.D. According to Fleet, Moga
flourished in the year 22 A.D.—the year 78 of the era
commencing 58 B.C. which afterwards came to be known
as the Kṛita-Mālava-Vikrama era. But the matter must
be regarded as not definitely settled. The Khalatse
Inscription of the year 187 (?) of Uvima (?) Wema
Kadphises) and the Taxila Silver Vase Inscription of
the year 191 of Jihonika possibly suggest that the era
to which the dates of these inscriptions, and presumably
that of the so-called Sirsukh (Taxila) plate of Moga, are
to be referred, began much earlier than B.C. 58,
Numismatists say that Maues was succeeded on the throne of Gandhāra by Azes who put an end to the remnant of Greek rule in the Eastern Pañjāb by annexing the kingdom of Hippostratos. In the opinion of Marshall he also conquered the Jumna valley where the Vikrama era was in use.¹ The coins of Azes are very closely related to the issues of the rulers of the Vonones group, and the assumption has always been made that Azes, the king of the Pañjāb, is identical with Azes, the colleague of Spalirises. Some scholars think that there were two kings of the name of Azes and that the first Azes was the immediate successor, not of Maues, but of Spalirises and that Maues came not only after Azes I, but also after Azes II. But the last part of the theory cannot be accepted in view of the synchronism of Gondophernes and Azes II proved by the fact that Aspavarmṣ served as Strategos, i.e., general or governor, under both the monarchs.² As Gondophernes ruled in the year 103,³ while Maues-Moga ruled in the year 78,⁴ and as both these dates are usually referred by scholars to the same era, both Gondophernes and his contemporary Azes II must be later than Maues-Moga. There is no room for Maues-Moga between Azes I and Azes II, because we shall see presently that the succession from Azes I to Azes II is clearly established by numismatic evidence. Maues came either before Azes I or after Azes II; but we have already seen that he could not have reigned after Azes II. He must, therefore, be placed before Azes I. He may have been ruling in the Pañjāb when Vonones was ruling in Sistān. When Vonones was succeeded by Spalirises, Maues was succeeded by Azes I. We have already seen that Spalirises and Azes I issued

¹ JRAS, 1947, 22.
³ Cf. the Takht-i-Bāhī Inscription.
⁴ Cf. the Taxila Plate of Patika.
joint coins. The relationship between the two monarchs is not known. They may have been related by blood, or they may have been mere allies like Hermaios and Kujula Kadphises.

King Azes I struck some coins bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of Azilises in Kharoshthi on the reverse. Then again we have another type of coins on which the name in Greek is Azilises, and in Kharoshthi is Aya (Azes). Drs. Bhandarkar and Smith postulate that these two joint types, when considered together, prove that Azilises, before his accession to independent power, was the subordinate colleague of an Azes, and that an Azes similarly was subsequently the subordinate colleague of Azilises. The two princes named Azes cannot, therefore, be identical, and they must be

1 Rapson on pp. 573-574 of CHI, identifies Azes, the colleague of Spalirises, with Azes II, and makes him the son of Spalirises. On page 572, however, the suggestion is found that Azes II was the son and successor of Azilises. It is difficult to see how the two views can be reconciled. For an inscription of Azes see Corpus, II, i. 17 (Shahdadur Inscription of Siwarakshita). The name of Aja or Aya (Azes) has also been recognised by certain scholars in the Kalawân Inscription of the year 135 and in the Taxila silver scroll record of the year 136. The absence of any honorific title before the name makes it difficult to say whether it refers to a king, and, if it does refer to a king, whether the ruler in question was Azes I or Azes II. Moreover, if Aja or Aya is a royal name, then it would seem, from the analogy of other early Indian epigraphs, that the years 134 and 136 actually belonged to his reign; not years of an era which he founded but of an era which he used. The absence of any honorific title has, however, led some writers to suggest that Aja-Aya was the founder of the reckoning mentioned in the epigraphs, and not the reigning sovereign in the years 134 and 136. The identity of the reckoning with the era of 58 B.C. cannot be regarded as certain, though the theory has many advocates. Another thorny problem is the relation between this reckoning and the reckonings or reckonings used by Moga and Gondophermes. For the Kalawân Inscription see Ep. Ind. XXI, 261 n.; IHQ. 1932. 825; 1933. 141; India in 1932-33, p. 192.

2 Cf. Whitehead, p. 178; Marshall, Taxila, p. 16.

3 Coins of Azilises are imitated by Mahâdeva Dharaghosha Audumbara (CHI, 529). Along with certain caskets discovered in Taxila (ASI. AR, 1934-35, pp. 29, 30) was a silver coin of the diochouari type of Azilises and a Roman coin issued by Augustus. The deposit was probably made early in the first century A.D. We have here new data for settling the chronology of the
distinguished as Azes I and Azes II. Whitehead, however, observes that the silver coins of Azilises are better executed and earlier in style than those of Azes. The best didrachms of Azes compare unfavourably with the fine silver coins of Azilises with Zeus obverse and Dioskouroi reverse, and with other rare silver types of Azilises. If Azilises preceded Azes, then following Dr. Smith we must have Azilises I and Azilises II, instead of Azes I and Azes II. In conclusion Whitehead says that the differences in type and style between the abundant issues of Azes can be adequately explained by reasons of locality alone, operating through a long reign.\(^1\)

Marshall, however, points out that the stratification of coins at Taxila clearly proves the correctness of Smith's theory, according to which Azes I was succeeded by Azilises, and Azilises by Azes II.\(^2\)

A notable discovery has unearthed the unique gold coin of a king named Athama. Whitehead has no hesitation in recognising him as a member of the dynasty of Azes and Azilises. His date is, however, uncertain.

Unlike most of the Indo-Greek princes,\(^3\) the Saka kings style themselves on their coins Basileus Basileon,

---

1 Inferior workmanship according to some, is a sign of remoteness (from Gandhāra?) rather than of late date (cf. CHI, 569f.). G. Hoffmann and Sten Konow not only reject the duplication of Azes, but suggest the identification of Aza with Azilises. According to Marshall Azilises ruled north-westwards as far as Kāpisth (JRAS, 1914, 25 ff).

2 The coins which Smith assigns to Azes II are found generally nearer the surface than those of Azes I (JRAS., 1914, 979). For Konow's view, see Ep. Ind., 1926, 274 and Corpus, II, i. xxxix-xl. The name 'Aza' is found in association with several rulers of various dates, while that of Azilises is found only with one (viz., Azes). This possibly points to the plurality of the kings named Azes.

3 With the exception perhaps of Pukratides one of whose coins bears
corresponding to the Prākrit on the reverse Mahārājasa Rājarājasa. They also appropriate the epithet Mahatasa, corresponding to the Greek Megalōy, which we find on the coins of Greek kings. The title Rājarāja—king of kings—was not an empty boast. Moga had under him the viceroys (satraps) Liaka and Patika of Chuksha (Chach) in the Western Punjab. One of the kings named Azes had under him at least one subordinate ruler, e.g., the Stratagos Aspavarman. The title Satrap or Kshatrapa occurs in the Behistum Inscription of Persia in the form Khshathrapāvan which means 'protector of the kingdom.' 1 "Strategos," a Greek word, means a general. It is obvious that the Scythians continued in North-Western India the Perso-Hellenic system of government by Satraps and military governors. Coins and Inscriptions prove the existence of several other Satrapal families besides those mentioned above.

The North Indian Kshatrapas or Satraps may be divided into three main groups, viz.:

1. The Satraps of Kāpiśi, Puspapura and Abhisāraprastha,
2. The Satraps of the Western Pañjāb, and
3. The Satraps of Mathurā.

A Manikiālā inscription affords the bare mention of a Satrap of Kāpiśi, who was the son of the Satrap Grauavhyaka. 2 A Kābul Museum Stone Inscription of the year 833 discloses the name of a Satrap of Puspapura

the legend Maharajasa rajatirajasa Evukratidasa (Corpus, II. i. xxix n.), and of a few other rulers including Hermaios (Whithead, p. 85).

1 Cf. Ksha-pāvan of the Rig-veda (Vedic Index, I. 208), Rāśṭra-pāla of the Arthaśāstra and Goptri or Dēśa-goptri of the Mālavikāgumintram and the Gupta inscriptions.

2 Rapson, Andhra Coins, ci; Ancient India, 141; JASB., 1924, 14, Corpus, II. i, 160-1.

named Tiravbara. 'Puspapura', the city of flowers, may have reference to Pushkaravati (lotus-city). The name of Śivasena, 'the Kshatrapa in the town of Abhisāraprastha' occurs in the legend of a copper seal ring found in the Pañjab.\(^1\) The territory of the three Satraps may have corresponded to Yona, Gandhāra and Kamboja of Asokan epigraphs.

The Pañjab Satraps belonged to three families, viz.—

(a) The Kusulua or Kusuluka Group.—It consisted of Liaka and his son Patika, possibly of the Chhaharata or Kshaharata family, who apparently governed the district of Chuksha.\(^2\) According to Fleet there were two Patikas.\(^3\) But in the opinion of Marshall there was only one viceroy of the name of Patika.\(^4\) The Satrapal line of Kusuluka was intimately connected with the Satraps of Mathurā.\(^5\) The coins of Liaka Kusuluka show the transition of the district to which they belonged, i.e., a part of Eastern Gandhāra, from the rule of the Greek house of Eukratides to the Śakas.\(^6\) We learn from the Taxila, or the so-called Sirsukh, plate, dated in the year 78, that Liaka was a Satrāp of the great king Moga and that Patika, his son, was a great gift-lord (mahādānapati).\(^7\)

(b) Manigul and his son Zeionises or Jihonika.—Numismatists consider them to be Satraps of Pushkala-vati during the reign of Azes II. But the Taxila Silver

---

1. Corpus, II. 1. 103.
2. Bühler, Ep. Ind. IV, p. 51; Konow, Corpus, II. i. 25-23. Chuksha, according to Stein, is the present Chach in the north of the District of Attock. See also AGI\(^2\), 63, 126.
3. JRAS., 1907, p. 1085. The existence of at least two Liakas is, however, proved by the Taxila plate and the Zeda inscription (Corpus, II. i. 145). A Liakā appears also to be mentioned in the Mānehrā inscription of the year 68. He may have been identical with the father of Patika, Ep. Ind. XXI, 257.
4. JRAS., 1914, pp. 979 ff.
5. Cf. Inscription G on the Mathurā Lion Capital.
6. Rapson’s Ancient India, p. 151.
Vase Inscription of the year 191 discovered by Marshall in 1927\(^1\) shows that Jihonika was a *Kshatrapa* in Cukhsha near Taxila in the year 191 of an era of Saka (or Parthian ?) institution whose exact epoch is not known.\(^2\) The successor of Zeionises was apparently Kuyula Kara.\(^3\)

(c) **The House of Indravarman**—It consisted of Indravarman, his son Aspavarman, and Aspa's nephew Sasa(s) or Sasa(n). Aspavarman acted as governor of both Azes II and Gondophernes, while Sasa(s) served under Gondophernes and Pakores.

**The Satraps of Mathurā**

The earliest of this line of princes were once believed to be the rulers Hāgāna and Hāgāmasha. They were supposed to be succeeded by Rājuvula, who may have governed Sākala at an earlier stage. According to Allan\(^5\) he established himself in Mathurā late in life. The genealogical table of the house of Rājuvula or Rājula as arranged by Sten Konow\(^6\) is given below in a foot-note.

**Rājuvula** or Rājula is known from inscriptions as well as coins. An inscription in *Brāhmī* characters at

\[\text{Arjī = Pişpaari} \]

\[\frac{\text{Abuhola = Kharaosta Kamuis}}{\text{Khalamaasa}}\]

\[\frac{\text{Hayuara}}{\text{Ayasi Kompia =}}\]

\[\frac{\text{Hana}}{\text{Nada Dika}}\]

\[\text{Sūjasa Nādluda} \]

\[\text{Kalui}\]

---

3. *CHI*, 582n, 583.
4. Indravarman has been identified by some scholars with Irivarman, son of Vijayamitra, who is known from certain coins. Vijayamitra is further regarded as identical with, or a successor of, Vyahakmitra, a feudatory of Men德拉 (Mānander). The importance of these identifications, in determining the chronological relation of the Indo-Greeks and the Sakas, is obvious. (Majumder, *Ep. Ind.* xxiv, 1ff; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, 102 ff; *Ep. Ind.* xxvi. 321 Mookerji, *IC*, XIV, 4, 1918, 205 f.);
5. *CIC.*, *AI*, *CXV*.
6. *Corpus* II. i. 47.
Mora near Mathurā calls him a Mahākṣatrāpa or Great Satrap (viceroy). But the Greek legend on some of his coins describes him as “king of kings, the Saviour” showing that he probably declared his independence.

Rājuvula was apparently succeeded by his son Śudāsa, Sōndāsa or Śodāsa. Inscription B on the Mathurā Lion Capital mentions him as a Kšatravā (Satrap) and as the son of the Mahākṣatravā Rajula (Rājuvula). But later inscriptions at Mathurā written in Brāhma characters call him a Mahākṣatrāpa. One of these inscriptions gives a date for him in the year 72\(^1\) of an unspecified era. It is clear that during his father’s lifetime he was only a Satrap. But on his father’s death some time before the year 72, he became a Great Satrap. Sten Konow adduces grounds for believing that Sōdāsa dated his inscription in the so-called Vikrama era.\(^2\) Consequently the year 72, in his opinion, possibly corresponds to A. D. 15.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar refers the dates of the Northern Satraps (of Taxila and Mathurā) to the Saka era, and places them in the middle of the second century A. D. But Ptolemy, who flourished about that time, places neither Taxila nor Mathurā within Indo-Scythia, i.e., the Saka dominion. This shows that neither Taxila nor Mathurā was a Saka possession in the second century A. D. The principal Indo-Scythian possessions in Ptolemy’s time were Patalene (the Indus Delta), Abiria (the Ābhir country in Western India), and Syrastrene (Kāthiāwāḍ).\(^3\) This is exactly what we find in the Junāgaḍh

The genealogy, as reconstructed by Sten Konow, is not accepted by many scholars. An older view makes Kharasota the son of a daughter of Rājuvula. For Rājuvula’s connection with C. Pañjāb, see Allan, CCAI, 185. Cf. 438 ante.

42 according to Rapson. But 72 is preferred by most scholars.

\(^{1}\) Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, pp. 139-141.
\(^{2}\) Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 354.
inscription of the Saka ruler Rudradāman I, who flourished in the middle of the second century A.D. In Ptolemy's time Taxila was included within the Arsa (Sanskrit Uraśā) territory,¹ and Mathurā belonged to the Kaspeiraioi.² Dr. Majumdar suggests that Ptolemy probably noticed the Saka empire of Maues and his successors (which included Taxila, Mathurā and Ujjayinī) under the name of 'Kaspeiraioi.'³ But we should remember that far from including Taxila, Mathurā and Western India within one empire, Ptolemy sharply distinguishes the land of the Kaspeiraioi from Indo-Scythia which was the real Saka domain in the middle of the second century A.D.⁴ Moreover, the territory of the Kaspeiraioi must have included the region below the sources of the Jhelum Chenab and the Ravi, i.e., Kaśmīra and its neighbourhood;⁵ and there is no evidence that the dynasty of Maues ever ruled in Kaśmīra. It was only under the kings of Kanishka's dynasty that Kaśmīra and Mathurā formed parts of one and the same empire. As suggested by the Abbé Boyer the Kaspeiraioi of Ptolemy evidently referred to the Kushān empire.

We learn from the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscriptions that when Sudasa, i.e. Soḍāsa, was ruling as a mere Kṣatrāpa, Kusuluka Patika was a Mahākṣatrāpa. As Soḍāsa was a Mahākṣatrāpa in the year 72, he must have been a

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 348.
⁵ Land of Kaśyapa? *Rājatarāṅgif*, 1, 27. IA. IV, 227. Stein accepts the identification of the territory of the Kaspeiraioi with Kaśmīr, but rejects Wilson's assumption that Kaśmīr was *derived from Kaśyapa pura* (*JASB.*, 1899, Extra 2, pp. 9-13). The evidence of Ptolemy seems to suggest that the city of Kaspeira stood close to Multan. Alberuni (I. 298) in a later age mentions Kaśyapapura as a name of Multan itself.
Kshatrapa before 72. Consequently Kusuluka Patika must have been reigning as a Mahâkshatrapa contemporary of the Kshatrapa Soâša before the year 72. The Taxila plate of the year 78, however, does not style Patika as a Kshatrapa or Mahâkshatrapa. It calls him Mahâdânâpati (great gift-lord) and gives the satrapal title to his father Liaka.  

Dr. Fleet thinks that we have to do with two different Patikas. Marshall and Sten Konow on the other hand, hold the view that the Mahâdânâpati Patika, who issued the Taxila plate, is identical with the Mahâkshatrapa Kusuluka Patika of the Mathurâ Lion Capital, but the era in which the inscription of Sam 72 is dated, is not the same as in the Taxila plate of Sam 78. In other words while Fleet duplicates kings, Marshall and Sten Konow duplicate eras. It is difficult to come to any final decision from the scanty data at our disposal. Fleet’s theory is not improbable in view of the fact that we have evidence regarding the existence of at least two Liakas. But the duplication of kings is not absolutely necessary as the designation ‘mahâdânâpati’ given to Patika in the Taxila plate does not preclude the possibility of his having been a Mahâkshatrapa as well a few years back. We should remember in this connection that there are instances among the Western Kshatrapas of Chashtana’s line, of Mahâkshatrapas being reduced to a humbler rank while other members of the family held the higher office, and of a Kshatrapa (Jayadâman) being mentioned without the satrapal title. It is, therefore, not altogether improbable that the inscription of Sam 72 and

---

2 JRAS., 1913, 1001 n.
3 Cf. Majumdar, The Date of Kanishka, Ind. Ant., 1917.
4 Rapson, Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, etc., cxxiv f.
5 Andhan Inscriptions.
that of Sam 78 are dated in the same era, and yet the two Patikas are identical.\(^1\) If Sten Konow and Sir John Marshall are right in reading the name of Aja-Aya (Azes) in the Kalawân Copper-plate Inscription of the year 134 and the Taxila Inscription of 136, we have additional instances of a ruler of this age being mentioned without any title indicative of his rank.

**Kharaosta** was, according to S. Konow, the father-in-law, and according to Fleet, a grandson (daughter's son), of Rājuvula and consequently a nephew of Śoḍāsa.\(^2\) The inscriptions A and E on the Mathurā Lion Capital mention him as the Yuvarāya Kharaosta. Sten Konow thinks\(^3\) that he was the inheritor to the position as "king of kings" after Moga. His known coins are of two types, presenting legends in Greek characters on the obverse and in **Kharoshṭhi** on the reverse. The **Kharoshṭhi** legend runs thus: *Kshatrapasa pra Kharaostasa Arütasa putrasa. 'Pra' according to Sten Konow, may be a reflex of Prachakshasa.*\(^4\)

The coins of the family of Rājuvula are imitated from those of the Stratos and also of a line of Hindu princes who ruled at Mathurā. This shows that in the Jumna valley Scythian rule superseded that of both Greek and Hindu princes.

---

\(^1\) The Rājatarangini furnishes an instance of a son being replaced by his father as king (cf. the case of Parthya), and of a king abdicating in favour of his son and again resuming control over the kingdom; cf. the case of Kalasa who continued to be a co-ruler after the resumption of control by his father, and that of Rājā Mānsingh of Jodhpur (1604-48). The cases of Vijayaḍiyā VII (Eastern Chalukya, D. C. Ganguli, p. 104) and of Zāfar Khān of Gujarāt may also be cited in this connection (Camb. Hist. Ind., III, 295).

\(^2\) JRAS, 1913, 919, 1009.

\(^3\) Corpus, 36.

\(^4\) Corpus, xxxv. *prachakshasa* (=epiphanous, "of the gloriously manifest one"), occurs on coins of Strato I and Polyxanos. It is, however, possible that the Sanskrit equivalent of the name of the Satrap is prakara-ojas, "of burning effulgence."

57-1829B
A fragmentary inscription found by Vogel on the site of Gaṇeshā near Mathurā revealed the name of Satrap of the Kshaharātā family called Ghaṭākā.¹

The Nationality of the Northern Satraps.

Cunningham held that the inscription P on the Mathurā Lion Capital—Sarvasa Sakastanasā puyae—gave decisive proof that Rājuvula or Rājula, Śoḍāsā and other connected Satraps were of Śaka nationality. Dr. Thomas shows, however, that the Satraps of Northern India were the representatives of a mixed Parthian and Śaka domination. This is strongly supported a priori by the fact that Patika of Taxila, who bears himself a Persian name, mentions as his overlord the great king Moga whose name is Śaka. The inscriptions on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Persian and Śaka nomenclature.² Attention may, however, be called here to the fact that in the Harivamśa there is a passage³ which characterises the Pahlavas or Parthians as "śmaśrudhārinah" (bearded).⁴ Judged by this test, kings of the family of Rājuvula and Nahapāna, who are not often taken to be Parthians, could not have belonged to that nationality as their portraits found on coins⁵ show no traces of beards and whiskers. They were, therefore, almost certainly Śakas.

¹ JRAS., 1912, p. 121.
³ I. 14, 17.
⁴ The passage is also found in the Vāyu Purāṇa, Ch. 88, 141.
⁵ JRAS., 1913, between pp. 630-631.
SECTION II. THE PAHLAVAS OR PARTHIANS

Already in the time of Eukratides, Mithradates I, King of Parthia (c. 171-138/37 B.C.), had probably conquered portions of the Pañjab or Sind, and in the days of the Saka Emperors of the family of Maues-Moga, princes of mixed Saka-Pahlava origin ruled as Satraps in Northern India. But it is important to note that Isidore of Charax, possibly a younger contemporary of Augustus, who wrote not earlier than 26 B.C. (reign of Phraates IV and the revolt of Tiridates) and is quoted by Pliny, does not include the Kābul Valley, Sind or the Western Pañjab within the empire of the Parthians or Pahlavas. The easternmost provinces of the Parthian empire mentioned by that writer are Herat (Aria), Farah (the country of the Anaouei, a segment of Aria (i.e., the Herat Province), the districts between the Lake Hamun and the Helmund (Drangiana and Sakasthāna), and Kandahār (Arachosia or “White India”). Towards the middle of the first century A.D., however, Saka sovereignty in parts of Gandhāra must have been supplanted by that of the Parthians. In 43-44 A.D., when Apollonios of Tyana is reputed to have visited Taxila, the throne was occupied by Phraotes, evidently a Parthian. He was however independent of Vardanes, the great King of Babylon and Parthia (c. 39-47/48 A.D.), and himself powerful enough to exercise

---

1 The Parthians (Parthava, Pahlava) were an Iranian people established on the borders of the district that is today Mazandarān and Khurāsān. About 249/8 B.C. they revolted against the Seleukids under the command of Arshaka (Arsaces), a leader of Scythia (Pope and Ackerman, A Survey of Persian Art, p. 71).

2 Aprathhata (Gondophernes) according to Herzfeld and Tarn (Greeks, 341).

3 Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, 270.
suzerain power over the "Satrap of the Indus." Christian writers refer to a king of India named Gundaphar or Gūdnaphar and his brother Gad who are said to have been converted by the Apostle St. Thomas and who, therefore, lived in the first century A.D.¹ We have no independent confirmation of the story of the biographer of Apollonios. But the "so-called" Takht-i-Bāhī record of the year 103 (of an unspecified era) shows that there was actually in the Peshāwar district a king named Guduvhara (Gondophernes). The names of Gondophernes and, in the opinion of some scholars, of his brother Gad, are also found on coins.² According to Rapson the two brothers were associated as sub-kings under the suzerainty of Orthagnes (Verethragna). Sten Konow, however, identifies Orthagnes with Guduvhara himself, while Herzfeld suggests that he was the "unnamed son of Vardanes, mentioned by Tacitus, who claimed the throne against Volagases I about A.D. 55."³ Dr. Fleet referred the date of the Takht-i-Bahāʾ (Bāhī) inscription to the Mālava-Vikrama era, and so placed the record in A.D. 47.⁴ He remarked "there should be no hesitation about referring the year 103 to the established Vikrama era of B.C. 58; instead of having recourse, as in other cases too, to some otherwise unknown era beginning at about the same time. This places Gondophernes in A.D. 47 which suits exactly the Christian tradition

¹ The original Syriac text of the legend of St. Thomas belongs probably to the third century A.D. (JRAS., 1913, 634). Cf. Ind. Ant., 3, 309.
² Whitehead, pp. 95, 155. Gondophernes = Vindaphara, "Winner of glory" (Whitehead, p. 146; Rapson and Allan). The king assumed the title of Devavrata. S. Konow, following Fleet, takes the word GuJanā on the coins to refer to the tribe of Gondophernes (Corpus, II. i. xlvi).
³ Corpus, xlvi; The Cambridge Shorter History of India, 70.
⁴ JRAS., 1905, pp. 223-235; 1906, pp. 706-710; 1907, pp. 169-172; 1013-1040; 1913, pp. 900-1003. Cf. the views of Cunningham and Dowson (IA, 4, 307). The discovery of the Khalatæ and the Taxila silver vase inscriptions, however,
which makes him a contemporary of St. Thomas, the Apostle."

The power of Gondophernes did not probably in the beginning extend to the Gandhāra region. His rule seems to have been restricted at first to Southern Afghanistān. He succeeded, however, in annexing the Peshāwar district before the twenty-sixth year of his reign. There is no epigraphic evidence that he conquered Eastern Gandhāra (Taxila) though he certainly wrested some provinces from the Azes family. The story of the supersession of the rule of Azes II by him in one of the Scythian provinces is told by the coins of Aspavarman. The latter at first acknowledged the suzerainty of Azes (II) but later on obeyed Gondophernes as his overlord. Evidence of the ousting of Saka rule by the Parthians in the Lower Indus Valley is furnished by the author of the Periplus in whose time (about 60 to 80 A.D.) Minnagarā, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e., the Saka kingdom in the Lower Indus Valley, was subject to Parthian princes who were constantly driving each other out. If Sten Konow and Sir John Marshall are right in reading the name of Aja-Aya or Azes in the Kalawān Inscription of 134 and the Taxila Inscription of 136, then it is possible that Saka rule survived in a part of Eastern Gandhāra, while Peshāwar and the Lower Indus Valley passed into the hands of the Parthians. But

makes the theory of Fleet less plausible unless we believe in the existence of a plurality of Saka-Pahlavā eras. Dr. Jayaswal was inclined to place Gondophernes in 20 B.C. But this date is too early to suit the Christian tradition.

1 JRAS, 1913, 1003, 1010.

2 For Fleet's interpretation of "Sa 136 ayasa ashaḍasa mārasa, etc.," see JRAS, 1914, 905 ff.; also Calcutta Review, 1922, December, 493-494.

8. Konow thought at one time that ayasa stood for uḍyasa (=the first). He took the word as qualifying ashaḍasa. But he changed his views after the discovery of the Kalawān Inscription of 134. He now thinks that the addition ayasa, ajasa does not characterize the era as instituted by Azes, but simply as 'connected with Parthian rulers' (Ep. Ind., xxi. 255 f.). He refers the dates 134, 136 to the era of 56 B.C.
the absence of an honorific title before the name of Aja-Aya and the fact that in the record of the year 136 we have reference to the establishment of relics of the Buddha in Takshaśila "for the bestowal of health on the Mahārāja Rājātirāja Devaputra Khushana," probably suggest that the years 134 and 136 belong, not to the pravardhamāna-vijayarājya (the increasing and victorious reign) of Azes, but to a period when his reign was a thing of the past (atitarājya), though the reckoning was still associated with his honoured name. The dating in the Jānibighā inscription (Lakšmana-senasy = atitarājye sam 83) possibly furnishes us with a parallel.¹

The Greek principality in the Upper Kābul Valley had apparently ceased to exist when Apollonios travelled in India. We learn from Justin that the Parthians gave the coup de grâce to the rule of the Bactrian Greeks. Marshall says² that the Kābul valley became a bone of contention between the Parthians and the Kushāns. This is quite in accordance with the evidence of Philostratos who refers to the perpetual quarrel of the "barbarians" with the Parthian king of the Indian borderland in 43-44 A.D.

With Gondophernes were associated as subordinate rulers his nephew Abdagases (in S. Afghanistān), his generals Aspavarman and Sasa(s) or Sasā(n), and his governors Sapedana and Satavastra (probably of Taxila).

After the death of the great Parthian monarch his empire split up into smaller principalities. One of these (probably Sīstan) was ruled by Sanabares, another (probably embracing Kandahār and the Western Pañjāb) by Pakores, and others by princes whose coins Marshall recovered for the

¹ Raychandburi, Studies in Indian Antiquities, pp. 165 f.
² ASI, AR, 1929-30, 56 ff.
first time at Taxila. Among them was Sasa(s) or Sasa(n) who acknowledged the nominal sway of Pakores. The internecine strife among these Parthian princelings is probably reflected in the following passage of the Periplus:—

"Before it (Barbaricum) there lies a small island and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Minnagara; it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out."

Epigraphic (and in some cases numismatic) evidence proves that the Pahlava or Parthian rule in Afghanistan, the Panjab and Sind was supplanted by that of the Kushâna, Gushâna, Khushâna or Kushân dynasty. We know that Gondophernes was ruling in Peshâwar in the year 108 (A.D. 47 according to Fleet, somewhat earlier according to others). But we learn from the Panjtar inscription that in the year 122 the sovereignty of the region had passed to a Gushâna or Kushân king. In the year 136 the Kushân suzerainty had extended to Taxila. An inscription of that year mentions the interment of some relics of the Buddha in a chapel at Taxila "for bestowal of perfect health upon the Mahârâja, añjñitirâja devaputra Khushâna." The Sui Vihâr and Mahenjo Daro Kharoshthi Inscriptions prove the Kushân conquest of the Lower Indus Valley. The Chinese writer Pan-ku, who died in A.D. 92, refers to the Yueh-chi occupation of Kao-fou or Kabul. This shows that the race to which the Kushâns belonged took possession of Kabul before A.D. 92. It is, no doubt, asserted by a later writer that Kao-fou is a mistake for Tou-mi. But the mistake

---

1 For a note on the dynastic nomenclature, see R. Schafer, JAOS, 67. 4, p. 296 ff.; cf. AOS, 65: 71 ff.

2 We learn from Philostratos that already in the time of Apollonios (A.D. 43-44) the barbarians (Kushâns?) who lived on the border of the Parthian kingdom of Taxila were perpetually quarrelling with Phraectes and making raids into his territories (The Life of Apollonius, Loeb Classical Library, pp. 183 ff.).
in Kennedy's opinion would not have been possible, had the Yueh-chi not been in possession of Kao-fou in the time of Pan-ku. The important thing to remember is that a Chinese writer of 92 A.D., thought Kao-fou to have been a Yueh-chi possession long before his time. If Sten Konow is to be believed, the Kushāns had established some sort of connection with the Indian borderland as early as the time of Gondopheres. In line 5 of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription Sten Konow reads "erhuna Kapasa puyae," "in honour of prince Kapa," i.e., Kujula Kadphises, the Kushān king, who is said to have succeeded Hermiaios in the Kābul valley. Kujula Kadphises has been identified with the Kuei-shuang (Kushān) prince K'iu-tsu-k'io who took possession of Kao-fou (Kābul), Po-ta and Ki-pin. It appears from numismatic evidence that this Kushān chief was possibly an ally of Hermiaios with whom he appears to have issued joint coins. Kadphises seems also to have been at first on friendly terms with the Parthian rulers of Gandhāra. But the destruction of

1 JRAS, 1912, pp. 675-678. Note also Pan-ku's reference to a man's head on the coins of Ki-pin (JRAS, 1912, p. 685 n.) which possibly suggests an acquaintance with the coinage of Kujula Kaphsa (or Kasa?).

2 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 294; XVIII (1926), p. 289. Corpus, II, i. 62. Some regard this "Kapa" as a phantom. It is interesting to recall in this connection a statement of Philostratos (The life of Apollonius of Tyana, Loeb Classical Library, p. 185) that in A.D. 43-44, the Parthian king of Taxila had enlisted the services of certain "barbarians" to patrol his country so that instead of invading his dominions they themselves kept off the "barbarians" that were on the other side of the frontier and were difficult people to deal with. Prince "Kapa" (if the reading and interpretation be correct) may have been at first one of these friendly barbarian chiefs. His date is indicated by his (?) imitation of a Roman emperor's head of a style not later than about A.D. 60 (JRAS, 1913, 918).


4 Pedigree coins according to Tarn.
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Hermaios' kingdom by the Parthians' probably supplied him with a *casus belli*. He made war on the latter and eventually destroyed their power in the north-west borderland of India.

1 Before the Parthian conquest, Kāpiši apparently had to obey, for a time, the rule of Manes and Spalirises (*CHI*, 590 f.). The Kushāns, the "barbarian" enemies of "Phraotes", may have had a hand in the restoration of Greek rule before its final disappearance in the Kābul valley.

58—1829 B
SECTION III. THE GREAT KUSHĀNS.

We are informed by the Chinese historians that the Kushāns (chiefs of the Kuei-shuang or Kouei-chouang principality) were a section of the Yueh-chi (Yüe-chü) race. The modern Chinese pronunciation of the name according to Kingsmill is said to be Yuē-ti. M. Lévi and other French scholars write Yue-tchi or Yuē-tchi.

We learn from Ssu-ma-ch’ien (the Chinese annalist, who recorded the story of the travels of Chang-k’ien, the famous envoy), that between B.C. 174 and 165 the Yueh-chi were dwelling between the Tsenn-hoang (Tun-huang) country and the K’i-lien mountains, or Tien-chan Range, south and east of Lake Issykul in Chinese Turkestan. At that date the Yueh-chi were defeated and expelled from their country by the Hiung-nū who slew their king and made a drinking vessel out of his skull. The widow of the slain ruler succeeded to her husband’s power. Under her guidance the Yueh-chi in the course of their westward migration attacked the Wu-sun whose king was killed. After this exploit the Yueh-chi attacked the Sakas on the upper Ili and in the plains of the Jaxartes or the Syr Darya and compelled their king or ‘lord’ to seek refuge in Kipin (Kāpiša–Lampāka–Gandhāra).

Meantime the son of the slain Wu-sun king grew up to manhood and, with the assistance of the Hiung-nū drove the

---

1 Smith says (EHI, p. 263) that they occupied land in the Kansuh Province in North-Western China. See also CH1, 565; Halfen, J. Am. Or. Soc. 65, pp. 71 ff. For the Hiung-nū-Hun Problem, cf. Stein, IA, 1905, 73 f., 84.

2 The main section of the Yueh-chi passed on westwards beyond Lake Issykkkül, the rest diverged to the South and settled on the frontier of Tibet. The latter came to be known as the "Little Yueh-chi". Eventually they established their capital at Purushapura in Gandhāra. Smith, EHI, 264; S. Konow, Corpus, II, i, lxxvi.

3 A part of the Saka horde apparently seized Ferghana (Ta Yuan) c. 128 B.C. (Tarn, Greeks, 278 n. 4, 279).
Yueh-chi further west into the Ta-hia territory washed by the Oxus. The Ta-hia, who were devoted to commerce, unskilled in war and wanting in cohesion, were easily reduced to a condition of vassalage by the Yueh-chi who established their capital or royal encampment to the north of the Oxus (Wei), in the territory now belonging to Bukhārā (in ancient Sogdiana). The Yueh-chi capital was still in the same position when visited by Chang-kien in or about B.C. 128-26.¹

The adventures of Chang-k‘ien as related by Ssu-ma-ch‘ien in the Sse-ke or Shi-ki (completed before B.C. 91) were retold in Pan-ku’s Ts‘ien Han-shu or Annals of the First Han Dynasty that dealt with the period B.C. 206—A.D. 9 or 24, and was completed by Pan-ku’s sister after his death in A.D. 92, with three important additions, namely:

1. That the kingdom of the Ta-Yueh-chi had for its capital the town of Kien-chi (Kien-she), to the north of the Oxus,² and Kipin lay on its southern frontier.

2. That the Yueh-chi were no longer nomads.

3. That the Yueh-chi kingdom had become divided into five principalities, viz., Hi (co)u-mi (possibly Wakhān³ between the Pamirs and the Hindukush), Chouangmi or Shuang-mi (Chitral, south of Wakhān and the Hindukush) Konei-chouang or Kuei-shuang, the Kushān principality, probably situated between Chitral and the Panjshir.

² Cf. Corpus, II, i, liv.
³ A Bakarapati, apparently lord of Wakhān, figures in the inscription of Mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Kushanaputra Shāhi Yamataksha(ma?) whose identity is uncertain. The title devaputra connects him with the Kanishka Group of Kushān kings, and not the Kadphises Group. ASI, 1911-12, Pt. I, 15; 1930-34, Pt. 2, 266.
country, Hit(h)um (Parwān on the Panjshir) and Kao-fou (Kābul). 1

We next obtain a glimpse of the Yueh-chi in Fan-Ye’s Hou Han-shu or Annals of the Later Han Dynasty which cover the period between A.D. 25 and 220. Fan-Ye based his account on the report of Pan-young (cir. A.D. 125) and others. 2 He himself died in 445 A.D. The capital of the Yueh-chi was then probably the old Ta-hia (Bactrian) city of Lan-shi, variant Ch’in-shi, to the north of the Oxus. Fan-Ye gives the following account of the Yueh-chi conquest:

“In old days the Yueh-chi were vanquished by the Huung-nū. They then went to Ta-hia and divided the kingdom among five Hsi-h(e)ou or Yabgous, 3 viz., those of Hsiiumi, Shuang-mi, Kuei-shuang, Hsitun and Tumi. More than hundred years after that, the hsi-hou or Yabgou (Yavuga) of Kuei-shuang (Kushān) named K‘iu-tsiu-k‘io attacked and annihilated the four other hsi-hou and made himself king or lord (Wang); he invaded Ngan-si (the Arsakid territory, i.e., Parthia) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fou (Kābul), overcame Po-ta 5 and Ki-pin and became complete

1 A later historian regards Kao-fou as a mistake for Tou-mi which, however, was probably not far from Kābul, JRAS, 1912, 669. For the proposed identifications see Corpus, III. i. lvi. Cf. JRAS, 1903, 21; 1912, 669. In Ep. Ind., XXI, 288, S. Konow suggests the identification of Kuei-shuang with Gandhāra or the country immediately to its north.

2 Cf. S. Konow, Corpus, liv: “It is accordingly the events of the period A.D. 25-125 which are narrated by Fan-Ye, though there are some additions referring to a somewhat later time in the case of countries which were near enough to remain in contact with China after the reign of emperor Ngan” (107-25). See also Ep. Ind., XXI, 258.

3 Alexandria = Zariaspa or Bactria (Tarn, Greeks, 115, 298). JAOS, 61 (1941), 242 n.

4 According to one view the five hsi-hou existed already in Ta-hia when the Yueh-chi invaded Bactria (JAOS, 65, 72 f.).

5 Perhaps identical with the country of Po-tai which, in the time of Sung-yun, sent two young lions to the King of Gandhāra as present (Real, Records of the Western World, Vol. I, ci). S. Konow (Ep. Ind., XVIII) identified P‘u-ta with Ghazni, but later on (Ep. Ind., XXI, 258) suggested its identification with Butkhak, ten miles east of Kābul.
master of these kingdoms. K‘iu-tsiu-k‘io died at the age of more than eighty. His son Yen-kao-tchen succeeded him as king. In his turn he conquered T‘ien-tchou (lit. ‘India,’ on the banks of a great river, apparently the kingdom of Taxila referred to by Philostratos), and established there a chief for governing it. From this time the Yue-chi became extremely powerful. All the other countries designated them Kushān after their king, but the Han retained the old name, and called them Ta-Yue-chi.”

“K‘iu-tsiu-k‘io” has been identified with Kujula, Kadphises (I), or Kozola Kadaphes, the first Kushān king who struck coins to the south of the Hindukush. Numismatic evidence suggests that he was the colleague or ally, and afterwards the successor, of Hermaios, the last Greek prince of the Kābul valley. The former view that Kadphises conquered Hermaios is, in the opinion of Marshall, wrong. Sten Konow finds his name mentioned in the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription of the year 103 belonging to the reign of Gondophernes. The inscription probably belongs to a period when the Kushān and Parthian rulers were on friendly terms. But the Parthian attack on the kingdom of Hermaios apparently led to a rupture which ended in war. The result was that the Parthians were ousted by Kadphises I.

1 Cf. Kusulūka. The expression probably means ‘strong’ or beautiful (S. Konow, Corpus, 1). According to Burrow (The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents, 82, 87) Kujula = Gushara = Vazir. Dr. Thomas (possibly) thinks that the word Kujula has the sense of ‘Saviour’.

2 Pahlavi Kad = chief + pises or pes = form, shape, JRAS, 1913, 632 n.

3 Fleet and Thomas, JRAS, 1913, 967, 1054; in the opinion of some scholars Hermaios was dead at the time of the Kushān conquest. Coins bearing his name continued, according to this view, to be struck long after he had passed away. Tarn regards the Hermaios-Kadphises coins as “pedigree coins”. His view is not accepted by Bachhofer (JAOS, 61, 240 n). Supporters of the ‘alliance’ theory may point to the gold dollars circulating in Chungking engraved with relief portraits of Marshal Chiang Kai-shek and President Roosevelt of the United States (A. B. Patrika, 29-3-1949).

4 The interpretation of S. Konow is not accepted by Professor Rapson, JRAS, 1930, p. 189.
Marshall identifies Kadphises I with the Kushān king of the Panjtar record (of the year 122) and the Taxila scroll of the year 136. ¹ We should, however, remember that in the Taxila inscription of 136 the Kushān king is called Devaputra, a title which was characteristic of the Kanishka group and not of Kadphises I or II unless we identify Kadphises I with Kuyula Kara Kaphsa. ² The monogram on the scroll is by no means characteristic only of coins of the Kadphises group, but it is also found, in Marshall’s and S. Konow’s opinion, on the coins of Zeionises and Kuyula Kara Kaphsa. If, however, S. Konow and Marshall are right in reading the name of Uvima Kavthisa in the Khalatse inscription of the year 184 or 187, and in identifying him with Vima Kadphises, the king of the Panjtar and Taxila records of 122 and 136 may have been a predecessor of Wema (Vima), and should preferably be identified with Kadphises I. But the reading ‘Uvima Kavthisa’ and his identification with Kadphises II are by no means certain.

Kadphises I probably coined no gold but only copper. His coinage shows unmistakable influence of Rome. ³ He

¹ JRAS, 1914, pp. 977-78; Rassam, CHI, 582, identifies the Kushān king of 136 with Vima (i.e., Kadphises II).
² Mentioned by R. D. Banerji, Prāchīna Mudrā, p. 85. I cannot vouch for the correctness of the reading.
³ In one class of his copper coins appears a Roman head which was palpably imitated from that of Augustus (B.C. 27-A.D. 14), Tiberius (A.D. 14-37), or Claudius (A.D. 41-54). JRAS, 1912, 679; 1913, 912; Smith, Catalogue, 66: Camb. Short Hist. 74. Rome and its people, Romakas, first appear in the Mahābhārata (II, 51, 17) and occur not unfrequently in later literature. Diplomatic relations between Rome and India were established as early as the time of Augustus who received an embassy from king Pandion (JRAS, 1860, 309 ff.). Camb. Hist. Ind. 1, 597.) about B.C. 27-20. An Indian embassy was also received by Trajan (A.D. 98-117) shortly after A.D. 99. Strabo, Pliny and the Periplus refer to a brisk trade between India and the Roman Empire in the first century A.D. See JRAS, 1904, 591; IA, 5, 281; 1923, 50. Pliny deprecates the drain of specie (JRAS, 1912, 956; 1913, 644-1031).
copied the issues of Augustus or those of his immediate successors preferably Claudius (A. D. 41-54), and used the titles Yavuga (chief), Mahārāja, Rājātirāja (the great king, the king of kings) and "Sachakrama thita", "Steadfast in the True Faith" (of the Buddha?).

"K'iu-tsiiu-k'io," or Kadphises I, was succeeded by his son Yen-kao-tchen, the Vima, Wima or Wema Kadphises of the coins, who is usually designated as Kadphises II. We have already seen that he conquered Tien-tchou or the Indian interior, probably Taxila, and set up a chief who governed in the name of the Yueh-Chi. According to Sten Konow and Smith it was Kadphises II who established the Saka Era of A.D. 78. If this view be accepted then he was possibly the overlord of Nahapāna, and was the Kushan monarch who was defeated by the Chinese between A.D. 73 and 102 and compelled to pay tribute to the emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). But there is no direct evidence that Kadphises II established any era. No inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an era of his institution. On the contrary we have evidence that Kanishka did establish an era, that is to say, his method of dating was continued by his successors, and we have dates ranging probably from the year 1 to 99.

The conquests of the Kadphises kings opened up the path of commerce between China and the Roman Empire and India. Roman gold began to pour into this country in payment for silk, spice and gems. Kadphises II began to issue gold coins. He had a bilingual gold and copper

1 The Cambridge Shorter History, 74, 75.
2 Smith, Catalogue, 67 n.; S. Konow, Corpus, II. i. lxiv f.; Whitehead, 181.
3 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141. 4 The Oxford History of India, p. 128.
5 For criticism of the "Omitted hundreds theory," see JRAS, 1913, 960 f.
6 A gold coin of Wima or Vima (NC, 1934, 293), gives him the title Basileus Basilewun Soter Megas (Tarn, Greeks, 354 n 5). This throws welcome light on the problem of the identification of the nameless king Soter Megas.
coinage. The obverse design gives us a new lifelike representation of the monarch. The reverse is confined to the worship of Śiva, which was gaining ground since the days of the Śiva-Bhāgacetas mentioned by Patañjali. In the Kharoshthi inscription Kadphises II is called "the great king, the king of kings, lord of the whole world, the Mahiśvara, the defender."

We learn from Yu-Houan, the author of the Wei-liao which was composed between A.D. 239-265 and covers the period of the Wei down to the reign of the emperor Ming (227-239), that the Yueh-chi power was flourishing in Kipin (Kāpisa-Gandhāra), Ta-hia (Oxus valley), Kao-fou (Kābul) and Tien-tchou (India) as late as the second quarter of the third century A.D. But the early Chinese annalists are silent about the names of the successors of Yen-kao-tchen (Kadphises II). Chinese sources, however, refer to a king of the Ta-Yueh-chi named Po-tiao or Puā-d’ieu (possibly Vāsudeva) who sent an embassy to the Chinese emperor in the year 230. Inscriptions discovered in India have preserved the names with dates of the following great Kushān sovereigns besides the Kadphises group, viz., Kanishka I(1-23), Vāsishka (24-28), Huvishka

---

1 A silver piece resembling the ordinary small copper type of Vima Kadphises is also known (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 174). Other silver coins of the monarch are apparently referred to by Marshall (Guide to Taxila, 1918, 81). A silver coin of Kanishka is also known (ASI, AR, 1925-26, pl. lx). Smith (EH)4, p. 270) and others make mention of silver coins of Huvishka.

2 V. 2. 76; cf. Saiva, Pāṇini, IV. 1. 112.

3 As already stated Sten Konow finds the name of Vima (Uvima) Kavhtisa (Kadphises?) in the Khalatse (Ladakh) inscription of the year 187(7). Corpus, II, i. 81. The identity of the King in question is, however, uncertain.


5 Corpus, II, i. lv.


7 If Vāsishka be identical with Vas Kushāga of a Sāñchi epigraph, his reign
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(28-60), Kanishka II, son of Vā-jheshka (41), and Vasudeva (67-98). Huvishka, Vā-jheshka and Kanishka II are probably referred to by Kalhaṇa as Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka who apparently ruled conjointly. It will be seen that Kanishka II ruled in the year 41, a date which falls within the reign of Huvishka (28-60). Thus the account of Kalhaṇa is confirmed by epigraphic evidence.

In the chronological order generally accepted by numismatists, the Kanishka group succeeded the Kadphises group. But this view is not accepted by many scholars. Moreover, there is little agreement even among scholars who place the Kanishka group after the Kadphises kings. The more important theories of Kanishka's date are given below:

1. According to Dr. Fleet, Kanishka reigned before the Kadphises group, and was the founder of that reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, which afterwards came to be known as the Vikrama Samvat. This view (held at one time by Cunningham and Dowson, and maintained by (as sub-king)) commenced not later than the year 22 as we learn from an inscription of that year on the pedestal of an image of the Buddha (Pro. of the Seventh Session of the I. H. Congress, Madras, p. 135).


For discussions about the origin of the so-called Vikrama era see JRAS, 1913, pp. 637, 694 ff.; Kielhorn in Ind. Ant., xx. (1891), 124 ff.; 397 ff.; Bhand. Com. Vol., pp. 187 ff.; CHI, pp. 168, 583, 671; ZDMO, 1929, pp. 250 ff. Ep. Ind. xxiii. 48 ff.; xxvi. 119 ff.; Kielhorn (and now Altekar) adduce evidence which seems to show that the early use of the era, as may be inferred from records with dates that may be recognized to refer to this reckoning, was mainly confined to Southern and Eastern Rājputāna, Central India and the Upper Ganges Valley. The name of the era found in the earliest inscriptions recalls designations like that of king KRTA o' Penzer, The Ocean of Story, III. 19. Kritya rulers are mentioned by Fleet, JRAS, 1913, 966n. Krita may also have reference to the inauguration of a Golden Age after a period of toil and moil. From the fifth to the ninth century the reckoning was believed to be used
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Franke) was accepted by Kennedy, but was ably controverted by Dr. Thomas, and can no longer be upheld after the discoveries of Marshall.\footnote{Thomas, \textit{JRAS}, 1913; Marshall, \textit{JRAS}, 1914.} Inscriptions, coins as well as the testimony of Hiuen Tsang clearly prove that Kanishka's dominions included Gandhāra, but we have already seen that according to Chinese evidence Yin-mofu, and not the Kushāns, ruled Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) in the second half of the first century B.C. Allan thinks that "the gold coinage of Kanishka was suggested by the especially by the princes and people of Mālava. The connection of the name Vikrama with the era grew up gradually and was far from being generally adopted even in the ninth century A.D. The phraseology employed in the poems and inscriptions of the next centuries shows a gradual advance from the simple Samvat to Vikrama Samvat, Śrīrīpa Vikrama Samvat and so on. The change in nomenclature was probably brought about by the princes and people of tujāraś whose hostility to the Mālavas is well known. The Sātavāhanas could not have founded this or any other era because they always used regnal years, and Indian literature distinguishes between Vikrama and Śātirāhana. As to the claims of Azes, see \textit{Calcutta Review}, 1922, December, pp. 493-494. Fleet points out (\textit{JRAS}, 1914, 995 ff.) that even when the name of a real king stands before the statement of the years, so that the translation would be "in the year of such a king" he is not necessarily to be regarded as the actual founder of that particular reckoning. The nomenclature of an era, current in a comparatively late period, more than a century after its commencement, is no proof of origins. Therefore, the use of the terms Āyasa or Ājasa in connection with the dates 134 and 186 of the Kalawan and Taxila inscriptions, does not prove that Azes was the founder of the particular reckoning used. His name may have been connected with the reckoning by later generations in the same way as the name of the Valahhi family came to be associated with the Gupta era, that of Sātavāhana with the Śaka era, and that of Vikrama with the "Kṛita"-Mālava reckoning itself which commenced in 58 B.C. Regarding the claims of Vikrama see \textit{Bhand, Com. Vol.} and \textit{Ind. Ant.}, cited above. The Purāṇas while mentioning Gadrabhūla are silent about Vikramādiśya. Jain tradition places Vikramādiśya after "Nahavāhana, or Nahapāna. Regarding the contention of Fleet that the Vikrama era is a northern reckoning attention may be invited to the observations of Kielhorn and to a note on \textit{Chola-Pandya Institutions} contributed by Professor C. S. Srinivasachar to \textit{The Young Men of India}, July, 1936. The Professor points out that the era was used in Madura in the 5th century A.D. Kielhorn proves conclusively that the area where the era of 58 B.C. was used in the earliest times did not include the extreme north-west of India.
Roman solidus” and that the Kushān monarch can hardly be placed before Titus (79-81 A.D.) and Trajan (98-117 A.D.).

2. According to Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and several other scholars Kanishka’s rule began about 125 or 144 A.D., and ended in the second half of the second century A.D. Now, we learn from the Sui Vihār inscription that Kanishka’s dominions included a portion at least of the Lower Indus Valley. Again we learn from the Junāgadh inscription of Rudradāman that the Mahākshatrapa’s conquests extended to Sindhu and Sauvira (which included Multān according to the Purānas and Alberuni) and even to the land of the Yaudheyas in the direction of the Sutlej. Rudradāman certainly flourished from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. He did not owe his position as Mahākshatrapa to anybody else (svayam adhiqata Mahākshatrapa nāma). If Kanishka reigned in the middle of the second century A.D., how are we to reconcile his mastery over the Sui Vihār region in the Lower Indus Valley with the

1 Comb. Short History, p. 77.
2 Recently Ghirshman suggested the period A.D. 144-72 for Kanishka (Begram, Recherches Archaeologique et Historiques sur les Kouchans). The argument that India was still in A.D. 125 governed by a Viceroy (and therefore, not by Kanishka or Huvishka) is effectively disposed of by Thomas in JRAS, 1913, 1024. He points out that the historian of the Later Han is obviously referring to the conditions at the time of the invasion of Wima Kadphises, and not to the state of things in A.D. 125.
3 Dr. Sten Konow’s views are difficult to ascertain. In the Indian Studies in honour of C. R. Lanman (Harvard University Press), p. 65, he mentions A.D. 134 as the initial point of the Kanishka reckoning which he and Dr. Van Wijk “have tried to establish” (cf. Acta Orientalia, III, 54 ff.). But in IHQ, III (1927), p. 851, he, along with Dr. Van Wijk, shows a predilection for A.D. 128-29 (cf. Corpus, lxxvii; Acta Orientalia, V, 168 ff.). Professor Rayson (in JRAS, 1930, 186 ff.) points out the conjectural and inconclusive character of the two Doctors’ calculations. “The year 79,” says he, “seems to be out of the running and a dark horse, the year 128-9, is the favourite.”
4 Ep. Ind., VIII. 44.
contemporary sovereignty of Rudradāman?" Again Kanishka's dates 1-23, Vāsishka's dates 24-28, Huviska's dates 28-60, and Vāsudeva's dates 67-98, suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era ever current in, or known to, North-West India, which commenced in the second century A.D.

3. Dr. R. C. Majumdar thought that the era founded by Kanishka was the Traikutaka-Kalachuri-Chedi era of 248 A.D. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil points out that this is not possible. In fact, the reign of Vāsudeva, the last of the Kushāņs, came to an end 100 years after the beginning of the reign of Kanishka. Numerous inscriptions prove that Vāsudeva reigned at Mathurā. It is certain that this country, over which extended the empire of Vāsudeva, was occupied about 350 A.D. by the Yaudheyas and the Nāgas and it is probable that they reigned in this place nearly one century before they were subjugated by Samudragupta. The capitals of the Nāgas were Mathurā, Kāntipura and Padmāvatī. The Kushāņ (?) realm in the Indian borderland was, in A.D. 360, ruled by Grumbates. The theory of Dr. Majumdar cannot, moreover, be reconciled with the Tibetan tradition which makes Kanishka a contemporary of king Vijaya-kīrti of Khotan, and the Indian tradition which makes Huviska a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, and hence of a king of the Imperial Sātavāhana line, who can hardly be placed later than the second century A.D., as he is described as 'lord of the three seas' and sovereign of

1 See IHQ, March, 1930, 149.
2 For this era see JRAS, 1905, pp. 566-68.
3 Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31.
4 EHI, p. 290. The Chionitaic identified by Cunningham with Kushāņs.
5 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 142.
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(South) Kośala (in the Upper Deccan). Lastly, the catalogues of the Chinese Tripitaka state that An-Shih-Kão (148-170 A.D.) translated the Mārgabhiśmi Sūtra of Saṅgharakṣha who was the chaplain of Kanishka. This shows conclusively that Kanishka flourished before 170 A.D. The arguments against the theory of Dr. Majumdar are equally applicable to the surmise of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who placed Kanishka’s accession in A.D. 278.

4. According to Fergusson, Oldenberg, Thomas, Banerji, Rapson, J. E. Van Lohuizen-De Leeuw, Bachhofer and many other scholars Kanishka was the founder of that reckoning commencing A.D. 78, which came to be known as the Saka era. This view is not accepted by Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil on the following grounds:

---

1 Rājatarāṅgini, I. 173; Harsha-charita (Cowell), p. 252; Watters, Yuan-Chwang, II, p. 200. The epithet trisamudrādhīpati which the Harsha-charita (Book VIII) applies to the Sātavāhana friend of Nāgārjuna cannot fail to remind one of Gautamiputra Satakarni ‘whose chargers drank the water of the three oceans’ (trisamudrādhīpatavahana), or one of his immediate successors.


3 According to the theory of Dr. Majumdar, Vāsudeva I ruled from (249+74) 323 to (249+96) 347 A.D. But Chinese evidence places a Po-t’iao (Vāsudeva?) in 230 A.D. The Khilāsa Ins. also presents difficulties.

4 For the origin of the Saka era see Fleet, CII, preface 56; JRAS, 1913, pp. 635, 650, 987 ff.; Dubreuil, AHD, 26; Rapson Andhra Coins, p. cv; S. Konow, Corpus, II. i. xvi f. Nahapāna, who was not even a Mahākhaṭrāpa in the years 42-45, and who never became a paramount sovereign, could not possibly have been the founder of the era. The theory which represents Nahapāna as the founder of the era used in his inscriptions (dated 42-46) is also contradicted by a Jaina tradition (relied on by Sten Konow, Corpus, II. i. xxxviii) which assigns to him (Nahavāhana) a period of only 40 years. Chashṭana has no better claims and the evidence of the Periplus shows that he could not have ruled at Ujjain in 78 A.D. As to the theory that Kadphises II founded the reckoning in question, it may be pointed out that no inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an era of his institution. The only Scythian king who did establish an era in the sense that he used a regnal reckoning that was continued by his successors, is Kanishka. And the only reckoning that is attributed by Indian writers, since the days of the early Chalukyas, to a Scythian king is the Saka era of 78 A.D.

(contd.)
(a) If we admit that Kujula-Kadphises and Heraclios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kanishka founded the Saka era in 78 A.D. we have scarcely 28 years for the duration of the end of the reign of Kadphises I and the whole of the reign of Kadphises II.

(But the date, A.D. 50, for Kadphises I is uncertain. Even if we accept it as correct, the period of 28 years is not too short in view of the fact that Kadphises II succeeded an octogenerian. When Kadphises I died "at the age of more than eighty" his son must have been an old man. It is, therefore, improbable that "his reign was protracted.")

(b) Marshall, says Prof. G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, has discovered at Taxila in the Chir Stūpa a document dated 136 which, in the Vikrama era, corresponds to 79 A.D., and the king mentioned therein is probably Kadphises I, but certainly not Kanishka.

(Now, the epithet Devaputra applied to the Kushan king of the Taxila scroll of 136, is characteristic of the Kanishka group, and not of the Kadphises kings.) So

Regarding the objection that the Saka era was foreign to the north it may be pointed out that the era of 58 B.C., was equally foreign to the extreme north-west of India. The assertion that the Saka era was never used in the north-west simply begs the question. It assumes what it has got to prove, viz., that the reckoning used by the house of Kanishka does not refer to the Saka era. The very name Saka points to its foreign, and possibly north-western, origin, as the imperial Sakas resided in that region, and it is only the viceroys who dwelt in Malwa Kāthiāwār and the Deccan. On the analogy of every famous Indian regnal reckoning it may be confidently asserted that the Saka era, too, originated with a sovereign and not with a mere viceroy.

I am glad to note that a somewhat similar suggestion is now made by Dr. Thomas in Dr. B. C. Law Volume, II, 312. It is, however, by no means clear why it is said that the possibility of the identification of Devaputra with Kanishka "has been ignored". The Kadphises kings meant here are Kujula (Kadphises I), and Vima (Wema) and not Kuyula Kara Kaphsa whose identification with Kadphises I is a mere surmise. Kara or Kalā probably means a Mahārājasputra, a prince (Burrow, The Language of the Kharoshthi Documents, 52). Even if Kuyula Kara be identical with Kujula (cf. Corpus, II, i, lxv) and the Kushan king of the Taxila inscription of 186, it may be pointed out that it is by no means certain that the date 136 refers to the Vikrama era.
the discovery need not shake the conviction of those that attribute to Kanishka the era of 78 A.D. The omission of the personal name of the Kushān monarch does not necessarily imply that the first Kushān is meant. In several inscriptions of the time of Kumāra Gupta and Budha Gupta, the king is referred to simply as Gupta nṛipa.)

(c) Professor Dubreuil says: "Sten Konow has shown that the Tibetan and Chinese documents tend to prove that Kanishka reigned in the second century." (This Kanishka may have been Kanishka of the Ārā Inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date in the second century A.D. Po-t'iao of Sten Konow, the king of the Yueh-chi who sent an ambassador to China in A.D. 230, may have been one of the successors of Vāsudeva I. "Coins bearing the name of Vāsudeva continued to be struck long after he had passed away."  

(d) Sten Konow has also shown that the inscriptions of the Kanishka era and those of the Śaka era are not dated in the same fashion. (But the same scholar also shows that all the inscriptions of the Kanishka era are also not dated in the same fashion. In the Kharoshṭhī inscriptions, Kanishka and his successors recorded the dates in the same way as their Śaka-Pahlava predecessors, giving the name of the month and the day within the month. On the other hand, in their Brāhma records Kanishka and his successors usually adopted the Ancient

---

3 Ibid, pp. 272-78, Corpus, ii, I. lxxvii.
Indian way of dating. Are we to conclude from this that the Kharos̱thi dates of Kanishka’s inscriptions are not to be referred to the same era to which the dates of the Brāhmi records are to be ascribed? -If Kanishka adopted two different ways of dating, we fail to understand why he could not have adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in Western India. Sten Konow himself points out that in the Śaka dates we have the name of the month as in the Kharos̱thi records with addition of the Paksha. "The Śaka era which (the Western Kṣatrapas) used was a direct imitation of the reckoning used by their cousins in the north-west, the additional mentioning of the ‘papsha’ being perhaps a concession to the custom in the part of the country where they ruled." It is not improbable that just as Kanishka in the borderland used the old Śaka-Pahlava method, and in Hindustān Proper used the ancient Indian way of dating prevalent there, so in Western India his officer added the ‘papsha’ to suit the custom in that part of the country.)

---

1 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141. For an exception see ibid., XXI. 60.

2 As to the statement of Fleet endorsed by S. Konow. Corpus, lxxxvii, that the use of the Śaka era was foreign to Northern India attention may be invited to Kielhorn’s List of Ins. of Northern India, Nos. 351, 352, 362, 364-365, 368, 370, etc. So far as North-West India is concerned there is as little positive proof of the early use of the Vikrama era as of the era of 78 A.D. The paucity of early records dated in the Śaka era in the valley of the Upper Ganges and its tributaries is possibly due to the fact that the era of 58 B.C. already held the field. Later eras of undoubtedly northern origin, like those of the Guptas and Harsha, have practically been forgotten, but the era of 58 B.C. is still in use in Southern India the case is different. The use of regnal years in the records of the Mauryas (many of which are located in the south) and those of the Sātavāhanas, Chetas, and other early dynasties, proves beyond doubt that there was no early reckoning in use that could compete with the new era that was introduced by the Śaka satraps. The story of the foundation of the Chālukya Vikrama era suggests that the Śaka reckoning was at times deliberately sought to be discontinued because of its foreign association. This might have happened in the north as well as in the south.
EMPIRE OF KANISHKA I

According to Sten Konow Kanishka came from Khotan and belonged to the Little Yüeh-chi. The theory presents many difficulties. It is certain that his successors in 230 were still known as the Ta (Great?) Yüeh-chi. The family name according to Kumāralāta's Kalpanāmanḍitikā was Kiu-sha.

Kanishka completed the Kushān conquest of Upper India and ruled over a wide realm which extended from Kāpiśa, Gandhāra and Kaśmīra to Benares. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Śāketa) and Paṭāliputra in Eastern India are preserved by Tibetan and Chinese writers. Epigraphic records give us contemporary notices of him, with dates, not only from Peshāwar and possibly from Zeda (near Und) in the Yuzufzai country, but also from Mānikiāla near Rāwalpindi, from Sui Vihār about 16 miles south-west of Bahāwalpur (north of Sind), from Mathurā and Śrāvastī, and from Sārnāth near Benares. His coins are found in considerable quantities as far eastwards as Ghāzipur and Gorakhpur. The eastern portion of his empire was apparently governed by the Mahā-Kshatrapa Kharapallāna and the Kshatrapa Vanashpara. In the northern portion we find the general Lala and the Satraps Vespasi and Liaka. He fixed his own residence at Peshāwar (Purusha-

1 Corpus, II, i, Ixxvi; cf. lxi; JRAS, 1903, 334.
2 Ibid, p. lxxvii.
3 Cf. Kusa of Kanika lekha and Kuśadvipa of the Purāṇas. See now Shafer, Linguistics in History, JAOS, 67, No. 4, pp. 296 ff.
4 Cf. The story of the Chinese hostage mentioned by H. Tsang.
5 Ep. Ind., xiv, p. 142; Ind. Ant., 1903, p. 382; Corpus, II, i, pp. lxxii and lxxv. The reference may be to Kanishka II.
6 In recent years Mr. K. G. Goswami has drawn attention to a Brāhmi Inscription of Kanishka, dated in the year 2 (?), which he found in the Municipal Museum at Allahabad (Calcutta Review, July, 1934, p. 83).
7 A gold coin from Mahāsthāna (Bogra) represents the standing bearded figure of Kanishka—possibly an imitation of the coinage of the great Kushān king.
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pura) and possibly established Kanishkapura in Kaśmīra. It is, however, more probable that Kanishkapura was established by his namesake of the Ārā inscription. After making himself master of the south (i.e., India) Kanishka turned to the west and defeated the king of the Parthians. In his old age he led an army against the north and died in an attempt to cross the Tsung-ling mountains (Ṭāghdumbāsh Pāmīr) between the Pāmīr Plateau and Khotan. The Northern expedition is apparently referred to by Huien-Tsang who speaks of his rule in the territory to the east of the Tsung-ling mountains, and of a Chinese Prince detained as a hostage at his court.

It is not improbable that Kanishka was the Kushān king repulsed by general Pan-ch'ao during the reign of the Emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). It has no doubt been argued that Kanishka "must have been a monarch of some celebrity and if the Chinese had come into victorious contact with him, their historians would have mentioned it." But if we identify Pan-ch'ao's Kushān contemporary with Kadphises II, the silence of the Chinese becomes still more mysterious and inexplicable because he was certainly well-known to the annalists. On the other hand, Kanishka was not known to them and the non-mention of his name, if he were Pan-ch'ao's contemporary, cannot be more surprising than that of his predecessor, Wema. In favour of Kanishka's identity with Pan-ch'ao's antagonist we may urge that Kanishka is known to have come into conflict with the Chinese, but the same cannot be said with regard to Wema, the events of whose reign, as recorded by Chinese annalists, do not

1 Cunningham (AGI², 114) located it near Śrīnagar. Stein and Smith identify it with Kanispor, "situated between the Vitāstā river and the high road leading from Varāhamūla to Śrīnagar" (EHI⁴, p. 275).
2 Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 382.
include a first class war with China. The legend of Kanishka’s death published by S. Lévi contains a significant passage which runs thus:—“I have subjugated three regions; all men have taken refuge with me, the region of the north alone has not come in to make its submission.” Have we not here a covert allusion to his failure in the encounter with his mighty northern neighbour?

Kanishka’s fame rests not so much on his conquests, as on his patronage of the religion of Sákyamuni. Numismatic evidence and the testimony of the Pesháwar Casket inscriptions show that he actually became a convert to Buddhism possibly at the commencement of his reign, if not earlier. He showed his zeal for his faith by building the celebrated relic tower and Saṅghārāma at Purushapura or Pesháwar which excited the wonder of Chinese and Muslim travellers. He convoked the last great Buddhist council which was held in Kaśmira or Jālandhar. But though a Buddhist, the Kushān monarch continued to honour the Greek, Sumerian, Elamite, Mithraic, Zoroastrian and Hindu gods worshipped in the various provinces of his far-flung empire. The court of Kanishka was adorned by Pārśva, Vasumitra,

1 EHI, p. 285; JRAS, 1912, 674.
2 The fame of the Kanishka Mahāvihāra remained undiminished till the days of the Pāla Kings of Bengal as is apparent from the Ghoshāvān Inscription of the time of Devapāla. Kanishka’s Chaitya is referred to by Alberuni.
3 One account possibly mentions Gandhāra as the place where the Assembly met. The earliest authorities seem to locate it in Kashmir. Kundalovana vihāra appears to be the name of the monastery where the theologians assembled probably under the presidency of Vasumitra. The chief business of the Synod seems to be the collection of canonical texts, and the preparation of commentaries on them (Smith, EHI, pp. 283 ff.; Law, Buddhistic Studies, 71).
4 See JRAS, 1912, pp. 1003, 1004. The Elamite (Sumerian? Hastings, 5, 827) goddess Nana possibly gave her name to the famous Nāṇaka coins (cf. Bhand., Carm. Lec., 1921, p. 161). For the influence of the Mithra (Mihr, Mihira, Miros) cult on Kushān India, see Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vaishnivism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems, p. 154. According to Professor Rapson
Aśvaghosha, Charaka, Nāgārjuna, Śaṅgharaksana, Māthara, Agesilaos the Greek and other worthies who played a leading part in the religious, literary, scientific, philosophical and artistic activities of the reign. Excavations at Māt near Mathurā have disclosed a life-size statue of the great king.

After Kanishka came Vāsishka, Huvishka and Kanishka of the Āra inscription. We have got inscriptions of Vāsishka dated 24 and 28 which possibly prove his control over Mathurā and Eastern Mālwa. He may have been identical with Vājheshka, the father of Kanishka of the Āra inscription, and Jushka of the Rājataraṇgini, the founder of the town of Jushkapur, modern Zukur to the north of Srinagar.

Huvishka’s dates range from 28 to 60. A Mathurā Inscription represents him as the grandson of a king who has the appellation “Sacha dhramathita,” i.e., steadfast or abiding in the true Law, which occurs on the coins of Kuyula Kaphsa. Kalhaṇa’s narrative leaves the impression that Huvishka ruled simultaneously with

(Andhra Coins, xii) the diversity of coin-types does not show religious eclecticism, but reflects the different forms of religion which prevailed in the various districts of the vast empire of the Great Kushāns. Cf., Asācari and Bednur types of coins of the time of Iltutmish and of Hyder Ali.

1 For the legend about Kanishka and Aśvaghosha see a recent article by H. W. Bailey (JRAS, 1942, pt. I)—trans. with notes of a fragment of a Khotan Ms. The king’s name is spelt Cadgra (Chandra) Kanishka.

2 It is possible that Nāgārjuna was a contemporary, not of Kanishka I, but of Kanishka II and Huvishka.


4 As the Sākeśi images may have been brought from Mathurā, the find-spots need not be regarded as forming necessarily a part of the empire of the king mentioned on the pedestal.

5 EH14, p. 275.

6 JRAS, 1924, p. 402.

7 The epithet is also applied to Aungka in the Kahrarshhti documents (Burrow, p. 126).
Jushka and Kanishka, *i.e.*, Vā-jheshka and *Kanishka of the Ārā inscription* of the year 41. The Wardak vase inscription possibly proves the inclusion of Kābul within his dominions. But there is no evidence that he retained his hold on the Lower Indus Valley which was probably wrested from the successors of Kanishka I by Rudradāman I. In Kaśmīra Huvishka built a town named Hushkapura.¹ Like Kanishka I, he was a patron of Buddhism and built a splendid monastery at Mathurā.² He also resembled Kanishka in his taste for a diversity of coin-types. Besides a medley of Greek, Persian and Indian deities we have, on one of his coins, the remarkable figure of Roma.³ A Mathurā inscription refers to the restoration during his reign of a delapidated *Devakula* of his grandfather.

Smith does not admit that the Kanishka of the Ārā inscription of the year 41 was different from the great Kanishka. Lüders, Fleet, Kennedy and Sten Konow, on the other hand, distinguish between the two Kanishkas.⁴ According to Lüders, Kanishka of the Ārā inscription was a son of Vāsishka and probably a grandson of Kanishka I. Kanishka II had the titles *Mahārāja*, *Rājātirāja*, *Devaputra* and possibly *Kaisara* (Caesar). It is probable that he, and not Kanishka I, was the founder of the town of Kanishkapura in Kaśmīra.

---

¹ It is identified with Ushkūr inside the Bāramula Pass (EHII, p. 387).
² Cf. Lüders, List No. 63.
³ Camb. Short Hist., 79. Numismatic evidence possibly suggests that the *lion-standard* was to some of the Great Kushānas what the *Garuda-dheaca* was to their Gupta successors. Cf. Whitehead, 196.

The mention of a distinguishing patronymic in the record of the year 41, and the fact that no inscriptions of Kanishka are known that are referable to the period 24 to 40 of the era used by the family (when the Kushān throne was occupied by Vāsishka and, possibly Huvishka as a junior partner), suggest that Kanishka of the year 41 is not to be identified with Kanishka of the years 1-23.
The last notable king of Kanishka’s line was Vāsudeva I. His dates range from the year 67 to 98, i.e., A.D. 145 to 176 according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. He does not appear to have been a Buddhist. His coins exhibit the figure of Śiva attended by Nandi. There can be no doubt that he reverted to Śaivism, the religion professed by his great predecessor Kadphises II. A king named Vāsudeva is mentioned in the Kārya Mīmāṃsā as a patron of poets and a Sabhāpati, apparently ‘President of a Society’ (of learned men). That the Kushān Age was a period of great literary activity is proved by the works of Āsvaghosha, Nāgārjuna and others. It was also a period of religious ferment and missionary activity. It witnessed the development of Śaivism and the allied cult of Kārttikeya, of the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism and the cults of Mihira and of Vāsudeva-Krishṇa, and it saw the introduction of Buddhism into China by Kāśyapa Mātaṅga (c. 61-68 A.D.).

“The dynasty of Kanishka opened the way for Indian civilization to Central and Eastern Asia.”

The inscriptions of Vāsudeva have been found only in the Mathurā region. From this it is not unreasonable to surmise that he gradually lost his hold over the northwestern portion of the Kushān dominions.

About the middle of the third century A.D., we hear of the existence of no less than four kingdoms all dependent on the Yueh-chi,’ and ruled probably by princes of the Yue-chi stock.  

1 Mr. M. Nagor makes mention of an inscription incised on the base of a stone image of the Buddha acquired from Pālikherā (Mathura Museum, No. 2907; which records the installation of the image in the year 67 during the reign of Vāsudeva.

2 Cf. Kennedy, JRAS, 1913, 1060 f. Among the successors of Vāsudeva I may be mentioned Kanishka (III); Vāsu (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, pp. 211-12; cf. RDB, JASB, Vol. IV (1906), 81 ff; Altekar, NHIP, VI. 14 n) or Vāsudeva II.
These were Ta-hia (the Oxus region, i.e., Bactria), Ki-pin (Kāpiṣa), Kao-fou (Kābul) and ‘Tien-tehou’ (lit. India, meaning probably the country on either side of the Indus with a vague suzerainty over a wider area). In 230 the Ta Yueh-chi, i.e., the Great (?) Yueh-chi king Po-tiao sent an embassy to the Chinese Emperor. The Yueh-chi kingdom of ‘Tientchou’ began to fall to pieces some time after this date and probably disappeared as an important power in the fourth century A.D. having already lost some of the remotest provinces to the Nāgas. Those nearer the Indus emerged as petty states. Sakasthāna and parts of North-West India were conquered by the Sassanians in the days of Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93). During the early part of the reign of Shāpūr II (A.D. 309-79) the Sassanian suzerainty was still acknowledged in those regions.

who is apparently to be identified with Po-tiao, A.D. 230 (Corpus, II. i. Lxxvii); and Grumbates(?), A.D. 360 (Smith, EHI, p. 290). Kings claiming to belong to the family of Kanishka continued to rule in Ki-pin and Gandhāra long after he had passed away (Itinerary of Oukong, Cal. Rev., 1922, Aug.-Sept., pp. 193, 489). The last king of Kanishka’s race was, according to tradition, Lagatūrman who was overthrown by his Brāhmaṇa minister Kallar (Alberuni, II, 13). For an alleged invasion of India in the later Kusān period by Ardeshr Bābagān (A.D. 226-41), the founder of the Sassanian dynasty, see Fērishta (Elliot and Dowson, VI, p. 557). Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93) conquered the whole of Sakasthāna and made his son Varhrān III Governor of the conquered territory. Sakasthāna continued to form a part of the Sassanian empire down to the time of Shāpūr II. A Pahlavi Inscription of Persepolis, which Herzfeld deciphered in 1923, dated probably in A.D. 310-11, when Shāpūr II (309-79) was on the throne, refers to the Sassanian ruler of Sakasthāna as “Sakānsūh, minister of ministers (dabīrān dabīr) of Hind, Sakasthāna and Tukhāristhān” (MASI, 34, 396). The Paikuli Inscription mentions the Saka chiefs of North-Western India among the retainers of Varhrān III; Governor of Sakasthāna in the last quarter of the third century A.D. (JRAS, 1933, 219). The Abhiras of Western India seem also to have acknowledged the sway of the Sassanians (Rapson, Andhra Coins, cxxxiv). J. Charpentier points out (Aiyangar Com., Vol. 16) that at the time of Kosmas Indiko-pleustes (c. 500 A.D.) the right side of the Indus Delta belonged to Persia. Persians figure also in early Chalukya epigraphs and the Rāghuvamśa of Kalidāsa.
SECTION IV. THE NĀGAS AND THE LATER KUSHĀNS

The successors of the Great Kushāns in Mathurā and certain neighbouring tracts were the Nāgas. The prevalence of Nāga rule over a considerable portion of northern and central India in the third and fourth centuries A.D., is amply attested by epigraphic evidence. A Lahore copper seal inscription of the fourth century A.D. refers to a king named Mahēśvara Nāga, the son of Nāgabhatṭa. The Allahabad Pillar inscription refers to King Ganapati Nāga, while several Vākāṭaka records mention Bhava Nāga sovereign of the Bhāraśivas whose grandson’s grandson Rudrasena II was a contemporary of Chandra Gupta II, and who accordingly must have flourished before the rise of the Gupta Empire. Some idea of the great power of the rulers of Bhava Nāga’s line and the territory over which they ruled may be gathered from the fact that the dynasty performed ten Āsvamedha sacrifices and were besprinkled on the forehead with the pure water of (the river) Bhāgirathi (Ganges) that had been obtained by their valour. The valiant deeds of the family culminating in the performance of ten Āsvamedha sacrifices indicate that they were not a feudatory line owing allegiance to the Kushāns. We learn from the Purāṇas that the Nāgas established themselves at Vidiśā (Besnagar near Bhilsa), Padmāvatī

1 A Yūpa Inscription from Barnāla (in the Jaipur State) discloses the existence of a line of kings, one of whom bore a name that ended in—Varidhana. They belonged to the Soharta or Sohartṛi gotra. But the dynastic designation is not known (Ep. Ind., xxvi. 120). The record is dated in Kṛita 284 corresponding to A.D. 297-298.

2 Fleet, CII, p. 283.

3 CII, p. 241; AHD, p. 72.
(Padam Pawāyā, "in the apex on the confluence of the Sindhu and Pāra),"
Kāntipuri (not satisfactorily identified),
and even Mathurā which was the southern capital of Kanishka and his successors. The greatest of the Nāga Kings was perhaps Chandrānāśa, ‘the second Nakhavant,’ whose name reminds us of the great king Chandra of the Delhi Iron Pillar inscription. It is by no means clear that the two are identical. But if Chandra preceded the rise of the Gupta empire, it is natural to seek a reference to him in the Purānic texts which were not compiled till the Gupta-Valāțaka age.

The hand of a Nāga princess was sought by Chandra Gupta II in the fourth century, and a ‘Nāga’ officer governed the Gangetic Doāb as late as the time of Skanda Gupta. The Kushāns, however, continued to rule in the Kābul

1 Coins of a Mahārāja or Aśhirāja named Bhavanāga have been found at this place. His identity with Bhavanāga of Vākāțaka epigraphs proposed by Dr. Altekar (J. Num. S. I, V. pt. II) must await future discoveries.

2 Mention is made of a Kāntipuri in the Skanda Purāṇa (Nāgarakhaṇḍa, ch. 47, 4ff). In the story narrated in the text a petty prince of Kāntipuri ‘marries a princess of Daśārū, the valley of the Dhasan, in Eastern Malwa which, in the time of the Meghadūta, included Vidiśā. Kāntipuri probably lay not far from the last-mentioned city.

3 JRAS, 1905, p. 233.

4 "Nṛpān Vidiśakāṃś e api bhavīṣyāṃstu nibodhata
  Sesaṇya Nāga-rājaśya putraḥ para puraṇājaḥ
  Bhogī bhavīṣyaḥ (?) rājā nṛpa Nāga-kul ivaahah
  Sadācandra tu Chandrāṃśo deviyo Nakhavāṃs tathā."

   —Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 49.

5 Devotion to Viṣṇu may suggest identification with Chandra-Gupta I, or preferably, Chandra II. But then we have to explain the significant omission of the termination -gupta in this memorable prāṣasti and the epithet Dhāva, especially as Chandra-Gupta II is known as Devagupta or Devarāja and not Dhāva. One should note also the claim to have acquired adhirāja and victory over a Trans-Indus people by his own prowess and not as a sequel to the power and prestige won by a line of distinguished ancestors. The Vishnuite association of this great King precludes the possibility of identification with Chandra Kanishka. Identification with the first Maurya is fantastic in view of the date of the epigraph and recorded achievements of the hero which do not include the overthrow of the Nandās and clash with the Yavanas.

6 For later traces of Nāga rule, see Bom. Gaz., 1, 2, pp. 281, 292, 313, 574; Ep. Ind., X, 25.
valley and parts of the Indian borderland. One of them gave his daughter in marriage to Hormisdas (or Hormuzd) II, the Sassanian King of Persia (A.D. 301-09). As already stated Varhran II (A.D. 276-93) and his successors up to the time of Shapur II seem to have exercised suzerainty over their Scythic neighbours. “When Shapur II besieged Amida in A.D. 350, Indian elephants served under his command.”1 Shortly afterwards the Sassanian supremacy was replaced by that of the Guptas, and the “Daiaputra Shahi Shahanushahi,” i.e., the Kushan monarch or monarchs of the North-West sent valuable presents to Samudra Gupta.2 In the fifth century3 the Kidara Kushans established their rule over Gandhara and Kasimira.4 In the sixth century the Kushans had to fight hard against the Huns and in the following centuries, against the Muslims. In the ninth century A.D. a powerful Muslim dynasty, that of the Saffarids, was established in Sistan (Seistan) and the sway of the family soon extended to Ghazni, Zabulistan, Herat, Balkh and Bamiyan.5 The later kings of the race of Kanishka seem to have had one residence in Gandhara at the city of Und, Ohind, Waihand or Udabhanda, on the Indus. Another capital was situated in the Kabul valley. The family was finally extinguished by the Brahmana Kallar or Lalliya who founded the Hindu Shahiyya dynasty towards the close of the ninth century A.D. A part of the kingdom of Kabul fell into the hands of Alptigin in the tenth century.6

1 JRAS, 1913, p. 1062. Smith (EH4, p. 290) and Herzfeld (MASI, 38, 36) give the date A.D. 360.
2 Cf. also JASB, 1908, 93.
3 Or probably earlier (about the middle of the fourth century according to Altekar, NHIP, VI. 21).
4 JRAS, 1913, p. 1064. Smith, Catalogue, 64, 89. R. D. Banerji JASB, 1918, 91.
5 Nazim, The Life and Times of Sultan Mahmud, 186.
CHAPTER IX. SCYTHIAN RULE IN SOUTHERN AND WESTERN INDIA

SECTION I. THE KSHAHARATAS

We have seen that in the second and first centuries B.C., the Scythians possessed Ki-pin (Kāpiṣa-Gandhāra) and Śakasthāna (Seistan) and soon extended their sway over a large part of Northern India. The principal Scythic dynasties continued to rule in the north. But a Satrapal family, the Kshaharātas, extended their power to Western India and the Deccan, and wrested parts of Mahārāṣṭra from the Śātavāhanas. The Śātavāhana king apparently retired to the southern part of his dominions, probable to the Janapada of the Bellary District which came to be known as Śātavāhanihāra, and was at one time under the direct administration of a military governor (mahāsenāpati) named Skanda-nāga.1 The waning power of the indigenous rulers of the Deccan and the waxing strength of the invaders seem to be hinted at in the following lines of the Periplus:

"The city of Calliena (Kalyāna) in the time of the elder Saraganus (probable Sātakarni I) became a lawful market town; but since it came into the possession of Sandanes (possible Sunandana Sātakarni)2 the port is much obstructed, and Greek ships landing there may chance to be taken to Barygaza (Broach) under guard."

1 Ep. Ind. XIV, 155.
2 Wilson in JASB, 1904, 272; Smith ZDMG, Sept., 1903; IHQ. 1932, 334; JBORS, 1932, 7f. The adjective 'elder' becomes pointless unless the passage mentions a younger Saraganus, and this person can only refer to Sandanes from whom the elder king is distinguished.
The name of the Scythian conquerors of the Broach region and of Mahārashṭra, Kshaharāta, seems to be identical with "Karatai," the designation of a famous Saka tribe of the north mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy.¹

The known members of the Kshaharāta, Khakhharāta, or Chaharata family are Liaka, Patika, Ghaṭāka, Bhūmaka and Nahapāna. Of these Liaka, Patika, and Ghaṭāka belonged to the Taxila and Mathurā regions respectively. Bhūmaka was a Kshatrapa of Kāṭhiāwār. Rapson says that he preceded Nahapāna. His coin-types are "arrow, discus and thunderbolt." These types have been compared with the reverse type "discus, bow and arrow" of certain copper coins struck conjointly by Spalirises and Azes (I).

Nahapāna was the greatest of the Kshaharāta Satraps. Eight Cave Inscriptions discovered at Paṇḍulena, near Nāsik, Junnar and Karle (in the Poona district) prove the inclusion of a considerable portion of Mahārāshṭra within his dominions. Seven of these inscriptions describe the benefactions of his son-in-law Ushavadāta (Rishabhhadatta) the Saka, while the eighth inscription specifies the charitable works of Ayama, the Amātya (minister or district officer). Ushavadāta’s inscriptions indicate that Nahapāna’s political influence probably extended from Poona (in Mahārāshṭra) and Sūrpāraka (in North Koṅkan) to Prabhāsa in Kāṭhiāwār, Mandasor (Daśapura) and Ujjain in Mālwa and the district of Ajmer including Pushkara, the place of pilgrimage to which Ushavadāta resorted for consecration after his victory over the Mālayas or Mālavas.

¹ Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400. Mr. Y. R. Gupte points out (Ind. Ant., 1926, 178, that among the shepherds of the Deccan we have the surname Kharāṭa which he considers to be a 'shortened from of Kshaharāta' (Khabharāṭa).
The Nasik records give the dates 41, 42, and 45, of an unspecified era, and call Nahapāna a Kshatrapa, while the Junnar epigraph of Ayama specifies the date 46 and speaks of Nahapāna as Mahākshatrapa. The generally accepted view is that these dates are to be referred to the Saka era of 78 A.D. The name Nahapāna is no doubt Persian, but the Kshaharāta tribe to which Nahapāna belonged was probably of Saka extraction and Ushavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, distinctly calls himself a Saka. It is, therefore, probable that the era of 78 A.D. derives its name of Saka era from the Saka princes of the House of Nahapāna. Rapson accepts the view that Nahapāna's dates are recorded in years of the Saka era, beginning in 78 A.D., and, therefore, assigns Nahapāna to the period A.D. 119 to 124. Several scholars identify Nahapāna with Mambarus (emended into Nambanus) of the Periplus whose capital was Minnagara in Ariake. According to one theory Minnagara is modern Mandasor, and Ariake is Aparāntika.

1 Allan thinks that the coins of Nahapāna cannot be assigned to so late a date in the second century A.D. He points among other things to the similarity of the bust on the obverse of Nahapāna's silver coins and that on the coins of Rājusūla. But he admits that this may be due to derivations from a common prototype such as the coins of Srīsto I. Camb. Short Hist., 801.

2 E.g., M. Boyer in Journal Asiatique, 1897; JASB, 1904, 272. In JRAS, 1918, 108, Kennedy points out that the name certainly ends in—bhoś—in bhoś, and not in bhoos.

3 JRAS, 1912, p. 785.

4 This is the view of D. R. Bhandarkar, who apparently follows Bemb. Gaz., 1. 15 n.; Cf., however, Ind. Ant., 1926, p. 148, Capital of Nahapāna (=Junnar). Fleet identifies Minnagara with Dehad in the Pāśch Mahāl (URAS, 1912, p. 785; 1913, 998c). In a paper read at the sixth conference of Orientalists at Patna Dr. Jayaswal referred to a Jain work which mentions Broach as the capital of Nahapāna (See now Asaya ka sūtra, JBOBS, 1930, Sept. Dec., 290). For a different tradition see IHQ, 1939, 356. Vasudhara (?) nagari.

5 Cf. also IA, 7, 298, 299: Ariake may also be Asaya of Varāhamihira's Brihat Sāhkhita.
R. D. Banerji and G. Jouveau-Dubreuil are of opinion that Nahapāna’s dates are not referable to the Śaka era. They say that if we admit that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in the Śaka era, there will be only an interval of five years between the inscription of this king, dated 46 and the inscriptions of Rudradāman, dated 52. Within these years must have taken place:

(1) The end of Nahapāna’s reign;
(2) The destruction of the Kshaharātas;
(3) The accession of Chashtana as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa his accession as a Mahākshatrapa, and his reign as Mahākshatrapa;
(4) The accession of Jayadāman as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa, and perhaps also his reign as Mahākshatrapa;
(5) The accession of Rudradāman and the beginning of his reign.

There is no necessity, however, of crowding the events mentioned above within five years (between the year 46, the last known date of Nahapāna, and the year 52, the first known date of Rudradāman). There is nothing to show that Chashtana’s family came to power after the destruction of the Kshaharātas. The line of Chashtana may have been ruling in Cutch and perhaps some adjacent territories, as the Andhau inscriptions of the year 52 suggest, while the Kshaharātas were ruling in parts of Mālwa and Mahārāṣṭra. Moreover, there is no good ground for believing that a long interval elapsed from the accession of Chashtana to that of Rudradāman. Drs. Bhandarkar and R. C. Majumdar have pointed out that the Andhau inscriptions clearly prove that Chashtana and Rudradāman ruled conjointly in the year 52. Professor J. Dubreuil rejects their view on the ground that
there is no "cha" after Rudradāman in the text of the
inscription: Rājña Chasṭanasa Ysāmotika-putrasa rājña
Rudradāmasa Jayadāma-putrasavarshe dvipachāse, 50, 2.
Professor Dubreuil translates the passage thus:

"In the 52nd year, in the reign of Rudradāman, son of
Jayadāman, grandson of Chashtana and great-grandson of
Ysāmotika."

The Professor who objects to a "cha" himself makes use
not only of "and" but also of the words "grandson" and
"great-grandson" no trace of which can be found in the
original record. Had his translation been what the
writer of the Andhau inscriptions intended, we should
have expected to find the name of Ysāmotika first, and
then the name of Chashtana followed by those of
Jayadāman and Rudradāman—Ysāmotika prapautrasa
Chashtana pautrasa Jayadāma-putrasa Rudradāmasa.¹
Moreover, it is significant that in the text of the inscription
there is no royal title prefixed to the name of Jayadāman
who ruled between Chashtana and Rudradāman according
to Dubreuil. On the other hand, both Chashtana and
Rudradāman are called Rājā. The two are mentioned
in exactly the same way—with the honorific rājā and
the patronymic. The literal translation of the inscrip-
tional passage is "in the year 52 of king Chashtana son
of Ysāmotika, of King Rudradāman son of Jayadāman,"
and this certainly indicates that the year 52 belonged
to the reign both of Chashtana and Rudradāman.²
The conjoint rule of two kings was known to ancient
Hindu writers on polity.³ The theory of the conjoint

¹ Cf. the Junāgadh, Gūḍa and Jāsahān inscriptions.
² Cf. the coin legends "Heramayasa Kaliyapaya," "Gudupharasa Srasasa,"
"Khatapana Hagānasā Hagāmasahasa," etc., where, too, we have no cha after
the second name. Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 86, 147; CHI, 538.
³ Cf. Devirāja in the Atharva Veda (V. 20, 9); Devirāja in the Kautāliya
Arthaśāstra, p. 325; Dvairoja of the Áyāraṅga Sutta; the classical account of
Patalene, p. 259 ante; the case of Dhṛitarāṣṭra and Duryodhana in the Great
rule of Chashṭana and his grandson is supported by the fact that Jayadāman did not live to be a Mahākšatrapa and must have predeceased his father, Chashṭana, as unlike Chashṭana and Rudradāman, he is called simply a Kšatrapa (not Mahākšatrapa and Bhadramukha) even in the inscriptions of his descendants.¹ We have already noticed the fact that the title Rājā, which is given to Chashṭana and Rudradāman in the Andhau inscriptions, is not given to Jayadāman.

Mr. R. D. Banerji says that the inscriptions of Nahapāna cannot be referred to the same era as used on the coins and inscriptions of Chashṭana’s dynasty because if we assume that Nahapāna was dethroned in 46 S. E., Gautamiputra must have held Nāsik up to 52 S. E. (from his 18th to his 24th year), then Pulumāyi held the city up to the 22nd year of his reign, i.e., up to at least 74 S. E. But Rudradāman is known to have defeated Pulumāyi and taken Nāsik before that time. Banerji’s error lies in the tacit assumption that Rudradāman twice occupied Nāsik before the year 73 of the Saka era. There is no clear evidence to suggest that the Sātavāhanas lost Poona and Nāsik to that great satrap though they may have lost Mālwa and the Koṅkan. Another untenable assumption of Mr. Banerji is that Rudradāman finished his conquests before the year 52 or A. D. 130, whereas the Andhau inscriptions merely imply the possession of Cutch and perhaps some adjoining tracts by the House of Chashṭana.

The theory of those who refer Nahapāna’s dates to the Saka era, is confirmed by the fact pointed out by Epic; of Enkrateides and his son in Justin’s work; of Strato I and Strato II; of Azes and Azilises, etc., etc. The Mahāvastra (III, 432) refers to the conjoint rule of three brothers:—“Kalāingeshu Siṁhapuram nāma nagaraṁ tatra traye bhrātāro ekamāṭikā rajyam kārayantī.” See also IA, 6, 29. Cf. Nilakanta Sastrī, Pandyān Kingdom, 120, 122, 130.

¹ Cf. the Guṇḍa and Jasdhān inscriptions.
Professor Rapson, and Dr. Bhandarkar after him, that a Nāsik inscription of Nahapāna refers to a gold currency, doubtless of the Kushāns who could not have ruled in India before the first century A. D.1

The power of Nahapāna and his allies, the Uttama-bhadras,2 was threatened by the Mālayas (Mālavas) from the north, and the Sātavāhanas from the south. The incursion of the Mālavas was repelled by Ushavādāta. But the Sātavāhana attack proved fatal to Śaka rule in Mahārāṣṭra.

We know very little about Chakora and Sivasvāti mentioned in the Purāṇas as the immediate successors of Sunandana during whose reign Sātavāhana prestige had sunk very low and marauders from Barygaza had been harrying the ports that had once enjoyed the protection of the elder Sātakarni, probably Sātakarni I. But the king whose name occurs next in the list, viz., Gautamiputra, regained the lost power of the house and dealt a severe blow at the power of the intruders from the north. The Nāsik praśasti calls him the "uprooter of the Kshaharāta race," and the "restorer, of the glory of the Sātavāhana family". That Nahapāna himself was overthrown by Gautamiputra is proved by the testimony of the Jogalthembi hoard (in the Nāsik district) which consisted of Nahapāna's own silver coins and coins restruck by Gautamiputra. In the

---

1 Rapson, Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, etc., pp. Iviii, clxxxv; Bhandarkar, Ind. Ant., 1918-1919, 'Deccan of the Sātavāhana Period'.
2 The Uttamabhadrās may have been a section of the Bhadra tribe mentioned in a list of gaṇas along with the Rohitakas (cf. Rohat in south-east Punjab), the Ağreyas (cf. Agra?) and the Mālavas (Mbh. III. 253.20). In Mbh. VI. 59.47 the Pra-bhadras are associated with the gaṇas or corporations of the Dāserakas, apparently of the desert region of Rājputāna (Monier Williams, Dic. 405).
restruck coins there was not a single one belonging to any prince other than Nahapāna as would certainly have been the case if any ruler had intervened between Nahapāna and Gautamiputra.
SECTION II. THE RESTORATION OF THE SATAVAHANA EMPIRE.

Gautamiputra's victory over the Kshaharātas led to the restoration of the Satavahana power in Mahārāṣṭra and some adjoining provinces. The recovery of Mahārāṣṭra is proved by a Nāsik inscription, dated in the year 18, and a Karle epigraph addressed to the Amātya or the king's officer in charge of Māmāla (the territory round Karle, modern Māval in the Poona district). But this was not the only achievement of Gautamiputra. We learn from the Nāsik record of queen Gautamī Balasrī that her son destroyed the Sakas (Scythians), Yavanas (Greeks) and Pahlavas (Parthians), and that his dominions extended not only over Asīka, Asaka (Asmaka on the Godāvari, a part of Mahārāṣṭra), and Mūlaka (the district around Paitāhān), but also over Suraṭha (South Kāṭhiāwār), Kukura (in Western or Central India, possibly near the Pāriyātra or the Western Vindhyas), Aparānta (North Koṅkaṇ), Anupa (district around Mahīśmati on the Narmada), Vidarbha (Greater Berar), and Ākara-Avanti (East and west Mālwa). He is further styled lord of all the mountains from

---

1 The Nāsik Edict was issued from the camp of victory of the Vejayanti army (Ep. Ind., VIII. 72) and was addressed to the Amātya or the king's officer in charge of Govardhana (Nāsik). According to Sircar 'Vejayanti' is not a city but an epithet of Sona (army).
2 On the Krishnavegā, i.e., the river Krīṣṇā (Khāravela's ins., IHQ. 1938, 275); cf. Aṛṣhika, Pataṇjali, IV, 2.2.
3 Shamaśāstry's translation of the Arthaśāstra, p. 143, n. 2. Its capital Potana probably corresponds to Bodhan in the Nizam's dominions.
4 Brihat Samhitā, XIV, 4.
5 Eastern Mālwa was possibly under Vāsishka, the successor of Kanishka I, in the year 28 of the Kushan Era which corresponds to A.D. 106 according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. Ākara has been identified with Āgar, 35 miles north-east of Ujjain, Bomb. Gaz., Gujarāt, 540; Ep. Ind., xxiii. 102.
the Vindhyas to the Malaya or Travancore hills, and from the Eastern (Mahendra) to the Western (Sahya) Ghāṭs. The possession of Vejayanti in the Kanarese country is possibly hinted at in the Nāsik inscription of the year 18. The names of the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) and South Kosala are, however, conspicuous by their absence. Inscriptions, coins and the testimony of Hiuen Tsang prove that both these territories were at one time or other included within the Sātavāhana empire. The earliest Sātavāhana king whose inscriptions have been found in the Andhra region is Pulumāyi, son of Gautamiputra. It is, however, possible that some vague claim of suzerainty over the areas in question is implied in the boast that Gautamiputra was lord of the Vindhyas and the Eastern Ghāṭs (Mahendra) and that his chargers "drank the water of the three oceans" (lisamudatoypita-vāhana). Moreover "Asika" seems to have included a considerable portion of the valley of the Krishṇa.

In the Nāsik prāsasti Gautamiputra figures not only as a conqueror, but also as a social reformer. "He crushed down the pride and conceit of the Kshatriyas, furthered the interest of the twice-born, apparently the Brāhmanas, as well as the lowest orders (Dvijāvarakutubavīvadhana) and stopped the contamination of the four varṇas (castes)."

According to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar and Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Gautamiputra reigned conjointly with his son Pulumāyi. They give the following reasons in support of their theory:

---

1 Kutumba means 'a household', 'a family' and apra-kutuba may be taken to mean 'households or families of the lowly'. The use of the word kutuba may suggest that the 'lowly' order or orders, whose families or households are referred to, are the traders and agriculturists (kutumbika).
(1) In Gautami's inscription (dated in the 19th year of her grandson Pulumāyi) she is called the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.

(2) If it were a fact that Gautamiputra was dead when the queen-mother's inscription was written, and Pulumāyi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription. But there is not a word in praise of him. A king dead for 19 years is extolled, and the reigning king passed over in silence.

(3) The inscription dated in the year 24, engraved on the east wall of the Veranda of the Nāzik Cave No. 3, which records a grant made by Gautamiputra and the "king's mother whose son is living", in favour of certain Buddhist monks "dwell in the cave which was a pious gift of theirs," presupposes the gift of the Nāzik Cave No. 3 in the 19th year of Pulumāyi. Consequently Gautamiputra was alive after the 19th year of his son.

As regards point (1), it may be said that usually a queen sees only her husband and sometimes a son on the throne. Queen Gautami Balaśri, on the other hand, was one of the fortunate (or unfortunate) few who saw grandchildren on the throne. Therefore, she claimed to be the mother of a great king and the grandmother of a great king.

As to point (2), is the silence satisfactorily explained by the theory of conjoint rule? Those who prefer the opposite view may point out that although it is not customary for an ordinary subject to extol a dead king and pass over a reigning monarch in silence, still it is perfectly natural for a queen-mother in her old age to recount the glories of a son who was associated with her in a previous gift.
As to point (3), it is not clear that the gift referred to in the postscript of the year 24 was identical with the grant of the year 19 of Pulumāyi. The donors in the postscript were king Gautamiputra and the rājamātā, the king’s mother, apparently Balaśri, while the donor in the year 19 of Pulumāyi was the queen-mother alone. In the inscription of the year 24, the queen-mother is called Mahādevi Jīvasutā Rājamātā, the great queen, the king’s mother; whose son is alive. In Pulumāyi’s inscription the epithets Mahādevi and Rājamātā are retained but the epithet “Jīvasutā,” “whose son is alive,” is significantly omitted. The donees in the former grant were the Tekirasi or Triräsī ascetics in general, the donees in the latter grant were the monks of the Bhadāvanīya school. The object of grant in the former case may have been merely the Veranda of Cave No. 3, which contains the postscript of the year 24, and whose existence before the 19th year of Pulumāyi is attested by an edict of Gautamiputra of the year 18. On the other hand, the cave given away to the Bhadāvanīya monks was the whole of Cave No. 3.

If Gautamiputra and his son reigned simultaneously, and if the latter ruled as his father’s colleague in Mahārāṣṭra, then it is difficult to explain why Gautamiputra was styled “Govadhanaśa Benākaṭakasvāmi,” “lord of Benākaṭaka in Govardhana” (Nāsik),1 and why he addressed the officer at Govardhana directly, ignoring his son who is represented as ruling over Mahārāṣṭra, while in the record of the year 19, Pulumāyi was considered as

---

1 The use of the expression “Govadhanaśa” suggests that there were other localities named Benākaṭaka from which this particular place is distinguished. A Benākaṭaka in the eastern part of the Vākāṭaka kingdom is mentioned in the Turco plate of Pravarasena II (7 III) (IHQ, 1935, 293; Ep. Ind. XXII, 167 ff). Beṣā or Bennā is apparently the name of a small stream in each case.
so important that the date was recorded in the years of his reign, and not in that of his father who was the senior ruler.¹

The generally accepted view is that Pulumāyi came after Gautamīputra.

The date of Gautamīputra Sātakarni is a matter regarding which there is a wide divergence of opinion. There are scholars who believe that the epithets varavāraṇa-vikrama, chāru-vikrama, "whose gait was beautiful like the gait of a choice elephant," and Saka-nishūdana, destroyer of Śakas, suggest that he was the original of Rājā Vikramāditya of legend who founded the era of 58 B.C. But, as already pointed out, the use of regnal years by Gautamīputra and his descendants indicates that no era originated with the dynasty. Further, Indian literature clearly distinguishes between Vikramāditya of Ujjain and Śālivāhana or the Śatavāhanas of Pratishṭhāna. The view accepted in these pages is that Gautamīputra was the conqueror of Nahapāna and that his 18th year fell after the year 46 of the Śaka era, the last recorded date of his vanquished opponent. In other words the conquest of Nāsik by Gautamīputra took place some time after A. D. 78+46=124, and his accession after A. D. 124—18=106. As he ruled for at least 24 years, his reign must have terminated after A. D. 130.

In the Purānic lists compiled by Pargiter the immediate successors of Gautamīputra are Pulumā, his son, and Sātakarni. Pulumā is doubtless identical with Siro P(t)olemaios of Baithana mentioned by Ptolemy and Vāsishṭhiputra Svāmi Sri Pulumāvi of inscriptions and

¹ Cf. R. D. Banerji, JRAS, 1917, pp. 281 et seq. Note also the epithet (Dakṣiṇā) pathēcara ‘lord of the Deccan,’ applied to Pulumāyi in the prāvartī of the year 19.
coins. Sātakarnī is perhaps to be identified with Vāsishṭhiputra Śrī Sātakarnī of a Kanheri Cave Inscription, or with Vāsishṭhiputra Chatarapana Sātakarnī of a Nānāghaṭ record. His exact position in the genealogical list cannot be determined with precision. The Kanheri epigraph represents Vāsishṭhiputra Śrī Sātakarnī as the husband of a daughter of the Mahākshatrapa Ru(dra). Rapson identifies this Rudra with Rudradāman I. There can hardly be any doubt that the Sātavāhana king mentioned in the Kanheri record, or one of his close relations who bore a similar name, was identical with Sātakarnī, lord of the Deccan, whom Rudradāman “twice in fair fight completely defeated, but did not destroy on account of the nearness of their connection.” Dr. Bhandarkar’s identification of Vāsishṭhiputra Śrī Sātakarnī of Kanheri with Vāsishṭhiputra Śīva Śrī Sātakarnī of coins and Śīva Śrī of the Matsya Purāṇa cannot be regarded as more than a conjecture. The ruler mentioned in the Kanheri Inscription may have been a brother of Pulumāyi.

We have seen that the capital of Pulumāyi was Baithan, i.e., Paithan or Pratishthāna on the Godāvari identified by Bhandarkar with Navanara or Navanagara, i.e., the new city. Inscriptions and coins prove that the dominions of this king included the Krishṇa-Godāvari reign as well as Mahārāṣṭra. It has already been pointed out that the Andhra country is not clearly mentioned in the list of territories over which Gautamīputra held his sway. It is not altogether improbable that Vāsishthiputra Pulumāyi was the first to establish the Sātavāhana power firmly in that region. Sukṭhankar identifies him with Śrī Pulumāyi, king of the Sātavāhanas, mentioned in an inscription discovered in the Adoni taluk of the Bellary district. But the absence of the distinguishing metronymic makes the identification uncertain and probably
indicates that the king referred to in the inscription is Pulumāyi I of the Purāṇas or some other prince of the dynasty who bore the same name. D. C. Sircar identifies him with the last king of Pargiter’s list. Numismatic evidence suggests that the political influence of a Pulumāyi extended to the Coromandel coast, and possibly to the Chanda district of the Central Provinces. But in the absence of epigraphic corroboration the matter cannot be regarded as definitely proved. Moreover, the absence of the metronymic Vāsishthiputra makes it uncertain in some cases as to whether the son of the great Gautamiputra is meant.

Vāsishthiputra Pulumāyi must have come to the throne some time after A. D. 130. He is known from a Karle epigraph to have ruled for at least 24 years, so that his reign terminated after A.D. 154.

The successors of Pulomā according to the Purānic lists compiled by Pargiter are Śiva Śrī¹ Pulomā and Śivaskanda (or Sivaskandha)² Śatakarni.

Yajñaśrī Śatakarnī.³

The immediate successor of Śivaskanda according to the collated text of Pargiter was Yajña Śrī. If the Purāṇas are to be believed his accession took place more

¹ Mirashi in the *Journal of the Num. Soc.* II (1940), p. 88 attributes to him the coins of “Śivaśri Pulumāyi III” of the Tarhāla hoard. He draws a distinction between this king (who was a Pulumāyi) and Vāsishthiputa Śivasirī Śatakarni who is known to Rason’s Catalogue. The *Vishnu Purāṇa*, however, represents Śivasirī as a Śatakarni (and not a Pulumāyi). The matter must, therefore, be regarded as sub judice.

² Mirashi (ibid. 89) identifies him with King Sirikhada or Skanda Śatakarni of the Tarhāla hoard (Akola district) and other coins whose name was wrongly read as Chaḍa Śatakarni by Smith and Rudra Śatakarni by Rason. This “Rudra” was represented as a ruler of the Andhra-deśa.

³ In *JRA*S, July, 1934, 560ff, Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that the name of this king was Śrī Yajña Śatakarni as stated in inscriptions, and not Yajña Śrī (as stated in the Purāṇas). It should, however, be remembered that Śrī is here an honorific.
than 35 years after the close of the reign of Gautamiputra Śatakarni, i.e., after A.D. 165 and ended after A.D. 194. Yajña Śrī’s inscriptions, which prove that he reigned for at least 27 years, are found at the following places, viz., Nasik in Mahārāṣhṭra, Kanheri in Aparānta, and China in the Krishṇa district. His coins are found in Gujrāt, Kāṭhiāwār, Aparānta, the Chanda District in the Central Provinces, and the Krishṇa district of the Madras State. There can be no doubt that he ruled over both Mahārāṣṭra and the Andhra country and recovered Aparānta (N. Konkan) from the successors of Rudradāman I. Smith says that his silver coins imitating the coinage of the Saka rulers of Ujjain probably point to victories over the latter, and that the coins bearing the figure of a ship suggest the inference that the king’s power extended over the sea. He thus anticipated the naval ventures of the Kadambas of Goa, of Sivāji and of the Angrias. \(^1\)

Yajñaśrī was the last great king of his dynasty. After his death the Śatavāhanas probably lost North-Western Mahārāṣṭra to the Ābhīra king Īśvarasena. \(^2\) The later

---

\(^1\) Rapson, however, says (Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, p. 22) in reference to certain lead coins (of the Coromandel coast): "ohv Ship with two masts. Inscr. not completely read, but apparently Sri-Pu (lumā) visā."

\(^2\) The earliest reference to the Ābhīras to which an approximate date can be assigned is that contained in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The Mahābhāṣya as well as the Mahābhārata connects them with the Śūdras—the Sodrai of Alexander’s historians. Their country—Ābhiras—finds mention in the Periplus and the geography of Ptolemy. In the third quarter of the second century A.D., Ābhīra chieftains figured as generals of the Saka rulers of Western India. Shortly afterwards a Chief named Īśvaradatta, probably an Ābhīra, became
Sātavāhana princes—Vijaya, Chaṇḍa Śrī (variant Chandra Śrī) and Pulomāvi of the Purāṇas—seem to have ruled in Berar, the Eastern Deccan and the Kanarese country.¹ The existence of Vijaya seems now to be confirmed by numismatic evidence.² Chaṇḍa Śrī may have been identical with Vāsisṭhī-putra ‘‘Sāmi-siri Chaṇḍa Sāta’’ of the Kodavali rock-cut well Inscription discovered near Piṭhāpuram in the Godāvari region, while Pulomāvi is, in the opinion of Dr. D. C. Sircar, to be identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Myakadoni inscription of the Bellary District. Coins disclose the existence of a few other Kings of the line who must be assigned to the latest Sātavāhana period. Sātavāhana rule in the

Mahākshatrāpa. His relation to the Ābhira king Maṇḍhariputra Iśvara Sena, son of Śiva Datta, remains doubtful. But some scholars are inclined to identify the two chiefs. It is also suggested that this dynasty of Iśvara Sena is identical with the Traikūṭaka line of Aparaṇa, and that the establishment of the Traikūṭaka era in A.D. 248 marks the date at which the Ābhira succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the Government of Northern Mahārāṣṭra and the adjoining region. The last known rulers of the Traikūṭaka line were Indradatta, his son Dharasena (455-86 A. D.), and his son Vyāghrasena (489-90), after whom the kingdom seems to have been conquered by the Vakrāṭaka king Harisheṇa.

¹ The Berar (Akola) group includes certain princes, not included in the Purāṇic lists, e.g., Śri Kumbha Sātakarni, Śri Karṇa Sātakarni (unless he is identified with the so-called Svaśikarna, the fourteenth king of Pargiter’s list) and Śri Saka Sātakarni (Miraśhi, J. Num. Soc., II, 1940). Miraśhi thinks that the real name of the so-called Krishna (II) of the Chanda board was Karṇa. Among kings of uncertain identity mention may be made of Śri Sivamaka Sata of the Amaravati inscription and Maṇḍhariputra Śri Sata of Kanheri.

² Miraśhi, Journal of the Num. Soc. of India, II (1940), p. 90. The only clear letters are ya-Sātakarni. The ascription to Vijaya must be regarded as tentative.
Krishnā, Guṇṭūr and Bellary districts was eventually supplanted by the Ikṣvākus and the Pallavas.

Provincial Government under the Śātāvahānas

A word may be said here regarding the internal organisation of the Śātāvahana empire. The sovereign

1 The Ikṣvākus are known from inscriptions discovered on the ruins of the Jagayyaspeta stūpa in the Krishnapā District and also at Nāgarjunikonda and Gurzala in the Guṇṭūr district (Ep. Ind., 1929, 11; 1941, 123). They were matrimonially connected with the Kekayas, probably a ruling family of Ancient Mysore (Dubrenil, AHD, pp. 88, 101). The most well-known rulers of the Ikṣvāku family of the Eastern Deccan are Chāṇḍamūla, Sri-Vira-Puruṣa-dutta, Ehuvela Chāṇḍamūla II and possibly ‘Rulupurisadāta’ (Ep. Ind., xxxvi. 125). The Ikṣvākus were succeeded by the ‘Xanda’ kings of Guṇṭūr, the Prihat-phalāyanas of Kudurābāra (near Masulipatam), the Śalānākāyana of Veṇḍi (cf. IA, 5, 175 and the Salakenoi of Ptolemy), and the Vishṇukundina of Lantulura (near Veṇḍi).

2 The Pallavas—a people of unknown origin, claiming descent from Āsatthāman and Nāga princesses, are the most important of all the dynasties that succeeded the Śātāvahānas in the Far South. The claim of descent from Brāhmaṇas of the Bharadvāja gotra, the performance of the Aśvamedha and patronage of Sanskrit learning, connect the dynasty with the Śuṅgas, while the Brāhmaṇa-Nāga connection, (cf. Saṃkīraṇa-jati, Brahma-khaṭa, SII, Vol. xii, Nos. 7, 48) the performance of Vedic sacrifices including the horse-sacrifice, early association with the Śātāvahāna Janapada in the Bellary district and the use of Prākriti in their early records, connect the family with the Śātāvahānas. There is no question of any Parthian affinity as the genealogical lists of the family are singularly devoid of Parthian nomenclature. The elephant’s scalp used as a crown is no test of race. The well-known hostility of the family to the Cholas and the decidedly northern character of their culture preclude the possibility of a pure Tamil extraction. The first great Pallava king, Śiva-Skanda-varman, is known from the inscriptions found at Mayidavolu (in Guṇṭūr) and Hirahāḍa-gadali (in Bellary) to have ruled over an extensive empire including Kāṇeśi, Andhrapatha and Śaṭṭhapatī raṭhā, and performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice. About the middle of the fourth century A.D. the emperor Samudra Gupta invaded Southern India, defeated the reigning Pallava king, Vishṇupōpa, and gave a severe blow to the power and prestige of the empire of Kāṇeśi which, in the long run, probably led to its disruption. The evidence of the Penukonda Plates, the Tāla-gunda inscription and the Hebbata grant (IHQ, 1927, 434) seems to suggest that the Pallava supremacy continued for some time to be acknowledged by the early Gaṅgas of Avantapura and East Mysore and the early Kudambas of Vaijayantī (Banaṇāsi) and Mahīsha-Vīshaya (Mysore). The history of the Pallavas.
himself seems to have resided in Pratishṭhāna or in "camps of victory" in Govardhana (Nāsik district),
during the fifth and sixth centuries is obscure. Certain inscriptions disclose the
names of the following kings, but little is known about them:

Kings of Kṛiṣhṇa, Guṇḍūr and Nellore districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King of Kāṇchi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vishṇugopa I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṇagopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virakūrca II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman I (Skandaiśyya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāravishṇu I, recovered Kāọc̣h̄t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhavarman, defeated Cholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda II Kumāravishṇu II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishṇugopa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishṇudāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidhavarman I*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viravarma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidhavarman II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 436?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandivarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhavarman III, IV, (two kings of this name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishṇugopa III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhavarman V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhavishṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendravarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasiddhavarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary of Pulakeśin II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vāyalūr, Veḷūrpalaiyam, Darsi and Chendidūr grants.

* Kings marked with asterisks may have been identical. But this is by no means certain. The settlement of early Pallava genealogy and chronology must still await future discoveries.

1. A Silhavarman is mentioned in the Palnad inscription. But his identity and date are uncertain.
2. Tambrapa is identified with Chembrolu.
Vaijayanti (in North Kanara) and other places. The imperial dominions were divided into administrative units called āhāra or janapada and placed under rulers who fell into two classes, viz., (a) amātyas who were ordinary civil functionaries and (b) military governors and feudatories styled mahāsenāpati, mahārathi, mahābhōja, and even Rājan. Amātyas are mentioned in connection with Aparānta (North Koṅkaṇ), Govardhana (Nāsik), Māmāḍ(l)a (Poona), Banavāsi (North Kanara) and Khaḍḍāvali (Godāvarī region). Mahārathis are found associated with Chitaldrug, Nānāghat, Karle and Kanheri (in the North Koṅkaṇ). They intermarried with the imperial family (and at times adopted its nomenclature) and also with the Chuṭu, Kauśika and Vāsishṭha clans. The Mahābhōjas had close relations with Chuṭu rulers of Banavāsi. Mahāsenāpatis are found in Nāsik in the days of Yajña Śrī and in Bellary in the time of a Pulumāyī. The rule of these military governors, some of whom belonged to the Kuśika family or were matrimonially connected with it, was very much in evidence in the last days of the Sātavāhana empire. Potentates with the title of rāja ruled in the Kolhapur region. The most notable among these were: Vāsishṭhiputra Vilivāyakura, Mātharīputra Śivalakura and Gautamiputra Vilivāyakura (II). The Vilivāyakura group cannot fail to remind one of Baleokouros of Hippokoura mentioned by the Greek geographer Ptolemy (c. 150 A. D.)

It is from the ranks of military governors and feudatories that the princes who carved out independent principalities on the dissolution of the Sātavāhana empire, evidently sprang. The Śaṅkāyanas (Salakenoi), for

1 E.g., Navamara—perhaps really identical with the port of Calliensa (Kalyāṇa, an ancient name of which, according to the Bombay Gazetteer, XIV. 114, is Navanaagara).
2 Vāsishṭhaas figure as rulers of Koṅga in later times.
3 A Kanākiputra Śatakarni is known from a coin (Bibliography of Indian coins, Part I, 1930, p. 86).
example, who appear to have been a feudatory family in the Andhra country, afterwards set up an independent sovereignty. The Pallavas were doubtless connected with the military governors of the Bellary district.

The Śatakārṇīs of Kuntala.

In the days of the great Gautamiputra, son of Bala Śrī, Banavāsi or Vaijayantī (Kanara) seems to have been the capital of an imperial province under an amātya named Sivagupta. By an obscure transition the sovereignty of the territory passed into the hands of a family, possibly styled Čhuṭu in inscriptions,¹ whose connection with the Śatavāhana-Śatakārṇīs is not known. The evidence of the Myakadoni inscription and notices in the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, the Gāthāsaptasati and the Kāvya Mimāṃsā, probably suggest that a group of Śatavāhanas preceded the so-called Čhuṭu kula in Kuntala or the Kanarese country. Some of them were great patrons of Prākrit learning. The most famous amongst them was Hāla. Another king of the group was Kuntala Śatakārṇī, mentioned in the Kāmasūtra whom the Purāṇas regard as a predecessor of Hāla. The Čhuṭu line is represented by Hāritiputra Vishnukaḍa-Čhuṭu kulānanda Śatakārṇī, Rājā of Vaijayantīpura, and his daughter’s son Śiva-Skandanāga Śrī who is identified by Rapson with Skandanāga Śataka of a Kanheri Inscription, and also with Hāritiputra Siva-[Skanda]-varman, lord of Vaijayantī, mentioned in a Malavalli record (in the Shimoga district of Mysore). The last identification seems to be doubtful as the mother and daughter of Vishnukaḍa could hardly

¹ Some scholars do not accept the theory that Čhuṭu is a dynastic designation. They regard it as a personal name. Prog. Rep. of the ASI. W. Circle, 1911-12, p. 5.
have belonged to the same gotra. Haritiputra Sivavaran was apparently succeeded by the Kadambas.¹

¹ The Kadamba line was founded by Mayūraśarman, a Brāhmaṇa, who rose against the Pallavas and helped by “Vrihad Bāṇa” and other kings, compelled the lord of Kañchi to confer on him the Paṭṭabandha of military governorship. He soon pushed his conquests to the western ocean. His great-grandson Kākusha varman gave his daughters in marriage to the Guptas and other kings. Krisha varman I performed the Aśvamedha. Mrigaśa varman defeated the Gaṅgas and Pallavas and had his capital at Vaijayanti. Junior branches of the family ruled at Palāśikī, Uchehaśrīngi and Triparvata. The Kadambas were finally overthrown by the Chalukyas. See Morace, Kadamba-Kula; Sirerar, JIH, 1936, 301 ff.
SECTION III. THE SAKAS OF UJJAIN AND KATHIWAR.

The greatest rivals of the restored Sātavāhana Empire were at first the Saka Kshatrapas of Ujjain. The progenitor of the Saka princes of Ujjain was Ysamotika who was the father of Chashtana, the first Mahākshatrapa of the family. The name of Ysamotika is Scythic. 1 His descendant, who was killed by Chandra Gupta II, is called a Saka king by Bāna in his Harsha-charita. It is, therefore, assumed by scholars that the Kshatrapa family of Ujjain was of Saka nationality.

The proper name of the dynasty is not known. Rapson says that it may have been Kārddamaka. The daughter of Rudradāman boasts that she is descended from the family of Kārddamaka kings; but she may have been indebted to her mother for this distinction. The Kārddamaka kings apparently derive their name from the Kārdama, a river in Persia. 2

According to Dubreuil, Chashtana ascended the throne in A.D. 78, and was the founder of the Saka era. But this is improbable in view of the fact that the capital of Chashtana (Tiastanes) was Ujjain (Ozene of Ptolemy), whereas we learn from the Periplus that Ozene was not a capital in the seventies of the first century A.D. 3 The Periplus speaks of Ozene as a former capital, implying that it was not a capital in its own time.

---

1 JRAS, 1906, p. 211. Lövi and Konow (Corpus, II. i. lxx) identify Ysamotika with Bhūmaka on the ground that the Saka word “Ysama” means earth. But identity of meaning of names need not necessarily prove identity of persons. Cf. the cases of Kumāra Gupta and Skanda Gupta.

2 Pārasika. Shamassurîy’s translation of the Kaunītiya, p. 86. See also IHQ, 1933, 37 ff. Cf. the Artemis of Ptolemy, VI. 11. 2, a tributary of the Oxus.

3 The Periplus mentions Malichos (Maliku), the king of the Nabataeans, who died in A.D. 75, and Zoscales (Za Hakale), king of the Auxumites, who reigned from A.D. 75 to 80 (JRAS, 1917, 827-830).
The earliest known date of Chashṭana is S. E. 52, i.e., A.D. 130. We learn from the Andhau inscriptions that in the year A.D. 130 Chashṭana was ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman. Professor Rapson and Dr. Bhandarkar point out that his foreign title Kṣhatrapa, and the use of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet on his coins, clearly show that he was a viceroy of some northern power—probably of the Kushāns. Jayadāman, son of Chashṭana, seems to have acted merely as a Kṣhatrapa and to have predeceased his father, and the latter was succeeded as Mahākṣatrapa by Rudradāman.

Rudradāman¹ became an independent Mahākṣatrapa some time between the years 52 and 72 (A.D. 130 and 150). We learn from the Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of the year 72 that men of all castes chose him as protector and that he won for himself the title of Mahākṣatrapa. This probably indicates that the power of his house had been shaken by some enemy (possibly Gautamiputra), and he had to restore the supreme satrapal dignity by his own prowess.

The place names in the inscription seem to show that the rule of Rudradāman extended over Purv-āpar-Ākar-Āvanti (East and West Mālwa), Anupa-nivrit or the Mābhishmati region (Mandhāṭā in Nimāḍ, or Mahēśvara),² Ānartta³ (territory around Dwārakā), Surāśṭra (district

1 For references to Rudradāman in literature, see Chatterjee, Buddhist Studies (ed. Law), pp. 384 ff.
2 IA, 4, 346.
3 Ānartta may according to some, however, designate the district around Vaḍaragara (Bom. Gaz. 1, i, 6). In that case Kukura may be placed in the Dwārakā region. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa refers to Dwārakā as "Kukur-Andhaka-Vṛishṇībhiḥ guptā" (11, 11, 10). The Vāyu Purāṇa (ch. 96. 134) represents Ugrasena, the Yādava rājā as Kukurodhava, of Kukura extraction. In Mbb. III. 183. 82, too, Kukuras are closely associated with Daśārhas and Andhakas who are known to have been Yādava clans. In II. 59. 15 they
around Junāgadh), Svabhra (the country on the banks of the Sābarmati), Maru (Mārwār), Kachchha (Cutch), Sindhu-Sauvira (the Lower Indus Valley), 1 Kukura (probably between Sind and the Pāriyātra Mt.), 2 Aparānta (N. Koṅkan), 3 Nishāda (in the region of the Sarasvati and the Western Vindhya), 4 etc. Of these places Surāshṭra, Kukura, Aparānta, Anupa and Ākāravanti formed part of Gautamiputra’s dominions, and must have been conquered either from that king or one of his immediate successors. The Junāgadh inscription gives the information that Rudradāman twice defeated Sātakarni, lord of the Deccan, but did not destroy him on account of their near relationship. According to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar this Sātakarni was Gautamiputra himself, whose son Vāsishṭhiputra Sātakarni was Rudradāman’s son-in-law. According to Rapson the lord of the Deccan defeated by the Saka ruler are associated with the Ambashṭbas and the Pahlavas. A branch of the people may have lived in the lower valley of the Chenab and the Indus, while another branch occupied a portion of Kāṭhiawār.

1 Sindhu is the inland portion lying to the west of the Indus (Watters, Yuan Chüang, II. 252, 253, read with 255; Vatsyāyana. Kāmasūtra, Benares Ed. 295). Sauvira includes the littoral (Mihinda Pañko, S. B. E., XXXVI, 269), as well, as the inland portion lying to the east of the Indus as far as Mūlān (Alberuni, I, 302; IA, 7, 269). The Jaina Pravachanasāroddhāra names Vitabhaya as the capital.

2 Brihat Saṁhitā, V, 71; XIV, 4.

3 Aparānta in its extended sense (cf. Aśoka, RE, V) no doubt embraces not only Śūrpaśaka but Nāsik, Bharukachchha, the Mahi valley, Cutch, Surāśṭra, Ānarta, Abu, etc. (Vāyu, 45, 129 f., Matsya, 114. 50-51; Mārk. 57, 49 f.—the Purānic text is corrupt and Śūrpaśaka Kachchhiyāḥ and Ānartaḥ should be substituted for Śūryārakaḥ, Kāśmirāḥ and Āvantaḥ). But as the Junāgadh record distinguishes Aparānta from Surāśṭra, Ānarta, etc., it is clearly used here in its restricted sense.

4 Cf. Nishāda-rāṣṭra, Mbb., III. 130. 4 (the place of the disappearance—Vinādana—of the river Sarasvati is described as the dvāra of Nishādarāṣṭra); note also Pāriyātra-charaḥ, Mbb., XII, 135, 3-5. In Mbb. ii, 31, 4-7 a Nishādabhūmi is placed between the Matsyas (of Jaipur) and the Chambal. The Vedic commentator Mahādhara explains the word Nishāda as meaning a Bhil (Vedic Index, I. 454). According to Bühler (IA, 7, 263) Nishāda probably corresponded with Hisar and Bhatnīr,
was Pulumāyi. It is more probable that the defeated ruler was Vāsishṭhiputra Sātakarnī himself, who may have been a brother and a predecessor of Pulumāyi.

The Great Satrap also conquered the Yaudheyas, possibly of Johiya-bār along the Sutlej, who are known, from a stone inscription, to have occupied also the Bijayagaḍh region in the Bharatpur state. If the Kushān chronology accepted by us be correct, then he must have wrested Sindhu-Sauvira from one of the successors of Kanishka I.

Rudradāman apparently held his court at Ujjain, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of his grandfather Chashtana, placing the provinces of Ānarta and Surāśṭra under his Pahlava (Parthian) Amāṭya1 Suviśākha. The Amāṭya constructed a new dam on the famous Sudarśana Lake which owed its origin to the “care bestowed by the Maurya government upon question of irrigation, even in the most remote provinces.”

The Great Kṣatrapa is said to have gained fame by studying grammar (śābda), polity (arthā), music (gandharva), logic (nyāya), etc. As a test of the civilised character of his rule it may be noted that he took and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle. The Sudarśana embankment was rebuilt and the lake reconstructed by “expending a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by

1 With this bureaucratic designation is to be contrasted the title Rāja applied to Tushāspaha, the local ruler of Surāśṭra in the days of Aśoka, who “was more than a mere official” (IA, 7, 257 n). While some of the Saka provinces or districts were placed under amāṭyas or officers whose functions were mainly of a civil character, others seem to have been governed by generals (Mahādāndagaṇāyaka). The name of such a military governor is disclosed by a Sāṅchi inscription (JASE, 1923, 343).
exacting taxes (Kara), forced labour (Vishti) benevences (Pranaya), and the like.\textsuperscript{1} The king was helped in the work of government by an able staff of officials, who were "fully endowed with the qualifications of ministers" (amatyagauna samudyuktaih) and were divided into two classes, viz., Matisachiva (Counsellors) and Karma-sachiva (Executive Officers).

Rudradaman had at least two sons and one daughter. The princess was given in marriage to Vasishthiputra Sri Satakarni of the Satavahana family of the Deccan. A Nagarijunikonda inscription\textsuperscript{2} refers to a princess from Ujjain named Rudradhara Bhattharikā who was the queen (Mahadevi) of an Ikshvaku ruler of the Guṇṭūr district and some adjoining regions in the lower Krishnā valley. It has been surmised by Vogel that she probably belonged to the house of Chashtana. Her father is styled a Mahāraja, a title which seems to have been formally assumed by one of the latest successors of Rudradaman I, viz., Svāmi-Rudrasena III, who ruled from c. A.D. 348 to 378, and was, apparently, a contemporary of Samudra-Gupta. It is, however, difficult to say if the Ikshvaku queen was a daughter of Rudrasena III or of some earlier prince.

Rudradaman I, was succeeded by his eldest son Dāmaghsada I. After Dāmaghsada there were, according to Rapson, two claimants for the succession: his son Jivādaman and his brother Rudra Simha I. The struggle was eventually decided in favour of the latter. To Rudra Simha’s reign belongs the Gunda inscription of the year 103 (= A.D. 181) which records the digging of a tank by an Ābhira general named Rudradhūti, son of the general Bāpaka or Bāhaka. The Ābhiras afterwards

\textsuperscript{1} Bomb. Gaz. I, 1, 39.
\textsuperscript{2} Ep. Ind., XX, 1 ff.
possibly usurped the position of Mahākṣhatrapa. According to Dr. Bhandarkar an Ābhira named Īśvaradatta was the Mahākṣhatrapa of the period 188-90 A.D. But Rapson places Īśvaradatta after A.D. 236.

Rudra Simha I was followed by his sons Rudrasena I, Saṅghadāman and Dāmasena. Three of Dāmasena’s sons became Mahākṣhatrapa, viz., Yaśodāman, Vijaysena and Dāmajada Śrī. This last prince was succeeded by his nephew Rudrasena II who was followed by his sons Viśvasimha and Bhartridāman. Under Bhartridāman his son Viśvasena served as Kṣatrapa.

The connection of Bhartridāman and Viśvasena with the next Mahākṣhatrapa Rudradāman II and his successors cannot be ascertained. The last known member of the line was Rudra Simha III who ruled up to at least A.D. 388.

Rapson points out that from A.D. 295 to c. 340 there was no Mahākṣhatrapa. The elder branch of the family came to an end after 305 and passed by an obscure transition to a new line of Satraps and Great Satraps. The rulers from A.D. 295 to 332 held only the subordinate title of Satrap, and the higher title was not revived till a few years before A.D. 348, when Rudrasena III styled himself Rājā Mahākṣhatrapa and Mahārāja Kṣatrapa. Now, it is precisely during the period when the old line passed away in obscurity, and the office of Mahākṣhatrapa remained in abeyance, that we find Sakasthāna and portions of Hind annexed to the Sassanian empire and dominated by Sassanian viceroyos. The Sassanian conquest began before the end of the reign of Varhrān (Bahlām) II (A. D. 293) and the Sassanian suzerainty

1. To Rudrasena’s reign belong the Mulwasar tank inscription, and the Jasdhan Pillar Inscription of A. D. 205. In the latter epigraph we have the title Bhadramukha applied to all the ancestors of Rudrasena, excepting Jayadāma.
was maintained till the early part of the reign of Shāpūr II (A.D. 309-79). The hold of the Persians on the distant Indian provinces became weak in the middle of the fourth century A.D. when Rudrasena III assumed the title of Mahārāja, and Samudra Gupta, the prototype of the Raghu of Kālidāsa, forced the foreign potentates of the north-west borderland to do him homage.

The revived power of the Sakas of Western India did not last long, being finally destroyed by the Guptas. Already in the time of Samudra Gupta the Sakas appear among the peoples who hastened to buy peace by the offer of maidens and other acts of respectful submission. The Udayagiri Inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II testify to that monarch’s conquest of Eastern Mālwa. One of the Inscriptions commemorates the construction of a cave by a minister of Chandra Gupta who “came here, accompanied by the king in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world.” The subjugation of western Mālwa is probably hinted at by the epithet “Simha-vikrānta-gāmini,” resorting to (as a vassal of) Simha Vikrama, i.e., Chandra Gupta II, applied to Naravarman of Mandasor.¹ Evidence of the conquest of Surāśṭra is to be seen in Chandra Gupta’s silver coins which are imitated from those of Saka Satraps. Lastly, Bāṇa in his Harsha-charita refers to the slaying of the Saka king

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, 1913, p. 162. The small copper coins of Chandra Gupta II bearing a vase as type were probably struck by him in the Mālava territory which may have been under Saka domination in the second century A.D. (Allan, *CICAI*, cvi).
by Chandra Gupta: \( Ar(1?) \) ipure cha para-kalatra kāmukam kāmini-veṣaguptaścha Chandra Guptaḥ Saka-patim aṣātayaditi.¹

¹ According to the commentator Saṅkara, the Paṇakalatra and Kāmini referred to above was Dhrūva-devi, and the ruler of the Sakas was secretly killed by Chandragupta disguised as Dhrūva-devi while the former was making advances of love. The Śṛṅgāraprakāśa by Bhoja throws additional light on the point quoting passages from the Devichandraguptam (see Aiyangar Com. Vol., 359 ff; also Lévi, J. A., 1923, 271 ff; Devichandraguptam by A. Rangaswami Sarasvati, Ind. Ant., 1923, p. 181 ff.) The last mentioned work is a play by Viśākhadatta, the author of the Mudrārūkṣhap. Quotations from the Devichandraguptam are also found in the Nāṭya darpaṇa of Rāmāchandra and Guṇāchandra.
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SECTION IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF THE
SCYTHIAN PERIOD. ¹

The little that we know about the administration of the Scythian Epoch leaves no room for doubt that the institutions of the age were not haphazard improvisations of military upstarts, having no relations with the past, but a highly developed and organised system—the fruit of the labours of generations of political theorists and practical statesmen (Vaktri-Prayoktri).

The influence of political thinkers (Arthachintakas) on Indo-Scythian Polity is evident. The ablest among the princes of the time assiduously studied the science of polity (Arthavidya); ² and the care taken to train the occupant of the throne, the employment of officers endowed with ministerial qualifications (Amatyaguna), the classification of ministers and other high officials (Sachivas), abstention from oppressive imposition of Pranaya (Benevolences), Vishiti (forced labour) etc., and the solicitude for the welfare of the Pauras and Janapadas, people of cities as well as country parts, clearly show that the teaching of the writers of treatises on polity (Arthaśāstra) was not lost upon the Scythian conquerors of India. There was no great cleavage with the past,

¹ The expression "Scythian Period" has been used in this section in a broad sense to denote the epoch of all the Post-Mauryan dynasties that ruled in India during the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. During the greater part of this period the most powerful potentate in India was the Scythian "King of Kings" who had his metropolis in the North-West, but whose commands were not unfrequently obeyed on the banks of the Ganges and the Godāvari. See Cal. Rev., Sept., 1859.

² The Janāgad inscription of Rudralaśman (Ind. Ant., 1878, p. 261; Ep. Ind., VIII, 36 f.).
and the references to Mahāmātras,1 Rajjukas,2 and Samcharāntaka or Saṅchārin3 spies, indicate that the official machinery of the Maurya period had not ceased to function at least in Southern India.

But we must not suppose that the entire administrative structure of the period was a replica of the Maurya constitution. The foreign conquerors of North-Western India brought with them several institutions which had been prevalent for ages in the countries through which they passed. Thus the Persian system of government by Satraps was introduced in several provinces of Northern, Western and Southern India, and officials with the Greek titles of Meridarch4 (probably District Officer) and Strategos (general or governor) ruled contemporaneously with functionaries having the Indian designation of Amātya (minister or civil officer in charge of a district) and Mahāsenāpati (great general or military governor).

The tide of Scythian invasion could not sweep away the tribal republics which continued to flourish as in the days of Buddha and Alexander. Inscriptions and coins testify to the existence of many such communities, and like the Lichchhavis and Sākyas of old, the most powerful among them were found very often ranged against their aggressive royal neighbours who were now mostly Scythian. Unfortunately, the contemporary records do not throw much light

---

1 Lüders' Ins., Nos. 937, 1144. Note the employment of a Śramaṇa as Mahāmātra (High Officer) by a Sātavāhana ruler.
2 Ins. Nos. 416, 1195. The Rajjukas were Surveyors and Judges in the country parts.
3 Ins., No. 1200; cf. IA, 5, 52, 155.
4 A Meridarkha Thāḍāra is mentioned in a Swāt Kharoshthī epigraph. Another Meridarkha is mentioned in a Taxila Kharoshthī Inscription. The two meridarchas are mentioned as establishing Buddhist relics and sanctuaries (Corpus, II. i. xv).
5 E.g., the Mālavas (Mālayas), Yaudheyas, Arjunāyanas and possibly the Audumbharas, Kulūtas, Kunindas (see Camb. Hist., 528, 529), and Uttamabhadrās. Cf. Smith, Catalogue of Coins, Sec. VII.
on their internal organisation, and it serves no useful purpose to ascribe to them institutions which really belong to their predecessors or successors.

Though the Scythians could not annihilate the republican clans, they did destroy many monarchies of Northern and Western India, and introduce a more exalted type of kingship. The exaltation of monarchy is apparent from two facts, namely, the assumption of high-sounding semi-divine honorifics by reigning monarchs, and the apotheosis of deceased rulers. The deification of rulers, and the use of big titles are not unknown to ancient Indian literature, but it is worthy of note that a supreme ruler like Asoka, whose dominions embraced the greater part of India and possibly Afghanistan, was content with the titles of "Rājā" and "Devaṇampiṭa Piyādasi." The great rulers of the Scythian age, on the other hand, were no longer satisfied with those modest epithets, but assumed more dignified titles like Chakravartin (emperor of a circle of states), Adhirāja (super-king), Rājātirāja (supreme king of kings), and Devaputra (the son and not merely the beloved of the gods).

In Southern India we come across titles of a semi-religious character like Kshemarāja, Dharma-Mahārāja-dhirāja and Dharma-Yuvamahārāja, assumed by pious defenders of Indian faiths, engaged in upholding dharma as practised by the ancient teachers and law-givers, and

1 'Of Gracious Mien, Beloved of the Gods.'
2 Lüders' Ins., No. 1345. 'The beneficent or propitious king', 'prince of peace'.
EXALTATION OF MONARCHY

purging it of the evils of the Kali Age, probably to distinguish themselves from the unbelieving foreigners and barbarian outcasts of the North-West.

The assumption of big titles by kings and emperors was paralleled by the use of equally exalted epithets in reference to their chief consorts. Asoka's queens appear to have been styled merely Devī. The mother of Tivara, for instance, is called "Dutā Devī" (the second queen) and the implication is that the elder queen was Prathamā Devī. But in the Seythian epoch we come across the titles of Agra-Mahishā and Mahāderī which distinguished the chief queen from her rivals. Among such chief consorts may be mentioned Ayasi-Kamuia, Nāganikā, and Balasrī.

The apotheosis of deceased rulers is strikingly illustrated by the practice of erecting Devakulas or "Royal galleries of portrait statues." The most famous of these structures was the Devakula of the Pitāmaha (grandfather) of Huvishka referred to in a Mathurā inscription. The existence of royal Devakulas as well as ordinary temples,

1 It is a characteristic of Indian history that imperial titles of one period became feudatory titles in the next. Thus the title Rājā used by Asoka became a feudatory title in the Seythian and Gupta periods, when designations like Rājārajā, Rājādhirāja, Mahārajādhirāja, Parama-Bhataṭaraka and Parama-Rājādhirāja (Allau, 63), came into general use. But even Mahārajādhirāja became a feudatory designation in the age of the Pratihāras when the loftier style of Paramabhaṭṭaraka, Mahārajādhirāja, Parmesvara was assumed by sovereign rulers.

2 JRAS, 1924, p. 462. For images of later kings, cf. Beginnings of South Indian History, 144, 153; Raverty, Tabaqāt, I, 622 (effigy of Bikramaśajit); C. S. Srinivasachari, The Evolution of Political Institutions of South India, Section IV. ("The Young Men of India." June and July, 1924), p. 5. Images of Sundara Chola and one of his queens were set up in the Tanjore temple and deified. C. V. Vaidya (Mediaeval Hindu India, I, 95) refers to the prevalence of the custom of raising some temples at the place of burning the dead body of the kings. But it is not clear if the temples contained images of the dead king and his queens. The deification and worship of the dead kings may be compared to devapitrāpūjā referred to in the Kaṭṭilīga (II. 6).
and the presence of the living Devaputra probably earned for Mathurā its secondary name of "The city (?) of the gods."

The exaltation of royalty in the epoch under review had the sanction of certain writers on kingly duty (Rājadharma) who represented the king as a "mahāti devatā," a great divinity, in human shape. But it was probably due in the first instance to the Scythians who acted as carriers of Persian, Chinese and Roman ideas of kingship. The title Rājātirāja, supreme king overpassing other kings, as Rapson points out, is "distinctively Persian." "It has a long history from the Xshāyathiyānām Xshāyathiya" of the inscriptions of Darius down to the Shāhān Shāh of the present day." The Kusān epithet "Devaputra" is apparently of Chinese origin, being the literal translation of the Chinese emperors' title "Son of Heaven" (Tien-tze; tien tzu). If Lüders is to be believed, one at least of the Indo-Scythian sovereigns (Kanishka of the Ārā Inscription)

1 For a different suggestion see Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, 262. Tarn prefers to translate Ptolemy's phrase as 'daughter of the gods'. But see Lévi, JA, 1915, p. 91.

2 The titles 'Theos' and 'Theotropos' were used by certain Indo-Greek rulers, but their example does not seem to have been widely followed. Gondophernes, it is true, calls himself Devavarta, but not yet Deva or Devaputra. As to the theory that the Kusāns had been invested competitively with the title "son of the gods" in opposition to the Huungnu rather than to the Chinese, it has to be admitted that there is no definite evidence that the title in question originated with the Huungnu, and was not borrowed in ancient times from the Chinese. Pace B. C. Law Volume, II. 305 ff. The Kusāns had direct contact with the Chinese in the time of Panchao.

3 Cf. the use of the term 'Kshiprita' in connection with the subversion of the Sūṅga sovereignty by Simuka. The expressions Kṣatrasya Kṣatras (Bṛihad Aranyaka Upanishad, I. 4. 14), Adhirāja, Chakravartin, etc., are, no doubt, known to our ancient literature. But there is no proof of the use of the last two as formal styles of sovereigns till the Post-Mauryan period, while the first is never so used.

4 JRAS, 1897, 203; 1912, 671, 682. Allan, Coins of the Gupta Dynasties xxvii. Aratbana (I or II) called himself 'son of a God' (Tarn, The Greeks,
assumed the Roman title of "Kaisar," and the dedication of temples in honour of emperors on the banks of the Tiber may have had something to do with the practice of erecting Devakulas on the banks of the Jumna.

A remarkable feature of the Scythian Age was the wide prevalence of the system of Dvairājya or Diarchy in Northern and Western India and Yauvarājya (rule of a crown-prince) in N. W. India and the Far South. Under both these forms of government the sovereign's brother, son, grandson, or nephew had an important share in the administration as co-ruler or subordinate colleague. In a Dvairājya or Diarchy the rulers appear to have been of equal status, but in a Yauvarājya (rule of a crown-prince) the reigning prince was apparently a viceroy. As instances of Dvairājya may be mentioned the cases of Lysias and Antialkidas, Agathokleia and Strato I, Strato I and Strato II, Spalirises and Aces, Hagāna and Hagāmasha, Gondophernes and Gad, Gondophernes and Abdagases, Chashtana and Rudradāman, Kanishka II and Huvishka etc., etc. Among ruling Yauvarājas may be mentioned Kharaosta and the Pallava Yuva-Mahārājas Siva-Śkanda-varman, Vijaya-Buddha-varman and Vishnu-gopa of Palakkada.

The king or viceroy, resided in cities called Adhishṭhāna. The number of such Adhishṭhānas and various other kinds of cities (Nagara, Nagari), was fairly numerous. But regarding their administration our information is very meagre. We hear of "nigama-sabhās"

---

p. 92). This may suggest Greek influence too. Some writers fail to distinguish between occurrence of similar royal epithets in literature and their formal use in contemporary epigraphic records in the time of the Kings themselves (B. C. Law Volume, II, pp. 305 ff).
or town councils and of a city official called Nagarākshadarśa whose functions are nowhere distinctly stated in the inscriptions but seem to have been similar to those of the Nagara-vyāvahārikas, or city judges, of the Maurya Age.

Regarding general administration, and the government of provinces, districts and villages, we have more detailed information. The designations of some of the highest officers of state did not differ from those in vogue during the Maurya period. Mahāmātras, and Rajjukas play an important part in the days of the Sātavāhanas and Scythians as in the time of Aśoka. But side by side with these functionaries we hear of others who do not figure in inscriptions of the Maurya Epoch although some of them appear in the Arthaśāstra attributed to Kauṭilya.

The officers most intimately associated with the sovereign were the privy councillors,—the Matisachivas of the Junāgadhi epigraph and the Rahasyādhihṛpta of the Pallava grants. Among other prominent court officials must be mentioned the Rāja Vaidya, Royal Physician, and the Rāja Lipikara, Royal Scribe.

No less important than the privy councillors were the high military officials—the Mahāsenāpati, the Daṇḍanāyaka and the Mahādaṇḍa-nāyaka who probably

1 KHI, 296; Lüder’s Ins., No. 1851 (Udayagiri Cave Inscription). Cf. Akshadaria, Patañjali, Index of Words. Oka, Amarakośa, 123; Agni Purāṇa, 366, 3; Vin. iii. 47. According to the last mentioned text the ‘akkhadassas’ constituted a class of Mahāmattas, like their prototypes in the time of Aśoka. In later ages the Akshadaria might have had revenue functions. Cf. Kahlra’s comment on the passage from the Amarakośa referred to above. The duties of the Akshapatralikas of the Gupta period may be mentioned in this connection.

2 Ins., 1190-93.

3 Ins., 271; Kauṭ., II, 10.

4 1124, 1146.

correspond to the Senāpati and Nāyaka of the Kauṭiliya Arthasastra. These important functionaries had probably under them subordinates like Senāgopas (captains), Gaulmikas (commanders of platoons), Arakshādhikrītas (guards), Aśvavārakas (troopers), Bhaṭamanushyas (mercenaries), etc.

We have already referred to one class of civil officers (Amātyas or Sachivas), viz., the Mati sачivas (counsellors). There was another class of Amātyās who served as executive officers (Karma Sachivas). From them were chosen governors, treasurers, superintendents, and secretaries as in the days of Megasthenes.

Among treasury officials mention is made of the Gaṇjavara, the Koshṭhāgārika and the Bhaṇḍāgārika who was one of the principal ministers of state (Rājāmātya). But we have no epigraphic reference to the Sannīḍhāṭrī (lit. piler) or the Samāhāṛī (collector) till the days of the Śaila kings of the Vindhyas and the Somavaṁśi kings of Kosala. The main heads of revenue received into the Bhaṇḍāgāra or Kośa (treasury) were, as enumerated in the Junāgaḍh Inscription, Bali (extra tribute), Sulk (duty), and Bhāga (customary share of the king). These sufficed to fill the exchequer of a benevolent prince like Rudradāman with

1 Kauṭ., Bk. X. Ch. 1, 2, 5.
2 Lüders' Ins., 1200; Ep. Ind., XIV, 155; cf. Manu, VII, 190.
3 Lüders, 1200.
4 Lüders, 381, 728.
5 Lüders, 1200.
6 Lüders' Ins., 965.
7 1141.
8 1166.
9 1195.
10 Lüders, 82; Rājatarāṅgini, V. 177. Note the employment of a Brāhmaṇa treasurer by a Scythian ruler.
11 Ep. Ind., XX, 28.
12 Lüders, 1141.
66–1829B.
kanaka (gold), rajata (silver), vajra (diamond), vaiduryaratna (beryl), etc. Rulers less scrupulous than the Mahakshatrapa doubtless oppressed the people with arbitrary imposts, forced labour and benevolences (kara-vishṭi-praṇaya-kiṛiyā-bhīḥ). Besides the Bāṇḍāgāra whose existence is implied by Lüders' Ins., No. 1141, we have reference to the storehouse, Kosṭhāgāra, which is described in Book II, Chapter 15, of the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra. The inscriptions afford us glimpses of the way in which the revenue was spent. The attempts to provide for "pāṇiya" or drinkable water are specially noteworthy. The Junāgadh Inscription tells us how "by the expenditure of a vast amount of money from his own treasury" a great Scythian ruler and his amātya restored the Sudarśana lake. References to the construction or repair of tanks, wells, lakes and other reservoirs of water, Pushkarinīs, udāpanas, hradas or taḍāgas, are fairly common. Lüders' Ins., No. 1137, makes mention of makers of hydraulic engines (Audayantrika), while another epigraph refers to a royal official called Pāṇiyaghārīka or superintendent of waterhouses. Inscription No. 1186, after recording the gift of a taḍāga (pond), a nāga (statue of a serpent deity) and a vīhāra (pleasance, monastery), refers to the Amātya Śkandasvāti who was the Karmāntika (superintendent of works), an official designation known to the Arthaśāstra.¹

In the department of Foreign Affairs we have the Dāta (envoy or messenger), but we do not as yet hear of dignitaries like the Sāmdhivigrāhīka (officer in charge

¹ In Ins. No. 937.
² Lüders, 1979.
³ Bk. I, Ch. 12.
of peace and war) and Kumārāmātya who figure so prominently in inscriptions of the Gupta and Post-Gupta periods.

Inscriptions of the period under review refer also to officials like the Mahāśāmiyas who preserved records, and others whose exact functions and status are nowhere indicated. Amongst these may be mentioned the Abhyantaropasthāyaka, 'servant of the interior (harem ?)', Māḍabika, Tūthika and Neyika.

The big empires of North-Western India were split up into vast satrapies and smaller provinces ruled by Mahākshatrapas and Kshatrapas. The satrapies as well as the kingdoms outside the limits of the Scythian Empire, were divided into districts called Rāshṭra, Āhāra, Janapada, Desa or Vishaya. We do not as yet hear of the organisation into Bhūktis (lit. allotments, administrative divisions) so widely prevalent in Post-Scythian times. Rāshṭra, Āhāra (or Hāra) and Janapada seem to have been synonymous terms in this age, as is proved by the case of the Sātahani-rāttha (rāshṭra) or Sātavāhani-hāra which is styled a janapada in the Myakadoni Inscription. The chief officer in a Rāshṭra or Āhāra was the Rāshṭrapati, Rāshṭrika (Rāṭhika) or Amātya. The Amātya Suviśākha, for instance, governed Surāshṭra.

1 Kumāra means 'a youth', 'a prince'. Hence Kumārāmātya may mean 'junior minister', or 'prince's minister'. The word Kumāra as the opposite of Paundha may correspond to Chikka, Chenna or Immaḍi of the South. Another interpretation is also possible. Kumārāmātya may mean an amātya from one's youth just as Kumāra-sevaka means ākaumārāparichārakah.

2 For another interpretation see JBBRAS, N.S., IV, 1928, pp. 64, 72; IHQ, 1933, 221. In the opinion of V. S. Bakhle the Mahāśāmiyas "seems to refer to the resolution of the corporate assembly of the city or to that body itself."

3 The word Māḍabika may perhaps be connected with Māḍamba of the Jaina Kalpaśutra, 89. Para. 62 refers to an official styled Māḍambiya (Burgomaster).

4 Sircar equates Neyika with Naiyogika.
under the Mahâkshatrâpa Rudradâman. The Amâtyas Vishnupalita, Syâmaka, and Śiva-skanda-datta successively governed the Āhâra or district of Govardhana (Nâsik) in the time of Gautamiputra Śatakarnî and Pulumâyi, while the neighbouring Āhâra of Mâmâla (Poona District) was under an Amâtya whose name ended in—Gupta. In the Far South the chief officer of the Āhâra seems to have been called ‘Vyāprita.’ The Janapadas, particularly those on vulnerable frontiers, were sometimes placed under the charge of military governors (Strategos, Mahâsenâpati, Mahâdaṇḍanâyaka, etc.). The Janapada of Śatavâhani-hâra was, for instance, under the Mahâsenâpati Skandânâga. Part of Eastern Mâlwa seems to have been governed by a Saka Mahâdaṇḍanâyaka shortly before its annexation by the Imperial Guptas and portions of the Indian borderland, were governed by a line of Strategoi (Aspavaran, Sasa) under Azes and Gondophernes.

Deśa, too, is often used as a synonym of Râšstra, or Janapada. It was under a Deśâdhikrita, the Deshmukh of mediaeval times, an officer mentioned in the Hîrâhâdagalli grant of Śiva-Skanda-varman. The next smaller unit was apparently the Vishaya governed by the Vishayapati. But sometimes even ‘Vishaya’ was used as a synonym of Deśa or Râšstra, and there were cases in the Post-Gupta period of the use of the term to designate a larger area than a Râšstra.

The smallest administrative units were the villages called Grâma or Grâmâhâra, and the smaller towns or

---

1 Lüders, 1827, 1828.
2 Cf. the Myakadoni Inscription.
3 For an amâtya named Sasa, see the Koçavali Rock Inscription of the Sâtavâhani king Śrî Chaṅdâ Śâti or Śâta (Ep. Ind., XVIII, 318).
4 929m (Lüders).
5 Fleet, CIII, 32 n.
6 Lüders, Ins. No. 1195.
emporia called Nigama. The affairs of a Grāma were controlled by officers styled Grāmeyika Ayutta who were apparently headed by the Grāmanī, Grāmika, Grāmabhōjaka or (Grāma) Mahattaraka. Lüders' (Mathurā) Inscription, No. 48, gives the names of two such Grāmikas, Jayadeva and Jayanāga. In Southern India we have the curious title "Muludā" applied to the head of a village. The chief men of the Nigamas were the Gahapatis, the counterparts of the Grāmavṛiddhas of villages. In Lüders' Inscription, No. 1153, we have evidence of the corporate activity of a dhamma-nigama headed by the Gahapati. The Grāma and Nigama organisation was the most durable part of the Ancient Indian system of government, and centuries of Scythian rule could not wipe it out of existence. The village and the Nigamas were also the nurseries of those ideas of associate life which found vent in the organisation of societies, committees, assemblies and corporations styled Goshṭhīs, Nikāyas, Parishads, Samghas etc., about which the inscriptions of the period speak so much. Not the least interesting of these institutions was the "Goshṭhī" which

1 In Pali literature Nigamas are distinguished from grāmas, villages, as well as from nagaras, cities which had strong ramparts and gateways (drīḍha prākāra torana).
2 1327.
3 1338.
4 48, 69a.
5 1200.
6 Ins., 1194. Cf. Murundā = lord (Saka). For the presence of Sakas in the Far South, see Ep. Ind., XX, 37.
7 Gahapati, house-lord, was a designation specially applied to the leading men of the gentry, the wealthy middle class, Kalyāna-bhattiko, men accustomed to a good dietary. They are often distinguished from priests and nobles (Rhys Davids and Stede).
8 Lüders' Ins., 273, 1332, 1335, 1338.
9 1133.
10 125, 925.
11 5, 1137.
afforded a field for co-operation between kings and villagers. Lüders’ Ins., Nos., 1332 to 1338, speak of a Goshṭhi which was headed by the Rājan, and which counted among its officials the son of a village headman.

A less pleasing feature of ancient Indian polity in the Scythian, as in other times, was the employment of spies, particularly of the “Saṃcharaṅtakas,” or wandering emissaries, whose functions are described with gruesome details in the Arthaśāstra. The evidence of foreign witnesses in Maurya and Gupta periods seems, however, to suggest that political morality did not actually sink so low as a study of the Arthaśāstra would lead us to think. Vatsyāyana probably voices the real feelings of his countrymen when he says that every single maxim for which there is provision in a theoretical treatise need not be followed in actual practice, because theoretical manuals have to be comprehensive, but practical application should have a limited range. No sane man will think of eating dog’s flesh simply because its flavour, tonic power, dressing, etc., are discussed in medical treatises.

Na śāstramastūtye tāvat prayoge kāraṇam bhavet śāstrārthān vyāpino vidyāt prayogāṁstvekadeśikān rasa-virya vipākā hi śvaṁāṁsasyāpi vaidyake kirtītā iti tat kim syād bhakṣhaṇīyam vichakṣhaṇaih.
CHAPTER X. THE GUPTA EMPIRE: THE RISE OF THE GUPTA POWER.

_Imām sāgaraparyantām Himavat-Vindhyā-kūḍālām mahīm ekātapatrāṅkām Rājasimha¹ praśāstu nah._

—Dūtavākyam.

SECTION I. THE FOUNDATION OF THE GUPTA DYNASTY

We have seen that the tide of Scythian conquest, which was rolled back for a time by the Sātavāhanas, was finally stemmed by the Gupta Emperors. It is interesting to note that there were many Guptas among the officials of the Sātavāhana conquerors of the Sakas e.g., Siva Gupta of the Nāsik Inscription of the year 18, (Pura or Puru?) Gupta of the Karle inscription, and Siva-Skanda Gupta of the same epigraph. It is difficult to say whether there was any connection between these Guptas and the Imperial Gupta family of Northern India, two of whom actually bore the names of Skanda Gupta and Purn Gupta.²

¹ With Rājasimha may be compared the epithet Narendrasimha occurring on coins of Chandragupta II (Allan, Gupta Coins, 43). All the letters here are not clearly legible (ibid, cxiii), but on many coins we find the analogous epithet Sinha-vikrama (pp. 38 ff.). The reference in the Dūtavākyā must be to a paramount ruler of Northern India, bounded by the seas and the Himalayan and Vindhyān ranges, who had the epithet 'lion-like king.' The ruler who answers best to the description is Chandra Gupta II. The author of the Dūtavākyā possibly refers to this monarch. If he is identical with Bhāsa, a distinguished predecessor of Kālidāsa, his career as a poet may have begun before the accession of Chandra Gupta II, Vikramādiṭya, 'Narendra-Simha,' i.e., in the time of the great patron and 'king of poets' (Kaviśāja) Samudrā Gupta.

² In the Modern Review (November), 1929, p. 499 f., it has been suggested that the Guptas are of Kārashāra origin. But the evidence on the point is hardly conclusive. The identification of the 'accursed' Chandraśena of the Kaumudimahotsava (adopted son of Sundaravarman), whose family was
Scions of the Gupta family are not often mentioned in old *Brāhmī* Inscriptions. The Ichchhāwar 1 Buddhist Statuette Inscription 2 mentions the benefaction of Mahādevī, queen of Śrī Hariḍāsa, sprung from the Gupta race (*Gupta-vamśodita*). A Bharhut Buddhist Pillar Inscription 3 of the Susa period refers to a "Gaupti" as the queen of Rājan Visadeva, and the grandmother of Dhanabhūti, probably a feudatory of the Sungas.

Traces of "Gupta" rule in Magadhā proper, or some neighbouring tract down the Ganges, are found as early as the second century A.D. 1-Tsing, a Chinese pilgrim, who travelled in India in the seventh century A.D., mentions a Mahārāja Śrī Gupta who built a temple near Mrīgasikhāvana 4 which was about forty yojanas uprooted (p. 500) with Chandra Gupta I, son of Mahārāja Śrī Ghaṭotkacha whose dynasty ruled gloriously for centuries, is clearly untenable. The mere fact that Lichchhavis helped Chaṇḍasena is not enough to prove that the prince in question is identical with Chandra Gupta I. Lichchhavis appear as enemies of Magadhā as early as the fifth century B.C. For a summary of the plot of the drama, which is attributed by some to a female writer, see Aiyangar *Com. Vol.*, 361ff. If Sundaravarman, and his son Kalyānavarman are real historical figures, and if they actually ruled over Magadhā, they must be placed either before Mahārāja Śrī Gupta or after Bālāditya (6th century A.D.). The memory of Varman adhipatya over Magadhā was fresh at the time of the Sirpur Stone Inscription of Mahāśīva Gupta (*Ep. Ind.*, XI, 191). Cf. also Pūrṇavarman and Devavarman mentioned by Chinese writers, as well as kings of the Maukhari line. The origin of the Imperial Gupta family is wrapped up in obscurity. We only know that they probably belonged to the Dhāraṇa gotra (*IHQ*, 1930, 565). They may have been related to Queen Dhārini, the chief consort of Agnimitra. Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out (IHQ, 1933, 930 ff.) that according to a Javanese text (*Tantri Kamandaka*) Mahārāja Aiśvaryapāla of the Ikshvāku race traced his genealogy to the family of Samudra Gupta. Little reliance can, however, be placed on the uncorroborated assertions of late writers. Even more unreliable is the testimony of works like the *Brāhīskottara Purāṇa* which, according to some critics, "is a palpable modern forgery" (*NHP*, VI. 133f). Cf. *Proceedings of the I. H. Congress*, 1944, pp. 119 ff.

1 Bānda District.
2 Lüders, No. 11.
3 Lüders, No. 687.
to the east of Nālandā, 'following the course of the Ganges.' Tsoing's date would place him about A.D. 175.\footnote{1 Dr. Majumdar in A New History of the Indian People, VI, 129; Dr. D. C. Ganguli, IHQ, XIV (1938), 332.} Allan rejects the date, and identifies Śrī Gupta, with Gupta the great-grandfather of Samudra Gupta, on the ground that it is unlikely that we should have two different rulers in the same territory, of the same name, within a brief period. But have we not two Chandra Guptas and two Kumāra Guptas within brief periods? There is no cogent reason for identifying Śrī Gupta of cir. A.D. 175, known to tradition, with Samudra Gupta's great-grandfather who must have flourished about a century later.

The names of Śrī Gupta's immediate successors are not known. The earliest name of a member of the Gupta family of Magadha which appears in inscriptions is that of Mahārāja Gupta who was succeeded by his son Mahārāja Ghaṭotkacha.\footnote{2 Allan, Gupta Coins, Introduction, p. xv. Cf. Ind. Ant., X (1881), 110.}
SECTION II. CHANDRA GUPTA I.

The first independent sovereign (Mahārājādhirāja) of the line was Chandra Gupta I, son of Ghaṭotkacha, who may have ascended the throne in 320 A.D., the initial date of the Gupta Era. Like his great fore-runner Bimbisāra he strengthened his position at some stage of his career, by a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Vaisāli or of Nepāl, and laid the foundations of the Second Magadhan Empire. The union of Chandra Gupta I with the Lichchhavi family is commemorated by a series of coins having on the obverse standing figures of Chandra Gupta and his queen, the Lichchhavi princess Kumāradevi, and on the reverse a figure of Lakṣmī, the goddess of luck with the legend "Lichchhavayah" probably signifying that the prosperity of Chandra Gupta was due to his Lichchhavi alliance. Smith suggests that the Lichchhavis were ruling in Pāṭaliputra as tributaries or feudatories of the Kushāns and that through his marriage Chandra Gupta succeeded to

1 In the Riddhapur plates (JASB, 1924, 69), however, Chandra Gupta I and even Samudra Gupta are called (carelessly) simply Mahārājas.

2 JRAS, 1893, 80; Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. IX, p. 21. The identity of the Gupta king with whom the era (Gupta-prahāla, Guptānaḥ kālā) of 320 A.D. originated, is by no means clear. The claims of Mahārāja Gupta (IHQ, 1942, 273 n) or even (less plausibly) of Samudra Gupta, cannot be altogether disregarded.

3 It is not suggested that the marriage took place after 320 A.D. The chronology of the Guptas before A.D. 380 is still in a state of uncertainty. Nothing definite can be stated about the relative date of the marriage till we know more about the length of Chandragupta I's reign, and the exact date of his accession, and that of his son and successor, Samudra Gupta. Some scholars think that Chandragupta I's alliance was with the ruling family of Nepāl (JRAS, 1889, p. 55) or of Pāṭaliputra (JRAS, 1893, p. 81).

4 There is difference of opinion among scholars regarding the attribution of these coins, see Altekar in Num. Suppl. No. XLVII, JRASB, III (1937), No. 3, 346. It is difficult to come to any final conclusion till the discovery of coins whose attribution to Chandragupta I is beyond doubt.
the power of his wife’s relatives. But Allan suggests that Pāṭaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Śrī Gupta’s time. ¹

From the record of Samudra Gupta’s conquests it has been deduced that his father’s rule was confined to Magadha and the adjoining territories. In the opinion of Allan the Purānic verses defining the Gupta dominions refer to his reign:

Anu-Gaṅgā-Prayāgamchā Sāketam Magadhāṁstathā
eTān jānapadān sārvān bhokṣhyante Guptavainśajāh.

"Kings born of the Gupta family will enjoy all these territories viz., Prayāga (Allahabad) on the Ganges, ² Sāketa (Oudh), and Magadhā (South Bihār)."

It will be seen that Vaiśāḷī (North Bihār) is not included in this list of Gupta possessions. Therefore, it is difficult to concur in Allan’s view that Vaiśāḷī was one of Chandra Gupta’s earliest conquests. Nor does Vaiśāḷī occur in the list of Samudra Gupta’s acquisitions, though the reference to Nepal as a border state in the famous Allahabad inscription may suggest that North Bihār was included within his dominions. It first appears definitely as a Gupta possession in the time of Chandra Gupta II, and constituted a viceroyalty under an imperial Prince. Prayaga (Allahabad) may have been conquered from a line of kings whose existence is disclosed in certain inscriptions discovered at Bhūṭā. ³ Two of these kings, Mahārāja Gautamiputra Śrī Sivamāgha and Rājan Vāsiṣṭhīputra Bhīmasena are

¹ Kielhorn’s North Indian Inscription, No. 541, however, suggests some connection between the Lichchhavīs and Pushpapura (Pāṭaliputra).


³ And Bandhogarh (Rewa)—Amrita Bazar Patrika, 11-10-38, p. 2; NHIP, VI, 41 ff. The Magha kings are also known from coins (Patērchpur hoard).
assigned by Marshall to the second or third century A.D. The name Śivamegha (or Śivamagha) reminds us of the 'Meghas' (Maghas) who ruled in Kosala in the third century A.D. Another king, Mahārāja Gautamiputra Vrishadhvaja, is assigned to the third or fourth century A.D.

One of the most memorable acts of Chandra Gupta I was the selection, before the assembled councillors (Śabhyas) and princes of the blood, of Samudra Gupta as his successor.

---

1 JNAS, 1911, 132; Pargiter, DKA, p. 51; see also a note on the Kosam Stone Inscription of Mahārāja Bhimavarman, by Mr. A. Ghosh in Indian Culture, 114, 1936, 177 ff; see also IC, I. 694, 715.
SECTION III. SAMUDRA GUPTA PARĀKRAMAŃKA.

The exact date when Chandra Gupta I was succeeded by his son, Samudra Gupta, is not known. If the evidence of the spurious Vālandā plate (issued from Nṛipura) has any value the event may have happened before the year 5 of the Gupta Era, i.e., A.D. 325. But this is doubtful. It is clear not only from the Allahabad Prasasti but from the epithet "tatpādaperigrihēta," applied to Samudra Gupta in the Riddhapur inscription, that the prince was selected from among his sons by Chandra Gupta I as best fitted to succeed him. The new monarch may have been known also as Kācha.¹

It was the aim of Samudra Gupta to bring about the political unification of India (dharani-bandha) and make

¹ The titles Parākrama, Vṛghraparākrama, and Parākramāṇka are found on coins (Allan, Catalogue, pp. cxi, 1f) and in the Allahabad Prasasti (CII, p. 6). Recently a coin has been found with the legend Śrī Vīrakāś with the reverse (Namāla hoard, Nīmar district, J. Num. Soc. Ind., Vol. V, pt. 2, p. 140, December, 1943).

² The epithet Sarra-rājo-chakkhetā found on Kācha's coins shows that he was in all probability identical with Samudra Gupta. Cf. Smith, Catalogue, 96; IA, 1902, 256f. For another view see Smith, JRAS, 1897, 19; Rapson, JRAS, 1893, 81; Heras, Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. IX, p. 89f. To us it is unthinkable that the style "uprooter of all kings" could have been assumed by a Gupta monarch other than the one who is actually credited with that achievement by a contemporary inscription, before the events presupposed by the expression had actually happened. In the Poona plates we find the epithet applied to Chandra Gupta II, son of Samudra Gupta, along with many other designations of the latter. But it should be remembered that the plates in question are not official records of the Guptas themselves. In no official epigraph of the Imperial Guptas is the style "Sarre-rājo-chakkhetā applied to any other king except Samudra Gupta. The application of the term to Chandra Gupta II in the Poona Plates is due to the same carelessness which led the writer to describe Chandra Gupta I as a mere Māhārāja (and not Māhārāja dhirāja). A comparison of the Amgāchhī record with the Bānagad Inscription shows that writers of Prasastis not unoften carelessly applied to a later king eulogies really pertaining to a preceding ruler.
himself an Ekarāt or sole ruler like Mahāpadma. But his only permanent annexation was that of portions of Āryāvarta in the upper valley of the Ganges and its tributaries, together with certain districts in Central and Eastern India. Following his "Sarvakshatrantaka" predecessor, this Sarra-rājo-chchhetā, "exterminator of all kings," uprooted Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandravarman, Ganapati Nāga, Nāgasena, Achyuta, Nandi, Balavarman, and many other kings of Āryāvarta, captured the seion of the family of Kota and made all the kings of forest countries (āṭavika-rāja) his servants. Rudradeva has been identified by Mr. Dikshit with Rudrasena Vākāṭaka. But the Vākāṭakas can hardly be regarded as rulers of Āryāvarta, and they were far from being uprooted in the time of Samudra Gupta. Equally untenable is the identification of Balavarman with a prince of Assam, a province that was then looked upon as a border state (Pratyanta) and not as a part of Āryāvarta. Matila has been identified with a person named "Mattila" mentioned in a seal found in Bulandshahr in the Central Doāb. The absence of any honorific title on the seal leads Allan to suggest that it was a private one. But we have already come across several instances of princes being mentioned without any honorific. Chandravarman has been identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Susunia inscription, who was the ruler of Pushkaraṇa and was

1 Destroyer of all Kahatriyas, an epithet of Mahāpadma.

2 Father Heras thinks (Ann. Bhan. Ins., IX, p. 88) that Samudra Gupta undertook two campaigns in Āryāvarta. But his theory involves the assumption that Achyuta and Nāgasena were "violently exterminated" in the second campaign after being "uprooted" in the first. To obviate the difficulty he takes "uprooted" to mean "defeated". This is, to say the least, unconvincing.

3 Cf. IHQ, I, 2, 254. Rudrasena is connected with Deotek in the Chanda Dist. of C. P. Eighth Or. Conf. 613 ff. Ep. Ind., xxvi. 147, 160.

4 "A sandstone hill 12 miles to the north-west of Bankura."
possibly the founder of Chandravarman-koṭa mentioned in the Ghugrahāṭī grant. Some scholars identify Pushkaraṇa with Pokran or Pokurna in Mārwār, and further equate Simhavaranma, the name of the father of Chandravarman, with Simhavaranma of the Mandalasor family. But there is very little to be said in support of this conjecture. No mention of Chandravarman, or reference to his exploits, is found in any epigraphic record of the Varman family of Western Mālwa. Pushkarna is really to be identified with a village named Pokharan on the Dāmodar river in the Bankura District, some 25 miles to the north-east of Susunia Hill.  

Ganapati Nāga, Nāgasena and Nandi seem to have been Nāga princes. That Ganapati Nāga was a Nāga prince is evident. This ruler is also known from coins

---

1 Cf. Dikshit, *AS!, AR, 1927-28*, p. 188; S. K. Chatterji, "The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language," II, 1961; IHQ, I, 2, 255. Paṇḍit H. P. Sāstri believed that this local ruler who bore the modest title of Mahārāja was identical also with the mighty emperor (bhūnāpā prāpta aikādūraja) Chandra of the Meharauli Iron Pillar Inscription who "in battle in the Vaṅga countries turned back with his breast the enemies who uniting together came against him and by whom having crossed in warfare the seven mouths of the Indus the Vāhlikas were conquered." Others suggest the identification of the great Chandra with one or other of the famous Chandra Guptas of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty. But Chandra is never styled either Chandravarman or Chandra Gupta and, unlike the court poets of the Varman and Guptas, the panegyrist of the mighty Chandra, who is said to have carried his arms to the distant corners of India, never gives the slightest hint about his pedigree. He does not even mention the name of his father. It may be noted here that the Purāṇas represent the Nāgas as ruling in the Jumna Valley and Central India early in the fourth century A.D. We learn from the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa that Nāga dynasties ruled at Padmāvatī and Mathurā. A Nāga line probably ruled also at Vīrāśā (Pargiter, *Kali Age*, p. 49). Two kings named Sadā-Chandra and Chandrikāśa, "the second Nakhabant," are mentioned among the post-Andhran kings of Nāga lineage. One of these, preferably the latter, who was obviously a ruler of note, may have been the Chandra of the Meharauli Inscription. The Vāhlikas beyond "the seven mouths of the Indus" are apparently the Baktrios occupying the country near Arachosia in the time of the geographer Ptolemy (*Ind. Ant.*, 1884,
found at Mathurā,¹ at Pawāyā near Narwar and at Besnagar.² Nāgasena, who met his doom at Padmāvatī³ near Narwar on the Sindh river between Gwalior and Jhansi, is mentioned as a scion of the Nāga family in the Harsha-charita (Nāga-kula-janmanah sārikāśrāvita mantrasya āśīdnāso Nāgasēnasya Padmāvatyām).⁴ Nandi was also probably a Nāga prince. In the Purāṇas Siśu Nandi and Nandiyāsas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know also the name of a Nāga prince named Śivanandī.⁵ Achyuta was probably a king of Ahichchhatrā, modern Rāmanagar in the Bareilly District. To him has been attributed the small copper coins bearing the syllables 'achyu' found at Ahichchhatrā.⁶ As to the Kota-kula Rapson⁷ draws our attention to certain coins bearing the inscription Kota. These resemble the "Sruta coins" attributed to a ruler of

---

¹ Altekar, NHIP, vi, 37.
² IHQ, I, 2, 255. Note the importance of the name of this king from the point of view of religious history. Cf. Gajamukha of the Brhat Samhitā, 58, 58. A reference to king Ganapati Nāga in the Bhāra Satakā, a late work, is more than doubtful. Gajamekttra Śri of that work is a misreading for Gata Vaktra Śri (IHQ, 1936, 1937 Kāryamālā, IV, pp. 461, 60).
³ Padmāvatī——"Padam Pawāyā (33 miles n. e. of Narwar) in the apex of the confluence of the Sindhu and the Pārā. Nāga coins have been found here; also a palmleaf capital with an inscription of the first and second century B.C." EHI, p. 300, ASI, AR, 1916-16, pp. 161 ff.
⁴ "In Padmāvatī Nāgasena, born in the Nāga family, whose confidential deliberations were divulged by a sārikā bird, met his doom."
⁵ Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31. It is interesting to note that Garuḍa was the emblem of the Gupta kings who did much to curb the power of the Nāgas. Cf. the passage of the Jñānaḍh Inscription of Skanda Gupta:

Narapati bhujagāṇam māṇḍarpat phanānām
pratikṣi Garuḍaśāntam nirvāthanāh chāvahātā

In the Purāṇas Kṛishṇa, the deity honoured by the Guptas, crushes the head of the serpent, nāga, Kāliya.

⁶ Allan, Gupta Coins, xxii; CCAI, lxxix.
⁷ JRAS, 1898, 449 f.
Śrāvasti and should apparently be referred to the upper Gangetic region.¹

The conquered territories were constituted as Vishayas or Imperial sub-provinces. Two of these vishayas are known from later inscriptions of the family, namely, Antarvedi or the Gangetic Doāb and Airikina in Eastern Malwa. It is significant that a Nāga styled the Vishayapati Sarva-nāga, figures as a ruler of Antarvedi as late as the time of Skanda Gupta.

The annexation of the northern kingdoms named above was not the only achievement of Samudra Gupta. He made the rulers of the Ātavika rājyas, or forest states, his servants. But his most daring exploit was an expedition to the south, which made his power felt by the potentates of the Eastern Deccan. We perceive, however, a difference between his northern and southern campaigns. In the north he played the part of a "dīgvijayi" or "conqueror of the quarters," of the Early Magadhan type.² But in the south he followed the Epic and Kauṭilyan ideal of a "dharma-vijayi" or "righteous conqueror," i.e., he defeated the kings but did not annex their territory. He may have realized the futility of attempting

¹ Smith (Coins in the Indian Museum, 258) points out that the Kota coins are common in the Eastern Pañjab and the Delhi bazaar. A Kota tribe is said to exist also in the Nilgiris (JRAS, 1907, 863; Ind. Ant., iii, 36, 96, 265). The passage in the Allahabad Inscription that "Samudra Gupta caused the scion of the Kota family to be captured by his armies and took pleasure at Pushpāhvaya" has been taken by some scholars to suggest that the Kotas were at the time the ruling family of Pātaliputra (cf. Jayaswal, History of India, c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D., p. 113). The identification of the Kota kula, with the Māgadha family of the Kuṃudī-mahotarca lacks proof.

² This kind of Vījaya or conquest is termed Āsura-viśaya "demon's conquest" in the Arthasastra (p. 369). The name may have been derived from the Assyrians, the ruthlessness of whose warfare is well-known. For a discussion regarding the possible derivation of Āsura from Aššur, see JRAS, 1916, 355; 1924, 265ff. Conquest of this type is first met with in India in the sixth century B.C. (cf. Ajātashatru's subjugation of the Lichchhavis and Viṣṇujabha's conquest of the Sākyas) when Persia served as a link between Assyria and India.
to maintain effective control over these distant regions in the south from his remote base in the northeast of India. His successor tried to maintain his hold on the Deccan by a system of marriage alliances.

The Āṭavika rājyas undoubtedly included the realm of Alavaka (Ghāzipur) as well as the forest kingdoms connected with Dabhalā or the Jabalpur territory. The conquest of this region by Samudra Gupta is suggested also by his Eran inscription.

The Kings of Dakshināpatha who came into conflict with the great Gupta were Mahendra of Kosala, Vyāghra-rāja of Mahākāntāra, Maṇṭarāja of Kaurala, Svāmidatta of Koṭṭūra, a chieftain of Pishṭapurā whose precise name is uncertain, Damana of Eranḍapalla, Vishnuçopopa of Kāñchi, Nilarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Venä, Ugrasena of Palakka, Kubera of Devarāśṭra, Dhanamjaya of Kusthalapura and others.

Kosala in Dakshināpatha, i.e., South Kosala, comprised the modern Bilāspur, Raipur and Sambalpur districts, and occasionally possibly even a part of Gañjām. Its capital was Šripura, the modern Sirpur, about forty miles east

1 Fleet, CII, p. 114; Ep. Ind., VIII, 284-287. In the latter part of the fifth and early part of the sixth century A.D., the Dabhālā country was governed by the Pariverājaka Mahārājās as feudatories of the Guptas. The Mbb. ii. 31, 13-15, like the Allahabad Praśasti, distinguishes the Āṭavikas from the Kāntārakas. One of the Āṭavika states may have been Koṭṭāravi mentioned in the commentary on the Rāma-charita of Sandhyākara Nandi (p. 36). In one epigraphic record, Ep. Ind., VII, p. 126, we have a reference to a place called Vaṭṭāravi, while another, Lüder’s List, No. 1195, mentions Sahalāravi.

2 For the various interpretations of the passage “Pāishṭapurāka Mahendragiri Kauṭṭūraka Svāmidatta,” see Fleet, CII, Vol. 3, p. 7; JRAS, 1897, pp. 420, 665-670; IHQ, 1925, 252; Barua, Old Brāhmi Inscriptions, 294. It is not improbable that Mahendragiri in this passage is a personal name. Cf. the name Kumāra-giri given to a chief of Koḍavidiṇḍha whose territories included a portion at least of the Godāvari district (Kielhorn, S. Ins., 596). In JRAS, 1897, 870, we have reference to Kamtagir, an ally of Sindhia.

3 Inclusion of Ratnapur, Ep. Ind., X, 26; of Kōṅgoda, Ep. Ind., VI, 141, unless Kosala is a misreading for Tosala.
by north from Raipur. Mahākāntāra is apparently a wild tract of the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradeśa) which probably included Kāntāra which the Mahābhārata places between Vennāṭaṭa (the valley of the Wāngaṅga) and Prāk-Kosala, the eastern part of Kosala mentioned above.  

Kaurāla cannot be Kolleru or Colair which must have been included within the territory of Hastivarman of Vengi mentioned separately. Dr. Barnett suggests its identification with one of the villages that now bears the name Korāḍa* in South India. There is a place named Kolaḍa near Russellkonda in Gānjam.

Koṭṭūra has been identified with Kothoor, 12 miles south-east of Mahendragiri in Gānjam. Pishtapura is Piṭhāpuram in the Godāvari district. Eraṇḍapalla is identified by Fleet with Eraṇḍol in Khandesh, and by Dubreuil with Eraṇḍapali, “a town probably near Chicacole” in the Gānjam district.  

But G. Ramdas* suggests the identification of Eraṇḍapalla

---

2 Mbh. II, 31, 12-13. G. Ramdas (IHQ, I. 4, 684) identifies Mahākāntāra with the ‘Jhāḍ-khāṇḍ’henery tracts of Gānjam and Vizagapatam. The sway of the rāja of Mahākāntāra or “Greater Kāntāra”, may have extended northwards as far as Nachna in the Ajaygarh (not Jazo) state (Smith, JRAS, 1914, 329). The identification of many of the southern kingdoms suggested by Mr. R. Sathianathaier (in his Studies in the Ancient History of Tondaimandalam) does not carry conviction. His conclusion that Samudragupta “first emerged on the east coast at Piṭhāpuram and conquered the Western Deccan” is based upon evidence that is clearly inadequate.
3 Cal. Rec., Feb., 1924, 253 n. Cf. Kurrālam, Tj. 500 (A Topographical List of Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency, by V. Rangacharya). The identification with Yayatrīkṣarī (Ep. Ind., XI. 189), which Dhoji connects with the sports o’ the Keralis, was suggested in some editions of this work. But the reading Kerali in the Pavanaduta is not beyond doubt. For Kolaḍa see Ep. Ind., XIX. 49.
4 There is another Koṭṭūra ‘at the foot of the Hilla’ in the Vizagapatam district (Vizag., District Gaz., 1. 137). See also Koṭṭūru (IA, 4, 329) and Kōtturāṇṇaṭ, MS. 338, Rangacharya’s List.
5 Dubreuil, AHD, pp. 58-60. A place called Eraṇḍavalli is mentioned in an inscription of Govinda III (Bhārata Itihāsa Sam. Maṇḍala, AR, XVI).
6 IHQ, 1, 4, p. 683. There is an Eraṇḍi sṛtha in Pādma, Svarga khaṇḍa, 45, 57, 61.
with Yeṇḍipalli in Vizagapatam or Eṇḍapilli in Ellore Tāluk. Kāṇchi is Conjeeveram near Madras. Avamukta cannot be satisfactorily identified. But the name of its king Nilarāja reminds us of Nilapalli, "an old seaport near Yanam" in the Godāvari district. Veṇgi has been identified with Vegi or Pedda-Vegi, 7 miles north of Ellore between the Krishnā and the Godāvari. Its king Hastivarman was identified by Hultzsch with Attivarman (of the Ananda family). But the more probable view is that he belonged to the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty. Palakka is probably identical with Palakkada, (or Pālatkāṭa) a Pallava royal residence or seat of a viceroy in Guntur or Nellore in South India. Allan and G. Ramdas locate it in the Nellore district. Devarāṣṭra is the Yellamaṇchili tāluk of the Vizagapatam district. Kusthalapura is, according to Dr. Barnett, probably Kuttalur, near Polur, in North Arcot.

The capture and liberation of the southern kings, notably of the ruler of Koṭṭūra near Mt. Mahendragiri remind us of the following lines of Kālidāsa’s Raghuvamśam:

\[
\text{Grihiṭa-pratimūktasya sa dharma-vijayi nriṇapāh Śriyāṁ Mahendra-nāthasya jahāra natu mediniṁ}
\]


2 Attivarman was wrongly assigned to the Pallava race. Cf. IHQ, 1, 2, p. 253; Ind. Ant., IX, 102. But he is actually described as born in the lineage of the great saint Ananda (Bomb. Gaz., I. ii. 334; Kielhorn, S. Ins., 1015; IA, IX, 102; ASI, 1924-25, p. 118).

3 The name Hastivarman is actually found in a Śālaṅkāyana Vamśacali (IHQ, 1927, 429; 1933, 212; Pedavegi plates of Nandivarman II).


"The righteous conqueror (Raghu) took away from the lord of the Mahendra Mountain, who was made captive and then released, his glory but not his territory."

It is not a little surprising that the Allahabad Prābasti contains no clear reference to the Vākāṭakas who are known to have dominated part of the region between Bundelkhand and the Pentaṅga in the fifth century A.D. The earliest reference to the Vākāṭakas occurs in certain inscriptions of Amarāvati.¹ The dynasty rose to power under Vindhyaśakti I and his son Pravarasena I. Pravarasena appears to have been succeeded in the northern part of his dominions by his grandson Rudrasena I. Prithivishena I, the son and successor of Rudrasena I, may have been a contemporary of Samudra Gupta and perhaps also of his son Chandragupta II, inasmuch as his son Rudrasena II married the daughter of the last-mentioned Gupta emperor. Prithivishena I's political influence extended over a fairly wide territory. The Nach-nē-ki-talāī and Ganj regions² were in all probability ruled by his vassal Vyāghra-deva. Professor Dubreuil, however, says that the Nāchnā and Ganj inscriptions, which mention Vyaghra, belong, not to Prithivishena I, but to his great-great-grandson Prithivishena II. This is improbable in view of the fact that from the time of Prithivishena II's great-grandfather, if not from a period still earlier, down to at least A.D. 528, the princes of the region which intervenes between Nāchnā and Ganj and the proper Vākāṭaka territory,³ owned the sway of the Gupta empire.

¹ Ep. Ind., XV, pp. 261, 267.
³ This was Berar with the adjoining regions (cf. Ep. Ind., xxvi, 147). That Nāchnā and Ganj were in the Gupta Age apparently included within Dakshināpatha is suggested by the Brihat Saṁhitā (xiv, 13) which places even Chitrakutā in the Dakshinā or Southern Division. A recent Vakāṭaka Inscription discovered in the Drug District contains an interesting reference to Padmapura which Professor Mirashi identifies with the ancestral home of Bhavabhūti.
Now as Vyāghra of the Nāchnā and Ganj records acknowledges the supremacy of the Vākāṭaka Prithivishena, this Prithivishena can only be Prithivishena I, who ruled before the establishment of the Gupta supremacy in Central India by Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II, and not Prithivishena II during whose rule the Guptas, and not the Vākāṭakas, were apparently the acknowledged suzerains of the Madhya Pradeśa as we learn from the records of the Parivrājaka Mahārājas.²

The absence of any clear reference to Prithivishena I in Harisheṇa’s Praśasti is explained by the fact that Samudra Gupta’s operations were actually confined to the eastern part of Trans-Vindhyan India. There is no reliable evidence that the Gupta conqueror carried his arms to the central and western parts of the Deccan proper, i.e., to the territory ruled by Prithivishena I himself. Professor Dubreuil has shown that the identification of Devarāṣṭra with Mahārāṣṭra and of Eranḍapalla with Eranḍol in Khandesh is probably wrong.³

Though Samudra Gupta did not invade the Western Deccan it is clear from his Eran Inscription that he did deprive the Vākāṭakas of their possessions in Central India. These territories were not, however, directly governed by the Vākāṭaka monarch, but were under a vassal prince. In the time of Prithivishena this prince was Vyāghra. We should naturally expect a conflict between the Vākāṭaka feudatory and the Gupta

and with the modern Padampur near Amgaon in the Bhaṇḍārā District of the Central Provinces. IHQ, 1935, 299; Ep. Ind., xxii, 207 ff. The Bēsim grant implies control of a branch of the family over the part of Berar south of the Ajanta range.

1 The Eran and Udayagiri Inscriptions. For evidence of Palaeography see JRASB, xii. 2, 1946, 73.
² Cf. Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 475. For Dubreuil’s views, see Ind. Ant., June, 1926.
conqueror. Curiously enough, the Allahabad Prāsasti refers to Samudra Gupta’s victory overVyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra. It is probable that this Vyāghrarāja is identical with the Vyāghra of the Nachnā inscription who was the Central Indian feudatory of Prithivishēna. As a result of Samudra Gupta’s victory the Guptas succeeded the Vākāṭakas as the paramount power in parts of Central India. Henceforth the Vākāṭakas appear in fact as a purely southern power.

The victorious career of Samudra Gupta must have produced a deep impression on the Pratyanta or frontier kings of North-East India and the Himālayan region, and the tribal states of the Panjāb, Western India, Mālwa and the Central Provinces, who are said to have gratified his imperious command (pruchāṇḍa śāsana) “by giving all kinds of taxes, obeying his orders and coming to perform obeisance.” The most important among the eastern kingdoms which submitted to the mighty Gupta Emperor were Samataṭa (part of Eastern Bengal bordering on the sea, having its capital probably at Karmmānta or Baḍ-Kamta near Comilla), Davāka (not yet satisfactorily identified) and Kmarūpa (in Lower Assam). We learn from the Dāmodarpur plates that the major portion of Northern Bengal, then known as Pundravardhana-bhukti, formed an integral part

---

1 Has the title Vyāghra-parākrama, found on a type of Samudra Gupta’s coins that represents the king as trampling on a tiger, anything to do with the emperor’s victory over Vyāghra-rāja? It is not a little curious that the next sovereign, conqueror of Rudrasinhha III, the last Satrap, assumed the title of Simha-vikrama.

2 For the significance of the term, see Dieyāśadāna, p. 22.

3 Bhattachari, Iconography, pp. 41. JASE, 1914, 85 ff. Cf. the position of Mahārāja Rudradatta under the emperor Vainya Gupta, early in the sixth century A.D. (Gunaighar Ins.).

4 Cf. Dekaka (Dacca), Hoyland, The Empire of the Great Mogul, 14. Mr. K. L. Barua identifies Davāka with the Kopili Valley in Middle Assam (Early History of Kmarūpa, 42 n.). For the alleged use of Gupta era in the Dabokā region, see Ep., xxvii, 18f.
of the Gupta Empire from A.D. 443 to A.D. 543, and was governed by a line of *Uparikas* as vassals of the Gupta Emperor. The identification of Ğavāka with certain districts of North Bengal is, therefore, probably wrong. The Northern *Pratyantas* were Nepal and Kārtīripura. The latter principality comprised probably Kātārpur in the Jālandhar district, and the territory of the Katuria or Katyar rāj of Kumaun, Garhwal and Rohilkhand.¹

The *tribal states* which paid homage were situated on the western and south-western fringe of *Āryavarta* proper. Among these the most important were the Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ābhīras, Prājunas, Sanakānikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas.

The Mālavas occupied part of the Pañjāb in the time of Alexander. They were probably in Eastern Rājaputāna ² when they came into conflict with Ushavadāta. Their exact location in the time of Samudra Gupta cannot be determined. In the time of Samudra Gupta’s successors they were probably connected with the Mandasor region. We find princes of Mandasor using the reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, handed down traditionally by the Mālava-gāṇa (*Mālava-gan-āmnāta*).

The Ārjunāyanas and the Yaudheyas are placed in the northern division of India by the author of the *Bṛihat-Samhitā*. They may have been connected with the Pandoouoi or Paṇḍava tribe mentioned by Ptolemy as settled in the Pañjāb.³ The connection of the Ārjunāyanas

---


³ *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, 331, 349.
with the Pāṇḍava Arjuna is apparent.\(^1\) Yaudheya appears as the name of a son of Yudhishthira in the Mahābhārata.\(^2\) The Harivaṁśa, a later authority, connects the Yaudheyas with Uśinara.\(^3\) A clue to the locality of this tribe is given by the Bijayagaḍh inscription.\(^4\) The hill-fort of Bijayagaḍh lies about two miles to the southwest of Byānā in the Bharatpur state of Rājaputāna. But the Yaudheya territory must have extended beyond the limits of this area and embraced the tract still known as Johiyābār along both banks of the Sutlej on the border of the Bahāwalpur state.\(^5\)

The Madrakas had their capital at Śakala or Śīlkoṭ in the Pāṇḍjab. The Ābhīras occupied the tract in the lower Indus valley and western Rājaputāna, near Vīnaśana\(^6\) in the district called Abiria by the Periplus\(^7\) and the geography of Ptolemy. We have already seen that an Ābhīra possibly became Mahākṣatrapa of Western India and probably supplanted the Śatavāhanas in a part of Mahārāṣṭra before the middle of the third century A.D. A section of the tribe apparently settled in Central India and gave its name to the Āhirwār country between Jhansi and Bhilsa.\(^8\) The territories of the Prārjunas, Sanakāṇikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas lay probably in Mālwa and the Central Provinces. The Prārjunakas are mentioned in the Arthaśāstra attributed

---

1 Their coins are found in the Mathurā region (Smith, Catalogue, 160). The Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi, p. 434, identifies a river called Arjuni with the Bahudā (Rāmgaṅgā?).
2 Adī., 95, 76. Yaudheyas are already known to Pāṇini, V. 3, 117.
3 Pargiter, Markandeya Purāṇa, p. 390.
4 Fleet, CII, p. 251, Yaudheya votive tables have been found in the Ludhiana District (JRAS, 1897, 887). Coins have been found in the area extending from Saharanpur to Multān (Allan, CCAI, cfr).
6 Śudrābhīrān prati devashād yatra nashta Saraseatī, Mbh., IX, 37. 1.
7 Cf. Ind. Ant., III, 226 f.
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to Kauṭilya and are located by Smith in the Narsinhapur District of the Central Provinces. A clue to the locality of the Sanakānīkas is given by one of the Udayagiri inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II discovered in Eastern Mālwa. The Kākas find mention in the Mahābhārata—Rishikā Vidabhāh Kākās Taṅganāh-Parataṅganāh. In the Bombay Gazetteer Kāka is identified with Kākūpur near Bithur. Smith suggests that the name may be locally associated with Kākanāda (Sāṃchi). The Kharaparikas may have occupied the Damoh District of the Central Provinces.

The rise of a new indigenous imperial power could not be a matter of indifference to the foreign potentates of the North-West Frontier, Mālwa and Surāśṭrā (Kāṭhīawār) who hastened to buy peace by the acts of homage, such as offer of personal service, the bringing of gifts of maidens, begging for seals marked with the Garuda sign (Garutmadaṇka) to allow them to rule over their respective districts and provinces (svaśishya bhukti). The foreign powers that thus established diplomatic relations with Samudra Guptar were the Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi and the Saka Murundas.

1 P. 194.
2 JRAS, 1897, p. 892.
3 Mbh. VI, 9, 64.
4 Bhandarkar, IHQ, 1925, 258; Ep. Ind., XII, 46. H. C. Ray, DHNI, I, 566, mentions a Kharpara padraka apparently in Mālwa. A Bhākār para-bhāga is mentioned in the Siwani plate.
5 The presence of Scythian maidens in the Hindu imperial harem is not surprising in view of the known facts about Chandra Gupta Maurya's alliance with Seleukos and the marriage of a Sattakarṇi with the daughter of a great satrap. Cf. also Penzer, II, 47; III, 170.
6 Cf. Nilakanta Sastri, The Paṇḍyan Kingdom, 145. 'The victor restored the crown and country of the Chola in the form of a religious gift, which was confirmed by the issue of a royal rescript with the Paṇḍyan seal on it.'
7 As to the form Daiva, see Achaemenian inscriptions of Xerxes, and forms like Bhaimarathī (instead of Bhimarathī).
8 Note the imitation by Samudra Guptar of coins of Kushān type with Ardochsho reverse (Allan, xxviii, xxxiv, lxvi). Such coins were, according to scholars, issued by Scythians of the North-West.
as well as the people of Simhala and all other dwellers in islands.¹

The Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi belonged apparently to the Kushān dynasty of the north-west, which derived its origin from the Devaputra Kanishka.² The Saka Murunḍas must have included the northern chiefs of Scythian nationality who issued the Ardochsho coins as well as the Saka chieftains of Surāshṭra and Central India, the representatives of a power which once dominated even the Ganges valley. Sten Konow tells us that Murunḍa is a Saka word meaning lord, Sanskrit Svāmin. The epithet Svāmin was used by the Kshatrapas of Surāshṭra and Ujjain. A Sāñchī inscription discovered by Marshall discloses the existence of another Saka principality or province which was ruled about A.D. 319 by the Mahādaṇḍanāyaka Śrīdharavarman, son of Nanda.³ A Murunḍa Svāminī (noble lady) is mentioned in a Khoh Inscription of Central India. To Scythian chiefs of the Vindhyan region should perhaps be attributed the so-called "Puri Kushān" coins which are found in large numbers in the neighbourhood of the Eastern Vindhya and some adjoining tracts. The

¹ Some control over the islands in the neighbouring seas is possibly hinted at in the epithet Dhanada-Varanendranātakasama, the equal of Dhanada (Kuvera, lord of wealth, guardian of the north), Yarucā (the Indian Sea-god, the guardian of the west), Indra, king of the celestials and guardian of the east, and Antaka (Yama, god of death, and guardian of the south). The comparison of Samudra Gupta with these deities is apposite and possibly refers not only to his conquests in all directions, but to his possession of immense riches, suzerainty over the seas, the spread of his fame to the celestial region and his extirpation of various kings. Inscriptions discovered in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago testify to the activities of Indian navigators (e.g., the Mahānāvika from Raktamūrttikā mentioned in a Malayan epigraph) and military adventures in the Gupta Age.

² Smith (JRAS, 1897, 32) identified him with Grumbates. Some scholars take the expression to refer to different kings and chieftains. Cf. Allan, xxvii. There may also be a reference to the Sassanids as well.

existence of a Muruṇḍa power in the Ganges valley a couple of centuries before Samudra Gupta is vouched for by Ptolemy. The Jaina Prabhāvakacarita testifies to the control that a Muruṇḍa family once exercised over the imperial city of Pātaliputra.

Samudra Gupta’s Ceylonese contemporary was Meghavarṇa. A Chinese writer, Wang Hiuen ts’e, relates that Chi-mi-kia-po-mo (i.e., Śrī Meghavarman or Meghavarṇa) sent an embassy with gifts to Samudra Gupta and obtained his permission to erect a splendid monastery to the north of the holy tree at Bodh Gayā for the use of pilgrims from the Island.

Allan thinks that it was at the conclusion of his campaigns that the Gupta conqueror celebrated the horse-sacrifice which, we are told in the inscriptions of his successors, had long been in abeyance. But it should be noted that the Aśvamedha was celebrated by several kings during the interval which elapsed from the time of Pushyamitra to that of Samudra Gupta, e.g., Pārāśariputra Sarvatāta, Śātakarnī, the husband of Nāyanikā, Vāsishṭhiputra Ikshvāku Śrī-Chāmintamūla, Devavarman Śālaṅkāyana, Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka, Śiva-skandavarman Pallava and the Nāga kings of the house of Bhāraśīva. It is probable, however, that the court poets

1 Ind. Ant., 1884, 377; Allan, xxix; cf. India Antiqua (Vogel Volume, 1947), 171 f., Muruṇḍas in the Ganges Valley c. 245 A.D. mentioned by the Chinese.

2 C. J. Shah, Jainism in N. India, p. 194; Cf. Indian Culture, III, 49.

3 Geiger, the Mahāvamsa (trans.), p. xxxix; Lévi, Journ. As., 1900, pp. 316 ff., 401 ff.; Ind. Ant., 1902, 194.

4 Cf. Divekar, Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, VII, pp. 164-65, “Allahabad Prājāstī and Alcamēda.” In the Poona plates Samudra Gupta receives the epithet anekācāmedhayaḥṣīn. He was believed to have celebrated more than one horse-sacrifice. Some of the campaigns described in the Allahabad panegyric may have been actually conducted by Princes or officers who kept guard over the sacrificial horse that was allowed to roam at large. In the inscription of Harisheṇa the credit for capturing some of the vanquished chieftains is given to the army. Among the great commanders were men like Tilabhajaka and Harisheṇa himself, who was the son of Dhruvabhūti.
of the Guptas knew little about these monarchs. After the horse-sacrifice Samudra Gupta apparently issued coins bearing the legend Aśva-medha-parākramah, 'whose prowess was demonstrated by the performance of the horse-sacrifice.'

If Harishena, the writer of the Allahabad Praśasti, is to be believed, the great Gupta was a man of versatile genius. "He put to shame the preceptor of the lord of Gods and Tumburu and Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments. He established his title of Kavirāja by various poetical compositions." "He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned. His is the poetic style which is worthy of study, and his are the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets." Unfortunately none of these compositions have survived. But the testimony of Harishena to his musical abilities finds corroboration in the lyrist type of his coins. Himself a poet like Harsha, Mahendravarman and other kings of a later age,

---

1 Rapson and Allan refer to a seal bearing a horse and the legend Parākrama, and the stone figure of a horse, now in Lucknow, which are probably reminiscent of the Aśvamedha of Samudra Gupta. (JRBs, 1901, 102; Gupta Coins, xxxi.)

2 For Tumburu see Adbhuta-Rāmāyaṇa, VI. 7; EL, I. 286.

3 According to the Kāvya Mīmāṁsā (3rd ed., GOS, pp. xv, xxxii, 19) a "Kavirāja is one stage further than a Mahākavi, and is defined as one who is unrestrained in various languages, various sorts of poetical compositions and various sentiments." For the intellectual activities of the Gupta Age see Bhandarkar, "A Peep into the Early History of India," pp. 61-74 and Bühlér, IA, 1913. The son and successor of Samudra Gupta had the title Rūpākṛiti, 'maker of plays'.

4 A poetical work called the Kṛishṇa-charitam is attributed to Vikramāditya Mahārājādhirājā Paramabhaṅgavaṇa Śrī Samudra Gupta (IC, X, 70, etc.). But the ascription has been doubted by competent critics (cf. Jagannāth in Annals, BOHI, and others).

5 A lute-player (Vignā-hāthin) plays an important part in the Aśvamedha.
the Gupta monarch associated with men of letters who were none too prosperous and "put an end to the war between good poetry and plenty" (satkāvyāśrīvirodha). As a result "he enjoyed in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory endured in many poems."

Samudra Gupta favoured poetry as well as the Sāstra, while Aśoka seems to have specialised in scriptural studies alone. The former undertook military campaigns with the object of sarva-prthivī-jaya, conquest of the whole earth, as known to his panegyrist, the latter eschewed military conquest after the Kalinga war and organised missions to effect Dhamma-vijaya, conquest of the hearts of men, in three continents. Yet inspite of these differences there was much that was common to these remarkable men. Both laid stress on parākrama, ceaseless exertion in the cause in which they believed. Both expressed solicitude for the people committed to their care, and were kind even to vanquished enemies. And both laid emphasis on Dharma. Samudra Gupta, no less than Dharmāsoka, made firm the rampart of the true law (Dharma-prāchira-bandhāh).

The attribution of the coins bearing the name Kācha to Samudra Gupta may be accepted. But the emperor's identification with Dharmāditya (sun of the true faith) of a Faridpur grant is clearly wrong. The titles used by this monarch were Apratiratha, 'unrivalled car-warrior' Aprativāryavīrya, 'of irresistible valour,' Kritānta-parasu, 'ax of death,' sarva-rāj-ochechhetā,1 'uprooter of all kings,' Vyāghra-parākrama, 'possessed of the strength of a tiger,' Aśva-medha-parākrama, 'whose might was demonstrated by the horsesacrifice,' and Parākramānka, 'marked with prowess,'

1 Cf. the epithet "sara-ksatirāntaka" applied to his great fore-runner, Mahāpadma Nanda.
but not Dharmāditya. Most of these epithets are connected
with particular types of coins issued by the emperor.
Thus Parākrama is found on the reverse of coins of the
standard type, Apratiratha on coins of the archer type,
Kritānta-paraśu on coins of the battle-axe type,1 sarva-
rājojochchhetta on coins of the Kācha type, Vyāghra-
parākrama (Rājā) on the tiger type of coins, and
Aśvamedha-parākrama on the Aśvamedha type.2 The
appearance of a goddess seated on a lion (simha-vāhinī,
i.e., Durgā or Pārvatī, Vindhyā-vāsinī or Haimavatī) may
point to the extension of the Gupta dominions to the
Vindhyā and the Himavat.3 The tiger and river-goddess
(makaravāhinī) type may indicate that the sway of
Samudra Gupta spread from the Ganges valley to the
realm of the ‘Tiger king’ in Mahākāntāra. The figures
of Gaṅgā and Yamunā occur frequently in door jambs
of the Gupta Age. It has been surmised that they
symbolise connection with the Gangetic Doāb.

Samudra Gupta’s ‘virtuous and faithful wife,’ possibly
Datta Devī, appears to be mentioned in an Eran inscrip-
tion referable to the period of his rule. We possess no
genuine dated documents for the reign of the great
emperor. The Nālandā4 and Gayā grants profess to be
dated in the years 5 and 9 respectively, but no reliance
can be placed on them and the reading of the numeral
in the Gayā record is uncertain. Smith’s date (A.D.
330-375) for Samudra Gupta is conjectural. As the
earliest known date of the next sovereign is A.D.

1 The battle-axe appears also on coins of the Udumbaras, CHI, 539; and
Jayadāman, Rapson (Andhra, etc.), 76.

2 Cf. ‘Horse facing post’ which appears also on a square coin attributed to
Chashṭana (Rapson ibid, 75) whose dynasty was overthrown by the Guptas.

3 Nana on lion of Huvishka’s coins (Whitehead, 207) may have suggested
this type.

380-381 it is not improbable that his father and predecessor died some time after A.D. 375. One of the last acts of Samudra Gupta was apparently the selection of his successor. The choice fell on Chandra Gupta, his son by Datta Devi.

1 An inscription of Chandra Gupta II, dated in the year 61, corresponding to A.D. 380-81 was discovered in the Mathura District (Ep. Ind., XXI, 1 ff.).

2 Sirecar (IHQ, 1942, 272) reads the dated portion of the inscription of the year 61 as Sri Chandra Gupta-ya vijaya-raiy-a samatsare panchame—the fifth regnal year of Chandra Gupta (II). Therefore, his first year may be taken to be A.D. 376-77.
CHAPTER XI. THE GUPTA EMPIRE—(continued): 
THE AGE OF THE VIKRAMĀDITYAS.

Kāmāṁ nripāḥ santu sahasraśo' nye 
rājanvatīmāhuranena bhūmin 
nakshatra-tārā-graha saṅkulāpi 
ijotishmati Chandramasaiva rātrih.

—Raghuvaṁśam.

SECTION I. CHANDRA GUPTA II VIKRAMĀDITYA.

Epigraphic evidence indicates that Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, also called Narendra Chandra, Simha Chandra, Narendra Simha and Simha Vikrama, born of queen Dattadevi. Chandra Gupta was chosen out of many sons by his father as the best fitted to succeed him. Another name

1 Cf. the name Vikrama Sūhā of Ujjaini, Ponnor, III. 11. The story narrated in Vishamalita Lambaka, has for its hero Vikramaditya, son of Mahendrāditya, who is apparently to be identified with Skanda Gupta. But some of the motifs such as striesaha (Kathā Sar. XVIII. 3. 49), visit to the enemy’s own place with a Vētāla (5. 40 f) were probably taken from the cycle of legends associated with Chandra Gupta II, father of Mahendra.

2 That Samudra Gupta had many sons and grandsons appears clear from the Eraq epigraph The theory of Dr. Apte Kar (JBORS, XIV. pp. 233-53; XV. pt. i-ii pp. 134 f.), and others that a king named Rāma (Srma? Srna?) Gupta intervened between Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II is unsupported by any contemporary epigraphic evidence. The tradition that a Gupta king killed his brother and took his wife and crown, dates only from a ninth century epigraph. The literary evidence on the point is discrepant and hardly conclusive. The version given by Bāga in the seventh century differs in important respects from the story known to the author of the Kṛgya-Mīmāṃsā. Cir. 900 A.D. (Cf. Ind. Ant., Nov., 1933, 201 ff.; JBORS, XVIII, 1, 1932. 17 ff.). The simple story, narrated in the Harsha-Charita, that Chandra Gupta, disguised as a female, destroyed a Saka (not Khasa) king, who coveted the wife of another, in the very city of the enemy, was doubtless embellished by later poets and dramatists, and (as is clear from certain data, to which Mr. V. V. Mirasi draws attention in IHQ, March, 1934, 49 ff.) details, such as fratricida, and association with ghouls, not found in the earlier account, continued to be
of the new monarch disclosed by certain Vākāṭaka inscriptions, several types of coins and the Sāñchi inscription of A. D. 412-3 was Deva Gupta, Deva-śrī or Deva-rāja.¹

For the reign of Chandra Gupta II, we possess a number of dated inscriptions so that its limits may be defined with more accuracy than those of his predecessors. His accession should be placed before A.D. 381, and his death in or about A.D. 413-14.

The most important external events of the reign were the emperor’s matrimonial alliance with the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II, son of Prithivisheṇa I, and the war with the Saka Satraps which added Western Mālwa and Surāshṭra (Kāṭhiāwār) to the Gupta dominions.

Matrimonial alliances occupy a prominent place in the foreign policy of the Guptas. The Lichchhāvi connection had strengthened their position in Bihār. After the conquest of the upper provinces they sought alliances with other ruling families whose help was needed to consolidate the Gupta power in the newly acquired territory and prepare the ground for fresh conquests. Thus Samudra Gupta received presents of girls (kanyopāyana) from Saka-Kushān chiefs and other foreign potentates. Chandra Gupta II married

added in the days of Amoghavarsa I (A. D. 915-78) and Govinda IV (A.D c. 927-939). The Devi Chandraguptam and similar works are as much unsuited to form bases of the chronicles of Chandra Gupta II as the Muddrāśīkhasam and the Akāvādāna are in regard to the doings of the great Mauryas. The subject has been fully discussed by the present writer in an article entitled “Vikramāditya in History and legend” contributed to the Vikrama-volume, Scindia Oriental Institute (1948), pp. 483-511. The story of Chandra Gupta’s adventure in its developed form has absorbed a good deal of folklore, such as tales about ghouls, Piśācha. The motif of the wife leaving a mean-spirited husband is found in Penuṣer, Kāṭha S. S., II, 390.

Kuberanāgā, a princess of Nāga lineage,\(^1\) and had by her a daughter named Prabhāvatī, whom he gave in marriage to Rudrasena II, the Vakāṭaka king of Berar and the adjoining districts. According to Dr. Smith\(^3\) "the Vakāṭaka Mahārāja occupied a geographical position in which he could be of much service or disservice to the northern invader of the dominions of the Saka satraps of Gujrāt and Surāśṭra. Chandra Gupta adopted a prudent precaution in giving his daughter to the Vakāṭaka prince and so securing his subordinate alliance."

The campaign against the Western Satraps is apparently alluded to in the Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Vīrasena-Sāba in the following passage "he (Sāba) came here (to Eastern Mālwa), accompanied by the king (Chandra Gupta) in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world." Sāba was an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra. He held the position, acquired by hereditary descent, of a Sachīva or minister of Chandra Gupta II, and was placed by his sovereign in charge of the Department of Peace and War. He naturally accompanied his master when the great western expedition was undertaken. Eastern Mālwa, which had already felt the might of Samudra Gupta, became the base of operations against the Sakas. Inscriptions at Udayagiri and Sāńchī suggest that the emperor Chandra Gupta II assembled at or near Vidiśā in East Mālwa many of his ministers, generals and feudatories, some of whom are

---

\(^1\) Nāga-kulotpāna, cf. JASB, 1924, p. 68. It is possible, as urged by many writers, that Chandra Gupta Vikramādiya also entered into marriage alliances with the Kadambas of Vaiśajayantī or Banavāsi in Kuntala, or the Kanaresas, country. The sending of an embassy to Kuntala by Vikramādiya, is vouched for by Bhoja and Kshemendra. (Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, p. 6.) Kākusthavarmān of the Kadamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings in or about the fifth century (Talagunda Inscription, Ep. Ind., VIII, 33 ff.; IHQ, 1933, 197 ff.).

\(^3\) JRAS, 1914, p. 324.
mentioned in records dating from A.D. 402 to 413. The campaign against the Sakas was eminently successful. The fall of the Saka Satrap is alluded to by Bāna. The annexation of his territory is proved by coins.\(^1\)

**Chief Cities of the Empire.** —The first important Gupta metropolis seems to have been at Pātaliputra—“the city named Pushpa” where Samudra Gupta is said to have “rested on his laurels” after one of his victorious campaigns, and from which a Gupta Minister for Peace and War went to East Mālwa in the company of his sovereign. From A.D. 402 Chandra Gupta seems to have had a residence in Mālwa, at first possibly at Vidiśā and later on, after his western conquests, at Ujjain. Certain chiefs of the Kanarese districts, who claimed descent from Chandra Gupta (Vikramādiśya), referred to their great ancestor as Ujjayint-puravar-ādhisvara, ‘lord of Ujjain, the best of cities,’ as well as Pātalipuravar-ādhisvara ‘lord of Pāṭali (putra), the best of cities.’ Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies Chandra Gupta II with the traditional Vikramādiśya Ṣakāri, “the sun of valour, the destroyer of the Sakas,” of Ujjain.\(^2\) The titles *Sri*

---

1. Silver coins of the Ganaḍa type bearing the legend *Parama-Bhāgarata*, probably struck in Surāšṭra (Allan, p. xciv). Some of the coins bear the date 90 (=A.D. 406, EHI, 4th ed., p. 346). It has been suggested that, like his father, Chandra Gupta, too, performed a horse sacrifice (IHQ, 1927, p. 725) and that a stone horse lying in a village named Nagawa near Benares, and bearing an inscription containing the letters Chamdragu, commemorates the event. But there is no clear reference to such a sacrifice in the inscriptions or coins hitherto published.

2. In literature Vikramādiśya is represented as ruling at Pātaliputra (Kathā-sarit-sāgara, VII, 4. 8:—Vikramādiśya ityāsidrāja Pātaliputreke) as well as Ujjayini and other cities. Sāhasānika of Ujjain is said to have ordered the exclusive use of Sanskrit in his bārem Kṛṣṇa Mīṁāṃsā, 3rd. ed. p. 50). He thus reversed the policy of Āḍhyāryāja (p. 197) or Śatavāhana of Kuntala. C.f. the verse in Sarvasrati Kṛṣṇabhārana 11. 15.

Ke'bhum Āḍhyāryājaśa rājye praṅjita-bhāhṣipah
kule śrī Sāhasāṅkvara ke na Saṁskritavādīnah.

Among the Kṛṣṇa-kāraṇa tested in Ujjain mention is made of a Chandra Gupta along with Kālidāsa, Amara, Bāhravi and others (Kṛṣṇa M., p. 55).
Vikramak, Sinhsa-Vikramak, Ajita-Vikramak, Vikramanka and Vikramaditya actually occur on Chandra Gupta’s coins.¹

We have no detailed contemporary notice of Ujjayini (also called Visala, Padmavati, Bhogavati, Hiranayavati)² in the days of Chandra Gupta. But Fa-hien who visited Mid India during the period A.D. 405 to 411, has left an interesting account of Pataliputra. The pilgrim refers to the royal palace of Asoka and the halls in the midst of the city, “which exist now as of old,” and were according to him “all made by spirits which Asoka employed, and which piled up the stones, reared the walls and gates, and executed the elegant carving and inlaid sculpture-work,—in a way which no human hands of this world could accomplish.” “The inhabitants are rich and prosperous, and vie with one another in the practice of benevolence and righteousness. Every year on the eighth day of the second month they celebrate a procession of images... The Heads of the Vaisyya families

Paramasrtha, the biographer of Vasubandhu, refers to Ayodhya as the capital of a Vikramaditya while Hiien Tsang represents Sravasti as the seat of the famous king (EHI, 3rd Ed., pp. 332-33). Subandhu refers to the fame of Vikramaditya, but not to his capital city, “like a lake Vikramaditya hath left the earth, save indeed in fame” (Keith, Hist. Sans. Lit., p. 312). Cf. Hais, v. 64.

1 Name, title or epithet.

Sri Vikramak

Vikramaditya

Rupakriti

Sinhsa-Vikramak, Narendra Chandra,
Narendra Sinhsa, Sinhsa Chandra

Ajita-Vikramak

Paramabhagavata

Vikramaditya

Vikramakka

Vikramaditya, Maharakja, Chandra

Type of coin.

Archer type (gold).

Couch type (gold).

Chhattra (Parasol) type (gold).

Couch type (gold).

Lion-Slayer (gold).

Horseman type (gold).

Silver coins of the Gaura type.

Copper coins (Gaura, Chhatta and Vase type).

establish houses for dispensing charity and medicines."

The principal port of the empire on the east coast was Tâmralipti or Tamluk in West Bengal from which ships set sail for Ceylon, Java (then a centre of Brâhmanism), and China.

Much light is thrown on the character of Chandra Gupta Vikramâditya’s administration by the narrative of Fa-hien and the inscriptions that have hitherto been discovered. Speaking of the Middle Kingdom, the dominions of Chandra Gupta in the upper Ganges Valley, the Chinese pilgrim says: "the people are numerous and happy; they have not to register their households, or attend to any magistrates and their rules; only those who cultivate the royal land have to pay a portion of the gain from it. If they want to go, they go: if they want to stay on, they stay. The king governs without decapitation or other corporal punishments. Criminals are simply fined, lightly or heavily, according to the circumstances of each case. Even in cases of repeated attempts at wicked rebellion they only have their right hands cut off. The king’s bodyguards and attendants all have salaries. Throughout the whole country the people do not kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic. The only exception is that of the Chândâlas. In buying and selling commodities they use cowries."¹ The last statement evidently refers to such small transactions as Fa-hien had occasion to make.² The pilgrim does not seem to have met with the gold coins which would only be required for large transactions. That they were actually in currency, we know from the references to "dinâras" and "suvarnas" in inscriptions.³

¹ Legge.
² Allan.
³ Chandra Gupta II also issued silver and copper coins. The silver coins were mainly intended for the western provinces conquered from the Saka satraps.
That Chandra Gupta II was a good monarch may be inferred also from the inscriptions. Himself a devout Vaishnava (Parama-bhāgavata), he appointed men of other sects to high offices. His general Āmrakārddava, the hero of a hundred fights, anēkasamar-āvāpta-vijaya-yaśas-patākah, appears to have been a Buddhist or at least a pro-Buddhist, while his Minister of Peace and War, Śāba-Virasesa, and perhaps also his Mantrin or High Counsellor, Sikharasvāmin, were Saivas.

Regarding the machinery of Government we have no detailed information. But the following facts may be gleaned from the inscriptions. As in Maurya times, the head of the state was the Rājā who was at times nominated by his predecessor. The king is now regarded as a divinity—Achintya Purusha, ‘the Incomprehensible Being’. Dhanada-Varunendrāntaka-sama, the equal of Kuvera, Varuṇa, Indra and Yama, loka-dhāma deva, ‘a god dwelling on earth,’ Paramadaivata, ‘the supreme deity.’ He was assisted by a body of High Ministers whose office was very often hereditary as is suggested by the phrase ‘anvaya-prāpta sāchivyā’ ‘acquirer of the post of minister by hereditary descent’, of the Udayagiri Inscription of Śāba.¹ The most important among the High Ministers were the Mantrin, ‘High Counsellor,’ the Sāṃdhi-vigrahika, ‘Minister for Peace and War,’ and the Akshapaṭal-ādhikṛita, ‘the Lord

but they are also mentioned in the time of his son in inscriptions of Northern Bengal. The Bāgram inscription of the year 129 (448 A.D.) for instance refers to rāpakas along with dinaras (cf. Allan, p. cxxvii). The copper coins issued by Chandra Gupta II are commonly found around Ayodhya (Allan, p. cxxxi).

¹ The Mahā-dāṇḍa-nāyaka Harishega was the son of the Mahādāṇḍa-nāyaka Dhruva-bhūti. The Mantrin Prithivishega was the son of the Mantrin Sikharasvāmin. Cf. also the hereditary governors (goptṛ), of Mandalasor, Sūrāśṭra, etc. Things were some what different in the Maurya Period. Pushya Gupta, Rāshtriya of Surāśṭra in the time of Chandra Gupta Maurya, was quite unconnected by blood with Tushāspha, governor or feudatory in the time of Aśoka.
Keeper of State Documents.' Like the Kauṭilyan Mantrin, the Gupta Sāṃdhi-vigrahika accompanied the sovereign to the battle-field. As in the case of most of the Pradhānas of Śivāji there was no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. The same person could be Sāṃdhi-vigrahika, Kumārāmātya (cadet-minister), and Mahā-ḍanda-nāyaka, 'great commandant of the army,' and a Mantrin could become a Mahā-bal-ādhikṛita 'chief commander of forces.'

It is not clear whether the Guptas had a central council of ministers (Mantri-parishad). But the existence of local parishads (e.g., the Parishad of Udānakūpa) is proved by a BasārKh seal discovered by Bloch.

The empire was divided into a number of provinces styled Deśas, Bhuktis, etc., sub-divided into districts called Pradeśas or Vishayas. Among Deśas the Gupta inscriptions mention Śukuli-deśa. Surāshṭra (Kāthiāvād), Ćabhaḷā (the Jubbalpore region, Ćahala or Chedi of later times) and "Kālindī Narmadāyor Madhya," the territory lying between the Jumna and the Nerburda, and embracing, no doubt, Eastern Mālwa, are also perhaps to be placed under this category.

Among Bhuktis (lit. allotments) we have reference in inscriptions of the Gupta and early Post-Gupta Age to Pupḍra-vardhana bhukti (North Bengal), Vardhamāna bhukti (West Bengal) Tīrabhukti (North Bihār), Nagarabhukti (South Bihār), Sāvastī bhukti (Oudh), and Ahichchhatra bhukti (Rohilkhand), all situated in the Ganges valley. Among Pradeśas or Vishayas mention is made of Lāṭa-vishaya (in continental Gujarāṭ), Tripurīvishaya (in the Jubbalpore region), Airikinā in Eastern

1 The Bilsā Ins. (CII, 44) refers to a [Paj]shād. But there is nothing to show that it was a central political assembly. The Sabhās mentioned in connection with the nomination scene in the Allahabad Pillar inscription may, however, have been members of a Central Curia Regis or Council.

2 A territorial unit styled Vitkh is also known.
Mālwa (called Pradeśa in Samudra Gupta’s Eran inscription, and Vishaya in that of Toramāna), Antarvedī (the Gangetic Doāb), Vālavi (?) Gayā, Koṭīvarsha (the Dinājpur region in North Bengal), Mahākhushāpara (?), Khāḍāṭāpara (?) and Kuṇḍadhānī.  

The Desas were governed by officers called Goptris, or Wardens of the Marches, as is suggested by the passage Sarveshu Deseshu vidhāya Goptrin ‘having appointed Goptris in all the Desas.’ The Bhuktis were usually governed by Uparikas or Uparika Mahārājas who were sometimes apparently princes of the Imperial family, e.g., Rājaputra-deva-bhaṭṭāraka, Governor of Puṇḍravardhana bhukti mentioned in a Dāmodarpur plate, Govinda Gupta, Governor of Tirabhukti mentioned in the Basārh seals and possibly Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of Tumain in Central India. The office of Vishaya-pati or District Officer was held by Imperial officials like the Kumār-āmātyas and Ayuktakas, as well as by feudatory Mahārājas like Mātri-vishṇu of Eran. Some of the Vishayapatis, e.g., Sarvanāga of Antarvedī, were possibly directly under the Emperor, while others, e.g., those of Koṭīvarsha, Airīkiṇa and Tripurī, were usually under provincial Governors. The Governors and District Officers were no doubt helped by officials and dignitaries like the Dāṇḍika, Chaur-oddharaṇika and Daṇḍapāśika (apparently judicial and police officials), Nagarā Sṛṣṭhī (President or Alderman of a city-guild), Sārthavāha (lit. caravan-leader or merchant), Prathama-Kulika (foreman of artisans) Prathama-Kāyastha (the


2 Govinda Gupta is known also from the newly discovered Mandaśor Ins. of the Mālava—Vikrama year 524 (noticed by Garde, ASI, Annual Report, 1922–23, p. 187; Cal. Rev., 1926, July, 155; Ep. Ind., xix, App. No. 7; xxvii, 12 ff.) which mentions his Senādhīpa or captain Vāyurakshita, and Vāyu’s son Dattabhaṭa, Commander-in-chief of the forces of king Prabhākara (167–68 A.D.).

3 They are also known as officers apparently in charge of vīthīs or smaller units.

4 And Kūlavṛddhi of Paṅchanaṇagari (in North Bengal), Ep. Ind., xxi, 81.

chief scribe), *Pusta-pāla* (record-keeper) and others. Every *Vishaya* consisted of a number of ‘‘grāmas’’ or villages which were administered by headmen and other functionaries styled *Grāmikas, Mahattaras* and *Bhojakas*.⁴

Outside the limits of the Imperial provinces lay the vassal kingdoms and republics, mentioned in the Allahabad *praśasti* and other documents.

The Basārīh seals throw some interesting sidelight on the provincial and municipal government as well as the economic organisation of the province of Tīrabhukti (Tirhut) in North Bihār. The province was apparently governed by prince Govinda Gupta, a son of the Emperor by the *Mahādevī Śrī Dhruva-svāminī*, who had his capital at Vaiśāli. The seals mention several officials like the *Uparika* (governor), the *Kumār-āmātya* (cadet-minister),⁵ the *Mahā-pratihāra* (the great chamberlain),

---

¹ In the *Mṛichhehhaṭikā* (Act IX), which may be a composition of the period between Bāga (who knew a king Śudraka, but no poet of the same name) and Vāmana (8th century) the judge (adhiparajika) in a court of law is accompanied by a *Sreshṭhīn* and a *Kāyastha*. Reference is also made to the Adhikaraṇya-Bhojakas and a Mahattaraka in connection with the arrangement of benches in the *Vyārahāra-maṇḍapa* (the hall of justice) and the detection of people ‘‘wanted’’ by the city Police (nagara-rakṣh-ādhiṣṭhaṇa). The *Mudrārākṣasā* of Viśakhadatta which is probably to be assigned to a period anterior to Rājaśekhara, the Dasaṛūpaṇa and Bhoja, perhaps also to Vāmana but not to Avantivarman (of the Maunkhari or Utpala dynasty) or Dantivarman (Rāṣṭhraṅgūta or Pallava) whose name or names occur in the *Bharata Vākya*, makes mention of *Kāyastha, Dasaṛūpaṇa*, etc. Village functionaries were ordinarily placed under officials of the Vishaya or district. But in exceptional cases they had direct dealings with the *Uparika* or governor of a Bhukti (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, 136).

² It has been taken to mean (1) minister of a Prince as distinguished from that of the King (rājāmātya), (2) minister in charge of Princes, C. V. Vaidya, *Med. Hind. Ind.*, I, 138, (3) a junior minister whose father is alive, or (4) one who has been a minister since the days of his youth. But cf. *Ep. Ind.*, X, 49; XV, 302 f. It will be seen that the Kumārāmātyas were, as stated by a previous writer, divided into two classes, viz., (i) *Yuvārājapādīya*, those serving the Crown Prince, and (ii) *Parama-bhṛṭarākapādīya*, those serving the Emperor himself. This perhaps makes the interpretation ‘counsellor of, or in charge of the Prince’ untenable. See, however, Penzer. I. 32; III, 136. The most probable view is that the term *Kumāra* in the expression *Kumārāmātya* corresponds to
Talavara (general or local chief),¹ the Mahā-danda-
nyaaka (the great commandant), the Vinayasthitii
sthāpaka,² the censor [?], and the Bhaṭāśvapati (lord of
the army and cavalry), and the following offices, e.g.,
Yuvarāja-pādiya Kumar-āmāṭya-ādhiṣṭhanaka (office of the
Minister of His Highness the Crown Prince, according
to Vogel), Raṇabhāṇḍāgar-ādhiṣṭhanaka⁴ (office of the chief
treasurer of the war department), Balādhiṣṭhanaka (war
office), Daṇḍapāś-ādhiṣṭhanaka (office of the chief of Police),
Tīrtha-bhūkty-Upārik-ādhiṣṭhanaka (office of the Governor of
Tirhut), Tiṟabhuktau Vinayasthitii-sthāpaka-ādhiṣṭhanaka
(office of the censor [?] of Tirhut), Vaiśāḷy-ādhiṣṭhān-
ādhiṣṭhanaka (office of the government of the city of Vaiśāḷi),
Sri-parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādiya Kumār-āmāṭya-ādhiṣṭhanaka
(office of the cadet-minister waiting on His Majesty).⁵

The reference to the Parishad (Council or Committee)
of Udānakūpā shows that the Parishad still formed an
important element of the machinery of local govern-
ment. The mention of the ‘mote-hall of aldermen
of guilds, caravan-leaders and foremen of artisans’
(Śresṭhī-sarṇha-vahā-kulika-nigama) is of interest to
students of economics.

Pīña, Chikka, Immadi, Ilaya, of the south, and is the opposite of Peda
(Praṇḍha), Piriya. In the Gupta Age the Kumārāmāṭyas often served as district
officers. The office was also combined with that of a general, counsellor and
foreign secretary.

¹ Cf. talārā of the Chirwā inscription of Samara Sinha.
² Dr. Basak takes Vinay-sthiti in the sense of law and order (The History of
North-Eastern India, p. 312).
³ In the Nāṭyā-stāstra, Sthāpaka is the designation of the introducer of a
play (Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 340). Here a different functionary may be
meant.
⁴ The mention of Raṇa-bhāṇḍāgar suggests that the finance department
had its military as distinguished from the civil side.
⁵ A distinction is drawn between imperial officials and those connected with
viceregal administration and amongst the latter officers of the province of Tiṟa-
bhukti are clearly distinguished from the public servants in charge of the subordinate
administration of the ādhiṣṭhāna of Vaiśāḷi.
Chandra Gupta II had at least two queens, Dhruvadevi and Kubera-nāgā. The first queen was the mother of Govinda Gupta and Kumāra Gupta I. The second queen had a daughter named Prabhāvati who became queen of the Vākāṭakas. The latter was the mother of the Princes Divākarasena, Dāmodarasena and Pravarasena II (or III). Certain mediaeval chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta. The origin of these chiefs is probably to be traced to some unrecorded adventures of Vikramāditya in the Deccan.

1 A son of Chandra Gupta styled bhūpati (king) Chandraprakāśa is mentioned in a verse quoted by Vāmana in his Kāyavyākāśa-Sūtravṛitti (JASB, Vol I, No. 10. [N.S.], 1905, 254 ff.). But the identity of this Chandra Gupta is uncertain. His identification with Vikramāditya (i.e., Chandra Gupta II) rests on the vexed problem of the date of Vasubandhu (or Subandhu?) alleged to be mentioned by Vāmana, and the question as to whether the personage mentioned may be identified with the Buddhist scholar whose biographer was Paramāṛtha (A.D. 600-69). Paramāṛtha was a Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāradvāja family of Ujjayini who stayed for a time in Magadha and then went to China (A. D. 546-69). According to his account Vasubandhu was born at Purushapura or Peshāwār, of the Brāhmaṇa family of Kauśika. He went to Ayodhya at the invitation of Bālāditya, son of Vikramāditya (JIRAS, 1905, 33 ff.). For some recent views about the date of Vasubandhu, see Indian Studies in Honour of C. R. Lamont, 79 ff.

2 Rājaś-khara in his Kāvyamānās and Bhoja, in his Śrīgara Prakāśika, mention that Kālidāsa was sent on an embassy to a Kuntala king by Vikramāditya. "Kṣemendra, in the Aucitga Viśrā Cacā, refers to Kālidāsa’s Kuntelcara Dautya" (Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, 1924, p. 6). That the Gutas actually established contact with Kuntala appears clear from the Tālāgund inscription which states that a Kadamba ruler of the Kanarese country gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. An important indication of Gupta influence in the South Western Deccan is possibly afforded by the coins of Kumāra Gupta I found in the Satara District (Allan, p. exx.). The rôle assigned to Kālidāsa by Rājaś-khara, Bhoja and Kṣemendra is not unworthy of credence as tradition points to a date for him in the early Gupta Age. For traditions about his synchronism with Mahārajaśīra Vikramāditya (Satkaratī) and Dignāga and with king Pravarasena who is held to be the author of the poem Setubandha written in Mahāraṣṭrī Prākṛita and is, therefore, presumably identical with one of the kings bearing the same name in the Vakāṭaka family, (recorded in Abhinanda’s Rāmacarita, ch. 32, Hāla, Gādhānapātaka, Bhūnmika, p. 8 and other works) see Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference, 99 ff.; Malimātha’s comment on Meghaduta, I. 14; Ind. Ant., 1912, 267, JIRAS, 1915, 118 ff. It has recently been
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Vindhyāsakti I (twice-born)  |
Mahārāja Pravarasena I a  |  Bhavanāga, King of the Bhārā-
Gantamiputra—daughter  |  śivas (Padmāvatī) b

Sarvasena*  |

Vindhyāsakti II  |
Dharmā-Mahārāja  |
Samudra Gupta  |
Mahārāja Rudrasena I (Deotek)  |
 Mahārājādhirāja  |
 Chandra Gupta II  |
 Mahārāja Prithivishena I c

Pṛabhāvatī—Mahārāja Rudrasena II  |
Agrā-Mahēśbi  |

Pravarasena II?  |

son  |

Yuvaratā Divākarasena  |
Dāmodarāsena  |
Devasena, Nandivardhana d  |
 Rāmagiri  |
 Supratishthāhāra  |
 Ajjhitabhaṭṭārikā—Narendraśena e

Harīshena f  |
his minister Hastibhoja  |

Pravarasena II? (or III) g  |

Prithivishena II  |
(Vembāra)  |
“raised his sunken family”  |
from Nalaś

pointed out by Mr. Mirashi that the Pattan plates of Pravarasena II (year 27) refer to a Kālidāsa as the writer of the charter, Ep. Ind., xxiii (1935), pp. 81 ff. But the identity of the scribe with the great poet remains doubtful.

* It must not be understood that Sarvasena was necessarily the elder of the two brothers. The matter may be settled when further evidence is available.

1 He performed four Āśāmedkas, and is styled a Mahārāja, and Śomāraj. His traditional capital Kāñchanakāpurā recalls Hiranyapurā (Hirapur ? SSE of Sāgar) of the Duddia plates (Ep. Ind. III. 258ff). The splitting up of the name into Purikā and Chanakā seems hardly justifiable.


3 A dharma-vijayi whose “kosa-dāṇḍa-sādhana” is said to have been accumulating for a hundred years.

4 Identified by some with Nagardhan near Ramtek (Hiralal Ins. No. 4.; Tenth Or. Conf. p. 458) and by others with Nandapur, near Ghughusagar, north-east of Ramtek (Wellsted, Notes on the Vākaṭakas, JASB, 1933, 160f).

5 Ruler of Pravarpura, Charāmāṅka and of following rāiyas viz., Bhujakāja (N. Berar), Ārammi, (east of Berar) and of the Wardha region. Pravarpura has been identified by some with Pavnār in Wardha District (JASB, 1933, 159).

6 His commands were honoured by rulers of Kosalā, Mekalā (at the source of the Nerbudda) and Mālava.

7 Credited with the conquest of Kuntala, Avanti, Kalinga, Kosala, Andhra, Trikūṭa, Lāṭa.
Section II. Kumāra Gupta I Mahendra-ditya.

Chandra Gupta II's successor was Kumāra Gupta I, surnamed Mahendra-ditya whose certain dates range from A.D. 415 to A.D. 455. His extensive coinage, and the wide distribution of his inscriptions show that he was able to retain his father's empire including the central and western provinces. One of his viceroys, Chirātadatta, governed Pundravardhana Bhūkti or roughly North

1 The Māndāsor inscription of the Mālava year 524 suggests that Kumāra may have had a rival in his brother prince Govinda Gupta. In the record Indra (vīrudhā dhīpa, Kumāra?, who is styled Sri Mahendra and Mahendra-karman on coins) represented as being suspicious of Govinda's power. Ep. Ind., XIX, App. No. 7 and n. 5; Ep xxvii. 15.

2 Also called Sri Mahendra (on coins of the Archer type), Ātvamedha Mahendra (on coins of the Ātvamedha type), Mahendra-karmā, Ājita Mahendra (on coins of the horseman type and sometimes on the lion-slayer type), Śīṅha Mahendra (on coins of the lion-slayer type), Śri Mahendra Śīṅha (also on coins of the lion-slayer type), Mahendra Kumāra (on coins of the peacock type) Mahendra-balāpa (Tumain Ins.), Śīṅha Vikrama (on coins of the lion-slayer type: Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 80), Vyāghra bala-parākrama (on coins of the tiger-slayer type) and Śri Pratāpa. On the swordsmen type of gold coins and on copper coins of the Garuḍa and possibly śīṅha-vāhini types the emperor is simply called Śri Kumāra Gupta. The title Mahendra-ditya with the epithet Parama bhāgavata, 'devoted worshipper of the Bhagavat (Vishṇu-Krīṣṇa),' is found on silver coins, apparently struck in Surāshṭra.

3 The date 96 (= A.D. 415) is found in the Bilar Inscription and the date 136 (= A.D. 455) on silver coins (EHI, 4th ed., pp. 345-46). The Brahm inscription of Samudra Gupta refers to his 'virtuous and faithful wife' and many sons and son's sons of the royal pair. From this it seems probable that Kumāra Gupta and his brothers were already born during the reign of their grandfather, and that Kumāra had seen not less than some thirty-five summers before his accession. As he reigned for at least forty years, he could not have died before the age of 75 (approximately).

4 The possession of the central districts in the Ganges valley is, according to Allan, confirmed by the silver coins of the peacock type (cf. the Ayodhyā coins of Kṛṣṇamitra, CHI, I. 533 and Meghadūta I. 48.) and the inclusion of the western province by those of the Garuḍa type. Silverplated coins with a copper core were intended for circulation in the Valabhi area, and coins of small thick fabric resembling the Traiśukṣaka coinage were apparently struck in South Gujarāṭ (Allan, pp. xcviii ff.)
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Bengal, another viceroy, prince Ghaṭotkacha Gupta, held office in the province of Erañ (in Eastern Mālwa) which included Tumbavana; a third viceroy or feudatory, Bandhuvarman, ruled at Daśapura in western Mālwa. The Karamadānḍē inscription of A. D. 436 mentions Prīthivishēṇa who was a Mantrin and Kumārāmāṭya, and afterwards Mahā-balādhiκrīta or general under Kumāra Gupta, probably stationed in Oudh. The panegyrist of a Mālwa viceroy claims that the suzerainty of Kumāra Gupta extended over “the whole earth which is decked with the rolling seas as with a rocking girdle, which holds in its breast-like mountain altitudes the

1 Cf. the Dāmodarpur plates of the years 124 and 128. (Ep. xvii. 193). The Baigrama inscription of the year 128 (A. D. 447-48) refers to a Kumārāmāṭya named Kulaśriddhi who governed a viṣaya with its headquarters at Paṇchhānagari, possibly Paṇchabibi or Paṇchbaḍ on the Karātoya, H. Standard 14.10.47 in N. Bengal. Ep. Ind., XXI, 78 ff. Year Book, ASB, 1950, 200. The Sultanpur or Kalaikudi Inscription (Bangāri 1350 B. S. Baidakha, pp. 415-51 and Bhāḍra; IHQ XIX. 12) of the year 120=A. D. 439 in the Bogra district, makes mention of another officer, the Ayuktaka, Achyutaddaśa of Purānsakūśikā in Śrīgavera-vīthī. The Natore inscription of A. D. 439 (JPASB, 1911) is another record of Kumāra’s reign found in N. Bengal.

2 Tumain in the Guna district of the Gwalior state, about 50 miles to the north-west of Erañ. M. B. Garde, Ind. Ant., xlix 1920, p. 114, Ep. Ind. xxvi (1941), pp. 116 ff; Tumain Inscription of the year 116, i.e. A. D. 435. The identity of the prince mentioned in the record, with Śrī Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of seals and Ghaṭo Kramāditya of coins is uncertain (Allan, xvi. xi, liv) Hema Chandra (in the Purāṇa parvan, xii, 2-3) places Tumbavana in the Avantideśa, “the ornament of the western half of Bhārata” in Jambu-dvipa.

Ihāra Jambūdīpī pāy Bharatārdhā vibhāṣaṇam
Avantirīti dāso sti svargādēṣyā riddhikībhūḥ
tāra Tumbavanamitrī viḍyate sannicchālam

3 Mandasor inscription of A. D. 437-38. Bhide suggests (JBORS, VII, March, 1921, pp. 33 f) that Viśva-varman of Gupta Ins. No. 17 is an independent king, who flourished a century before his namesake of ins. No. 18, who is a governor (Goṭrīśī) of the Guptas. S. Majumdar points out that even Viśva-varman of Ins. No. 17 must be later than Naravarman of V. S 461 (=A. D. 404-05). In the Bihar Kotra (Bāigung state, Mālwa) Ins. (Ep. Ind. xxvi. 150 ff) of Mahārāja Naravarman of the year 474 (i.e., A. D. 417–18) the king is styled ‘auklāko’, thus establishing his connection with Viśnuvardhana of the Mālava Era 589 (A. D. 532-33).
founts of the vivifying liquid, and smiles with the flowers of its forest glens.  

Like his father, Kumāra was a tolerant king. During his rule the worship of Śvāmī Mahāsena (Kārttikeya), of Buddha, of Siva in the liṅga form and of the sun, as well as that of Vishnū, flourished peacefully side by side.¹

The two notable events of Kumāra’s reign are the celebration of the horse sacrifice, evidenced by the rare Aśka-medha type of his gold coinage, and the temporary eclipse of the Gupta power by the Pushyamitrās. The reading Pushyamitra in the Bhitari inscription is, however, not accepted by some scholars because the second syllable of this name is damaged.² Mr. H. R. Divekar in his article—“Pushyamitrās in the Gupta Period”³ makes the plausible emendation Yudhy-āmitrāṁś-ça for Dr. Fleet’s reading Pusyamitrāṁś-ça in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription.⁴ It is admitted on all hands that during the concluding years of Kumāra’s reign the Gupta empire “had been made to totter.” Whether the reference in the inscription is simply to amitraś (enemies), or to Pushyamitrās, cannot

¹ Cf. the Bilsaj, Mankuwār, Karamadāṇḍe and Mandava inscriptions. Siva appears to have been the favourite deity of many high ministers, Vishnū of the most powerful ruling race and the sun of traders and artisans in the early Gupta period. The expression Jītaṃ Bhagavatā appears to have been popularised by the king. His example seems to have been followed by Mādhava Gaṅga of Penukonda plates (Ep. Ind. XIV. 834), Vāsāvarman I Kadamba of Hebbata grant (Mys. A. S., A. R., 1925. 98), Nandivarman Pallava of Udaiyendiram (Ep. Ind., III. 145) and other kings of the south. The popularity of the cult of Kārttikeya is well illustrated not only by the sanctuaries erected in his honour, but also by the names Kumāra and Skanda assumed by members of the imperial family, and the issue of the peacock type of coins by the emperor Kumāra Gupta I. The Gupta empire reached the zenith of its splendour before its final decline in the time of the originator of the ‘peacock’ coins, as a later empire did in the days of the builder of the peacock-throne.

² Cf. Fleet, CII, p. 55 n.

³ Annals of the Rhandarkar Institute, 1919-20, 93 f.

⁴ CII, iii, p. 58.
be satisfactorily determined. We should, however, remember in this connection that a people called Pushyamitra is actually referred to in the Vishnu Purana and a Pushyamitika-Kula in the Jain Kalpasutra. The Purana text associates the Pushyamitrnas, Patumitrnas, Durmitras and others with the region of Mekala near the source of the Nerbudda. References to the warlike activities of Mekala and the neighbouring realm of Kosala that had once been overrun by Kumara’s grandfather, are found in inscriptions of the Vakataka relations of Kumara Gupta. Bana relates the tragic story of a ruler of Magadha who was carried off by the ministers of the lord of Mekala. A passage in the Mankuwar stone image inscription of the year 129 (A.D. 449) where the emperor Kumara Gupta I is styled simply Maharaja Sri instead of Maharajadhiraja Sri has been interpreted by some scholars to mean that he was possibly deprived by his enemies of his status as paramount sovereign. But the theory is rendered improbable by the Daimodpurp plate of about the same date where Kumara is given full imperial titles. It may be noted in this connection that in several inscriptions, and on certain coins, his immediate predecessors, too, are simply called Raja or Maharaja.

The assumption of the title Vyaghra-bala-parakrama “displaying the strength and prowess of a tiger”, on coins of the tiger-slayer type, by Kumara may possibly indicate that he attempted to repeat the southern venture of his

---

1 SBE, XXII, 292 Cf. the legend Pusamitasa found on Bhita seals in characters of the Kushan period or a somewhat earlier date (JRAS, 1911, 138).

2 Vash. IV, 34. 17; Wilson, IX, 213. “Pushyamitra, and Patumitra and others to the number of 13 will rule over Mekala.” The commentary, however, distinguishes the 13 Pushyamitra-Patumitrnas from the 7 Mekalas. But from the context it is apparent that the position of the Pushyamitrnas was between the Mahisbyas (people of Mahishmati?) and the Mekalas in the Nerbudda-Son valleys if not in a part of the country of the Mekalas themselves. Cf. Fleet, JRAS, 1889, 228, cf. also Bhita seals. For Mekala see also Ep. Ind. xxvii 138 f.
grandfather and penetrate into the tiger-infested forest territory beyond the Nerudda. Expansion towards the south is also indicated by a find of 1,395 coins in the Satara District. But the imperial troops must have met with disaster. The fallen fortunes of the Gupta family were restored by prince Skanda Gupta who may have been appointed his father’s warden in the Ghāzipur region, the Atavi or Forest Country of ancient times.

The only queen of Kumāra I named in the genealogical portion of extant inscriptions is Anantadevi. He had at least two sons, viz., Puru Gupta, son of Anantadevi, and Skanda Gupta the name of whose mother is, in the opinion of some scholars, not given in the inscriptions. Sewell, however, suggests that it was Devaki. This is not an unlikely assumption as otherwise the comparison of the widowed Gupta empress with Krishna’s mother in verse 6 of the Bhitari Pillar Inscription will be less explicable. Hsiuen Tsang calls Buddha Gupta (Fo-to-kio-to) or Budha Gupta, a son (or descendant?) of Śakrāditya. The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had a synonymous title was Kumāra Gupta I who is called Mahendrāditya on coins. Mahendra is the same as Sakra.

1 Allan, p. cxxx. Cf. also the Kadamba inscription referring to social relations between the Kadambas of the fifth century and the Guptas.
2 Cf. the Bhitari Inscription.
3 Historical Inscriptions of Southern India. p. 349.
4 The name Fo-to-kio-to has been restored as Buddha Gupta. But we have no independent evidence regarding the existence of a king named Buddha Gupta about this period. The synchronism of his successor’s successor Bhalāditya with M. hirakula indicates that the king meant was Budha Gupta, cf. also Ind. Ant., 1886, 251 n.
5 That Śakrāditya was a reality is proved by a Nālandā seal (H. Sastri, MASI, No. 66, p. 38). To him is ascribed an establishment at Nālandā, the far-famed place, which grew into a great university in the seventh century A.D. The pilgrim was not indulging in mere fancy as suggested by Sri N. Sastri in a treatise on Nālandā.
The use of terms conveying the same meaning as titles and epithets was not unknown in the Gupta period. \textit{Vikramāditya} was also called \textit{Vikramānka}. Skanda Gupta is called both \textit{Vikramāditya} and \textit{Kramāditya}, both the words meaning "puissant like the sun" or "striding like the sun." If Śakraditya of Hiuen Tsang be identical with Mahendrāditya or Kumāra I, Buddha Gupta\textsuperscript{1} was closely related to Kumāra. Another member of Kumāra's family was possibly Ghaṭotkacha Gupta.\textsuperscript{2}

Recent discoveries show that Budha Gupta was really a grandson (not a son) of Kumāra Gupta I. The Chinese pilgrim may have failed to distinguish between a son and a grandson. Cf. The Koppam plates where Pulakesīn II is represented as a grandson of Kīrtivarman I. But he was really the son of the latter. It is also possible that Śakrāditya was an epithet of Purugupta, the father of Budha.

\textsuperscript{1} The Tumain Inscription referred to by Mr. Garde; cf. also the Basāzh seal mentioning Śri Ghaṭotkacha Gupta. The exact relationship with Kumāra is, however, not stated in the inscription.
SECTION III. SKANDA GUPTA VIKRAMADITYA.

According to the evidence of the Ārya-Maṅjuśrī-mūla-
kalpa, confirmed by epigraphic testimony, the immediate
successor of Mahendra, i.e., Kumāra Gupta I, was Skanda
Gupta. In an interesting paper read at a meeting of
the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Dr. R. C. Majumdar sugges-
ted that after Kumāra’s death, which apparently took
place while the struggle with the Pushyamitrās was still
undecided, there was a fratricidal war in which Skanda
Gupta came off victorious after defeating his brothers
including Puru Gupta, the rightful claimant, and rescued
his mother just as Kṛṣṇa rescued Dvārakī.¹ Dr. Majum-
dar observed that the omission of the name of the mother
of Skanda Gupta in the genealogy given in the Bihār
and Bhitāri Stone Pillar Inscriptions indicated that she
was not the chief queen and Skanda ‘had no natural
claim to the throne’. The rightful heir of Kumāra was
Puru Gupta, the son of the Mahādevi Anantadevi.

We should, however, remember that there was no rule
prohibiting the mention of ordinary queens in inscriptions.
The mother of Princess Prabhāvatī, Kuberanāgā, was not
the chief queen of Chandra Gupta II.² No doubt the title
Mahādevi is once given to her in the Poona plates of her
daughter in the year 13, but it is not repeated in the
Riddhapur plates of the year 19, where she is called
simply Kuberanāgā devī without the prefix Mahādevi,
whereas Kumāra-devī, Datta-devī and even her own
daughter, Prabhāvatī-guptā are styled Mahādevis. The
contrast is full of significance and we know as a matter of
fact that the real Mahādevi (chief queen) of Chandra

¹ Cf. the Bhitāri Inscription, JASB, 1921 (N. S. XVII), 253 ff. In IC. 1944,
171, Dr. Majumdar modified his views regarding the omission of the name of the
queen mother in the Bihār ins. and finds the names of Mahādevī Anantadevi and
her son Purugupta in the inscription.
² JASB, 1924, 58.
Gupta II was Dhruva-devi or Dhruva-Svāminī. Though Kuberanāgā was not the principal consort (agramahishā) of her husband, she is mentioned in the inscriptions of her daughter. On the other hand the names of queens, the mothers of kings, are sometimes omitted.\(^1\) In the genealogical portion of the Banskhera and Madhuban plates the name of Yaśomati as Harsha’s mother is not mentioned, but in the Sonpat and the Nālandā seals\(^2\) she is mentioned both as the mother of Rājya-vardhana and as the mother of Harsha. Therefore it is not safe to draw conclusions from a comparison of genealogies given on seals and those given in ordinary praśastis. From a comparative study of the seals and plaques referred to above on the one hand and ordinary panegyrical epigraphs on the other, two facts emerge, viz., (a) genealogies given by the records of the former class are fuller than those given in the others, and (b) names of mothers of reigning kings that are invariably given (even though this meant repetition\(^1\)) in documents of the first group are sometimes omitted by the writers of praśastis, even though they be the names of the chief queens. There is no real analogy between the genealogy on the Bhītārī seal and that in the Pillar Inscriptions. A seal should be compared to another seal and an ordinary praśasti with another document of the same class.\(^3\)

---

\(^{1}\) The name of the father of a reigning king is also sometimes omitted (cf. Kielhorn’s N. Ins. Nos. 464, 468).

\(^{2}\) A. R. of the ASI. Eastern Circle, 1917-18, p. 44; Ep. Ind., XXI. 74 ff. MASI, No. 66, 68 f.

\(^{3}\) We have already seen that in the opinion of Sewell the name of Skanda’s mother is actually mentioned in one epigraph. According to that scholar her name was Devaki. The comparison with Krishnā’s mother (who, with all her misfortunes, did not experience the pangs of widowhood) in the Bhītārī Inscription would be less explicable, if not altogether pointless, if Devaki was not the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta as well as that of Krishnā. Why were Krishnā and Devaki thought of in connection with the victory over hostile powers, instead of, say, Skanda (Kārttikeya) and Pārvatī, Indra or Vishṇu and Aditi,
As to the question of rightful claim to the succession; we should remember that the cases of Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II suggest that the ablest among the princes was chosen irrespective of any claim arising out of birth.

There is nothing to show that the struggle at the end of Kumāra's reign, referred to in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription, was a fratricidal conflict. The relevant text of the inscription runs thus:

Pitari divam upetē viplutām vamśa-lakshmim
bhujā-bala-vijit-ārir-yyah pratishthāpya bhūyah
jitam-iti paritoshān mātaram sārā-nettrām
hata-ripur-iva Krishṇa Devakīm-abhyupetah

"Who, when (his) father had attained heaven (i.e., died), vanquished (his) enemies by the strength of (his) arm, and steadied once more the drifting fortunes of his family; and then exclaiming 'the victory has been won' betook himself, like Krishṇa, when his enemies had been slain, to his weeping mother, Devaki".

The hostile powers (ari), who made the Vamśa-lakṣāṃti, goddess of family fortune, of Skanda Gupta "vipluta," 'convulsed,' after the death of his father, were apparently enemies of the Gupta family, i.e., outsiders not belonging to the Gupta line. As a matter of fact the protagonists expressly mentioned in the Bhitari Pillar

by the panegyrist of Skanda Gupta who is compared to Sakra (Sakropama, Kahaun Inscription) and Vishnu (Sriparikšiptasacakha, Junagadh epigraph)?

A possible explanation is that the name of his mother coupled with her miserable plight suggested to the court-poet comparison with Krishṇa and Devaki. Cf. Ep. Ind. I, 364; xiii. 126, 131 (Hampe and Conjeeveram ins. of Krishṇadeva Raya) where we have a similar play on the name Devaki—:

tadvahis Devahijānirddidipe Timma bhūpatiḥ
yadavi Tuluvendreshu Yadoh Krishṇa ivāna... 
sarasadhahkṛttaṃ Namasya
dhavi Narasācanipalakah
Devakainandana (var. "nandanaḥ") Kāmo Devakī naṇḍanādīva.

The problem, however, is not free from difficulties and its final solution must await fresh discoveries.

1 For the reference to Devaki, see Vishṇu Purāṇa, V, 79.
Inscription were outsiders, e.g., the Pushyamitras and the Hūṇas. There is not the slightest reference to a fratricidal war. There is no doubt a passage in the Junāgadh Inscription of Skanda which says that "the goddess of fortune and splendour (Lakṣmī) of her own accord selected (Skanda) as her husband (svayāṁ vṛayaṁ-chakāra)...having discarded all the other sons of kings (manujendra-putra)." But "svayameva śrīyā gṛihita" "accepted by Śrī or Lakṣmī of her own accord" is an epithet which is applied by Prabhākara-vardhana, shortly before his death, to Harsha whose devotion to his elder brother is well-known. That Skanda Gupta like Harsha was considered to be the favourite of the Goddess of Luck is well-known. Attention may be invited to the Lakṣmī type of his coins and the epithet Śrī-parikshipta-vakshāḥ ("whose breast is embraced by Śrī, i.e., Lakṣmī"), occurring in the Junāgadh Inscription. The panegyrist of the emperor refers to a svayambhara in the conventional style. A svayambhara naturally presupposes an assemblage of princes, not necessarily of one particular family, in which all the suitors are discarded excepting one. But there is no inseparable connection between a svayambhara and a fight, and, even when it is followed by a fight, the combatants are hardly ever princes who are sons of the

1 Even if the reference be merely to "amītras" (see ante, p. 568), these amītras could not have included an elder brother, as the passage "kṣhitipā-charanāpiṣṭhe sthūpita rāma-pādah," ("placed (his) left foot on a feet-stool which was the king (of that hostile power himself)" clearly shows. The expression samudita bala kośa ("whose power and wealth had risen") would be singularly inappropriate in the case of the rightful heir to the imperial throne of the Guptas with its enormous resources existing for several generations, and can only point to a powerful power that had suddenly leaped to fame.

2 Allan, p. xcix.


Gurjareśvara-tājya-Srīr
yāṣya jaṭācā svayambhā
The Svayambhara of Lakṣmī forms the subject of the drama which Urvāśī acts before Indra with her sister nymphs (JASB, 59, 32).
same king. The epigraphic passage referring to Lakshmi's svayambhara, therefore, does not necessarily imply that there was a struggle between the sons of Kumāra in which Skanda came off victorious. It only means that among the princes he was specially fortunate and was considered to be the best fitted to rule because of the valiant fight he had put up against the enemies of the family and empire. In the Allahabad prašasti we have a similar passage: —"who (Samudra Gupta) being looked at with envy by the faces, melancholy through the rejection of themselves, of others of equal birth...was bidden by his father,—who exclaiming 'verily he is worthy' embraced him—to govern of a surety the whole world." It may be argued that there is no proof that Skanda was selected by Kumāra. On the contrary he is said to have been selected by Lakshmi of her own accord. But such was also the case with Harsha. Skanda like Harsha was called upon to save the empire of his forbears at a time when the fortunes of the imperial family were at a low ebb, and both these eminent men owed their success to their own prowess. The important thing to remember is that the avowed enemies of Skanda Gupta mentioned in his inscriptions were outsiders like the Pushyamitrás, Hūṇas,¹ and Mlechchhas.² The manujendra-putras of the Junāgadh Inscription are mentioned only as disappointed suitors, not as defeated enemies, comparable to the brothers of Samudra Gupta who were discarded by Chandra Gupta I. We are, therefore, inclined to think that as the tottering Gupta empire was saved from its enemies (e.g., the Pushyamitrás) by Skanda Gupta it was he who was considered to be the best fitted to rule. There is no evidence that his brothers disputed his claim

¹ Bhitari Ins.
² Jurāgaḍh Ins.
and actually fought for the crown. There is nothing to show that Skanda shed his brothers' blood and that the epithets ‘\textit{amalātmā},’ ‘pure-souled,’ and ‘\textit{parahitakāri},’ ‘the benefactor of others,’ applied to him in the Bhitarī Inscription and coin legends,\textsuperscript{1} were unjustified.

The view that Skanda Gupta was the immediate successor of Kumāra Gupta I seems to be confirmed by a verse in the \textit{Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa}\textsuperscript{2} which runs thus:

\begin{quote}
Samudrākhya nṛpraschaiva  
Vikramaśchaiva kīrtitaḥ  
Mahendranṛipavaro mukhyah  
Sakārādyam atah param  
Devarājākhya nāmāsau yugādhame
\end{quote}

It is impossible not to recognise in the kings (\textit{nṛpa}) Samudra, Vikrama, Mahendra and ‘Sākārādyā’ mentioned in the verse, the great Gupta emperors Samudra Gupta, Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya, and Skanda Gupta.\textsuperscript{3}

Skanda Gupta assumed the titles of \textit{Kramāditya} and \textit{Vikramāditya}.\textsuperscript{4} The passage from the \textit{Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa} quoted above refers to his appellation \textit{Devarāja}. The titles Vikramāditya and Devarāja were apparently assumed in imitation of his grandfather. The latter

\textsuperscript{1} Allan, \textit{Gupta Coins}, cxxi.
\textsuperscript{3} IHQ, 1932, p. 352.
\textsuperscript{4} Allan, Catalogue, pp. 117, 122; cf. Fleet, CII, p. 53: –

\"\textit{Vinaṇa-bala-sunhitair-vikramaṇa kramaṇa}  
pratidinam-abhiyogād āpiśām yena labdhvā.\"

The epithet Kramāditya is found on certain gold coins of the heavy Archer type as well as on silver issues of the Garuḍa, Bull and Altar types. The more famous title of Vikramāditya is met with on silver coins of the Altar type.
epithet reminds one further of the name Mahendra given to his father. It is also to be noted that in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription Samudra Gupta is extolled as the equal of Indra and other gods and in the Kahaum record Skanda Gupta is called Sakropama.

From the evidence of coins and inscriptions we know that Skanda ruled from A.D. 455 to c. 467. The first achievement of the monarch was the resuscitation of the Gupta Empire and the recovery of lost provinces. From an inscripational passage we learn that while preparing to restore the fallen fortunes of his family he was reduced to such straits that he had to spend a whole night sleeping on the bare earth. Line twelve of the Bhitari Inscription tells us that when Kumara Gupta I had attained heaven, Skanda conquered his enemies by the strength of his arms. From the context it seems that these enemies were the Pushyamitras "whose power and wealth had (suddenly) gone up."

The struggle with the Pushyamitras was followed by conflicts with the Hunas1 and probably also with the Vakakakas in which the emperor was presumably victorious in the end. The invasion of the Hunas took place not later than A.D. 458 if we identify them with the Mlechchhas or barbarian outlanders of the Junagadh Inscription. The memory of the victory over the Mlechchhas is preserved in the story of king Vikramaditya, son of Mahendradasita of Ujjain, in Somadeva's Katha-sarit-sagara.2 Central India and Surashtra seem to have been the vulnerable parts of the Gupta empire. The Bahlaghat plates3 refer to Narendrasena

1 The Hunas are mentioned not only in inscriptions, but in the Mahabharata, the Puranas, the Raghuvarsha and later in the Harsha-charita and the Nitayagamita of Somadeva. The Lalita Vistara (translated by Dharmaraksha, d. A.D. 813) mentions the Hugalip (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 265). See also W. M. McGregor, "The Early Empires of Central Asia, 399ff, 455ff, 485ff.
3 Ep. Ind., IX, p. 271.
Vākāṭaka, son of Skanda Gupta's cousin Pravarasena II (III?) as "Kosalā-Mekalā-Mālav-ādhipatyābhyaśitaśasana" whose commands were treated with respect by the lords of Kosalā (Upper Mahānadi Valley), Mekalā (Upper Valley of the Nerbudda and the Son), and Mālava (probably Eastern Mālwa). The Junāgadh Inscription tells us that Skanda 'deliberated for days and nights before making up his mind who could be trusted with the important task of guarding the lands of the Surāśṭras.' Allan deduces from this and from the words "sarveshu deseshu vidhāya goprin" 'appointing protectors in all the provinces' that the emperor was at particular pains to appoint a series of Wardens of the Marches to protect his dominions from future invasion. One of these Wardens was Parṇadatta,¹ governor of Surāśṭra. In spite of all his efforts Skanda Gupta could not, however, save the westernmost part of his empire from future troubles. During his lifetime he no doubt, retained his hold over Surāśṭra, the Cambay coast and the adjoining portions of continental Gujarāṭ and Mālwa.² But his successors do not appear to have been so fortunate. Not a single inscription or coin has yet been discovered which shows that Surāśṭra and Western Mālwa formed parts of the Gupta empire after the death of Skanda Gupta. On the contrary Harishēṇa Vākāṭaka, cousin of Narendrasena, claims victories over Lāṭa

¹ Persian Parṇa-dāta seems, according to Jarl Charpentier, to be the form underlying the name Parṇadatta JRAS, 1931, 140; Aiyangar Com. Vol., 15.

² The inclusion of Surāśṭra within his empire is proved by the Junāgadh Inscription and that of the Cambay coast by silver coins of the 'Bull type'. The type was imitated by Krishparāja (Allan, ci), who is to be identified with the king of that name belonging to the Kāṭachchuri family. Krishṇa's son and successor, Sanāharagaṇa appropriates the epithets of the great Samudra Gupta. His son Buddhāraja effected the conquest of Eastern Mālwa early in the seventh century A.D. (c. 603 A.D.; Vādner plates, Ep. Ind., xii, 31 ff.; see also Marshall, A Guide to Sānchī, p. 21n). The dynasty was overthrown by the early Chalukyas and it is interesting to note that three of the characteristic epithets of Samudra Gupta are applied to the Chalukya Vijaya-rāja in the Kaira grant; Fleet, CII, 14.
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(South Gujarāṭ) and Avanti (district around Ujjain) besides Trikūṭa in the Koṅkan, Kuntala (the Kanarese country), Andhra (the Telugu country), Kaliṅga (South Orissa and some adjoining tracts), and Kosala (Upper Mahānāḍī Valley), while the Maitrakas of Valabhi (Wala in the peninsular portion of Gujarāṭ) gradually assume independence.

The later years of Skanda seem to have been tranquil.¹ The emperor was helped in the work of administration by a number of able governors like Parṇadatta, viceroy of the west, Sarvanāga, District Officer (Vīshayapati) of Antarvedi or the Gangetic Doab and Bhīmavarman, the ruler of the Kosam region.² Chakrapālīta, son of Parṇadatta, restored in A.D. 457-58 the embankment of the lake Sudarśana at Girnar which had burst two years previously.

The emperor continued the tolerant policy of his forefathers. Himself a Bṝhāvatva or worshipper of Krishṇa-Viśnū, he and his officers did not discourage followers of other sects, e.g., Jainas and devotees of the Sun. The people were also tolerant. The Kahāum inscription commemorates the erection of Jaina images by a person "full of affection for Brāhmaṇas."³ The Indore plate records a deed by a Brāhmaṇa endowing a lamp in a temple of the Sun.

¹ Cf. the Kahāum Ins. of 141 = A.D. 460-1.
² The inclusion within Skanda's empire of provinces lying still further to the east is proved by the Bhitari and Bihār Pillar Inscriptions and possibly by gold coins of the Archer type struck on a standard of 144 ½ grains of metal. Allan, p. xcvi, 118.
³ Cf. The Pāhājur epigraph of the year 159 (A.D. 479) which records a donation made by a Brāhmaṇa couple for the worship of the Divine Arhata, i.e., the Jinas.
CHAPTER XII. THE GUPTA EMPIRE (continued):

THE LATER GUPTAS.

Vasvaukasārāmatibhūya sāham
saurājya cādhotsavaya bibhūtyā
samagraśaktāv tvayi Sūryavrāṁśye
sati prapannā karuṇāmavasthām

—Raghuvamsa.

SECTION I. SURVIVAL OF THE GUPTA POWER AFTER SKANDA GUPTA.

It is now admitted on all hands that the reign of Skanda Gupta ended about A.D. 467. When he passed away the empire declined, especially in the west, but did not wholly perish. We have epigraphic as well as literary evidence of the continuance of the Gupta empire in parts of Central and Eastern India in the latter half of the fifth as well as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. The Dāmodarpur plates, the Sārnāth Inscriptions and the Eran epigraph of Budha Gupta prove that from A.D. 477 to 496 the Gupta empire extended from Bengal to Eastern Mālwa. The Betul plates of the Parivrājaka Mahāraja Sāmkshobha, dated in the year 199 G. E., i.e., 518 A.D., “during the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta King,” testify to the fact that the Gupta sway at this

1 Smith *The Oxford History of India*, additions and corrections, p. 171, end.
2 For the probable causes of decline, see *Calcutta Review*, April, 1933, p. 36 ff; also post. 626 ff.
4 Srimati pravardhamāna vijaya-rājya saimāvatsara-date nava-navatītṛ uttara Gupta-nrīpa-rājya bhuktā. "In the glorious, augmenting and victorious reign, in a century of years increased by ninety-nine, in the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta King."
period was acknowledged in Ṇabhālā, which included the Tripuri Vishaya (Jabalpur region).\(^1\) Another inscription of Samkshobha found in the valley near the village of Khoi in Baghelkhand, dated in A.D. 528, proves that the Gupta empire included some of the central districts even in A.D. 528.\(^2\) Fifteen years later the grant of a village in the Koṭivarsha Vishaya (Dinajpur District) of Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti (roughly North Bengal) 'during the reign of Paramadaicata (the Supreme Divinity) Parama-bhatṭaraka (the Supreme Lord) Mahārājādhirāja (King of Kings) Śrī...........Gupta,'\(^3\) shows that the Gupta dominions at this period included the eastern as well as the central provinces. Towards the close of the sixth century a Gupta king, a contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushyabhūti\(^4\) family of Śrikanṭha (Thānēsār), was ruling in "Mālava."\(^5\) Two sons of this king, Kumāra Gupta and

---

\(^1\) Ep. Ind., VIII, pp. 384-87. Ṇabhālā = later Ṇabhala.
\(^2\) Flect. CII, III, pp. 113-16; Hoerula in JAAS, 1889, p. 95.
\(^4\) This seems to be the correct spelling and not Pushpabhumī (Ep. Ind., I. 68).
\(^5\) "Mālava" was graced by the presence of the Guptas as early as the fifth century. This is proved by the Udayagiri inscriptions of Chandragupta II and the Turān inscription of Ghatotkacha Gupta. In the latter part of the sixth and the commencement of the seventh century, it seems to have been under the direct rule of a line of Guptas whose precise connection with the Great Guptas is not clear. Magadha was probably administered by local rulers like Kumārāmātya Mahārāja Nandana (A.D. 551-2?) of the Amaunus plate, Gayā Dist., Ep. Ind., X, 49, and the Varmanas (of Nāgārjunī Hill Cave Ins., CII, 226; also Pārṇavarman mentioned by Hiuen Tsang and De va-varman, IA, X, 110). For a detailed discussion see Ray Chaudhuri, JBORS, XV, parts iii and iv (1929, pp. 651 f.). The precise location and extent of the "Mālava" of the "later Guptas" cannot be determined. In Ep. Ind., V, 229, the Daṇḍanāyaka Ananta-pāla, a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI, is said to have subdued the Saptā Mālava countries up to the Himālaya Mountains. This suggests that there were as many as seven countries called Mālava (cf. also Rice, Mysore and Coorg, 46). These were probably: (1) the country of the 'Mālavas' in the Western Ghats (Kanarese Districts, p. 559), (2) Mo-la-po Mālavaka śāra of Valabhi grant) on the Mahi governed by the Maitrakas, (3) Avanti in the wider sense of the term ruled by the Ratashchuris or Kalachuris of the Abhona plates (sixth century) and by a Brāhmaṇa family in the time of
Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon the princes Rājya-vardhana and Harsha of Thānesar. From the Apsaḍ inscription of Ādityasena we learn that the fame of the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, marked with honour of victory in war over Susṭhitavarman, doubtless a king of Kāmarūpa, was constantly sung on the bank of the river Lohitya or Brabmaputra. This indicates that even in or about A.D. 600 (the time of Prabhākara-vardhana) the sway of kings bearing the name Gupta extended from “Mālava” to the Brahmputra.

In the sixth century Gupta suzerainty was no doubt successfully challenged by the Huns and their conquerors belonging to the Mandasor and Maukhari families. In

Huen Taong Chinese pilgrim, (4) Pārva Mālava (round Bhilā), (5) District round Prayāga, Kausāmbi and Fatehpur in U. P. (Smith, EHI, 4th ed., p. 380n.; IHQ. 1891, 150f.; cf. JRAS, 1903, 561), (6) part of eastern Rājputāna, (7) Cis-Sutlej districts of the Pañjāb together with some Himalayan territory. The later Guptas probably held (4) and (5) and at times, Magadha as well. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (xii. 1. 36) whose date is not probably far removed from that of the later Guptas, associates Mālava with Arbuda (Abu) and distinguishes it from Avanti. The rulers of Mālava and Avanti are also distinguished from each other by Rājaekkhara in his Vidyādala ātihjīkā, Act IV (p. 121 of Jivānanda Vidyāśāgara’s edition). Early, in the seventh century the Guptas seem to have lost Eastern Mālava to the Kāśchehuris. In the Vaiṣṇava plates issued from Vidiśā (Bensagar) in or about A. D. 608, a Kāśchehuri king, Śrīkaraṇḍa receives epithets that are palpably borrowed from the Allahabad Prādasti of Samudra Gupta. The overthrow of the Kāśchehuris was effected by the early Chalukyas of Baṇḍami and South Gujārāt. Fleet points out (CII, 14) that three of the epithets of Samudra Gupta are applied to the Chalukya chieflain Vijayarāja in the Kaira grant of the year 394 (IA. VII, 248). Adityasena of the later Gupta family, who ruled in the second half of the seventh century A. D., seems to be referred to in Nepalese inscriptions as ‘King of Magadha’. Magadha, now replaced Eastern Mālava as the chief centre of Gupta power.

1 Cf. Hoernle in JRAS, 1906, 561.
2 An allusion to the later Guptas seems to occur in the Kādambari, Verse 10, of Bāpa which says that the lotus feet of Kubera, the poet’s great-grandfather, were worshipped by many a Gupta:—

Babhune Vātāgāyana vahā saṃbhava
devī jagadgītavye graṇih satām
aneke Guptārcheita pāda paśkajah
Kubera nāmāhī eca Sevānabhuvah.
the first half of the seventh century the Guptas lost Vidiśā to the Kaṭachchuris and their power in the Ganges Valley was overshadowed by that of Harsha. But, after the death of the great Kanauj monarch, the "Gupta" empire was sought to be revived by Ādityasena, son of Mādhava Gupta, who "ruled the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans," performed the Āśvamedha and other great sacrifices and assumed the titles of Paramabhāṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja.
SECTION II. PURU GUPTA AND NARASIMHA GUPTA

BALADITYA.

We shall now proceed to give an account of Skanda Gupta's successors. The immediate successor of the great emperor seems to have been his brother Puru Gupta. The existence of this king was unknown till the discovery of the Bhitari seal of Kumāra Gupta II. in 1889, and its publication by Smith and Hoernle. The seal describes Puru Gupta as the son of Kumāra I by the queen Anantadevi, and does not mention Skanda Gupta. The mention of Puru Gupta immediately after Kumāra with the prefix tat-pād-ānudhyāta "meditating on, or attached to, the feet of" (Kumāra), does not necessarily prove that Puru Gupta was the immediate successor of his father, and a contemporary and rival of his brother or half-brother Skanda Gupta. In the Manahali grant Madanapāla is described as Śri-Rāmapāla-Deva-pād-ānudhyāta, although he was preceded by his elder brother Kumārapāla. In Kielhorn's Northern Inscription No. 39, Vijayapāla is described as the successor of Kṣitipāla, although he was preceded by his brother Devapāla.

1 JASB, 1889 pp. 84-105.
2 The omission of Skanda's name in the Bhitari seal of his brother's grandson does not necessarily imply that the relations between him and Puru's family were unfriendly as suggested by Mr. R. D. Banerji (cf. Annals of the Bhand, Ins., 1918-19, pp. 74-75). The name of Pulakesin II is omitted in an inscription of his brother and Yuvardāja Viṣṇuvardhana (Sātārā grant, Ind. Ant., 1890 pp. 93ff). The name of Bhoja II of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty is not mentioned in the Pratihāra inscription of his nephew Mahendrapāla II, but it is mentioned in an inscription of his brother Vinayakapāla, the father of Mahendrapāla. Besides, there was no custom prohibiting the mention of the name of a rival uncle or brother. Maṅgalesa and Govinda II are mentioned in the inscriptions of their rivals and their descendants. On the other hand even an ancestor of a reigning king was sometimes omitted, e.g., Dharapatīa is omitted in his son's inscription (Kielhorn, N. Ins., No. 464).
3 Kielhorn, Ins. No. 81.
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Smith and Allan have shown that Skanda ruled over the whole empire including the eastern and the central as well as many of the western provinces. He may have lost some of his districts in the Far West. But the coin-types of the successors of Kumāra Gupta, with the exception of Skanda Gupta and Budha Gupta, show that none of them could have held sway in the lost territories of Western India. Epigraphic and numismatic evidence clearly indicates that there was no room for a rival Maharājādhiraṇā in Northern India including Bihār and Bengal during the reign of Skanda Gupta. He was a man of mature years at the time of his death cir. A.D. 467.\(^1\) His brother and successor Puru Gupta, too, must have been an old man at that time. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that he had a very short reign and died some time before A.D. 473 when his grandson Kumāra Gupta II was ruling. The name of Puru Gupta’s queen has been read by various scholars as Śrī Vatsadevi, Vainyadevi or Śrī Chandradevi.\(^2\) She was the mother of Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya.

The coins of Puru Gupta are of the heavy Archer type apparently belonging to the eastern provinces of the empire of his predecessors.\(^3\) Some of the coins hitherto attributed to him have the reverse legend Śrī Vikramāḥ\(^4\) and possible traces of the fuller title of Vikrāmadītya. Allan identifies him with king Vikramādītya of Ayodhya,

---

\(^1\) When sons succeed a father or mother after a prolonged reign they are usually well advanced in years. In the case of Skanda Gupta we know that already in A.D. 455 he was old enough to lead the struggle against all the enemies of his house and empire in succession. Cf. 566 n.3 ante.

\(^2\) Ep. Ind., XXI. 77; ASI, AR, 1934-35, 68.

\(^3\) Allan, pp. Lxxx, xcviili.

\(^4\) Mr. S. K. Sarasvati attributes these coins to Budha Gupta (Indian Culture, I, 189). This view, however, is not accepted by Prof. Jagan Nath (Summaries of papers submitted to the 12th All India Oriental Conference, Nagpur, 1946, Sec. IX p. 11). According to Mr. Jagan Nath the reading is definitely Puru and not Budha. As to the title Vikramāditya, see Allan, p. cxxii, Dr. R. C. Majumdar (ASB, 4-4-49) adduces evidence in support of the view of Mr. Sarasvati.
father of Bālāditya, who was a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu. The importance of this identification lies in the fact that it proves that the immediate successors of Skanda Gupta had a capital at Ayodhya probably till the rise of the Maukharis. If the spurious Gayā plate is to be believed Ayodhya was the seat of a Gupta jaya-skandhāvāra, or ‘camp of victory,’ as early as the time of Samudra Gupta. The principal capital of Bālāditya and his successors appears to have been Kāśi.1

The identification proposed by Allan also suggests that Puru Gupta could not have flourished much later than 472 A.D., for a Chinese history of the Indian patriarchs belonging to that year mentions "Ba-su-ban-da."2

The evidence of the Bharsar hoard seems to show that a king styled Prakāśāditya came shortly after Skanda Gupta. Prakāśāditya may be regarded as possibly a biruda or secondary epithet of Puru Gupta or of one of his immediate successors. Even if we think with Allan that Puru had the title Vikramāditya there is no inherent improbability in his having an additional Āditya title. That the same king might have two "Āditya" names is proved by the cases of Skanda Gupta (Vikramāditya and Kramāditya) and Silāditya Dharmāditya of Valabhī. But the identification of Prakāśāditya still remains sub judice. His coins are of the combined horseman and lion-slayer type. The "horseman type" was associated with the southern provinces of the empire of the Guptas3 and the lion-slayer type with the north.4

1 CII, 285.
2 JRAS, 1905, 40. This is now confirmed by the seal which represents Puru as the father of Budha (476-85.)
3 Allan, p. lxxxvi.
4 Ibid., xci.
Puru Gupta seems to have been succeeded by his son Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya. This king has been identified with king Bālāditya whose troops are represented by Hiuen Tsang as having imprisoned the tyrant Mihirakula. It has been overlooked that Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was the immediate successor of Tathāgata Gupta,¹ who was himself the immediate successor of Bud(d)ha Gupta,² whereas Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya was the son and successor of Puru Gupta who in his turn was the son of Kumāra Gupta I and the successor of Skanda Gupta. The son and successor of Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was Vajra³ while the son and successor of Narasimha was Kumāra Gupta II. It is obvious that the conqueror of Mihirakula was not the son of Puru Gupta but an altogether different individual.⁴ The existence of several kings of the eastern part of the Madhyadesa having the biruda Bālāditya is proved by the Sārnāth Inscription of Prakaṭāditya.⁵ Narasimha Gupta must have died in or about the year

² For-lo-ki-o-to, Beal, Fleet and Watters render the term by Buddha Gupta, a name unknown to imperial Gupta epigraphy. The synchronism of his second successor Bālāditya with Mihirakula proves that Budha Gupta is meant. We have other instances of corruption of names, e.g., Skanda is transformed into Skandha in several Purāṇo lists of the so-called Andhra dynasty.
³ Yuan Chüan, II, p. 165.
⁴ Drs. Bhaṭṭaśekīrti and Basāk, who upheld the identification of Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya with the son of Puru Gupta do not apparently attach due weight to the evidence of the Life of Hiuen Tsang, p. 111, which, as we shall see later on, is corroborated by the combined testimony of the Sārnāth inscription of Prakaṭāditya and the Ārya-Mahā-sūrya-kālpa. The evidence of these documents suggests that Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was identical with Bhānu Gupta and was the father of Prakaṭāditya and Vajra.
⁵ CII, p. 285. A Bālāditya is mentioned in the Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yasovarman (Ep. Ind., 1029, Jan., 38) and also a seal (Śrī Nālandāyām Śrī Bālāditya Gandhakūḍi, MASI, 66 38).
A.D. 473. He was succeeded by his son Kumāra Gupta II Kramāditya by queen Mitra-devī.¹

The coins of Narasimha and his successor belong to two varieties of the Archer type. One class of these coins was, according to Allan, apparently intended for circulation in the lower Ganges valley, and the other may have been issued in the upper provinces. The inclusion of Eastern India within the dominions of Bālāditya (Bālākhiya) and Kumāra (II) is vouched for by the Arya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa.²

1 It is suggested in Ep. Ind., xxi, 77 (clay seals of Nālandā) and ASI, AR, 1934-35, 63, that the name of Kumāra Gupta’s mother has to be read as Mitra-devī and not Śrimati devi or Lakshmidevi.


Bālākhiya nāmasau nri-paṭir bhavitā Pūrva-deśakāḥ
tasyāpareṇa nri-paṭiḥ Gauḍānām prabhavishnavaḥ
Kumārākhyo nāmataḥ praktaḥ so’piḥ atyanta dharmarāṇ.
SECTION III. KUMĀRA GUPTA II AND VISHNUGUPTA.

Kumāra Gupta II of the Bhitāri seal, son of Narasimha Gupta, has been identified with Kramaḍāitya of certain coins of the Archer type that are closely connected with the issues of Narasimha Bālāditya. He is also identified with king Kumāra Gupta mentioned in the Sārnāth Buddhist Image Inscription of the year 154 G. E., i.e., A.D. 473-74. Drs. Bhaṭṭasālī, Basāk and some other scholars think that the Kumāra Guptas of the Bhitāri seal and the Sārnāth epigraph were distinct individuals. The former places Kumāra, son of Narasimha, long after A.D. 500. But his theory is based upon the doubtful identification of Narasimha, with the conqueror of Mihirakula. According to Dr. Basāk Kumāra of the Sārnāth Inscription was the immediate successor of Skanda. In his opinion there were two rival Gupta lines ruling simultaneously, one consisting of Skanda, Kumāra of Sārnāth and Budha, the other comprising Puru, Narasimha and his son Kumāra of the Bhitāri seal. But there is not the slightest evidence of a partition of the Gupta empire in the latter half of the fifth century A.D. On the contrary inscriptions and coins prove that both Skanda and Budha ruled over the whole empire from Bengal to the West. We have already seen that according to the traditional account of the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa the kingdom of Bālākhyā, i.e., Bālāditya and his successor Kumāra embraced the Purva-deśa (Eastern India) including Gauda (Western and part of Northern Bengal).


2 Dacca Review, May and June, 1920, pp. 54-57.

can we reconcile the rule of these kings with the contemporary sovereignty of a rival line represented by Skanda and Budha?\(^1\) There is no cogent reason for doubting the identity of Kumāra of the Bhitāri seal with his namesake of the Sārnāth inscription.

Kumāra II's reign must have terminated in or about the year A.D. 476-77, the first known date of Budha Gupta.\(^2\) The reigns of Puru, Narasimha and Kumāra II appear to be abnormally short, amounting together to only ten years (A.D. 467-77). This is by no means a unique case. In Veyaṅgi three Eastern Chālukya monarchs, viz., Vijayāditya IV, his son Ammarāja I, and Ammarāja's

---

1 The seal of Budha Gupta (MASS, No. 66, p. 64) proves conclusively that Budha, far from belonging to a rival line, was actually a son of Puru Gupta. It also negatives the late date for Puru Gupta suggested by Dr. Bhaṭṭasālī.

2 One of the successors of Kumāra (II), son of Balāditya, is according to the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kālpa, a prince styled Ukārakhyā. That appellation may according to Jayaswal apply to Prakāśāditya, for Allan finds the letters su or s on his coins. But the identification of a prince whose designation was ū, (Ukārakhyā), with Budha Gupta (Jayaswal, An Imperial History of India, 38), does not seem to be plausible. The passage in the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kālpa suggests a name like Upagupta, Upendra. Though there is no direct epigraphic evidence for the name Upagupta, the existence of such a prince does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that an Upagupta is mentioned in Maukkhari records as the mother of Isānavarman [Aśīrgadh (Fleet, CII, p. 220) and Nālandā (Ep. Ind., xxi, p. 74) seals]. Cf. Bhānu Gupta and Bhānu Guptā, Harsha Gupta and Harsha Guptā, Mahāsaṇa Guptā and Mahāsaṇa Guptā. On the analogy of these cases it is possible that there was a prince named Upagupta, apparently the brother of Upaguptā. If this surmise be correct Upagupta may have to be placed in the same period as the mother of Isānavarman, i.e., in the first half of the sixth century A.D., sometime after Budha Gupta. If ū is the initial of Upendra (Vishnū or Krishnā) and not of Upagupta, it may refer to Vishnū Gupta or to Krishnā Gupta, just as Somākhyā has reference to the Gauḍa king Saṅgāka. The existence of a son of Kumāra Gupta II named Mahārājādhirāja 81 Vishaṅgu Guptā has recently been disclosed by a fragmentary seal at Nālandā (Ep. Ind., xxvi. 285; I.H.Q., XIX. 19). It is difficult in the present state of our knowledge to say whether he was the immediate successor of his father, or had to wait till the death of his great uncle Budha Gupta. Those who place him and his father after Budha Gupta, have to dissociate Kumāra of the Bhitāri and Nālandā seals from the homonymous prince of Sārnāth. This is not improbable but must await future discoveries for confirmation.
son, another Vijayaditya, ruled only for seven years and six and a half months. In Kashmir six kings, Sūravarman I, Pārtha, Sambhuvardhana, Chakravarman, Unmattāvanti and Sūravarman II, ruled within six years (A.D. 933-39); and three generations of kings, viz., Yaśaskara, his uncle Varnaṭa, and his son Samgrāmadeva ruled for ten years (A.D. 939-49). A fragmentary seal discovered at Nālandā refer to Kumāra's son Vīshṇu Gupta who is probably to be identified with Chandrāditya of the coins.

1 Hultsch, St., Vol. I, p. 46.
SECTION IV. BUDHA GUPTA

For Budha Gupta, now known to have been a son of Puru Gupta¹ we have a number of dated inscriptions and coins which prove that he ruled for about twenty years (A.D. 477-c. 495).

Two copper-plate inscriptions discovered in the village of Dāmodarpur in the district of Dinājpur, testify to the fact that Budha Gupta’s empire included Pundravardhana bhukti (roughly North Bengal) which was governed by his viceroy (Uparika Mahārāja) Brahmadatta and Jayadatta.² The Sārnāth inscription of A.D. 476-77 and Benares Ins.⁴ of 479 prove his possession of the Kāśi country. In A.D. 484-85 the erection of a dhvaja-stambha or flag staff in honour of Janārdana, i.e., Vishṇu, by the Mahārāja Mātrivishṇu, ruler of Eraṇ, and his brother Dhanyavishṇu, while the Bhūpati (King) Budha Gupta, was reigning, and Mahārāja Suraśminchandra was governing the land between the Kālindī (Jumna) and the Narmadā (Neruddha), indicates that Budha Gupta’s dominions included part of Central India as well as Kāśi and North Bengal.

The coins of this emperor are dated in the year A.D. c. 495. They continue the peacock-type of the Gupta silver coinage that was meant, according to Allan, for circulation in the central part of the empire.⁴ Their

¹ Seal of Budha Gupta (MASB, No. 66, p. 64).
² To the reign of this Gupta king belong also probably the Pāhādpur (ancient Somapura) (Bājashahi District) plate of A.D. 478-79 (Mod. Rev., 1931, 150; Prabāśī 1888, 671; Ep. Ind., XX, 59 ff.) and also a copper-plate of A.D. 483-9 (Ep. Ind., xxiii. 52), originally found at Nandapura (Monghyr District). For a possible reference to Budha Gupta in Pāṇinic literature, see Pro. of the Seventh Or. Conf., 576.
³ JRASB, 1949, 5 ff.
⁴ Cf. also Mahābhārata, ii. 32. 4; Kālīdāsa, Meghadūta, I. 45.
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legend is the claim to be lord of the earth and to have won heaven,—found on the coins of Kumāra Gupta I and Skanda Gupta.
SECTION V. SUCCESSORS OF BUDHA GUPTA

According to the Life of Hiuen Tsang Budha Gupta was succeeded by Tathāgata Gupta, after whom Bāladitya succeeded to the empire.\(^1\) At this period the supremacy of the Guptas in Central India was challenged by the Hun king Toramāna. We have seen that in A.D. 484-85 a Mahārāja named Mātrivishṇu ruled in the Airikina Vishaya (Eran in Eastern Mālwa, now in the Saugar District of the Central Provinces) as a vassal of the emperor Budha Gupta. But after his death his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu transferred his allegiance to Toramāna. The success of the Huns in Central India was, however, short-lived. In 510-11 we find a general named Goparāja fighting by the side of a Gupta king at Eran and king Hastin of the neighbouring province of Dabhāla to the south-east of Eran acknowledging the sovereignty of the Guptas. In A.D. 518-9 the suzerainty of the Guptas is acknowledged in the Tripūrī vishaya (Jubbalpore District). In the year 528-29 the Gupta sway was still acknowledged by the Parivrājakasa-Mahārāja of Dabhāla. The Parivrājakas Hastin and Sam-kshobha seem to have been the bulwarks of the Gupta empire in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradeśa. The Harsha-charita of Bāna recognises the possession of Mālava, possibly Eastern Mālwa, by the Guptas as late as the time of Prabhākara-vardhana (cir. A.D. 600). There can be no doubt that the expulsion of the Huns from parts of Central India was final.\(^2\)

The recovery of the Central Provinces was probably

---

1 Beal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 168; the Life, p. 111.
2 For the survival of the Huns in the Mālwa region, See Ep. Ind., xxiii. 102.
effected in the time of Bālāditya whose troops are represented by Hiuen Tsang as having imprisoned Mihirakula, the son and successor of Toramāna, and set him at liberty at the request of the Queen Mother. The Hun king had to be content with a small kingdom in the north. It is not improbable that Bālāditya was a biruda of the "glorious Bhānu Gupta, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Pārtha" along with whom Goparāja went to Ėraṇ and having fought a "very famous battle" died shortly before A.D. 510-11.2

Mihirakula was finally subjugated by the Janendra2 Yāsodharman of Mandaśor some time before A.D. 533.

1 Beal, Si-yu-ki, I, p. 171.
2 In a Nālandā Stone Inscription (Ep. Ind., XX, 43-45) Bālāditya is described as a king of irresistible valour and vanquisher of all foes. The last of the Bālādityas mentioned in a Sārnāth Inscription (Fleet, CII, 285 f.) had a son named Prakaṭāditya by his wife Dhavālā. In the Aṛya-Manjūrī-mūla-kalpa (ed. G. Sāstri, p. 637 ff.) Pakārākhyā (Prakaṭāditya) is represented as the son of Bhakārākhyā (Bhānu Gupta). Buddhist tradition thus corroborates the identification, first proposed in these pages, of Bālāditya with Bhānu Gupta. Cf. now Jayaswal, An Imperial History of India, pp. 47, 53. An inscription found at Guṇāghara near Corimia and certain seals at Nālandā disclose the existence of a king named (Val)nya Gu(p)ta who ruled in or about A.D. 507 and must have been also a contemporary of Mihirakula or of his father (Prabhāsi, 1333, 675; IHQ, 1930, 53, 561). The seals give him the style Mahārājādhirāja (ASI, AR, 1930-34, Pt. I, 260, 264; MASI, 66, 67; IHQ, XIX, 275) and suggest relationship with the imperial Guptas. Dr. D. C. Ganguly identifies him with the Devādātīya of coins (IHQ, 1933, 784, 989). But owing to damaged condition of the Nālandā seal his parentage cannot be ascertained.
3 The ascription of the title of Vikramāditya to Yāsodharman of Mandaśor, and the representation of this chief as a ruler of Ujjain, the father of Śiśaditya, Mo-la-po and the father-in-law of Prabhākara-vardhana are absolutely unwarranted. According to Father Heras (JBOORS, 1937, March, 8-9) the defeat of Mihirakula at the hands of Bālāditya took place after the Hun king's conflict with Yāsodharman. It should, however, be remembered that at the time of the war with Bālāditya Mihirakula was a paramount sovereign to whom the king of Magadha had been tributary, and with whom he dared not fight, being only anxious to conceal his poor person (Beal, Si-yu-ki, Vol. I, p. 168). This is hardly possible after the Janendra of Mandaśor had compelled the Hun "to pay respect to his two feet". The victory of Bālāditya over Mihirakula was certainly not decisive. The "loss of the royal estate" was only temporary, and the tyrant soon placed himself on the throne of Kaśmir and conquered
Line 6 of the Mandaśor Stone Pillar inscription leaves the impression that in the time of Yaśodharman Mihirakula was the king of a Himalayan country ("small kingdom in the north"), i.e., Kaśmīra and that neighbourhood, who was compelled "to pay respect to the two feet" of the victorious Janendra probably when the latter carried his arms to "the mountain of snow the tablelands of which are embraced by the Gaṅgā."

Yaśodharman claims to have extended his sway as far as the Lauhiṭya or Brahmāputra in the east. It is not improbable that he defeated and killed Vajra, the son of Bāḷāditya, and extinguished the viceregal family of the Dattas of Puṇḍra-vardhana. Huien Tsang mentions a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra. The Dattas, who governed Puṇḍra-vardhana from the time of Kumāra Gupta I, disappear about this time. But Yaśodharman's success must have been short-lived,

Gandhāra (Beal, Si-yu-ki, I, p. 171). To the court-poet of Yaśodharman Mihirakula was pre-eminently a king of the Himalayan region. This is clear from the following passage which was misunderstood by Fleet whose interpretation has been followed by Father Heras (p. 8 n):—

"He (Yaśodharman) to whose feet respect was paid—by even that (famous) king Mihirakula, whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Śhānu (and) embraced by whose arms the mountain of snow falsely prides itself as being styled an inaccessible fortress" (Kielhorn in Ind. Ant., 1885, p. 219). Kielhorn's interpretation was accepted by Fleet. [The statement that Mihirakula's head 'had never been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Śhānu' shows that he refused to do homage to Bāḷāditya, and probably accounts for the order, given for his execution by that king.]

1 CII, pp. 146-147; Jayaswal, The Historical Position of Kalki, p. 9.
2 If the identification of Bāḷāditya with Bhānu Gupta first proposed in these pages is correct, his son Vajra may be identified with Vakārākhyā, the younger brother (anuja) of the Prakāṭaditya of the Sārnāth Inscription (Fleet, CII, 284 ff.—the Pakārākhyā of the Arjya-Mañjusri-mula-kalpa who is represented as the son of Bhakārākhyā, i.e., Bhānu Gupta (ed. G. Sāstri, pp. 637-44). Prakāṭaditya is represented in the inscription named above as the son of Bāḷāditya by Dhavalā. Cf. now Jayaswal, An Imperial History of India, pp. 47, 53, 56, 63.
because in A.D. 543-44, ten years after the Mandaśor inscription which mentions the Janendra Yaśodharman as victorious, the son (?) and viceroy of a Gupta parama-bhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja prithivipati, 'supreme sovereign, king of kings, lord of the earth,' and not any official of the Central Indian Janendra, was governing the Pundra-vardhana-bhukti, a province which lay between the Indian interior and the Lauhitya.
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Prakāṭāditya (?) Vajra (?)
SECTION VI. THE LINE OF KRISHNA GUPTA

The name of the Gupta emperor in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 543-44 is unfortunately lost. The Aphsād inscription, however, discloses the names of a number of "Gupta" kings,¹ the fourth of whom, Kumāra Gupta(III), was a contemporary of Īṣānavarman Maukharī who is known from the Harāhā inscription to have been ruling in A.D. 554.² Kumāra Gupta III, and his three predecessors, viz., Krishṇa, Harsha and Jīvita, should probably be placed in the period between A.D. 510, the date of Bhānu Gupta, and 554, the date of Īṣānavarman. It is possible, but by no means certain, that one of these kings is identical with the Gupta emperor mentioned in the

¹ Although the rulers, the names of most of whom ended in -gupta, mentioned in the Aphsād and connected contemporary epigraphs, who ruled over the provinces in the heart of the early Gupta empire, are called "Guptas" for the sake of convenience, their relationship with the early Gupta-kula or Gupta-varṇa is not known. It is, however, to be noted that some of them (e.g., Kumāra Gupta and Deva Gupta), bore names that are found in the earlier family, and Krishṇa Gupta, the founder of the line, has been identified by some with Govinda Gupta, son of Chandra Gupta II. But the last suggestion is hardly acceptable, because Govinda must have flourished more than half a century before Krishṇa Gupta. And it is surprising that the panegyrist of Krishṇa Gupta's descendants should have omitted all references to the early Guptas if their patrons could really lay claim to such an illustrious ancestry. In the Aphsād inscription the dynasty is described simply as Sad-varṇa 'of good lineage'. The designation Gupta, albeit not "Early Imperial Gupta," is possibly justified by the evidence of Bāna. The Guptas and the Gupta-Kulaputra mentioned in Bāna's Kādambarī and Harsha-charita may refer to the family of Krishṇa, if not to some hitherto unknown descendants of the early imperial line. One of the princes of the early Gupta line, Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of the Tumain inscription is known to have ruled over Eastern Mālwa and it is not impossible that Krishṇa Gupta was, in some way, connected with him. We must, however, await future discoveries to clear up the point.

Dāmodarpur-plate of A.D. 543-44. The absence of high-sounding titles like Mahārājādhirāja or Parama-bhattachāraka in the Ṣlokas or verses of the Aphsaḍ inscription does not necessarily prove that the kings mentioned there were petty chiefs. No such titles are attached to the name of Kumāra I in the Mandasor inscription, or to the name of Budha in the Eran inscription. On the other hand the queen of Mādhava Gupta, one of the least powerful kings mentioned in the Aphsaḍ inscription, is called Parama-bhattachārikā and Mahādevi in the Dēo Baranārk epigraph.

Regarding Krishṇa Gupta we know very little. The Aphsaḍ inscription describes him as a hero whose arm played the part of a lion, in bruising the foreheads of the array of the rutting elephants of (his) haughty enemy (dṛiptārāti), (and) in being victorious by (its) prowess over countless foes. The dṛiptārāti against whom he had to fight may have been Yaśodharman. The next king Deva Śrī Harsha Gupta had to engage in terrible contests with those who were "averse to the abode of the goddess of fortune being with (him, her) own lord." There were wounds from many weapons on his chest. The name of the enemies, who tried to deprive him of his rightful possessions, are not given. Harsha's son Jivita Gupta I probably succeeded in re-establishing the power of his family in the territory lying between the Himālayas and the sea, apparently in Eastern India. "The very terrible scorching fever (of fear) left not (his) haughty foes, even though they stood on seaside shores.

1 Mr. Y. R. Gupte (Ind. Hist. Journal) reads the name of Kumāra in the inscription of A. D. 543-44, but he identifies him with the son of Narasimha Gupta. The ruler whose name is missing may represent one or other of the "Gupta" lines already known to scholars or some new line. Cf. the cases of Vainya Gupta and the princes mentioned on pp. 214-15 of Ep. Ind., xx, Appendix.
that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water, (and) were covered with the branches of plantain trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra palms; (or) even though they stood on (that) mountain (Himālaya) which is cold with the water of the rushing and waving torrents full of snow.' The "haughty foes" on seaside shores were probably the Gaudas who had already launched into a career of conquest about this time and who are described as living on the sea shore (samudr-āśraya) in the Harāhā inscription of A. D. 554.¹ The other enemies may have included ambitious Kumārāmātyas like Nandana of the Amauna plate.

The next king, Kumāra Gupta III, had to encounter a sea of troubles. The Gaudas were issuing from their "proper realm" which was in Western Bengal as it bordered on the sea and included Karnasuvarna² and Raḍhāpuri.³ The lord of the Andhras who had thousands of three-fold rutting elephants, and the Śūlikas who had an army of countless galloping horses, were powers to be reckoned with. The Andhra king was probably Mādhava-varman (I, Janāśraya) of the Polamuru plates belonging to the Vishnukundin family who "crossed the river Gandāvari with the desire to conquer the eastern region"⁴ and performed eleven horse-sacrifices. The Śūlikas were probably the Chalukyas.⁵ In the Mahākūṭa pillar

¹ Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 110 et seq.
² M. Chakravarti, JASB, 1908, p. 274.
³ Prabodha-chandrodaya, Act II.
⁴ Dubreuil, AHD, p. 92 and D. C. Sircar, IHQ, 1933, 276 ff.
⁵ In the Brīhat-Saṃhitā, IX. 15; XIV. 8, the Śūlikas and Saulikas are associated with Aparānta (N. Kökān), Vanavāsi (Kanara) and Vidarbha (Berar). In Brīh. Saṃh., IX. 21, X. 7, XVI. 35, however, they are associated with Gandhāra and Vokkāga (Wakhan). A branch of the people may have dwelt in the north-west. In JRAS, 1912, 129, we have a reference to Kulastambha of the Sulkī family. Tārāntaḥ (Ind. Ant., IV, 364) places the kingdom of "Sulik" beyond "Togara" (Thr in the Deccan ?).
inscription the name appears as Chalikya. In the Gujarāt records we find the forms Solaki and Solanki. Sūlika may have been another dialectic variant. The Mahākūṭa pillar inscription tells us that in the sixth century A.D., Kirtivarman I of the “Chalikya” dynasty gained victories over the kings of Vaṅga, Áṅga, Magadha, etc. His father is known to have performed the Áśvamedha sacrifice, “the super-eminent touch-stone to test the might of warriors conquering the world and an indication of the conquest of all the warriors.” Prince Kirtivarman may have been entrusted with the guardianship of the sacrificial steed that had to roam about for a year in the territories of the rulers to whom a challenge was thrown by the performer of the sacrifice.

A new power was rising in the Upper Ganges Valley which was destined to engage in a death grapple with the Guptas for the mastery of Northern India. This was the Mukhara or Maukharī1 power. The Maukharis claimed descent from the hundred sons whom king Áśvapati got from Vaivāsvata, i.e., Yama2 (not Manu). The family consisted of several distinct groups. The stone inscriptions of one group have been discovered in the Jaunpur and Bārā Bankī districts of the Uttra Pradeśa, while lithic records of another group have been discovered in the Gayā district of Bihār. A third family has left inscription at Bādvā in the Kotah state in Rājputāna. The Maukharis of Gayā, namely, Yajñavarman, Sār dulavarmā, and Anantavarman were a

1 The family was called both Mukhara and Maukharī, “Soma-Sūrya vamsāviva Puspbhāti (sic) Mukhara Vaṁśāu”, “sakalabhuvana namaskṛito Maukharī vaṁśāh.” (Harsha-charita, Parab’s ed., pp. 141, 146). Cf. also CII, P. 229.

2 Mbh., III. 296. 36 ff. The reference is undoubtedly to the hundred sons that Áśvapati obtained as a boon from Yama on the intercession of his daughter Sāvitrī. It is surprising that some writers still identify the Vaivāsvata of the Maukharī record with Manu.
feudatory family. Sārdūla is expressly called sāmanta chūḍāmaṇi, ‘crest-jewel of vassal chiefs’ in the Barābar Hill Cave Inscription of his son. The Baḍvā Maukhari held the office of general or military governor under some Prince of Western India in the third century A. D. The Maukhari of the Uttara Pradesā probably also held a subordinate rank at first. The earliest princes of this family, viz., Harivarman, Ādityavarman, and Īśvaravarman, were simply Mahārājjas, Ādityavarman’s wife was Harsha Guptā, probably a sister of king Harsha Gupta. The wife of his son and successor Īśvaravarman was also probably a Gupta princess named Upa-Guptā. In the Harāhā inscription Īśāna-varman, son of Īśvaravarman and Upa-Guptā, claims victories over the Andhras, the Śūlikas and the Gauḍas and is the first to assume the Imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. It was this which probably brought him into conflict with king Kumāra

1 CII, p. 223. The connection of the Maukhari with Gayā is very old. This is proved by the clay seal with the inscription Mokhaliṣa, or Mokhatiṇam (Fleet, CII, 14), to which attention has already been drawn above. A reference to the Mokaris seems also to occur in the Chandravalli Stone Inscription of the Kadamba king Mayūrāśarman (Arch. Survey of Mysore, A. R. 1929, pp. 50 ff.). Dr. Tripathi finds a possible reference in the Mahābhāṣya (JBORS, 1934, March). For the Baḍvā ins., see Ep. Ind., XXIII, 42 ff. (Altekar).

2 In literature the Maukhari line of U. P. is associated with the city of Kanauj which may have been the capital at one time. Cf. C. V. Vaidya, Medieval Hindu India, I, pp. 9, 33; Aravamuthan, the Kaveri, the Maukhari and the Symgam Age, p. 101. Huien Tsang, however, declares Kanauj to have been included within the realm of the House of Pushyabhūti even before Harsha. A Gupta noble was in possession of Kuśasthala (Kanauj) for some time after the death of Rāyavardhana and before the rise of Harsha. (Harsha-Charita, Parab’s ed., pp. 226, 249).

3 Fleet, CII. 290.

4 The victory over the Andhras is also alluded to in the Jaumpur stone inscription (CII, p. 230) which, according to Fleet, also seems to refer to a conflict with Dhārā, the capital of Western Mālava (?). Dr. Basāk thinks that Dhārā in this passage refers to the edge of the sword (Hist. N. E. Ind., 109).
Gupta III. Thus began a duel between the Maukharis and the Guptas which ended only when the latter with the help of the Gaudas wiped out the Maukharis power in the time of Grahavarman, brother-in-law of Harshavardhana.

We have seen that Isanavarman’s mother and grandmother were probably Gupta princesses. The mother of Prabhakaravardhana, the other empire-builder of the second half of the sixth century, appears also to have been a Gupta princess. It seems that the Gupta marriages in this period were as efficacious in stimulating imperial ambition as the Lichchhavai marriages of more ancient times.

Kumara Gupta III claims to have “churned that formidable milk-ocean, the cause of the attainment of fortune, which was the army of the glorious Isanavarman, a very moon among kings.” This is not an empty boast, for the Maukharis records do not claim any victory over the Guptas. Kumara Gupta III’s funeral rites took place at Prayaga which probably formed a part of his dominions.

The son and successor of this king was Dāmodara Gupta. He continued the struggle with the Maukharis and fell fighting against them. “Breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the

1 Any one acquainted with the history of Europe knows that enumeration as I, II, III etc. need not imply that the kings in question belonged to the same dynasty.
2 The successors of Grahavarman may have survived as petty nobles. With them a “Later Gupta” king contracted a matrimonial alliance in the seventh century A.D.
3 Cf. Heermele, JRAS, 1903, p. 557.
4 Aphsaq Ins.
5 The Maukharis opponent of Dāmodara Gupta was either Suryavarman or Sarvavarman (both being sons of Isanavarman), if not Isanavarman himself. A Suryavarman is described in the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahādeva Gupta as “born in the unblemished family of the Varmans, great on account of their adhipatya (supremacy) over Magadha.” If this Suryavarman be identical with,
Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Ḥuṇas (in order to trample them to death), he became unconscious (and expired in the fight).

Dāmodara Gupta was succeeded by his son Mahāsena Gupta. He is probably the king of Mālava, possibly Eastern Mālwa, mentioned in the Harsha-charita, whose sons Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon Rājya-vardhana and Harsha-vardhana by their father, king Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushyabhūti family of Śrīkantha (Thānesar). The intimate relation between the family of Mahāsena Gupta and that of Prabhākara-vardhana is proved by the Madhuban grant and the Šonpat copper seal inscription of Harsha which represent Mahāsena Guptā Devī as the mother of Prabhākara, and the Apśaad inscription of Ādityasena which alludes to the association of Mādhava Gupta, son of Mahāsena Gupta, with Harsha.

The Pushyabhūti alliance of Mahāsena Gupta was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukhari. The policy was eminently successful, and

or a descendant of, Sūryavarmān, the son of Yaśaṅnavarmān, then it is certain that for a time the supremacy of Magadha passed from the hands of the Guptas to that of the Maukhari. The Deo-Baranārk inscription (Shāhābāad District) of Jivita Gupta II also suggests (CII, pp. 216-218) that the Maukharis Sarvavarmān and Avantivarman held a considerable part of Magadha some time after Bālāditya-deva. After the loss of Magadha the later Guptas were apparently confined to 'Mālava,' till Mahāsena Gupta once more pushed his conquests as far as the Saunhityas.

1 Reference to Mahābhārata XII. 93, 46-47; Raghuvansā, VII. 53; Kāvyādarśa, II, 119; Rājatarahāqinī, I. 68, shows that the objections raised against the interpretation of Fleet are invalid. The significance of the touch of Surabadhās as distinct from a human being, is entirely missed by a writer in Bhand. Com. Vol. 181, and a reviewer of Dr. Tripathi's History of Ancient India.

2 And perhaps of other aggressive states mentioned in the beginning of the fourth Uchchhvaṣa of the Harsha-charita. The Lāṭas of that passage may have reference to the Kaṭachchhuras who finally ousted the Guptas from Vidiśā in or about A.D. 608. The Kaṭachchhuri (Kalachhuri) dominions included the Lāṭa
during his reign we do not hear of any struggle with that family. But a new danger threatened from the east. A strong monarchy was at this time established in Kāmarūpa by a line of princes who claimed descent from Bhagadatta. King Susthitavarman of this family came into conflict with Mahāsena Gupta and was defeated. "The mighty fame of Mahāsena Gupta," says the Apsaḍ inscription, "marked with honour of victory in war over the illustrious Susthitavarman.....is still constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya."

Between Mahāsena Gupta, the contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana, and his younger or youngest son Mādhava Gupta, the contemporary of Harsha, we have to place a king named Deva Gupta II who is mentioned by name in the Madhuban and Banskhera inscriptions of Harsha as the most prominent among the kings "who resembled wicked horses," who were all punished and restrained in their evil career by Rājya-vardhana. As the Gupta princes are uniformly connected with Mālava in the Harsha-charita there can be no doubt that the wicked Deva Gupta is identical with the wicked lord of Mālava who cut off Grahavarman Maukhari, and who was himself defeated "with ridiculous ease" by Rājya-vardhana. It is difficult country in the latter part of the sixth and the first decade of the seventh century A.D. (Dubreuil, A.H.D., 82).

1 See the Nidhanapur plates. A writer in the JRAS (1926) revives the theory that Susthitavarman was a Maukhari and not a king of Kāmarūpa. But no Maukhari king of that name is known. The association of Susthitavarman with the river Lohitya or Brāhmaputra clearly shows that the king of that name mentioned in the Nidhanapur plates is meant.

2 The Emperor Chandra Gupta II was Deva Gupta I.

3 It is difficult to believe, as does one writer, that the Mālava antagonist of Grahavarman and Rājya-vardhana was Buddhārāja of the Kalachuri (Kāṭachchuri) family. Had that been the case then it is rather surprising that a shadowy figure like Devagnuta, and not Buddhārāja, would be specially selected in the epigraphic records of the time of Harsha, for prominent notice among "the kings who resembled wicked horses," who received punishment at the hands of Rājya-vardhana. It is the 'Guptas' who are associated with Mālava in the Harsha-
to determine the position of Deva Gupta in the dynastic list of the Guptas. He may have been the eldest son of Mahāsena Gupta, and an elder brother of Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta.\(^1\) His name is omitted in the Aphsaṅ list of kings, just as the name of Skanda Gupta is omitted in the Bhāratarī list.

Shortly before his death, king Prabhākara-vardhana had given his daughter Rājyaśrī in marriage to Grahavarman, the eldest son of the Maukhari king Avantivarman. The alliance of the Pushyabhūtis with the sworn enemies of his family must have alienated Deva Gupta, who formed a counter-alliance with the Gaudas whose hostility towards the Maukharis dated from the reign of Iśānavarman. As soon as Prabhākara died the Gupta king and the Gauda king, Saśāṅka,\(^2\) seem to have made a joint attack on the Maukhari kingdom. "Graha-varman was by the wicked rājā of Mālava cut off from the living along with his noble deeds. Rājyaśrī also, the princess, was confined like a brigand's wife with a pair of iron fetters kissing her feet...

charita which deals mainly with events till the rescue of Rājyaśrī. The rulers mentioned in connection with the tragic fate of the last of the Maukharis, the vicissitudes through which Rājyaśrī passed, and the struggles in which Rājya-vardhana engaged, include Guptas and Gaudas but no Kāṭacchhuri king.

\(^1\) Hoerle, JRAI, 1908, p. 562. The suggestion, however, cannot be regarded as a well-established fact. Devagupta may have represented a collateral line of the Mālava family who continued to pursue a policy hostile to the Pushyabhūtis and the Maukharis, while Kumāra, Mādhava, the Gupta Kulaśūtra who connived at the escape of Rājyaśrī from Kuśasthala (Kanaūj), and Ādiyaśasena, son of Mādhava, who gave his daughter in marriage to a Maukhari, may have belonged to a friendly branch.

\(^2\) There is no reason to believe that Saśāṅka belonged to the Gupta family (pace Allan, Gupta Coins, later). Even if it be proved that he had a secondary name, Narendra Gupta, that by itself cannot establish a connection with the Gupta line in view of (a) the absence of any reference to his supposed Gupta ancestry in his own seal matrix ins. or in the record of his feudatories, (b) the use of the Nandākṛjaya to the exclusion of the Garuḍādvaja, (c) his Gauda connection. The epithet 'Samudrāṭrāya' applied to the Gaudas of the sixth century A. D., can hardly be regarded as an apposite characterisation of the Guptas of Magadha, Prayāga or Mālwa.
and cast into prison at Kanyakubja." "The villain, deeming the army leaderless purposes to invade and seize this country (Thanesar) as well." Rājya-vardhana, though he routed the Mālava army "with ridiculous ease," was "allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the overlord of Gauḍa, and then weaponless, confiding and alone despatched in his own quarters."

To meet the formidable league between the Guptas and the Gauḍas, Harsha, the successor of Rājya-vardhana, concluded an alliance with Bhāskara-varman, king of Kāmarūpa, whose father Susthita-varman Mrigānka had fought against Mahāsena Gupta. This alliance was disastrous for the Gauḍas as we know from the Nidhanapur plates of Bhāskara. At the time of the issuing of the plates Bhāskara-varman was in possession of the city of Karnasuvarna that had once been the capital of the Gauḍa king, Śaśānka, whose death took place some time between A.D. 619 and 637. The king overthrown by Bhāskara-varman may have been Jayanāga (nāgarāja-samāheya Gauḍarāja, the king of Gauḍa named Nāga, successor of Somākhyā or Śaśānka), whose name is disclosed by the Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription. The Gauḍa people, however, did not tamely acquiesce in the loss of their independence. They became a thorn in the side of Kanauj and Kāmarūpa, and their hostility towards those two powers was inherited by the Pāla and Sēna successors of Śaśānka.

In or about A.D. 608 the Guptas seem to have lost Vidiśā to the Kāṭachchuriṣ. Magadha was held a little before A.D. 637 by Pūrṇavarman. Mādhava Gupta, the younger or youngest son of Mahāsena Gupta, remained a subordinate ally of Harsha of Thanesar and Kanauj and

1 Harsha-charita, Uḍçchhvaṭa 6, p. 163.
2 Ep. Ind., XVIII, pp. 60 ff; Arga-Manjuḍrī-mūla-kalpa, ed. G. Śāstri, p. 636. The same Jaya is also given in the Buddhist work.
apparently resided at his court. In the period 618-27, Harsha "punished the kings of four parts of India" and in 641 assumed the title of King of Magadha. After his death the Gupta sovereignty in Magadha was revived by Adityasena, a prince of remarkable vigour and ability, who found his opportunity in the commotion which followed the usurpation of Harsha's throne by Arjuna (?). For this "Later Gupta" king we have a number of inscriptions which prove that he ruled over a wide territory extending to the shores of the oceans. The Apsasad, Shāhpur and Mandāra inscriptions recognise his undisputed possession of south and part of east Bihār. A Deoghar inscription, noticed by Fleet, describes him as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the seas, and the performer of the Aśvamedha and the other great sacrifices. He renewed contact with the Gauḍas as well as the Maukhariṣas and received a Gauḍa named Sūkshamśiva in his service. A Maukhari chief, Bhogavarman, accepted the hands of his daughter and presumably became his subordinate ally. The Dēo-Baraṅārk inscription refers to the Jayaskandhāvāra of his great-grandson Jīvita Gupta II at Gomatikoṭṭaka. This clearly suggests that the so-called Later Guptas, and not the Maukhariṣas, dominated about this time the Gomati valley in the Madhya-desā. The Mandāra inscription applies to Adityasena the imperial titles of Parama-bhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja. We learn from the Shāhpur stone image inscription that he was ruling in the year A.D. 672-73. It is not improbable that he or his son Deva Gupta (III) is the Sakalottarā-patha-nātha, lord of the whole of North India,

1 Ind. Ant., IX. 19.
2 CII, p. 313 n. Aditya is said to have performed three Aśvamedha sacrifices.
3 Kielhorn, INI, 541.
who was defeated by the Chalukya kings Vinayāditya (A.D. 680-96) and Vijayāditya.1

We learn from the Dēo-Baranārāk inscription that Ādityasena was succeeded by his son Deva Gupta (III), who in his turn was succeeded by his son Vishnu Gupta (II).2 The last king was Jīvita Gupta II, son of Vishnu. All these kings continued to assume imperial titles. That these were not empty forms appears from the records of the Western Chalukyas of Vatāpi which testify to the existence of a Pan-North Indian empire in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D. The only North Indian sovereigns, Uttarāpatha-nātha, who laid claim to the imperial dignity during this period, and actually dominated Magadha and the Madhya desa as is proved by the Aphpṣad and Dēo-Baranārāk inscriptions, were Ādityasena and his successors.3

The Gupta empire was probably finally destroyed by the Gauḍas who could never forgive Mādhava Gupta’s desertion of their cause and who may have grown powerful in the service of Ādityasena. In the time of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, i.e., in the first half of the eighth century A.D., a Gauḍa king occupied the throne of Magadha.4

---

2 This king seems also to be mentioned in an inscription discovered at Mangraon in the Buxar subdivision.
3 For a curious reference to the Chalukyas and king Jīh-kwaṇ (‘Sun army’ i.e. Ādityasena), see IA, X, p. 110.
4 Cf. the Gauḍacaṇho by Vākpatirāja. Banerji confounds the Gauḍas with the later Guptas. In the Harāhā Inscription the Gauḍas are associated with the sea-coast, Samudrāśraya, while the later Guptas, as is well-known, had their centres in the hinterland including Magadha and Mālwa. The people on the seashore were, according to the evidence of the Aphpṣad Inscription, hostile to Jīvita Gupta I. The Prāhasītikāra of the Aphpṣad record is expressly mentioned as a Gauḍa, a designation that is never applied to his patrons. The family of Kṛiṣṇa Gupta is simply characterised as Sadvamsa and there is not the slightest hint that the kings of the line and their panegyrist belonged to the same nationality. The fact that Gauḍa is the designation of the lord of Magadha.
Petty Gupta Princes, apparently connected with the imperial line, ruled in the Kanarese districts during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries A.D. and are frequently mentioned in inscriptions. Evidence of an earlier connection of the Guptas with the Kanarese country is furnished by the Tālagund inscription which says that Kākūsthā-varman of the Kadamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. In the fifth or sixth century A. D. the Vakāṭaka king Narendrasena, a descendant of Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya through his daughter Prabhāvatī Guptā, is said to have married a princess of Kuntala, i.e., of the Kanarese region. Curiously enough, the Gutta or Gupta chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya, lord of Ujjayinī.

In the days of Yāsovarman early in the eighth century cannot be taken to prove that Ganjā and later Gupta are interchangeable terms. In this period lordship of Magadha is not inseparably connected only with later Gupta lineage. Cf. the passage Magadhātipatyamahātām jāta kule varmanām, which proves the existence of non-Gupta lines among rulers of Magadha in this age.

1 Jouveau-Dubreuil, AHD, p. 76.


3 The account of the Later Guptas was first published in the JASB, 1920, No. 7.
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Suryavarman

Pushyabhuti

Rajyavardhana I

Deva Gupta II ?) Kumara Gupta Madhava Gupta=Srimati Devi

Adityasena=Koja Devi

Rajyavardhana II

Harshavardhana

Rajyasri=Grahavarman

Maukhari

daughter=Dhrusasena II of Valabhi

A.D. 672-73

A.D. 698-847

Bhogavarman=daughter

Devagupta III=Kamaladevi

Maukhari

Vatsa Devi

Vishnu Gupta=Iljadevi

Jayadeva Parachakraka 148 A.D. ? or 759

Jivita Gupta II

A.D. (?)=Rajyamati, daughter of Harshadeva

1 A. Ghosh, *Two Maukhari seals from Nalanda*, Ep. xxiv, 285. We have reference to another son of Avantivarman named Suva or Such . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . who seems to have succeeded his father. Grahavarman too, has royal epithets in the *Harsha-charita* (pp. 149, 183). The order of succession is not, however, clear from available evidence.
APPENDIX A.

The Results of Asoka's Propaganda in Western Asia.¹

The vast region beyond the western frontiers of India came within the geographical horizon of Buddhist writers as early as the Bāveru Jātaka, and possibly the Sussondi Jātaka, and its princes figure not inconspicuously in Buddhist inscriptions of the third century B.C. The records of Asoka show that the eyes of the imperial missionary of Magadha were turned more to the West than to the East; and even the traditional account of early Buddhist proselytising efforts given in the chronicles of Ceylon,² does not omit to mention the country of the Yonas where Mahārakkhita ‘delivered in the midst of the people the 'Kālakāvāma suttanta,’ in consequence of which a hundred and seventy thousand living beings attained to the reward of the path (of salvation) and ten thousand received the pabbajjā.’ It will perhaps be argued that the Yona country mentioned in the chronicles is to be identified with some district in the Kābul valley, and is not to be taken to refer to the realm of ‘Antiocchos,’³ the Yona king, and the kings, the neighbours of that Antiocchos, namely, Ptolemy, Antigonus, Magas and Alexander,” mentioned in the second and the thirteenth rock edicts of Asoka. Rhys Davids, in fact, is inclined to regard the declaration in these edicts about the success of Asoka’s

¹ Mainly an extract from an article published in the Buddhistic Studies (ed. B. C. Law).
² Mahāvamsa, Ch. XII.
³ Dr. Jarl Charpentier has contributed a paper to A Volume of Indian Studies presented to Professor E. J. Rapson in which he revives the suggestion of Prinsep (Hultzsch, Asoka, xxxi) that “Antiyyaka” referred to by Asoka is Antiocchos Soter (c281-61), and not his son Antiocchos Theos (261-46). But his theory requires that Chandragupta ascended the throne in 337-25 B.C., that he was identical with Xandrames and that the story of his visit to Alexander (recorded by Justin and Plutarch) is a myth. The theory is opposed not only to the evidence of Justin and Plutarch, but to the known facts about the ancestry of Chandragupta. Unlike Xandrames, Chandragupta is nowhere represented as of barber origin. His paternal ancestors are described as rulers by Brāhmaical and Buddhist writers alike.
missionary propaganda in the realms of Yona princes as mere "royal rhodomontade". "It is quite likely," says he, "that the Greek kings are only thrown in by way of make-weight, as it were; and that no emissaries had been actually sent there at all." Sir Flinders Petrie is, however, of opinion that in the Ptolemaic Period Buddhism and Buddhist festivals had already reached the shores of Egypt. He infers this from Indian figures found at Memphis. An epigraph from the Thebaid mentions as the dedicator "Sophon the Indian".

Alberuni, writing in the eleventh century A. D. says, "In former times Khurāsān, Persis, Irāk, Mosul, the country up to the frontier of Syria, was Buddhistic, but then Zarathustra went forth from Adharbaijān and preached Magism in Balkh (Baktra). His doctrine came into favour with king Gushtasp, and his son Isfendiyād spread the new faith both in East and West, both by force and by treaties. He founded fire-temples through his whole Empire, from the frontiers of China to those of the Greek Empire. The succeeding kings made their religion (i. e., Zoroastrianism) the obligatory state-religion for Persis and Irāk. In consequence the Buddhists were banished from those countries, and had to emigrate to the countries east of Balkh ...... Then came Islam." The above account may not be correct in all its particulars. The statement that Buddhism flourished in the countries of Western Asia before Zoroaster is clearly wrong. But the prevalence of the religion of Śākyamuni in parts of Western Asia in a period considerably anterior to Alberuni and its suppression by Zoroastrianism and Islam may well be based upon fact. The antagonism of Buddhism to the fire-cult is hinted at in the Bhūridatta Jātaka. It has even been suggested that Zoroastrian scriptures allude to disputes with the Buddhists.

Four centuries before Alberuni, Hsiian Tsang bore witness to the fact that Lang kie(ka)-lo, a country subject to Persia, contained above 100 monasteries and more than 6,000 Brethren

1 Buddhist Indīā, p. 238.
2 Mahaffy, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, 155 f.
4 No. 543.
who applied themselves to the study of the Great and Little "Vehicles". Persia (Po-la-sse) itself contained two or three Saṅghārāmas, with several hundred priests, who principally studied the teaching of the Little Vehicle according to the Sarvāstivādin school. The pātra of Śākya Buddha was in this country, in the King's palace.¹

The Chinese pilgrim did not probably personally visit Persia. But no doubt need be entertained regarding the existence of Buddhist communities and Saṅghārāmas or monasteries in Irān. Stein discovered a Buddhist monastery in "the terminal marshes of the Helmund" in Seistān.² Māṇī, the founder of the Manichaean religion, who was born in A.D. 215-16, at Ctesiphon in Babylonia and began to preach his gospel probably in A.D. 242, shows unmistakable traces of Buddhist influence.³ In his book Shābūrgān (Shapurakhan) he speaks of the Buddha as a messenger of God. Legge and Eliot refer to a Manichaean treatise which has the form of a Buddhist Sūtra. It speaks of Māṇī as the Tathāgata and mentions Buddhas and the Bodhisattva. In Bunyiu Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka, App., II, No. 4, we have reference to a Parthian prince who became a Buddhist śramaṇa or monk before A.D. 148. In his History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon,⁴ Dr. Vincent Smith refers to a picture of a four-armed Buddhist saint or Bodhisattva in the guise of a Persian with black beard and whiskers, holding a thunderbolt (vajra) in his left hand, which has been found at a place called Dandān-Uliq in Turkestān. Such figures are undoubtedly the products of a type of Buddhism which must have developed in Irān, and enjoyed considerable popularity as late as the eighth century A.D. which is the date assigned by Dr. Smith to the fresco or distemper paintings on wood and plaster discovered at Dandān-Uliq.

It is difficult to say to what extent Buddhist literature made its influence felt in Western Asia. Sir Charles Eliot points

² Sir Charles Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, III, 3.
³ Ibid., p. 446; The Dacca University Journal, Feb., 1926, pp. 108, 111; JRAI, 1913, 69, 76, 81.
⁴ P. 819.
out the close resemblance between certain Manichæan works and the Buddhist Suttas and the Pātimokkha, and says that according to Cyril of Jerusalem, the Manichæan scriptures were written by one Scythianus and revised by his disciple Terebinthus who changed his name to Boddas. He finds in this "jumble" allusions to Buddha Sakyamuni and the Bo-tree. It may further be pointed out that some Jātaka tales show a surprising similarity to some of the stories in the Arabian Nights. The Samugga Jātaka², for instance, tells the story of the demon who put his beautiful wife in a box and guarded her in this manner in order that she might not go astray. But this did not prevent her from taking pleasure with others. The tale in all its essentials recurs in the Arabian Nights.³

The Jātaka verse,

"He his true bliss in solitude will find,  
Afar from woman and her treachery"

is comparable to the statement of the poet in the Arabian Nights:

"Never trust in women; nor rely upon their vows;  
For their pleasure and displeasure depend upon their passions.  
They offer a false affection;  
For perfidy lurks within their clothing."

Whatever may be the case at the present day, in times gone by Western Asia was clearly not altogether outside the sphere of the intellectual and spiritual conquests of Buddhism.

---

¹ Cf. McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 186. "Terebinthus proclaimed himself learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and gave out that his name was no longer Terebinthus but that he was a new Buddha (Buddas) and that he was born of a virgin. Terebinthus was the disciple of Scythianus, who was a Saracen born in Palestine and who traded with India."

² No. 496

³ Burton, The Book of the Thousand Nights, I. 122; Olcott, Stories from the Arabian Nights, p. 3; Lane's Arabian Nights, pp. 8-9. A similar story is found in Lambaka X, taraka 8 of the Katha-sarit-sagara; Penzer, The Ocean of Story, Vol. V. pp. 151-52. "So attachment to women, the result of infatuation produces misery to all men. But indifference to them produces in the discerning emancipation from the bonds of existence."
APPENDIX B.

A NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION OF KANISHKA
AND RUDRADĀMAN I.¹

Some years ago⁴ Mr. Haricharan Ghosh and Professor Jayachandra Vidyalankar contributed two very interesting notes on the date of Kanishka. The latter upholds the theory of Dr. Sten Konow, fortified by the calculations of Dr. Van Wijk, that the great Kushān Emperor began his rule in A.D. 128-29, and criticises the view put forward in this work that Kanishka I's rule in the "Lower Indus Valley" (this and not "Sind," is the expression actually used) could not have synchronised with that of Rudradāman I, who, "did not owe his position as Mahākṣatrāpa to anybody else." The conclusions of Professor Konow and Dr. Van Wijk are admittedly hypothetical, and little more need be said about them after the illuminating observations of Professor Rapseon in JRAS, 1930, January, pp. 186-202. In the present note we shall confine ourselves to an examination of the criticism of Professor Jayachandra Vidyalankar and Mr. Haricharan Ghosh of the views expressed in the preceding pages.

The Professor has not a word to say about the contention that Kanishka's dates 1-23, Vāsishka's dates 24-28, Huvishka's dates 31'-60, and Vāsudeva's dates 67-98 suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era current in North-West India which commenced in the second century A. D. He only takes considerable pains to prove that Rudradāman's sway over Sindhu-Sauvīra (which he identifies with modern Sind) between 180 and 150 A. D. does not imply control over Sui Vihār and Multān, and consequently Kanishka's sovereignty over Sui Vihār in the year 11 of an era starting from 128-29 A.D., i.e., in or about 140 A.D., is not irreconcilable

¹ IHQ, March, 1930, pp. 149 ff.
² IHQ, V, No. 1, March, 1929, pp. 49-60, and JBORS, XV, parts I & II March-June, 1929, pp. 47-63.
³ The earliest recorded date of Huvishka is now known to be the year 28
with the rule of the Great Satrap in Sindhu-Sauvīra at about the same time. He is not oblivious of the difficulty of harmonising this limitation of Rudradāman’s power with the known fact of the Great Satrap’s campaign against the Yaudheyas in the course of which he claims to have uprooted that powerful tribe “in their country proper which was to the north of Suē Vihār” and, according to the theory advocated by the Professor, “formed part of Kanishka’s dominions” at that time. He meets the difficulty by saying that “the pressure of the Kausāna armies from the north had driven the Yaudheyas to the desert of Marwar”. Such surmises to explain away inconvenient details, are, to say the least, not convincing, especially in view of the fact that Maru finds separate mention in the inscription of Rudradāman as a territory under the rule of the mighty Satrap.

But is the contention of the Professor that Sindhu-Sauvīra did not include the country up to Multān correct? Alberuni, who based his assertions on the geographical data of the Purāṇas and the Brihatsaṃhitā, made the clear statement that Sauvīra was equivalent to Multān and Jahrvār. Against this Professor Vidyalankar quotes the evidence of Yuan Chwang who says that in his days “Mou-lo-san-pu-lu,” i.e. Mūla-sthāna-pura or Multān was a dependency of the “Che-ka” or Takka country in the C. Pañjāb. It should be noted, however, that the Chinese pilgrim is referring to political dependence, and not geographical inclusion. India was a dependency of Great Britain. But geographically it was not a part of the British Isles. On the other hand, Alberuni does not give the slightest hint that what he actually means by the equation “Sauvīra, i.e., Multān and Jahrvār” is political subjection of Multān to Sind. His account here is purely geographical, and he is merely giving the names of the countries, as taken from the Saṃhitā of Varāhamihira with his own comments. Far from making Multān a political dependency of Sind he carefully distinguishes “Sauvīra, i.e., Multān and Jahrvār” from “Sindhu” which is mentioned separately.

The view that ancient Sauvīra was confined to Southern Sind and that Sindhu and Sauvīra together correspond to
modern Sind, and nothing but Sind, is unsupported by any early evidence. Yuan Chwang went east from Sin-tu above 900 li and, crossing to the east bank of the Indus, came to the Mou-lo-san-pu-lu country. This proves that Sin-tu lay to the west of Mou-lo-san-pu-lu (Multān), and was situated on the west side of the Indus. The commentator of the Kāmasūtras of Vātsyāyana makes the clear statement: "The major part of modern Sind was clearly outside the geographical (as opposed to the political) limits of ancient "Sin-tu" or Sindhu and was, in the days of Yuan Chwang, included in the countries of A-tien-p'o-chih-lo, Pi-to-shih-lo, and A-fan-tu. Part of the modern territory of Sind may have been included in Sauvīra whose southern limits undoubtedly reached the sea, because the Milinda-Pañho mentions it in a list of countries where "ships do congregate". We are informed by the author of the Periplus that "ships lie at anchor at Barbaricum" (at the mouth of the Indus). But the evidence of Alberuni leaves no room for doubt that the northern limits of Sauvīra reached Multān. A scholar like Alberuni thoroughly conversant with Purānic lore, is not likely to make an unwarranted statement. In fact, the inclusion of Multān within Sauvīra receives striking confirmation from some of the Purānas. The Skandapurāṇa, for instance, referring to the famous temple of the Sun at Mūla-sthāna or Multān, says that stood on the banks of the river Devikā (Devikātāta):—

In the Agnipurāṇa the Devikā is brought into special relations with the realm of Sauvīra:—

According to Yuan Chwang, Sin-tu and Multān were neighbouring countries lying on opposite sides of the Indus.

1 Watters, II. 264.
3 Prabhāsa-ks eitra-Māhātmya, Ch. 278.
4 Ch. 200.
This is quite in accordance with the close association of Sindhu and Sauvira in early literature.

Rudradāman’s mastery over Sindhu and Sauvira (in the sense in which these terms were understood by the Purāṇas, the commentator on the Kāmasūtras of Vātsyāyana, Yuan Chhwang and Alberuni) is clearly irreconcilable with the simultaneous sovereignty of Kanishka over Sui Vihar.

Apart from the identification of Sauvira with Multān and Jahrāvār, is it unreasonable to hold that a power which exercised sway over ancient Sindhu and Maru, and fought with the Yaudheyas of Johiyawār, had the Sui Vihar region under its control?

Mr. H. C. Ghosh asserts 4 that it cannot be proved that Rudradāman held Sindhu and Sauvira some time from 136 A.D. at least. He also thinks that the argument that Kanishka started an era “involves a petitio principii.” Now, we know that by 150 A.D. Rudradāman was “the lord of the whole of eastern and western Ākarāvanti, Anupanīvīḍ, Ānartta, Surāṣṭra, Svabhra, Maru, Kachchha, Sindhu, Sauvira, Kukura, Aparānta, Nishāda, and other territories gained by his own valour.” The conquest of so many countries must have taken a long time, and the Andhau inscriptions show that one of the countries, at any rate, namely, Kachchha, had come under the sway of the Great Satrap as early as 130 A.D. On p. 277 of the Political History of Ancient India (second edition) it has been pointed out that “the name of the capital of Scythia (i.e., the Lower Indus Valley) in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Sakasthāna mentioned by Isidore. Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the name of the western

1 Mbbh., III, Ch. 266.
2 Mbbh., III, Ch. 266.
3 Mbbh., III, Ch. 270.
4 IH Q., 1929, p. 79.
Kshatrapas of Cāshṭana’s line, viz., ‘Dāman’ (-dama) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the Kārddamaka family, from which the daughter of the Mahākshatrapa Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Kardama river in Persia.’’

The facts noted above indicate that the Saka sept to which Chashṭana and Rudradāman belonged came from Sakaštāna in Irān through the Lower Indus Valley to Cutch and other places in Western India. In view of this and the contiguity of Cutch to the Lower Indus Valley, it is permissible to think that the date of the conquest of Sindhu and Sauvira could not have been far removed from, and may have even preceded, that of Cutch (Kachchha). As the great Satrap retained his hold on these provinces till 150 A.D. it stands to reason that he was their ruler from c. 136 A.D.

As to the second contention of Mr. Ghosh, it may be pointed out that Kanishka’s dates 1-23, Vasishka’s dates 24-28, Huvishka’s dates 29-60, and Vasudeva’s dates 67-98, do suggest a continuous reckoning. To deny that Kanishka started an era is tantamount to saying that the dates of his successors, Vasishka, Huvishka, and Vasudeva are regnal years. But no serious student will contend that Vasudeva’s dates 67-98 are to be taken as regnal years.
APPENDIX C.

A NOTE ON THE LATER GUPTAS.¹

It was recently urged by Professor R. D. Banerji that Mahāśena Gupta of the Apsāḍ inscription, father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, could not have been a king of East Mālava, and secondly, that Susthitavarman whose defeat at the hands of Mahāśena Gupta, in the Lohita or Lauhitya region, is mentioned in the Apsāḍ inscription, was not a Maukhari, but a king of Kāmarūpa.

The second proposition will be readily accepted by all careful students of the Apsāḍ epigraph and the Nidhanapur plate inscription, though some western scholars are still, I know not why, of a contrary opinion.² As to the first point, viz., whether Mahāśena Gupta was a direct ruler of East Mālava or of Magadhā, a student will have to take note of the following facts:—

(i) In the Dēō-Baraṇārk Inscription of Jīvita Gupta II, which records the continuance of the grant of a village³ in South Bihar, we have reference to Bālāditya-deva, and after him, to the Maukharis Sarva-varman and Avanti-varman. Not a word is said about their later Gupta contemporaries in connection with the previous grants of the village. The inscription is no doubt damaged, but the sovereignty of Sarva-varman and Avanti-varman undoubtedly precludes the possibility of the direct rule of their contemporaries of the later Gupta line.

¹ Mainly an extract from an article published in JBORS, Sept.-Dec., 1929, pp. 561 ff.
² JRAS, 1928, July, pp. 689ff.
³ Dr. R. C. Majumdar’s suggestion that the village in question may have been situated in U. P. has been commented upon by Dr. Sircar who points out that Fleet’s reading of the name of the village (on which Dr. Majumdar bases his conclusions) is tentative and unacceptable.
(ii) Inscriptions discovered in the Barābar and Nāgārjuni hill caves disclose the existence of another line of Maukhari "Varmans" who were feudatory (sāmanta) chiefs of the Gayā district in the time of the later Guptas.

(iii) Yuan Chwang who visited Magadha in the time of Harsha mentions Pūrṇa-varman as the occupant of the throne of Magadha. He does not say a word about Mādhava Gupta or his father in connection with Magadha.

(iv) Bāna indeed, refers to Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, but he expressly mentions his father as the king of Mālava, and not of Magadha. The existence of two associates of Harsha, each bearing the name of Mādhava Gupta, one of whom was the son of a king of Magadha, is not known to the biographer of the great emperor.

From the evidence adduced above two facts emerge, viz., that the father of the only Mādhava Gupta whom the biographer of Harsha knew to be the associate of his royal patron, was a king of Mālava, and that before Harsha's conquest of the province in A. D. 641, direct control over Magadha was exercised, not by the Guptas, but by the "Varmans". The memory of "Varman" ādhipatya (supremacy) over Magadha had not died away even in the time of the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśiva Gupta.

The only relevant argument that Professor Banerji urged against the view that Mahāsena Gupta, the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, was "probably" a king of Mālava, is that "it was impossible for a king of Mālava to reach the banks of the Lauhitya without strenuous opposition from the kings" who governed the intervening region. But how did Professor Banerji solve the problem? By making Mahāsena Gupta king of Magadha, and assuming that "Assam

1 Watters, III, 115.
2 Ind. Ant., IX, 19.
very probably lay on his frontier and Rādhā and Vanga or Mithilā and Varendra were included in his kingdom."

Any-thing in the nature of a proof he failed to give, but we were asked to accept his surmise because "in this case only is it possible for Mahāsena Gupta to have fought with Sushita-varman of Assam."

Regarding the possibility of a king of Mālava carrying his arms to the banks of the Lauhitya, attention may be invited to the Mandaśor inscription of Yaśodharman. In the case of Mahāsena Gupta a careful student of the Apshaḍ inscription cannot fail to note that the way before him had been prepared by his immediate predecessors. Kumāra Gupta, his grand-father, had pushed to Prayāga, while Dāmodara Gupta, father of Mahāsena Gupta, claims to have "broken up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari"—the same power which we have already seen, held control of Magadha a little before Harsha's conquest of the Province. The Gaṇḍa expansion had already been stopped for a time by the victories of Isanavarman Maukhari. What was there to prevent the son of Dāmodara Gupta (who must have assumed command after the death of his father on the battle-field) from pushing on to the Lauhitya?

---

APPENDIX D.

THE DECLINE OF THE EARLY GUPTA EMPIRE.¹

Towards the close of the fifth century A.D., the empire built up by the genius of Samudra Gupta and Vikramâditya was fast hastening towards dissolution. Skanda Gupta (A.D. 455- c. 467) was the last king of the Early Gupta line who is known to have controlled the westernmost provinces. After A.D. 467 there is no evidence that the Imperial Guptas had anything to do with Surâshêtra or the major part of Western Mâlwa.² Budha Gupta (A.D. 476-77 to c. 493) was probably the last prince of the family to be implicitly obeyed on the banks of the Lower Ganges as well as the Narmadâ. The rulers who came after him retained a precarious hold for some time on Eastern Mâlwa and North Bengal. But they had to fight with enemies on all sides, and, if a tradition recorded

¹ First published in the Calcutta Review, April, 1930.
² The identity of the supreme lord (Paramâ-vrâmî) mentioned in connection with the consecration of the early Valabhi king Droçasâhîha, is unknown. The surmise that he was a Gupta, though plausible, lacks convincing proof. Some scholars lay stress on the fact that the era used is the Gupta era (IC, V. 409). But the use of an era instituted by a dynasty does not always indicate political subordination to that line. It may simply have a geographical significance, a continuation of a custom prevailing in a particular locality. Even undoubted Gupta vassals used the Mâlava-Vikrama Samvat in Mandašor. Conversely the Gupta era is found used in regions, e.g., Shorkot, beyond the proper limits of the Gupta empire. Teipur, too, should possibly come under the category, as we are not sure as to whether it formed a part of the state of Kâmarûpa in the fourth century A. D. Equally conjectural is the identification of the ruler in question with a Hun or a sovereign of Mandašor. Theories and speculations in the absence of clear data are of little value. Some connection of the later kings of the Gupta line with the Mandašor region in W. Mâlwa in the first quarter of the sixth century A. D. may possibly be hinted at by the expression Guptâdâthâ ‘by the Gupta lords’ used in the Mandašor prâśasti or panegyrical of Yaśodharman. The term nâtha, may have reference to the fact that the Guptas were once overlords of Mandašor. But the analogy of Haṇâdhipa occurring in the same record may suggest that nâtha simply means ‘lord’ or ‘king’ without reference to any special relations subsisting between Mandašor and the Guptas in or about 528 A.D.
by Jinasena,\(^1\) is to be believed, their power collapsed in A.D. 551 (320 + 231):

\[
\text{Guptānāṁ cha šaṭa-devayam}
\]
\[
\text{eka-trimśachcha varshāṇi}
\]
\[
\text{kāla-viḍbhīr udāḥritam.\(^2\)}
\]

The supremacy over Āryāvarta then passed to the houses of Mukhara (cir. A.D. 554)\(^3\) and Pushyabhūti (family of Harsha, A.D. 606-47) under whom the centre of political gravity shifted from Magadha to Kanauj and that neighbourhood. Attempts were no doubt made by a line of so-called later Guptas to restore the fallen fortunes of their family, but these were not crowned with success till after the death of Harsha.

The causes of the decline of the early Gupta Empire are not far to seek, though a detailed presentation of facts is impossible in view of the paucity of contemporary records. The broad outline of the story is, however, perfectly clear. The same causes were at work which proved so disastrous to the Turki Sultanate of Delhi in the fourteenth century, and to the so-called Mughul Empire in the eighteenth, viz, outbreak of rebellions within, devastating invasions from without, the growth of a class of hereditary governors and other officials who commanded enormous influence in local centres, and assumed the titles of Mahārāja and Mahārājādhirāja, and dissensions in the imperial family itself.

Already in the time of Kumāra Gupta I, the stability of the empire was seriously threatened by a turbulent people whose name is commonly read as Pushya-mitra. The danger was averted by the crown prince Skanda Gupta. But a more formidable enemy appeared from the steppes of Central Asia. Inscriptions discovered at Bhitarī, Kura, Gwalior and Erān, as well as the records of several Chinese pilgrims, prove that shortly after the

---

1 Harivamśa, Ch. 80-  
2 Ind. Ant., 1885, 142; Bhand. Com., Vol., 105  
death of Kumāra Gupta I, the fierce Huns swooped down upon the north-western provinces of the empire and eventually made themselves masters of the Pañjāb and Eastern Mālwa.

The newcomers were long known to the people of India as a race of Uitlanders closely associated with the Chinese. The Mahācastu₁ mentions them along with the Chīnas, while the Sabhāparva of the Mahābhārata² includes them in a list of foreign tribes amongst whom the Chīnas occupy the first place:—

Chīnān Ṣakāns tathā ch Oḍrān(?) Varvarān Vanavāsinaḥ Vārṣhṇeyān(?) Hāra-Huṇānsaḥa Krishṇān Haimavatānāṃstathā.

A verse in the Bhīṣmaparva³ brings the Huns into relations with the Pārasikas or Persians:—

Yavanās China-Kāmbojā dārunā Mlechchhajātayaḥ Sakṛidgrahāḥ Kulatthāscha Huṇāḥ Pārasikaiḥ saha.

This verse is reminiscent of the period when the Huns came into contact with the Sassanian dynasty of Persia.⁴ Kālidāsa, too, places the Huns close to Persia—in the saffron-producing country watered by the river Vaṅkṣhu, the modern Oxus.⁵ Early in the reign of the Emperor Skanda Gupta they poured into the Gupta Empire, but were at first beaten back. The repulse of the Huns is mentioned in the Bhītāri Inscription and is also probably alluded to by the grammarian Chandragomin as a contemporary event.⁶ With the passing away of Skanda Gupta, however, all impediments to the steady advance of the invaders seem to have been removed and, if Somadeva, a Jaina contemporary of Krishṇa III, Rāṣṭrakūṭa, is to be

---

1 I. 135.
2 II. 51, 23-24
3 The mention of the Odras in this connection is odd. It is tempting to read in the epic verse Chaḍotāñcha (instead of tathādṛṣṭān). Chaḍota is the name of a territory in Central Asia near Khotān.
4 9,65-66.
6 Ind. Ant., 1912, 265f.
7 Ind. Ant., 1896, 105.
believed, they penetrated into the Indian interior as far as Chitrakūṭa. They certainly conquered the Eran district (Airikaṇa pradeśa) in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradeśa. The principal centres of their power in India, in the time of their kings Toramāṇa and Mihiirakula, were Pavvaiya on the Chināb and Sākala, modern Siālkoṭ, between the Chenāb and the Degh, in the Upper Paňjāb.

Next to the Hun inroads must be mentioned the ambition of generals and feudatories. In the time of the Emperor Skandagupta, Surāshāra was governed by a Goptri or Margrave named Parṇadatta, who was appointed by the emperor himself to the Viceroyalty of the Far West. Shortly afterwards, Bhaṭārka, a chief of the Maitraka clan, established himself in this province as general or military governor, with his capital probably at Valabhī. He, as well as his immediate successor, Dharasena I, was satisfied with the title of Senāpati or general, but the next chief Drōnasimha, the second son of Bhaṭārka (A.D. 502-03) had to be installed as Mahārāja by his suzerain. A branch of the dynasty established itself in Mo-la-po (Mālavaka) or the westernmost part of Mālwa in the latter half of the sixth century, and made extensive conquests in the direction of the Sahya and Vindhya Hills. Another, and a junior, branch continued to rule at

1 Bhand., Com. Vol., 216. Chitrakūṭa may be Chitor in Rājaputāna, or more probably the equally famous Chitrakūṭa on the Mandakini in Central India, where Rama lived for a short time during his banishment. A Hūgamaṇḍala is mentioned in an inscription as being situated in the Mālwa region (Ep. Ind. XXIII. 102).

2 JBORS. 1928, March, p. 33; C. J. Shah, Jainism in Northern India, 210, quoting Kuvalayamālā (? 5th century A. D.).


4 Dharasena II, king of Valabhi, left two sons, viz., Siḷāditya II Dhrāmāditya and Kharagrawa I. The account of Huen Tsang seems to suggest that in his time (i.e., shortly after Siḷāditya) the Maitraka dominions split up into two parts, one part including Mo-la-po and its dependencies probably obeying the line of Siḷāditya-Dhrāmāditya, the other part, including Valabhi, obeying Kharagrawa and his sons, one of whom was Drhuvasena II, Bālāditya or Dhruva-bhāja, who married the daughter of Harsha of Kanauj. The account of the Chinese pilgrim seems to receive confirmation from the Alina plate of Siḷāditya VII (Fleet, CH, 171 f. esp. 182n) which associates Derabhāja, the son of Siḷāditya I Dhrāmāditya, with the region of the Sahya and Vindhya mountains, while the descendants of Kharagrawa I are connected with Valabhi. The Navalakhi and Nogāwā plates, however, suggest that occasionally the same
Valabbi. In the seventh century Dhruvasena II of Valabbi married the daughter of Harsha. His son Dharasena IV (A.D. 645-49) assumed the imperial titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka Paramēśvara Chakravartin.

But the Maitrakas of Mo-la-po and Valabbi were not the only feudatories who gradually assumed an independent position. The rulers of Mandaśor pursued the same course, and their example was followed by the Maukhari of the Madhyadeśa and the kings of Navyāvakāśikā-Vardhamāna and Karṇasuvārṇa in Bengal.

Mandaśor, the ancient Daśapura, was one of the most important Viceregal seats of the Early Guptā Empire. It was the capital of a long line of marzaves belonging to the Anikara family, who governed part of Western Mālwa on behalf of the Emperor Chandra Guptā II Vikramādiṭya and his son Kumāra Guptā I Mahendrādiṭya. With the sixth century A.D., however, a new scene opened. Yasodharman, ruler of Mandaśor about A.D. 533, emboldened no doubt by his success over the Huns, defied the power of the Guptā lords (Guptanātha), and set up pillars of victory commemorating his conquests, which, in the words of his court panegyrist, embraced the whole of Hinduštān from the river Lauhitya, or the Brahmaputra, to the Western Ocean, and from the Himalayas to the mountain Mahendra or the Eastern Ghāṭs. After his death the Guptas figure again as lords of Mālava (Eastern Mālwa) in literature and possibly in inscriptions of the time of Harsha. But Western Mālwa could not be recovered by the family. Part of it was, as we have already seen, included within the dominions of the Maitrakas. Another part, viz., Avanti or the district round Ujjain, the proud capital of Vikramādiṭya and Mahendrādiṭya in the fifth century A.D., is found in the next centuries in the

ruler governed both Mālavaka and Valabbi. In the latter half of the seventh century A.D. the line of Kharagrāha I became extinct, and the Maitraka dominions were once more united. For an alleged connection of the Valabbi dynasty with the Kanarese country, see Moraeus, Kadamba-kutu, 64 f. The recently discovered Virdi copperplate grant of Kharagrāha I of the year 207 (= A.D. 616-17) shows that for a time that ruler held Ujjain (Pro of the 7th Or. Conf. 659 ff.). It is from the camp at Ujjain that the grant was issued.

1 Ep. Ind. XXVI. 130 ff.; Fleet, III, 183.
possession of Sāmkaragaṇa of the Kātachchhuri or Kalachuri dynasty\(^1\) and Kharagraha I of the Maitraka line which gave way to a Brāhmaṇa family in the days of Hiuen Tsang.\(^2\) which in its turn, was replaced by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Gurjara Pratihāras and other families.\(^3\)

Another family which came to the forefront in the sixth century A.D. was the line of the Mukharas or Maukharis. The stone inscriptions of the princes of this dynasty prove their control over the Bārā Bankī, Jaunpur and Gayā districts of the Uttar Pradeśa and Bihār. All these territories formed integral parts of the Gupta Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. In the next century they must have passed into the hands of the Maukharis. The feudatory titles of the earlier princes of the Mukhara line leave no room for doubt that they occupied a subordinate position in the first few decades of the sixth century A.D. In or about the year A.D. 554, however, Isānavarman Maukhari ventured to measure swords with the Guptas, and probably also with Huns, and assumed the Imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. For a period of about a quarter of a century (A.D. 554-cir. A.D. 580) the Maukharis were beyond question the strongest political powers in the Upper Ganges Valley. They anticipated to some extent the glorious achievements of Harsha, the brother-in-law, and, apparently, the

---

\(^1\) G. Jouveau Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Deccan, 82.

\(^2\) Watters, Yuan Chuang, ii. 250. This family may have been connected with the viceregal line of Naigamas mentioned in the Mandaśor Inscription of the Malava year 589, of the time of Yaśodharman and Vishnuvardhana.

\(^3\) Abhayadatta of this family was the vicereign (Rājāsthanīgya, Sāchīva) of a district bounded by the Vindhya, the Pāriyātra (Western Vindhyas including the Aravalli range) and the Sindhū (the sea or a Central Indian stream bearing the same name). His nephew is called a nripata (king). Daksha, the young brother of the ruler, excavated a well in the year 589 (= A. D. 533-34).

\(^3\) Ind. Ant., 1886, 142; Ep. Ind., XVIII, 1926, 239 (verse 9 of Sañjam grant); cf. Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 177 (reference to a governor of Ujjain under the Pratihāra King Mahendrapāla II). In the Sañjam inscription it is claimed that at Ujjain an early Rāṣṭrakūṭa king made the Gurjara and other lords his door-keepers (Pratihāra). It is not improbable that, like the Paramāras, the Gurjara lords brought to Ujjain were for a long time feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the name Pratihāra had reference to their status under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, before the theory of descent from Lakhmaṇa was adumbrated. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the home territory (Śravishṭa) of Nāgabhaṭa’s line was in Marwar as is clear from the Jaina Kuvalayamāla and the Buchkala inscription.
successor (on the throne of Kanauj?) of their last notable king Grahavarman.

Like the Maukhariis, the rulers of Bengal, too, seem to have thrown off the Gupta yoke in the second half of the sixth century A.D. In the fourth and fifth centuries Bengal undoubtedly acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gupta Empire. The reference to Samatāṭa in Eastern Bengal as a pratyanta or border state in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of the emperor Samudra Gupta proves that the Imperial dominions must have embraced the whole of western and central Bengal, while the inclusion of northern Bengal (Pauṇḍravardhana bhūkṣa) within the empire from the days of Kumāra Gupta I (A.D. 443-44) to A.D. 543-44 is sufficiently attested by the Dāmodarapur plates. Samatāṭa, though originally outside the limits of the Imperial provinces, had, nevertheless, been forced to feel the irresistible might of the Gupta arms. The Harāhā Inscription of Iśānavarman, however, shows that the political situation had changed completely about the middle of the sixth century A.D.

A new power, viz, that of the Gauḍas, was fast rising to importance in the valley of the Lower Ganges. Gauḍa was already known to Paṇini² and the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra.³ The grammarian seems to associate it with the East.⁴ A passage occurring in the Matsya, Kūrma and Liṅga Purāṇas⁵ has, however, been taken to mean that the Srāvasti region was the cradle of the Gauḍa people. But the passage in question does not occur in the corresponding text of the Vāyu and Brahma Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata.⁶ In early literature the people of the Srāvasti region are always referred to as the Kosalas. Vātsyāyana, the author of the Kāmasūtra, writing probably in the third or fourth century of the Christian era, refers to Gauḍa

---

1 For the date, see Ep. Ind., XVII, Oct., 1924, p. 345.
2 VI. ii. 100.
3 ii. 13.
4 Cf. VI. ii. 99 (in regard to accentuation).
Nirmītī yena Srāvastī Gauḍa-deśe mahāpurī (Kūrma, I. 20. 19).
6 Yājñē Srāvastako rājā Srāvastī yena nirmītā (Vāyu, 88. 27; Brahma, VII, 59).

Taṣya Srāvastako jñeyaḥ Srāvastī yena nirmītā (Mbh., III. 201. 4).
and Kosala as names of distinct countries. Gauda in the Matsya-Kurma-Lingga MSS. may have been inserted as a Sanskritised form of Gonda in the same way as the term Madra-mandala is employed to denote the Madras Presidency, by some modern pandits of the Southern Presidency, as well as other scholars and journalists who are unacquainted with the topography of Ancient India. In the Central Provinces the name "Gond" is very often Sanskritised into Gauda. Varahamihira, writing in the sixth century A.D., places Gaudaka in the Eastern division of India. He does not include Gauda in the list of countries situated in the Madhyadeśa. Mention is no doubt made of a place called Guda. But, if Alberuni is to be believed, Guda is Thanesar and not Oudh. The use of the term Pańcha Gauda as the designation of a territory embracing Northern India as far as Kanauj and the river Sarasvatī, is distinctly late and dates only from the twelfth century A.D. The term is possibly reminiscent of the Gauda empire of Dharmapāla and Devapāla, and cannot be equated with the ancient realm of the Gaudas in the early centuries of the Christian era. The distinct statement in the Harīhā Inscription that the Gaudas were on the seashore clearly suggests that the Bengal littoral and not Oudh, was the seat of the people in the sixth century A.D. In the next century, their king Śaśāṅka is found in possession of Karnasuvarna near Murshidabad. In the century that follows a Gauda appears, in the Gauda-aha of Vākpati-rāja, as the occupant of the throne of Magadha. The zenith of Gauda power is reached in the ninth century when the Gauda dominion extends over the Gangetic Doab and Kanauj. About the early kings of the Gaudas our information is meagre. Certain copper-plate inscriptions, discovered in the Faridpur and Burdwan Districts, disclose the existence of three kings—Dharmāditya, Gopachandra and Samāchāradeva, who are described as

1 For Kosala, see datanachchhedya-prakaraṇam; for Gauda, see nakha-chchhedya-prakaraṇam and dāraraṇikā-prakaraṇam.
3 Cf. Imperial Gazetteer of India. Provincial Series. Central Provinces, p. 188.
4 i. 300.
5 Mallasāruła Plate (S. P. Patrikā, 1844, 17).
6 Gopachandra may be the Gopakhya nīpati who was apparently a contemporary and rival of Prakāṣāditya, son of Bhamu Gupta (Arva-Mahākai-mula-
overlords of Navyāvakāśīkā, Vāraka-maṇḍala, and, in one case, of Vardhamāna-bhukti (Burdwan Division). The Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription introduces to us a fourth king, viz., Jayanāga, who ruled at Karnasuvarṇa. These kings are, however, not expressly referred to as Gaṇḍas. The earliest king, to whom that epithet is applied is the famous Saśāṅka, the great rival of Rājya-vardhana of Thanesar and his brother Harsha. The title Mahārājādhirāja assumed by the Bengal kings mentioned above, leaves no room for doubt that they no longer acknowledged the suzerainty of the Guptas and set themselves up as independent sovereigns.

The uprising of the Pushyamitras, the invasions of the Huns and the intransigentism of provincial governors and feudatories, were not the only sources of trouble to the Guptas in the last days of their sovereignty. Along with foreign inroads and provincial insubordination we should not fail to take note of the dissensions in the Imperial family itself. The theory of a struggle amongst the sons of Kumāra Gupta I may or may not be true, but there is evidence to show that the descendants of Chandra Gupta II did not pull on well together, and the later kings who bore the Gupta name sometimes took opposite sides in the struggles and convusions of the period. The later Imperial Guptas do not seem to have been on friendly terms with their Vākāṭaka cousins. Narendrasena Vākāṭaka, a great-grandson of Chandra Gupta II through his daughter Prabhāvatī, seems to have come into hostile contact with the lord of Mālava. Narendrasena’s cousin Harisbeṇa claims victories over Avanti. Inasmuch as the Guptas are associated with parts of Mālava as late as the time of Harsha, some of the victories gained by the Vākāṭakas must have been won over their Gupta cousins. In the seventh century A.D., Deva Gupta appears as an enemy of Harsha’s family, while Mādhava Gupta was a friend.

Lastly, it is interesting to note that while the earlier Guptas were staunch Brāhmaṇists, some of whom did not scruple to
engage in sacrifices involving the slaughter of living beings, the later kings, or at least some of them, e.g., Budha (Buddha) Gupta, Tathāgata Gupta and Bālāditya had Buddhist leanings. As in the case of Asoka after the Kaliṅga war and Harsha after his intimate relation with the Chinese Master of the Law, the change of religion probably had its repercussions on the military and political activities of the Empire. In this connection it is interesting to recall a story recorded by Huien Tsang. When "Mahirakula," the Hun tyrant ruling at Śākala, proceeded to invade the territory of Bālāditya, the latter said to his ministers, "I hear that these thieves are coming, and I cannot fight with them (their troops); by the permission of my ministers I will conceal my poor person among the bushes of the morass." Having said this he withdrew to an island with many of his subjects. Mihirakula came in pursuit but was taken alive as a captive. He was, however, set free and allowed to go away on the intercession of the Queen Mother.¹ We do not know how far the story is authentic. But it seems that Indians of the seventh century A.D. from whom the Chinese pilgrim must have derived his information, did not credit the later Pro-Buddhist rulers of the Gupta dynasty with the possession of much courage or military vigour, though they bear testimony to their kindness and piety. The misplaced clemency of Bālāditya and his mother helped to prolong the tyrannical rule of Mihirakula and gave Yasodharman and the succeeding aspirants for imperial dominion, viz., Īśānavarman and Prabhākara-vardhana, an opportunity of which they were not slow to take advantage and thereby seal the doom not only of the Hun (Yetha), but also of the Gupta domination in Northern India.

¹ Bcai, Si-yu-ki, 1, 168 l.; Watters, 1, 288-89.
APPENDIX E

KINGDOMS, PEOPLES AND DYNASTIES OF TRANS-VINDHYAN
INDIA CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.

Brāhmaṇa Period:—1. Nishadhas (capital Giriprastha, Mbh., III, 324. 12).
           2. Vidarbhas (capital Kuṇḍina) and other Bhojas.
           3. Dasyu tribes—Andhras, Sabaras, Pulindas and Mūtibas.

Sūtra Period:—1. Māhiṣmatī (Māndhātā or Maheśvara, IA, 4, 346).
           2. Bhrigu-Kachchhha (Broach).
           3. Śūrpaṇhaka (Sopara in the Koṅkaṇ).
           4. Aśmaka (capital Pandanya, Bodhan).
           5. Mūlaka (capital Pratishtāhāna).
           7. (?) Ukkala (N. Orissa).

Rāmāyaṇic Period:—Aryan Expansion south of the Godāvari—
settlement on the Pampa—exploration of Malaya, Mahendra and Laṅkā.

Maurya Period:—

Maurya Empire.

1. Aparāntas proper (capital Śūrpaṇhaka)
2. Bhojas (capital Kuṇḍina?).
3. Rāṣṭrīkas (capital Nāsik?).
4. Petenikas (of Pratishtāhāna?).
5. Pulindas (capital Pulinda-nagara).
6. Andhras (capital Bezvāḍa etc.?).
7. Aṭavi.
8. Kaliṅgas (including Tosali and Samāpā).
10. Āhāra of Isila.
11. Cholas.
14. Satyaputra (Satyabhāmi of Keralolpatti?).
15. Tāmraparṇī (Ceylon).
EARLY KINGDOMS OF SOUTHERN INDIA

Early Post Maurya Period:—
1. Kingdom of Vidarbha.
2. Sātavāhanas of Dakshināpatha.
3. Chetas of Kaliṅga.
5. " " Chola.
7. " " Kerala.
8. " " Ceylon (sometimes ruled by Chola princes).

Age of the Periplus:—
1. Southern part of Ariake under Mambarus (or Nambanus?).
2. Dachinabades under Saraganus and his successors (i.e., the Deccan under the Sātavāhana-Sātakarnis).
3. Damirica (Tamilakam, Draviḍa) including:
   (a) Cerobothra (Keralaputra).
   (b) The Pandian Kingdom.
   (c) (Kingdom of) Argaru (=Uragapura)
4. Masalia (Masulipatam).
5. Dosarene (=Tosali).

Age of Ptolemy:—
1. Kingdom of Baithana (Pratishṭhāna) ruled by Pulumāyi (Sātavāhana).
2. Kingdom of Hippokoura (Kolhapur), ruled by Baleokouros (Vilivāyakura).
4. " " Karoura ruled by Kerobothros (Keralaputra).
5. Pounnata (S. W. Mysore).
7. Kingdom of the Kareoi (Tāmraparṇī Valley).
8. Kingdom of Modoura (Madurā) ruled by ‘Pandion’ (Pāṇḍya).
9. Kingdom of the Batoi (capital Nikama)
10. Kingdom of Orthoura, ruled by "Sornagos" (Chola-Nāga ?).
11. Kingdom of Sora (Chola) ruled by Arkatos.
12. Kingdom of Malanga (Kāṇchi ? Mavilangai ?), ruled by Basaronagas ("Nāga ?)

A. D. 150-350 :—1. Ābhīras (N. Mahārāṣṭra and W. India).
2. Vākāṭakas (Berar and adjoining provinces) and chiefs of Mahākāntāra.
3. Kingdoms of South Kosala, Kaurāla, Koṭṭura, Erandapalla, Devarāṣṭra (under the Vāśishṭha family ?), Pīṣṭapura (under the Māṭhara-kula ?), Avamukta, Palakka, Kusīthalapura.
4. Kingdom of Andhrāpatha (and Veṇgī) :
(a) Ikshvākus.
(b) Rulers of the Ānanda-gotra (Kandarapura).
(c) Bṛihatphalāyanas of Kudura, etc.
(d) Sālaṅkāyanas (Salakenoi of Ptolemy ?) of Veṇgīpurā, one of whom was Hastivarman of Veṇgī.
5. Pallavas of Kāṇchi,

A. D. 350-600 :—1. Traikutakas and Mauryas of the Koṅkaṇ ; and Lāṭas, Nāgas and Gurjaras of South Gujarāṭ.
2. Vākāṭakas (C. Deccan).
4. Kings of Sarabhapura (S. Kosala ?).
5. Pāṇḍavas of Mekalā.
6. Kingdoms of Uḍra, Koṅgoda, Kaliṅga [under the Vāśishṭha family, the Māṭhara-kula, the Mūḍgaḷa family (Ep. Ind. xxiii. 198ff) and Eastern Gaṅgas]; Lēṇḍulura (under Vishnu-kunḍins) in East Deccan.
7. Pallavas of Kāñchi (in Dravida or Dravīḍa).
8. Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, Mūshakas and Keralas of the Far South.
10. Bāṇas of E. Mysore and N. Arcot, Kekāyas of Dāvangere ātaluk, Kadambas of Vaijayantī, etc. and Sendrakas of Nāgarakhaṇḍa (N. W. Mysore), or of the Tumkur region.
11. Nalas of (a) Pushkarī who governed the Podagadhi region (Jeypore Agency), (b) Yeotmal in Berar and perhaps also (c) the Bellary District.

After A. D. 600:—
1. Silāhāras of Koṅkan.
2. Early Chālukyas, Rāshṭrakūṭas including the lines of Mānadeśa, etc., Later Chālukyas, Kalachuryas and Yādavas of W. Deccan.
3. Haibayas, Kalachuris or Chedis of Tripuri and Ratnapura, and Nāgas of Chakrakūṭa (C.P.).
5. Western Gaṅgas, Sāntaras and Hōysalas (Mysore).
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Androkoṭṭa, see Chandrā Gupta Maurya
Androkoṭṭa, 361, 380
Aṅga, 98, 106 ff, 152, 310 n, 608
An-Sih-Kao, 469
Antapāla, 317
Antarvānīka, 166, 317 n
Antarvedī, 587
Antālakīdas, Aṃṭalikīta, 384, 384, 404 n, 424
Antagonos Gonatas, 331 f
Antimachos, 422
Antiochos Soter, 614 n
Antiochos Theos, 299, 307, 331, 614
Antiochos the Great, 381, 385, 433
Ampa, 491, 506 f, 621
Ampiyā, 128
Ampūṭāda, 218
Aṃśarddha, 23
Aṃśahārā, 319, 336
Anyataplakāhā, 23
Anyathā, 306, 306 f, 429
Aporos, 246 n
Apra Matrār, 67
Aprānta, 314, 491, 502, 507, 526, 602 n
Aphrikas, 426
Apollopeidos, 429
Arakshādikṛtā, 621
Archeblos, 425
Ardea Bāgān, 479 n
Argarau (Uruga-pura), 687
Aria, 273
Ariake, 657
Aritṭapura, 253
Arjuna, of Kanauj, 610
Bharatas, 23, 24, 40, 73, 75, 142
Bhāratavasuba, 420
Bhārat War, 27, 40
Bhagat, see Bhagga
Bhāmhar board of coins, 567
Bhāratiyānam, 510
Bhāskaravarman, 609
Bhāṭāmamahayā, 521
Bhājarāka, 608
Bhājaśvapati, 563
Bhājiprīn Inscription, 312 n
Bhāṣṭiya, 117
Bhaṣṭya, 175 f
Bhava Nāgā, 480
Bhāmasena, 15
Bhāmasena, Rājān, 531
Bhima, King of Vīdarbha, 86
Bhāmovarman, 680
Bhītari Inscription, 582, 572
Bhogas (cīlan), 190 and note
Bhoganagara, 120 and note
Bhogavarman, 610
Bhoja, Dāṇḍakya, 91
Bhoja (title), 169
Bhojaka, 562
Bhojakā, 91
Bhojanagara, 56
Bhojas, 69 f, 180 f, 146, 311 ff
Bhuṣyā, Lāhūyāni, 49, 56
Bukti, 580 f
Būmaka, 484
Bāmimitra, 392
Būtānapa, 338
Būtāvīravān, 567 n
Bimbaka, 869 n
Bimbasaṃapati, see Girirāja, 111
Bimbisārā, 115, 185, 204 ff
Bindusārā, Amitraghātā, 267, 283 n, 295, 296 ff
Boar worship (significance), 196
Boards of Five, 283 f
Boddas, 617
Boukophala, 262 f
Brahmadatta of Aṅga, 110
Brahmadatta of Asaṅka, 144, 170 n
Brahmadatta of Kāśi, 75 f, 183
Brahmadatta of Panchala, 138
Brahmadatta (Uparika Mahārāja), 593
Brahmakāśatra, 132 and note
Brahmaśītra, 392
Brahmarāhaseda, 68
Brahmavardhana, 74
Bṛhadāśīla, 71 n
Bṛhadārtha (of Girirāja), 113 f
Bṛhadārtha, Maurya, 350, 353
Bṛhadakśa, 82, 165
Bṛhaspati Mītra, 373 f, 420
Bṛhatpāñchāyana, 500 n, 638
Buddhagupta, 570, 588 n, 593
Buddha Gupta, 388, 593
Buddhāraja, 607 n
Buddhavarman, 501 n
Buddhism in Iran, 615 f
Buddhist Council, 215, 222
Buja, 193
C
Cacouthos, 136
Caddra Kapiñkha, 476 n
Calingae, see Kaliṅga
Cambodia, 148
Care of foreigners, 292
Ceylon, Sinhala, 330 f, 647 f
Chādota, 628 n
Chakrāpāli, 580
Chakravarti-kabeta, 271 n
Chākāraṇa, 46, 68
Chalikya, 602 f, 610 f
Chalukya (Eastern), 691 f
Champā City, 107 f, 138, 207, 300
Chāpākya, Kauṭiya, 237 f, 265 n, 268, 277, 296
Chandana, 109
Chandradevī, 586
Chāṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsenā, 204
Chāṇḍāśena, 527 n
Chandra of the Meharuuli Iron Inscription, 461, 535 n
Chandrabāli, see Chandana
Chandragomin, 628
Chandra Gupta I, 523 n, 530 ff
Chandra Gupta II, 479 f, 511 f, 553 ff, 600, 612
Chandragupta Maurya, 194 n, 238, 264 ff,
385 n, 514 n
Chandragupta's date, 214, 295
Chandragupta's government, 277 ff
Chandra Gupta Vikramādiyā, see Chandra Gupta II
 Chandraprakāśa, 564 n
Chandraravaran of Bengal, 534
Chandraravaran of Kamboja, 100
Chang-K'ien, 469
Chapaṇa, 320
Chāra, 320
Charaka, 475
Chārāyanā, 211
Chāṣṭiṇā, 469 n, 466 f, 605 f, 622
Chetarapana, see Vaiśābhīputra Chetarapa
Chāṣṭiṇā Sātakarṇī
Chauoddharapika, 561
Checks on absolutism, 172 ff
Chēdis, 63, 128 ff, 151, 416
Chellānā, 500 n, 511
Chēra, see Kerala
Chētaka, 125, 211
Chetas, 418 f
Chhavillaka, 309
China, 9 n, 474, 628
Chirādadya, 566
Chitrakut, 629
Chitraratha, see Arya, 78
Chola, 328
Chora Rajajk, 318
Chouang-zi, 459
Chronology of the Bimbisara-Siṣunā group, 225 ff
Chuksha, 444
Chūrpi, 330
Chinsapatā, 9 n, 277
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Chu'tuku'sia, 503
Clescubora, 133
Copherus, see Kophaios, 200
Copher, see Kâbûi, 299
 Coronation Oath, see Oath, 166
Courts of Justice, 205, 279, 296, 317, 318, 662
Cutch, 331 n, 466, 468
Cyrene, 331
Cyprus, 289 ff

D

Dabbasena, 154
Dahanā, 560, 595
Daddarapura, 130
Dadhivāhâna, 109, 133, 170 n
Dahome, 260
Dharasena, 499 n
Dairāpa, see Saunaka, Indrota Dairāpa
Dairāputra-Shāhī-Shāhānushāhī, 482, 546 f
Dakash, 139 n
Daksha, 139 n
Dakshina Mathurā, 338
Dakshināpada, 85
Dakshināpata, 85, 286; 403, 538, 636 f
Dakshināpati-pati, 411, 415, cf. 495 n
Dakshināyata, 85
Dālbhya Čaikītīyana, 74
Dālbhya Kesin, 73
Dāmāghanaka, I, 509
Dāmajaga Sfr, 510, 513
Dāmana, 583
Dāmasena, 510
Dāmijada (or Namijada), 487 ff, note
Dāmodara Gupta, 665 f, 625
Dāmodaranasa, 564 f
Dāmodarpur plate, 543, 561, 567 n, 593
Dāndajaka, 91
Dāndajāyaka, 520, 563
Dāndaphāśishhikārāpa, 563
Dāndajāyaka, 561
Dāndjā-samāsa, 583 f
Dāndika, 561
Dāntābala Dhaumra, 39 n, 51 n
Dāntukūra, 59 n, 305 n
Dāntapura-nagara, 59, 305 n
Dāntavaktra, 39 n
Dārius I, 147, 240, 518
Dārius III, 244
Dāsaka, 216
Dārvābhishāra, 248
Dārayavuṣa, 240
Dāsaphura, 454, 567, 630
Dāsaratha (Ikhāvakū), 75, 101
Dāsaratha, Māurya, 381
Dāsārpa, 94, 95 n
Dattadevi, 551 f
Dattāmītra, 5, 382
Dattāmītrī, 382
Dattas of Puṇḍravardhana, 597
Dāvāka, 543
Deccau, see Dakshināpata
Deimachos, 299
Demetriaspolis, 332
Demetrios, 5, 382 ff, 422
Democracies, 256, 288
Derbhaṭa, 629 n
Desa, 523, 560
Deśādikṛṣṭa, 534
Desika, 285 n
Devabhūmi, Devabhūti, 395
Deva Gupta I, 554
Deva Gupta II, 607 f
Deva Gupta III, 610 f
Deva-Srī Harasa Gupta, 601
Devakī, 141 n, 570, 573, 573 n
Devakulas, 477, 517
Devāsanaṭika, cf. 271, 303, 326, 351
Devānāpīya Tissa, 333
Devapāla ītrāda, 357
Devapāla (Prasūhara), 595
Devāpī, 161
Devaputra, 477, 516, 518, 547
Devarama Chandra Gupta II, 554
Devarama Skanda Gupta, 577
Devaramatā, 538, 540, 638
Devāśrī, 564, 601
Devavarman (Eastern India), 528 n, 582 n
Devavarman Māurya, 350
Devavarman Sālaṇkāyana, 548
Devavrat, 463 n
Devikā, 630
Dhamma, Law of Pesty, 324 f, 335, 383 f
Dhammagnoha, 327, 385
Dhamma-mahāmatra, 316, 386 f, 397 f
Dhamma-nigama, 528
Dhamma-niyama, 343 n
Dhamma Vijaya, Dharma Vijayī, 327, 332, 365, 516 n, 537, 540
Dhamma-yutas, 383 f
Dhammāṇakāḍa, Dhammāṇakāḍa, 93, 312 n
Dhāta (Nanda), 207
Dhanabhūti, 253
Dhanadā Varupendrāntaka-samā, 547 n, 569
Dhanānjaṇaya of Kuṣṭhāla-pura, 538
Dhanānjaṇaya Karavaya, 194
Dhanika, 353
Dhānyavāhaka, 508, 595
Dhārā, 604 n
Dharasena II (Valabhi), 639
Dharasena IV, 630
Dharmāditya of Eastern India, 550, 633
Dharmāditya (Śilāditya I), see Śilāditya
Dharma-mahāmatras, see Dhamma mahā-
matras
Dharma-Mahārāja-dhīrāja, 516
Dharmapāla, 637
Dharmarakkhita, 304 n
Dharmarāṇya-Vihāra, 308
Dharmasatras, 283 n
Dharmayuta, 388 f
Dhauri, 308
Dhavala, 353
Dhavāla, 506 n, 597 n
Dhavalappadvasa, 353
Dhīriasādyanmma, 21 n, 73 n
Dhīrārāṣṭra, Prince of Kāśi, 44, 75, 97
Dhīrārāṣṭra Vaichitravirya, 7, 25, 351, 487 n
Dhruvabhāja, 629 n
Dhruva-Devi, Dhruvasvāmin, 312 n, 562, 564, 573
Dhvasan Dvaitavana, 67
Dīghatī (Dīghita), 106, 153, 173
Dīghāvī, 173
Diōdotos I (King of Bactria), 379, 426
Diōdotos II, 379
Diomedēs, 420 n, 425
Dion, 394
Dionysios, Ambassador, 299
Dionysios, king, 432
Dioscuri, 434
Dipí, 248
Dirgha Çārṣūya, 199
Dīvākara, 106, 114
Dīvākarasena, 504
Divodāsa (of Kāfi), 75
Divodāsa Paśchāla, 73
Drangian, 437 f., 621
Dridhāvarman, 110
Drop of the Epic, 21 n, 371 n
Dropamukha, 263 n
Dropa Sintha, 626 n, 629
Druhyu, 146
Drupada, 73
Dummukha Lāchchhavi, 124
Dummukha Paśchāla, 62, 135 f.
Durdhrā, 296
Duryodhanā, 487 n
Duṣṭa, 316, 320, 522
Dvādasāditya, 596 n
Dvārāyya, 437 n, 519
Dvaitavana, 68
Dvāraka, 150, 506
Dvīmukha, see Dummukha Paśchāla

E
Eastern Chalukya, 591
Egypt, 276, 284, 290, 331
Ekakāra, 71
Ekkraṭ, 164, 283, 534
Embere Topo, 194
Emetresus, 382
Enumeration of homonymous Kings, 605 n
Epsander, 428
Epirus, 331
Epsiokopoi, 290
Era of Samprati, 376 n
Eran, 583
Eraqapalla, 583 f.
Errombas, 274
Eudemos, 263
Eukratides, 383 ff., 386, 422 ff
Euthydemia, 383
Euthydemos, 379 f.
Euthymedia, 383

F
Female guards, 276 f
Fo-to-kio-to, 570, 598 n, 598

G
Gad, 483
Gahapātis, 538
Gaggarā, 109
Gajavāra, 521
Gaṇapati Nāga, 534 ff
Gaṇapraya, 325, 326
Gandarī, 505
Gandhāra, 59 f., 146 ff., 152, 157, 240 ff.
247, 250, 275, 308, 438, 444, 466, 473,
482, 597 n, 603 n
Gandhāri, 60
Gaṅga of Mysore, 599 f
Gangaridae, 236, 251, 309
Gardabhila, 466 n
Gārgi, 68
Gārgya Bālāki, 77
Gauda, 603, 604 ff., 608 f., 625, 632 ff
Gaulimikas, 591
Gaupāllayana, see Suchivriksha, 44
Gaupāllayana Śhipatī, 44 n
Gautami Balaśri, see Balaśri, 347, 401
Gautilimputra Sātakarṇi, 410 n, 413, 429, 491
Gayā (Prince), 214
Gedrosia, 239, 273
Gaṅgā, 450, 484
Gaṅgotri (Gupta), 529
Gaṅgotri (Gupta, prince, 561, 567, 571,
600 n
Gaṅgo (Kramāditya, 567 n
Ghora Xingiras, 141 n
Girinagara (Girnar), 314
Girivraja (in Kekaya), 62
Girivraja (in Magadha), 62, 110
Glauchukayana, 250 n
Glaunikai, Glausian, 250
Go'dhyaksha, 386
Gomatikottaka, 610
Gomitra, 401
Gonaśa, 397
Gondophernes, 426, 440, 452 ff
Gopa, 283
Gopachandra, 633
Gopāli Vaihidari, 393
Goparāja, 595 f
Goptri, 317, 371, 561, 579
Gorathagiri, 420
Gosāla Mathkaliputta, 213
Gosṭhis, 515 f
Gotama Rāhugāna, 54
Govardhana, Naśika, 91, 494, 501 f
Govikaraṇa, 167
Govindachandra Gāhadavāla, 347
Govinda Gupta, 561, 666 n, 600 n
Govindarāja, 367
Govishāga, 237
Grahavaran, 605, 607 f
Grāma, 293, 324, 563
Grāmabhūtaka, 293
Grāmāhāra, 524
Grāmāni, 163, 165, 173, 174, 525
Grāmavṛddhida, 293 n, 595
Grāmeyika, Ayutte, 525
Grämi̱ka, 174, 208, 292, 525, 562
Grämahora, 525
Grapsavhryaka, 443
Grumbates, 463
Guda, 633
Gudhā-Purusha, 320
Guduvhura, 452
Gunakha Sāṅkhāyana, see Sāṅkhāyana, 33 ff
Gupta administration, 558 ff
Gupta Era, 550, 626 n
Gupta (King), 529
Guptas (Early), 527 ff, 626 ff
Guptas (Later), 561 ff, 628 ff, 626 ff
Gurasea, 245
Gusan, see Kushān
Gushtas, 615
Guttas (Kanarese), 518, 564

H
Hagamasha, 445
Hagāna, 445
Haihaya, 98, 145 f, 233
Hairanyanātha, 101 ff
Hakur, 417
Hala, 407 n
Hall, 200 n, 211
Harappā discoveries at, 2
Haridchandra, 101
Harishena, Praśastikāra and General, 542, 549
Harishena, Vākātaka king, 499 n, 579, 634
Hāritisūtra Siva-Skanda-Varmān, 503
Hāritisūtra Vishňukade Chuțukulānanda Sātkārī, 503
Harivarman, 604
Harsha of Kanauj, 583, 600, 605 f, 609
Harsha Gupta, 600 f, 604
Harsha Gupṭa, 604
Harysankaracalā, 115
Haṭṭidasaṇā, 340 n
Haṭṭin, 313 n, 595
Haṭṭisapura, 22, 23, 48
Haṭṭivarman, 583 f
Haṭṭih Grumpha inscription, 235, 373 ff, 418 ff
Hathichinha, 419
Haṭṭihāvshaka, 198 n
Haṭṭihgāma, 120 and note
Heliodores, son of Diya (Dion), 394
Heliodores, 883 ff, 425
Hēpasa, 247
Hermes, 384, 425, 429, 441, 461, 470
Hītus, 240
Hīsoumi, 459
Hi-haco, 460
Hiinsrikās, 286
Hippokoura, 502, 637
Hippostratos, 422
Hīranyavāha, 274 n
Hīranyanātha, 79, 101 f
Hīranyavatī, 126
Hī-thun, 460
Hi-touen, 460
Hiung-nu, 431, 458 f
Ho-ling, 305 n
Harmidas, 481
Ho-ti, 463, 474
Hunās, Hunās, 575 ff, 583, 595 f, 606, 626 n
Hunās, Hunās, 628 n
Huṇāmānḍalā, 629 n
Hurvishka, 464, 476 f
Hydaspes, battle of, 281
Hydracis, 240
Hyperarch, 319

I
Ibhyas, 337
Ikhāvākus, 100 f, 127, 143, 233, 500
Indradatta, 499 n
Indradyumna, 51 n, 64
Indramitra, 592
Indrāpalīita, 380
Indrāprastha, Indrāpattana, Indrāpattana, 97, 133
Indravarma, 445
Indrotā, 17, 18, 38, 50
Īravati, 88 n
Irrigation in the Maurya Period, 294
Isamun, 330
Iśānavarman (Maukhari), 600, 604 ff, 625, 631
Isauba, 134
Isala, 307, 317
Īśvaradatta, 498 n, 510
Īśvarasena, 499 n
Īśvaravarman, 604 f
Iṭhājava-mahāmātrras, 317

Jaivali, 74
Jaḷajiṭukarniya, 74
Jaḷanaka, 349 f, 381
Jaḷika, 223
Jambudīpa, Jambudvīpa, 97, 357
Janaka (father of Sitā), 54
Janaka of Kāśi, 74
Janaka of the Upanishads, 48 ff, 55 ff, 74
Janaka yahā, 55
Janamejaya, 13, 16 f, 36 ff, 50, 51 n
Jana Sārkaraśaka, 64
Jarāsandha, 113
Jarātārava, 58
Jangada, 306
Jaya (Itihaśa), 42
Jayādāman, 487 f, 506
Jayadatta, 693
Jayadeva, 525
Jayānaga headman, 625
Jayānaga (Gandha king), 598, 634
Jetāmītra, 393
Jettuttara, Jettuttara, 198, 259
Jīh-kwan, same as Aditya Sena, 611 n
Jihonikas, 444, 462
Jinasena, 627
Jitādāman, 509
K

Kabandhi Kātyāyana, 34
Kābul, 239, 331
Kāccha, 153
Kachchha, 507, 621
Kadambas, 504 n, 555 n, 564 n, 612
Kadphises I, see Kujula
Kadphises II, see Wema
Kahola Kauhtakta, 33, 53
Kairīśi Sutvan, 192
Kālsara, 477
Kalvata (king), 237
Kākanāda (Śānchā), 546
Kānas, 454 f
Kānakaraṇa, 112
Kānavarṇa, 112, 221 f, 222 f
Kakebasaṇa, 16, 44
Kākubaseni, 44
Kakuda Kachchhāyana, see Pakudha
Kākutsaṅha, 120
Kākushthavarman, 504 n, 612
Kalbhā, 639
Kalāchampā, 107
Kalāchuri, Era, 468
Kalāchuris, 570n, 583 n, 606 n, 607 n, 608 n, 609 n, 607 n
Kalajasa, 209 n
Kalāmaka, 99, 155, 183
Kalāra Janaka, see Kārāla
Kalasa, 449 n
Kalasena, 105
Kalāsena, 593
Kalāsoka, 221 f, 222 f
Kalīdāsa, 564 n
Kalindī, 593
Kalīṅga, 87 ff, 233, 304 ff, 324, 365 f, 373 f, 401, 560
Kalīṅga-nagarā, 89 n, 419
Kalivuga, Era, 27
Kallār, 479 n, 492
Kalīpoca, Callipoca, 384, 425
Kalīśrāma, 881
Kalīyānavarman, 593 n
Kāmāntaka, 3
Kāmarūpa, 310, 546, 607 f
Kamboja, 145 f, 243, 293, 307 f
Karīṣaṇa, 233
Kammasañadama, 194
Kāmpila, Kampila, 135, 198
Kāhosa of Kōsala, 154
Kāhosa of Mathurā, 141
Kanīva, 148
Kāmīyaka, 22
Kanakagiri, 311
Kanakha, 66
Kanauj, 136, 532, 584, 604 n, 608 n
Kānchi, 501, 538 f
Kanishka I, 365 ff, 618 ff
Kanishka II, 465 ff, 477
Kanishka III, 478 n
Kanishka-pura, 474
Kāṅka, 166 n
Kāntakāśodhana, 319
Kantha, 251
Kāntipurī, 481
Kāṇyas, 398 ff
Kanyākubja, see Kānauj, 136
Kao-fou, 455 f
Kāpa, 456
Kārpa, 291
Kāpeya, 44
Kapilavastu, Kapilavata, 191
Kāpisā, Kāpiśi, 239, 386 f, 422, 424, 425, 434, 443, 473
Kapisha, see Kujula
Kāpya Patañjala, 65
Karaṅḍu, 83, 147
Kāraṇa, 61, 62
Kārapaka, 316
Karandu, 87
Karasa, 639
Kāraskara, 527 n
Karantai, 436, 484
Kārddamaka, 437, 506, 623
Kareol, 637
Karmamātasa, 543
Karmāntika, 529
Karma Sāchivas, 282 n, 509
Kārya, 149, 153
Kāryādā, 112
Kārpaśuvara, 510, 602, 609, 630
Kāriyippura, 544
Kārtikeya (worship), 478, 568
Kārohā, 93
Kāruvaktī, 343
Kāśi, Kāśi, Kaśi, 74 ff, 83, 89 f, 153 f, 206, 210, 212, 223, 387, 393
Kasā, 126
Kāṣmintra, Kauṭśīputra, 393
Kāśmira, Kāshmir, 308, 473, 482, 506 n
Kaspeñeloi, 447
Kassapiya Arhatas, 393
Kasites, 189 n
Kāšu Chāldv, 180
Kāśyapa Mālāha, 478
Kāśyapā, 18, 369 n
Kātacchuri, see Kalāchuris
Katha, 251
Kathailoi, 260 f
Katur (Katuria or Katyūr) rājas, 544
Kauḍinīya-pura, 87
Kauḍinīya, Vidarbha, 87
Kaurāla, 538 f
Kaurava, 120, and note
Kanśambhi, Kosambari, 48, 47, 70 f, 131, 275, 307, 401
Kauśāki river, 23
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Kausiki (lady), 302 n
Kauṭiliya, see Chāṇākya, 9, 62, 237 f., 263, 277, 298
Kauṭtya, 51
Kāvaśheya, see Tura
Kavirāja, 549
Kāvirāppiṇī, 338
Kekeya, 62 f.
Keralaputra, 330
Kesaputta, 99, 193
Kesins, 72 f., 93
Ketumati, 74
Kevatta, Minister, 136
Khaḍḍaṇa, 502
Khallataka, 398 n
Khaliṣṭaka-pavata, 307
Khaṇḍaṇa, 22
Khapiṅgala, 307
Kharaṇgala I, 629 n, 631
Kharaṇga, 449
Kharaṇapālana, 473
Kharaṇapālura, 544, 546
Kharaṇavala, 473 ff., 405 ff., 413 f.
Kharaṇa, 125, 298
Khamā, 296 n
Khotaṇa, 809 n
Khetenīya, see Xerxes
Kidāra Kushāna, 492
Kles-cū, 469
Klēon-seion-klo, 460 ff.
Kīṣaṭa, 111 f.
Kinds of rulership, 156 ff.
Kīng-maker, 178
Kīngship, 156 ff.
Kī-piṇ, 492 ff., 496 n, 456 ff., 466, 470, 482
Kṁaṇa, 473
Kṛiti Varman I (Chalikya), 603
Kleophis, 146
Kolivesa, 192
Kokī, 338
Kollāga, 119
Konākamaṇa, 342, 345
Koṇḍaṇa, 538 n
Kokkān, 580
Kopahos (Cophaeus), 290
Korāṇdavārya, 292
Kōsala (North), 74, 77 ff., 97, 99 ff., 151, 162 ff., 199 ff., 211, 212, 225, 371
Kōsala (South), 306 n, 469, 538, 580
Kośṭhagāra, 532
Kōtā, 402, 534, 536
Kotāyati, 558 n
Kotīgarma, 119
Kotivarsha, 561, 582
Kōṭṭa-Vishayas, 317 n
Kōṭṭura, 638 f.
Kouli Choung (Kushān), 458
Kraukuchchhaṇa, 309
Krāmiḍātiya, see Ghatotkacha Gupta
Krāmiḍātiya, see Kumāra Gupta II
Krāmiḍātiya, see Kumāra Gupta II
Krāmiḍātiya, 577
Krāñca, 251
Krīmīlāvya, 71 n
Kṛishna Gupta, 600 f., 611 n
Kṛishna Śālavāhana, 414 f.
Kritahvarman, 504 n
Kṛishna Vāṃdeva, Devakṣiputra, see Vāṃdeva Kṛishna
Kṛitakṣapata, 81
Kṛitamālā, 338
Kṛita-Malavā-Vikrama Era, 439
Kṛiti, 54, 61
Krivis, 71 f.
Kṣaharātra, 444, 483
Kṣatrapas, 483 ff., 483 ff., 491 ff., 523
Kṣatri (tribe), 257
Kṣattrī (official), 166
Kṣemārāja, 518
Kṣhitipāla, 585
Kebudrakas, 254, 260
Kubera (ancestor of Bāṇa), 583 n
Kubera of Devarāṣṭra (king), 583
Kuberanāga, 555, 564, 572
Kubirāka, 312 n
Kujula Kadphises, 441, 461 ff., 470 f.
Kukura, 491, 507
Kukutha, 127
Kulaśantha, 602 n
Kulūta, 615 n
Kumāras, 388, 317, 349
Kumārādevi (Gaṅḍavālā Queen), 304
Kumārādevi (Līchchhavi princess), 530
Kumāragiri, 538 n
Kumārā Gupta I, 595 ff., 627
Kumārā Gupta II, 538, 539 ff.
Kumārā Gupta III, 600, 602, 604 f., 606, 625
Kumārā Gupta, Prince, 583
Kumārāmāyā, 390 n, 523, 560, 562 n, 567 n
Kumārāpāla, 565
Kumāravishṇu, 601
Kumbhavati, 91
Kuṇāla, 350 f., 463
Kuṇḍadhāni, 561
Kuṇḍagrama, Kuṇḍapura, 119
Kuṇḍina, 87
Kūnika, see Ajātashatru
Kunindas, 515 n
Kuntala, 285, 359, 407, 508 f., 580
Kuntala Śatākarni, 407 f., 503
Kuraragha, 145
Kuru (Kingdom), 21 f., 45, 63, 133 f.
Kuru (dakshina), 26 n
Kurubindas, 139 n
Kurujaśāla, 23
Kurukshetra, 23
Kurukshetra, battle of, 40
Kurus, 13 ff., 21 ff., 22, 41, 66, 73, 233
Kurush, 239
Kurūrvavata, 23, 25 n
Kuśadhvaja, 54
Kuśagrāpura, 111, 208
Kuśāvatī, 196
Kuśahāns, 455 ff., 458 ff., 618 ff
Kuśahāns (Later), 480 ff
Kusināra, 126
Kuśāthala, see Kanaj
Kuśhalapura, 538, 540
Kusuluka, 444
Kusumadhvaja, 354
Kusumapura, 217
Kuvinda, 143
Kulya (Kujula) Kadphises, see Kadphises I
Kulyukara Kaphas, 470 n

L
Lagatūrman, 479 n
Lāla (general), 473
Lāla, 331 n
Lālāka, 419
Laliya, 482
Lampāka, 433
Lānākā, 433, see also Tāmraparāṇī
Lauhītīya, Lohitīya (Brahmaputra), 597, 625
Lekhahārakas, 320 n
Lekhakas, 283
Liaka, 444, 473, 484
Liechchavis, 58, 118 ff, 122 ff, 211, 401, 590, 605
Lipīkāras, 316, 320
Laimmimārma, 307
Līyāla, 384, 424

M
Māchala, 56
Māchcha, see Māteya
Mādvika, 523
Maddā, 206 n
Mādhava Gup'ta, 563, 601, 606, 609 f, 623
Mādhavasena, 373
Mādhava-varman I, 603
Mādhunmitra, 91
Mādhurā, Uttara, 138
Mādhvadea, Mājijimadea, 65, 142, 264, 288, 353, 611
Mādhyanikā, 213, 387
Mādra, Madrakas, 68, 64 f, 192, 250 n, 544 f
Mādragāra, 65
Mādravatī, 16, 20
Mādurā, 328
Magadha, 96, 110 ff, 151, 205 ff, 307, 377, 400 f, 420, 529 f, 530 f, 582 n, 603, et passim
Magadhapura, 111
Māgandiyā, 903
Māra, 381 f
Mahābaladhikrīta, High Officer in charge of the Army, 560
Mahābhārata-chāvyā, 41
Mahābhīshka, 156, 168
Mahābhūja, 314
Mahābānajā-nāyaka, general, 520, 547, 559 n, 563
Mahābānaka I, 57
Mahābānaka II, 57
Mahābānapadas, 95 ff
Mahākāntāra, 538 f
Mahākosala (king), 103, 154 f
Mahākushāpāra, 561
Mahāmanḍala, 222 n
Mahāmātras, 206, 280, 308, 316 f, 336 ff, 515, 580
Mahānāman, 200
Mahānandī, 218, 220
Mahāpandma (father of Bumbisāra), 117 n
Mahāpandma (Nanda), 231 f, 377
Mahāprabūhāra, 552
Mahāśrījā, 168
Mahāśrītṛa, 314, 463 ff, 542
Mahāraṭṭha, 314
Mahāśāmīyas, 523
Mahāsena, Pradyota, see Chaṇḍa Pradyota
Mahāsena
Mahāsena Gupta, 605 f, 623 ff
Mahāsena Gupṭa Devī, 606
Mahāsenaṇapati, 371 n, 515, 520
Mahāśikākārtta, 218
Mahāśīlava, 154
Mahāśīlava Gupta, 605 n, 624
Mahāśīṅgāra, 275 n
Mahāśudassana, 127
Mahattara, Mahattaraka, 525, 562
Mahāvīra, 119, 213, 323
Mahendra Maurya, 300, 333, 349
Mahendra (of Kosala), 338
Mahendra, see Kumāra Gupta I, 560
Mahendragiri, 538 f
Mahendrapāla II (Prathāhāra), 555 n, 631 n
Mahendravarman I, Pallava, 328, 501 n
Mahēśvara (sect), 369
Mahēśvara Naga, 480
Mahirakula, see Mihirakula
Mahīśeh, 162, 166, 517, 573
Mahīśāmati, 140, 144 f
Mahodya, 150
Mahorakas of Valabhi, 580, 629 f
Makhādeva, 55
Mālava, Mālava, 96, 280 n, 294 f, 290
484, 489, 515 n, 544, 582, 605 f, 606, et passim
Mālava-gana, 544
Malichos. Malliku, 506 n
Mālinī, 107
Malla, Mallik, 95, 126 ff, 219
Mallasārul plate, 633 n
Malgin, 201
Mallow, 224 f
Mānālīka, 491
Mangar, 437, 486
Māndikanī, 373 n, 380 n
Mandāsa, et passim
Māṇḍava (of Vedic texts), 51
Māṇḍava (of Epic), 359
Māṅgala, Māṅgala, 320, 389
Māṅgalaśī, 585 n
Māṅgura, 292
Māni, 616 f
Manigul, 444
Manivatapra, 281
Māṇīkāluputta, see Goaīla Māṇīkāluputta
Manoja, 98
Nāṭikas, 119
Nau-Nand-Dehra (Nander), 235
Nāvadhikara, 286
Navananda, 233 f
Navanara, 496
Navy, 286, 498
Navyāvākāśīkā, 630, 634
Nāyaka, 521
Nāyanika, 404 f
Nemi, 81
Nepāl, 53, 309, 530 n, 544
Neyika, 523
Ngo-nti, 460
Nichaku, 43, 70 f, 131
Nichchhivi, see Lichchhavi
Nigama, 535
Nigamaspradhānāh, 285 n
Nigamasāhā, 519
Nigantthā Naṭaputta, see Mahāvīra, 323
Nihjati, 337
Nikaia, 269
Nikias, 425 n
Nilapāli, 540
Nīlāraja, 593 f
Nim, 84, 135
Nipishta, 243
Nirgranthas, 583
Nirvāṇa (of Mahāvīra and Gotama), 213 n, 216, 226 f
Nirvāṇa Temple, 125
Nishāda, 507
Nishadhā, 686
Nirābhārttha, 233, 320
Nomarch, 250
Nyagrodhavana, 194
Nysa, 246

Oath (coronation), 168
Odhāvāli, 188
Odhīyāna, 245
Odāka, Udāka, 393
Ohind, 493
Okkāka, 127, 162
Omphis, 345
Ophir, 2
Orthagoras, 453
Osadīl, 297
Oxydrakai, see Kahudraka, 254
Oxykanos, 259
Ozene, see Ujjaṇa

P
Pabhosa Inscription, 393
Padmāvati, city, 468, 490, 536 n
Padmāvati, queen of Ajāṭhāsaṭrū, 211
Padmāvati, queen of Udāyana, 203
Pahavās, 451 ff
Pathan, see Pratishthāna
Pathānakas, 311 n
Pakore, 454
Pakhbas, 241, 253
Paktyike, 341
Pakudha, Kachchhāyana, 34
Paḷadas, 311, 313
Palasimundu, 330 n
Paḷāgala (courier), 167
Paḷāgali, 163
Paḷaka, 218
Paḷa Kings, 301, 475 n
Paḷakka, Paḷakkāda, 533, 540
Paḷāśīkā, 504 n
Palibothra, Palimbothra, 235
Palibothri, 310
Palava, 500
Paloua, 305 n
Pampā, 540
Paṇcha Gaṇḍa, 633
Paṇḍhala, 90, 134 ff, 151, 233, 391
Paṇḍhamakā, 223
Pān-chhao, 474
Paṇḍgava, Paṇḍus, 38, 40 f, 147, 329, 544
Pandion, 456 n
Paṇḍugati, 236
Paṇḍuka, 236
Paṇḍya, 633, 641
Paṇḍiyagharika, 623
Panchu, 455, 459
Pantaleon, 422
Para Atiṣṭhā, see Atiṣṭhā
Pāradās, 313
Parākrama, 563, 550
Paramadivata, 559
Parameśhīya, 163
Pāramadurda, 330
Pārasikā, 505 n, 623
Pārāśūrama, 414
Pariksit, 12 ff, 27 f
Parīkṣhatas, 12 ff, 48
Parimitārthaḥ, 320
Parishad (Parishā), 174 f, 280 n, 331, 341, 526
Parivakrā, Parichakrā, 71
Parivrajaka Mahārājas, 542, 595
Parivrajikās, 291
Parivrykit, 169
Parīyātra, 491
Parsham Āttā, 214 n
Parṣadattā, 679 f, 629
Paropanisadait, 273
Parśus, 139
Parśva (Buddhist), 475
Parśva, Jina, 97
Pārtha of Kāśmīra, 449 n
Parthalis, 305
Parthians, 425, 429
Parushini, 68
Pasenādi, see Prasenajit
Pata, Patalene, see Taula, 259, 361, 446
Pāṭaliputra, 217, 224, 274 f, 298, 307, 310, 351, 401, 473, 590, 543, 557
Pataśchala, 65
Pātiaka, 444, 447 f, 484
Paṭivedaka, 316, 330, 337
Pātama Stātamas, 216 n, 222 n
Patrocles, 299
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Psandya, 143 n
Paumâvali, wife of Ajâtaâtrau, 211
Prurava, 28, 249
Paura Vyâvahârika, 317
Pauâkkaraâdhi, 84
Pâva, 127
Pâvriyâ, 629
Pâyâsi, Chief of Setavây, 155
Pêdda-Vege, 540
Perinuda, 333 n
Përiyar, River, 330
Perian, 239 f
Petanika, Pitinika, 311
Peuâkaotis, 247
Peuâkaolos, 435
Phegalos (Phegeus), 252
Philadelpheos (Ptolemy, II), 299
Philippas, 262
Philozeos, 425
Phrontos, 451
Phryni, 381
Pitunda, 420
Pimpramâ, 250
Pinjola, 203
Pinjala, 289
Pippalados, 79
Pipphalaveas, 194, 267
Pipprawâ, 191 n
Piahupura, Piahuparam, 538 f, 636
Piahupa, Pithunda, 420
Piyâda, see Aíoka
Pityil Hill, 269, 310
Po-ho, 63
Pokia, 554 f
Poling, 306 n
Polyandry, 41
Poros, 349, 292 n
Portikante, 209
Po-ta, 466, 469
Potali, Potana, 99, 98, 143
Po-t'iao, 464, 479
Pounota, 637
Prabhakara, 661 n
Prabhâkaravardhana, 605 f, 605 f, 608
Prabhavati (of Utkala), 187
Prabhavati (Guptâ), 564
Prachshita, see Pratyanta, 315, 296, 543
Prachmanâda, Aupamanyasa, 64
Pâchya, 156, 268
Pâchya Pañchâlasa, 71
Pradesâna, 317 n, 660
Pradeśikôsvâra, 319
Pradeshtri, 393, 319
Pradesikas, Pradesikas, 316, 319, 336
Pradyota of Avanti, 114, 146, 204
Præseti, 259
Prakrâsîditya, 597, 591 n
Prakrâsîditya, 588, 586 n, 587 n, 683 n
Pramaganda, 113
Prâpyâ, 9 n, 509, 522
Prâjuna, 544 f
Prasenajit (Pasenadi), 102 f, 154 f, 199 f, 210
Prasenajit, successor of Kâkâvarpin, 223 n
Prasânas, Prasîli, 286, 261, 310
Prâśînputra, 51
Pratardana, 75, 63, 36
Prathama-Kâyasitha, 561
Prathama-Kulika, 561
Pratiharas, 631
Pratipa, 13
Pratihâhana, 311 n, 369, 415, 495
Pratîravasa, 13
Prâvahanâ Jâvali, see Jâvali
Pravarrasena I, 541 f
Pravarrasena II, 564, 579
Prâvhitheôs, 541 f, 554
Prâvhitheôs I, 561
Prâvhitheôs, mantrini, 569 n, 567
Prijaka, 319 n
Prôti Kauâümbeya, 69
Ptolemy Philadelphiaos, King, 331 f
Puâ-dieu, 464
Pugâ, 326
Pukkasâti, 147, 227
Pukkesin II, 526, 585 n
Pulika, Pûnîka, Pûngâka, 146
Pûlinâda, 94, 313
Pûlâs, 316, 330
Pûlmâvî of Sàtavahanâ, 412
Pûlumâvî of Bihâkha, 495 f
Pûnârâbhisheka, 163, 167 f
Pundranagara, 275
Pûṇârvarshâhana, 310, 453, 560, 593, 597 f, 632
Pûppavâla, 74
Pûru Gûpta, 560, 572, 586 ff, 593
Purikâ, 396
Pûrâvarman, 583, 586 n, 609, 624
Purohitâ, 166, 359
Pûru, 23 f, 249
Pûrukutâsa, 100
Pûrûravas, 25
Pûrûshapura, 473 f
Pûrûva-Mâlava, 583 n
Pûshkara, 454
Pûshkarâsa, 334 f
Pûshkarâsa, 60, 247, 260, 425, 445, 444
Pûshpapura, 534, 461, 443
Pûshyatudita, 583, 584 n, 636 f, 608 n, 637
Pûshyadharman, 350
Pûshyagûpta, 271, 269
Pûsyaimitra (King), 350, 360 n, 361, 388 f,
353, 429
Pûsyaimitras, 563 f, 575 f, 627
Pûpapâla, 562

R

Râdha, Râdhâpuri, 331 n, 602
Râdhougupta, 303
Râghu, 511, 540
Rahamusala, 213
Rahasyâddikrita, 520
Râhula, 102
Râjagriha (Kekâya), 63
Râjgrihâ (Magadha), 63, 106, 110, 111,
116, 209, 230, 374, 430
Râjagriha (Balkh), 63
Râjakartri, Râjakrit, 163, 173
Râjalipura, 260
Râjâmâtya, 521
Râjun, 58, 159
Râjapura (Kalunga), 89
Râjapura (Ramboja), 148 f
Râjaputra-deva-bhâjtâraka, 561.
Râjâsûdana, 279
Râjasîhiha, 537
Râjasûda, 159, 165 f
Râjârâjâraja, 516
Râjâvaidya, 520
Râjâvishaya, 310, 315
Râjâyuktas, 316 f
Rajjugâha, 318
Rajjuka, Râjuka, 286, 287, 318 f, 336, 366 n, 515, 520
Râjula, Râjuvula, 445 f
Râjyadri, 608
Râjyavardhana, 553, 604 n, 606 n
Râma, 76, 101
Râmâgâma, 191
Râma (Sarma) Gupta, 553 n
Râmâpâla, 565
Rammenty, city, 74
Râpa-Bhâpâgar-âdhikara, 563
Rashada, 291
Râshtri, 12, 523
Râshtrakutâs, 631
Râshrâpâla, King, 236
Râshrâpâla oficial, 317
Râshrâpati, 533
Râshtrakasas, 311 f
Râshtriyas, 289, 315 n
Rathagritea, 44
Râthika, 290 n, 311 f, 315
Ratnâ, 166, 173
Râvadeva, 371 n
Reçu, 87, 89, 144
Republika, 121, 128, 134, 137, 140, 150, 173, 191 f, 245 ff, 615, 544 f
Revettarae Pârâva Châkra Sthapati, 175
Rishabha (mountain), 145 n
Rishabhadatta, see Ushwardâta
Rishyapura, 101, 103
Roada (Maurya), 234, 343
Robi, 192
Românas, Rome, 4, 462
Roucha, 197
Rudrâbhūti, 509
Rudrâdâman I, 9 n, 304, 467, 486 f, 496, 605 f, 618 ff
Rudrâdâman II, 510
Rudrâdeva, 534
Rudrâdharas Bhâttârikâ, 509
Rudrasena I, Khahatrapa, 510
Rudrasena II, 510
Rudrasena III, 511
Rudrasena (I) Vâkâtaka, 534, 541
Rudrasena II, 541, 554
Rudrasinha I, 509
Rudrasinha III, 610 f, 543 n
Rudrâya, 197
Rumminde, 300, 342
Rûpaddrâka, 286
Rûpamitha, 313

Saba, 555, 559
Sabarne, 93
Sabbamitra, 105 n
Sabbathaka, 208
Sacraya, 426
Sachiva, 250, 373, 555
Sadârnâra, 52
Saffarids, 482
Sâgala, Sâgalanagara, 64, 65 n, 361, 422, 645, 699
Sahadeva Sârâjaya, 121
Sahaja, 137
Sahajâti, 109
Sahalâjavy, 538 n
Sahâli, 222, 238 n
Sahasrajika, 132
Salvi, 484, 478
Sai-wang, 431 f
Saka (people), 3, 426 f, 431 ff, 508 ff
Saka era, 23, 469 n, 618 f
Sâkala, see Sâgala
Sâkalya, 65
Saka Murupâ, 546 f
Sakasatha, 434 f, 479, 488, 621
Sâketa, 99, 105, 378
Sakrâdîtya, 501, 570 f
Sakti-Kumâra, Sakti-Sri, 417
Sâks, 102
Sâksa, 39, 426 f, 431 ff, 508 ff
Sâkasa, 29, 469 n, 618 f
Sambata, see Sâgala
Sambod, 65
Sambodhika, 389
Sambod, 259
Sanheharshata, Sancharin, 291, 515, 526
Sambhoragubika (Minister of Peace and War), 622, 590
Sanhehidri, 166
Sanmiti, 174
Sanhâra-gana, 631
Samkasa (Sâkaksya), 54, 198
Sandhakobha, 580, 595
Samprati, Sampati, 361 f
Samrâj, Samrâj, 63, 159
Sâmrâja, 157 f
Sanâhat, 291
Sanatana, 25
Samudra Gupta, 468, 482, 533 ff
Samudra Vijnaya, 114
Sanabara, 454
Sanâkânikas, 544 f
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Sanda, 166
Senapati, 292, 378, 320, 521
Seniya, 305
Seres, 381
Sri, 99
Satakappika, 412
Setavat, 99, 155
Seyanaga, 211
Seyavija, 64
Shahān-Shah, 515
Shahāragiri, 507
Shapur II, 509 n, 544, 511
Silī, Sibi, 66, 95 n, 252 f, 257
Siquipa, 253
Shyrtios, 274
Siddhārtha, father of Mahāvīra, 119
Siddhārthas (Buddha), 102
Singal, 438 n
Sigerdis, 381
Sihapura, 130
Sikhandin, 73
Sikharavāmin, 559
Sīlādevīyā Dharmādītāy of Mo-la-po, 506 n,
629 n
Silākā Śālavatya, 74
Silavatī, 163
Sīhhachandra, 553
Sinhala, see also Ceylon, 547
Sinhapura, 89
Sīhhasena, 295, 393
Sīhhasvarman (Mandasar), 535
Sīhhasvarman (Pallava), 501 n
Sīhha Vikrama (Chandra Gupta II), 553
Sīhhasvarnī, 501 n
Simuka, 403 ff, 416
Sinkhu-Saavira, 267, 467, 507, 618 ff
Singupura, 89 n
Sinnu, 438
Sin-tu, see Sīndu, 629
Stradhvālas (Janaka II), 54, 86, 50
Sri-Vaṭha, 203
Sisikottos (Sākūgupta), 960
Sītānaga (Susunāga), 115, 219 f
Sītanandli, 396, 536
Sītupāla, 130
Sītā, 78
Sīva (worship of), 322 n, 464, 568
Sivas, Sivis, see Sibi, Sibol
Sīva-Bhāgavata, 454
Sīva-Datta, 499 n
Sīva-Gupta, 526
Sīvalakura, 502
Sīvamegha, 551
Sīva Nandi, 536
Sīvapa, 253
Sivasena, 444
Sīva-Skanda-Datta, 524
Sīva-Skanda-Gupta, 503
Sīva-Skanda-Nāga Sīri, 503
Sīva-Skanda-Varmān, 548
Sīva-Sīri, Apilaka, 409, 497
Sīri, 173, 252 f
Sīkandā (God), 327 n
Sīkanda Gupta, 481, 560, 572 ff, 628
Sīkanda-Nāga, 483
Skanda Nāga Sātaka, 407, 503
Skandavatī, 407, 692
Skandavarman, 591 n
Slaves, 256, 276 n, 339
Somas, 247
Sōdas, 446
Sohrai (Sogd), 257
Sogdian, 244, 426 f, 486
Soked (Sāketo), 473
Sola, Solañki, 603
Solar race, 99
Somass Mahāsanapāda, 95 ff
Somadeva, 698
Somakas (tribe), 73
Somaka Śāhadērva, 82, 86, 121
Somāśarman, 350
Sōpa, 274 n
Sōpa daṇḍa, 207
Sōpa Kollivisa, 174
Sōpa Sātrāsāha, 71
Sonbon the Indian, 615
Sophagesum, see Subhāgasena
Sonhvies, see Saubhuti
Sōthisa, 76
Sōthivatthagara, 129
Sovira, see Sauvita
Spalagadama, 438
Spalaphora, 498
Spallirises, 428, 440
Sīles, 295 f
Samarana Mahāmātra, 340 n
Sārvastī, see Sāvatthī
Sārvastī bhūkta, 600
Srenika, 205
Sreya, 115, 205
Srethaiśtvavāhā-volika-nigama, 683
Śrīdāharavarman, 157
Śrī Gupta, 528 f
Śrī Haridāsa, 598
Śrīkantha, 592, 606
Śrīmāra rāja (kings of the family of), 109 n
Śrenisara, 599
Śrīlavas of Vaiśāli, 123
Śrīlavas (tribe), 26, 40 n, 71 f
Śrī Pārāśa, 566 n
Śrīnara, 599
Śrīrāiva, 92
Śrī Sīta, 415
Śrī Viśva, 92 n
Śrī Vikramak, 556
Śrī Viśva Purushadatta, 500 n
Śrī Viṣhaya, 92 n
Śruta coins, 556
Śravīkā, 293
Śravīka, 293 n
Śravīka, 167 n
Śravīkas, 443, 515
Śrato, 384, 386 f, 429
Śravīkakāśa, 317
Śrī Thomas, 492 n, 453
Śrīnari, 93
Śrībhūtu, 197
Śrībhūtu, 298
Śrībhūgasena, 350, 351 f
Śrībhūyaśaka, 44
Śudakahūpa, 150
Śuddha, 692
Śuddasana Lake, 271, 590
Śuddārika, 145
Śuddasana, 74
Śuddhodana, 102
Śūdra kings, 355
Śūdra (Sōradi of Alexander) (tribe), 257, 498 n, 545 n
Śūdraka, 301, 569
Śūgāṅga palace, 275 n
Śūli Vīhar, 425, 455, 467, 618 ff
Śivakṣa, 350
Śukakāśa, 79, 102
Śuketvarman, 967
Śukhşamāvīra, 610
Śuktimati, Śuktisāhavya, city, 129
Śuktimati river, 139
Śukulīda, 500
Śūlikas, 602 f, 604
Śūlka, 527
Śupama, 350
Śumantra, 165 n
Śumati of Vaiśāli, 129
Śumatra, 92 n
Śumamāragiri, 133, 193
Śunahēna, 165
Śunekkhattra, 124
Śun-gra, 306 f, 306 ff
Śungrūn, 460 n
Śunthi, 212
Śunthi, 190
Śunlan Śāvīla, 120
Śurārasas, Śurārasakas, 68, 133, 142 f, 151, 197, 204
Śurāṣṭra, 370, 388, 207, 314, 361, 384, 446, 491, 506 f, 546
Śurāmabhanda, 683
Śūrāpāka, 424, 507 n
Śūrānḍhana, 74
Śūravarman, 605 n
Śūravarman, 258, 408
Śuthena, 16
Śuvakēra, 209
Śuvamitra, 303 f
Śuvambhara, 693, 697, 699, 623
Śutā, 163, 166, 178, 174
Śutasoma, 134
Śuvāraśāna, 107, 333
Śuvāvaragiri, 688, 307, 311
Śvāstik (Śvāst), 245, 247
Śvātiśāka, 509
Śvāsā, 350
Śvabhāra, 507, 621
Śvāmīdatta, 638
Śvārāśi, 157 f
Śvarjī, 147
Śvāsa, 298, 304, 309 n
Śvayamvara, 576
Śvetaketa, 49, 62, 74, 174
Śyandika, 69
Śymbolate, 263
Śynedro, 293
Śyrasthen, 446
Vaijayanti, 492, 502, 504 n
Vainyadevi, 586
(Vaijnya Gupta), 596 n, 601 n
Vairāgya, 158 f
Vairochana, 108
Vaisali, 118, 206, 211, 219, 531, 562
Vaisālīka Dynasty, 120 f
Vaisaly-adhīnakāna-adhikaranā, 563
Vaisampayana, 5, 18, 30, 41
Vaiśāra, 218 n
Vajapya, 159, 163 f
Vājēuhi, 465, 477
Vajura, 231, 210
Vajii, 83, 118 ff, 212
Vajta, 457, 597
Vākṣājakas, 541 ff, 554, 564, 576, 576, 612, 634
Vaiśāki, 590, 626, 629 f
Vālavi, 661
Vāmadeva, 82
Vamatakesha (ma ?), 450 n
Vamba Moriyar, 270
Vandēśa, see Vatsa, 131
Vamādhara, 89 n
Vanaśvara, 478
Vanaśvā, 602 n
Vanā, 106, 309 n, 331 n, 586 n, 603, 624
Vāpīyagāma, 198
Vāñji, 330
Vāñka, 105, 154
Vāñkhu, 628
Varadā, 378
Varadātāja, 86
Vārakamāgala, 560, 634
Varāpaśi, see Bārāpaśi, 74, 96, 154
Varāpavata, 134
Vardhamānaśabhuṭi, 560, 634
Vardhamānaśa, see Nīgaṭṭha Nāṭaputta
Mahāvira, 119, 215
Varhran, 479 n, 481, 510
Varmans, 605 n, 624
Varahaganyā, 5
Vaśas, 65, 131 ff
Vasabha-Khastiyā, 200
Vāsāṭi, 257
Vāsvadatta, 200
Vāseṭṭhas, 127
Vāsishṭha, 465, 477
Vāsishṭha-Dynasty, 543
Vāsishṭhiputra Čatarapana Saṭākaṇi, 496
Vāsishṭhiputra Čhauvala Chaṅkhamaṇa, 600 n
Vāsishṭhiputra Pumāṇiya, 410 n, 492 ff
Vāsishṭhiputra Śiva Śri Saṭākarṇi, 496
Vāsishṭhiputra Śri Chaṅḍa Sāti, 497 n
Vāsishṭhiputra Śri Saṭākarṇi, 496, 507
Vas Kusāha, 464 n
Vasakara, 212
Vasubandhu, 564 n, 587
Vasu of Čhedha, 113, 139
Vasudāna, 192
Vāsudeva Kārya, 392, 395, 398
Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, see Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva, 141, 294, 478
Vāsudeva Kusāha, 465, 478
Vasu Jyēṣṭha, 392
Vasualattā, see Vāsvadatta
Vasumati, 111
Vasumitra, Kṛṣṇa, 379, 388, 393, 475
Vasumitra, sage, 475
Vāṭāpya, 685 n
Vatsa, Vānța, 132, 193, 202 ff
Vāṇāyana, 408, 526
Vāṇāśa, 162
Vayurakshita, 561 n
Vedehaputta, 76
Vedēhiputta, 206 n
Vedhas, 104
Vehalia, 399 n, 211
Vējāvant, 491 n
Venči, 500 n, 586 f
Vesai, see Vēsai
Vēspāsi, 473
Vessantara, Prince, 176
Veṣṭhāda, 193 and note
Vichitra, 473
Vidgūtha, Śākalya, 58
Vidārāha, 86 f, 91, 148, 372 f, 602 n
Vidēgha, Māthava, 64, 77
Vidēha, 45 f, 62 f, 74, 80 f, 118, 132, 209 n
Vidēha, 369 ff, 396 f, 396 f, 440, 555, 606 n, 609
Viṣṇu Jābha, 209, 211, 333 n, 587 n
Vigataśoka Tathya, see Tathya
Vigataśoka II, 300
Vigraha, 223 n
Vinārayātra, 523
Vijaya (conquest), 327, 365, 537
Vijaya (prince), 330 n
Vijaya Buddha Varman, 519
Vijyakūri, 468
Vijyāmitra, 445
Vijyāyesa, 308
Vikrama era, 465 f, 472 n
Vikramāditya, Chandragupta II, 653 ff
Vikramāditya of Ayodhya, 566
Vikramāditya (Skanda), 577
Vikramāditya Sakā, 465 n, 556, 596
Vikrama, Puru (Buddha ?) Gupta, 486
Vīlīvyākura, 502, 637
Village Administration, 203, see Grāma
Vima Kadaphises II, see Wema
Vimala-Kopaṇiṇa, 209 n
Vimānādhana, 340 n
Vinaśana, 545
Vinayāditya, 611
Vinayakāpala (Pratihāra), 585 n
Vinaya-sṭhiti-sṭhāpaṇa, 663
Vindhayāski, 541
Vipāsā, 380 n
Vira Choja, 16
Virakuro, 601 n
Vira Mātayasa, 67
Viraśāvyā moti, 606, 635
Virascena, General, 371, 390 n
Virasena, Mauliya, 350, 361
Virasena, Śaha, 555, 559
Viraṭa, 67, 137
Viraṭaṇagara, 67, 137
Viravarman, 501 n
Vāsudeva, 48
### GENERAL INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIASAKHA, 323 n**  
Viasahadatta’s Mudrarakahasa, 663  
Viasahayaparama, 290 n  
Viasala, King, 120  
Vitala (Ujain), 557  
Vitala (Vaisali), 120  
Visharman, 253  
Vishaya, 321, 523, 587, 560  
Vishayapati, 524, 557, 561  
Vishnu Worship, 668  
Vishnugopa, 538  
Vishnugopa (of Palakkada), 519  
Vishnugopata, Chandrakirti, 611  
Vishnupaksha-Chuṣad-Kâlaṇḍina Sâtakarni, 503  
Vishnukundin, 500 n, 602, 638  
Vishnuputira, 401  
Vishnupada, 106  
Vishnupâla, 524  
Vishnurâdhana, 585 n, 631 n  
Vibhuti, 9 n, 354 n, 514  
Vibhvaksen, 98 n  
Vivasimha, 510  
Vivavaran, 567 n  
Viva-phaya, 507 n  
Vivahâyana, 28  
Vivâkapuru, 106  
Vivastâtra, 368  
Vivhotras, 146, 283  
Voharika Mahâmattas, 203, 286  
Vokkâpâ, 602 n  
Vovones, 427 f, 622  
Vrâja, 320  
Vrâsâya, 119, 123, 137, 142  
Vîrdhadyumna, 44  
Vrihaspati (King), 350, 392  
Vrijika, 369  
Vrishabhala, 295 n, 355 n  
Vrishbâla, 291  
Vrishasena, 359  
Vrishipis, 140 ff  
Vyaghra-bala-parâkrama, 566 n, 569  
Vyaghradvâra, 543 f  
Vyaghra-parâkrama, 550  
Vyaghra-râja, 538  
Vyaghra-sena, 490 n  
Vyâprâjita, 524  
Vyâvahâra samatâ, 253 f  
Vyavaharika Mahâmattas, 203, 286  
Vyâsâya, 49  
Vyuhtâ, 341 n  

**W**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wardak, 485

**Wei, 464**  
Wema Kadphises, 463 f, 470  
Wu-sun, 458  
Wu-t’ou-lao, 433

**X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233, 236, 519 n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Xandrames, 233, 236, 519 n  
Xathroi, 257  
Xasxes, 242 f

**Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yahgou, Yavunga, 460  
Yâdava, Yadu, 138, 145  
Yajñasena of Vidarbha, 373  
Yajñasena of Raichâla, 78  
Yajña śṛt, 497 f, 502  
Yajñavâlîka, 49 f  
Yajnâvarman, 603  
Yâsakara, 592  
Yâsodâman, 510, 513  
Yâsodharman, 696 ff, 601, 625, 639  
Yâsomâti, 573  
Yâsavarman, 588 n, 611  
Yancheyas, 250 n, 467 f, 508, 515 n, 544 f, 619, 621  
Yona, Yavana, Yona, 3, 5, 307, 354, 366, 378 f, 397  
Yuvavarâya, 519  
Yavâiti, 25, 69  
Yuvâtinaagara, 390 n  
Yen-kac-hiken, see Wema Kadphises  
Yin-mo-fu, 432, 439, 456  
Yonaka, 424, 428  
Yasîmoti, 487, 505  
Yudhisthira, Yudhisthira, 46, 81, 133, 166  
Yueh-chi, Yueh-ch (Yueh-chi, Yuo-tchi), 427, 431, 458 ff, 473  
Yunkas, Yutas, 316, 319 f, 386  
Yung-ku, 432  
Yuva Mahâraja, 619

**Z**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>505 n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Za Hakale, Zosacles, 505 n  
Zela, 473  
Zeolitises, see Jihonika, 462  
Zeilos, 422  
Zoroastrians, 276, 475, 615
SOME ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page  Line

148  fn1  Add “in the Pāla-Pratihāra age they are also found in Pehoa (Ep. Ind. I. 247) and Bengal.

240  4  For contact between the Medes and India, see India Antiqua, 1947, 180ff.

28  (Satrapy of Hidus was formed before 513 B.C., Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, p. 145. Some scholars believe that the conquest of Sind preceded Scylax’s exploration of the Indus—India Antiqua, p. 181).

241  24  after ‘was’ add ‘at first’.

241  28  There is no reason to believe that the Indian satrapy of Darius refers to Sind or to some small territory to the west of the Indus. The account of Herodotus III. 94-96 seems to suggest that it extended eastwards beyond the Beas as far as the river Sarasavi which flowed past the Marudhanavan in the days of the Mahābhārata (see 22n 2 ante; cf., desert beyond the Beas, ANM, p. 16) and finally disappeared in the sands of Rājputāna. “Eastward of India lies a tract which is entirely sand... the Indians dwell nearest to the east, and the rising of the Sun. Beyond these the whole country is desert on account of the sand.” The Sattagydians, the Gaudarians, the Dacians and the Aparytæae constituted the seventh satrapy and the Indians the twentieth (Herod. III. 91-94).

262  29  The completion of Nikaia is doubted by Tarn (Alexander the Great, II, 238).

262  30  The confluence of the Indus and the Akesines was fixed as the boundary of the Upper and Lower Indus satrapies.

262  31  Nikaia and Boukephala stood one on each side of the Jhelum. Tarn thinks (Alexander the Great, Sources and Studies, p. 236) that “Boukephala stood on the east bank of the Jhelum and Nikaia on the west bank (ibid p. 238).

265  After his (Sandrocottus’) victory he forfeited, by his tyranny, all title to the name of a liberator, for he oppressed with servitude the very people whom he had emancipated from foreign thraldom (Justin). The tyranny of the dush̄māñīyas is known to Indian literature. But the sovereign himself is noted for his justice in early Maurya times.

273  18  Dr. G. C. Raychandhuri draws my attention to an Aramaic inscription of Devanampiya found at Laghman (ancient Lampaka,
BSOAS, Vol XIII, pt. I. 1949, 80ff). This confirms the Greek evidence about the inclusion of Kabul and its neighbourhood within the dominions of the early Mauryas.

For the date of the Arthaśāstra, see also Raychaudhuri, the History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. II, ed. by R. C. Majumdar, pp. 265-87.

For the date of Aśoka, see Raychaudhuri, History and Culture of Indian People, Vol. II, 92ff; for the views of Eggert, Acta Orientalia (1940) 103ff. For the views of Filliozat, see Manuel des études indiennes, Vol. I, pp. 213-19. Filliozat prefers the Jaina date 318 B.C. for the accession of Chandragupta, ignoring not only the evidence of the Ceylonese Chronicles but also the fact that the Jaina verses refer to the commencement of Maurya rule in Avanti, not in Magadha or the Indus Valley. For the date of Magas, see also Cary, A History of the Greek World, 393ff.

For the Aśoka chakra, see IC, XV (1948-49), pp. 179ff.

Cf. Strabo, XV. I. 27—“We became acquainted with the eastern parts of India on this side of the Hypanis and whatever parts beside which have been described by those who after Alexander advanced beyond the Hypanis to the Ganges and Palibothra“.

Add after Seleukos “The Antiochos-Sophagassenus alliance may also have been directed against the Imperial Mauryas of Paṭaliputra“. Greek intrigue may have played a part in the disintegration of the empire before the Greek raids.

A Śūgarāja (Agraśa?) is known from certain coins found at Kausāmbi (JNSI, IV. 1, 14). His identity is, however, uncertain.

For Coins of Apollodotus and Menander in Gujarāt, see Gaz. Bomb. I, i, pp. 16-17; Num. Chr. JRNS (1950) 207.

After “Strato I“ add the following: “Saltman (Greek Coins 235) refers to a large gold coin which Eukratides struck to mark his triumph over Demetrius. Some distinguish between a Bactrian and an Indo-Bactrian Helioleos (JRNS, 1950, 211-12). The duplication of the Indian Helioleos requires cogent proof.

Whitehead in JAOS, 1950, 216, throws doubt on the conjecture that Agathoclēs was the mother and not the wife of Strato I. In that case the theory of her marriage with Menander requires more convincing proof than that adduced by Rapson and Tarn.

Tarn, Greeks, second edition, 527n. Debands mural crowns; J. Banerji yaksahs.

The from Yena is also found in the Post-Aśoka period (cf. the Besnagar inscription of Heliodoros). Doubts were raised by Tarn Greeks in Bactria and India, 2nd. ed. 536.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Tahia is apparently different from the &quot;Dahae&quot; of the classical writers which, says Macgovern, lay far to the west. According to Trogus the Asiani were the lords of the Tochari (Reges Thocarorum Asiani, JAOS, 61, 246ff; 65, 71ff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>For the Scythian Period, see now a monograph by Johanna Engelberta von Lohuizen de Leeuw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Leeuw suggests that the era of the old Saka inscriptions began from the Yue-chi conquest of Bactria c 129 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>The Charsadda Inscriptions of the year 303 refers to a grāmasvāmin and satrap (of Chukhsa?) named Avakhajhāda (Konow, Acta Orientalia XX, p. 108ff).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 445  | fn4 Add at the end "Also Whitehead, Numismatic Chronicle, 1944, pp. 19-104. Apacharaja of the Bajaur inscription is taken by some to mean 'ruler of the West'.

The periods of Yue-chi migration have been discussed by several scholars. The first period of march from Kanshu to the Upper Li, c. 172-161 B.C. Second stage from the Upper Li to the Oxus between 133-129 B.C. The third period began with the conquest of Bactria (c. 129 B.C.) Leeuw, The Scythian Period, pp. 31-33. |
<p>| 469  | 12 Bachhofer, JAOS, 61, 242. |
| 540, 627 | Recently Dr. D. C. Sircar has come across evidence in the Sumaṇḍala (Orissa) inscription which indicates that in 569 one Prithivi-Vigraba held Kaliṅga apparently as a Gupta vassal. Cf IHQ, XXVI, March, 1960. |
| 593  | 11 Add after 476-7 &quot;together with the Benares Stone Pillar ins. of 159 (=A.D. 478-79)&quot; noted by Dr. D. C. Sircar (A.S.B. 6-12-48). (JRASB, 1949, 5ff). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>the Pargiter</td>
<td>Pargiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>distinguishes</td>
<td>distinguishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(aggamahi)</td>
<td>(aggamahāhi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jam udvipa</td>
<td>Jambudvipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hammurali</td>
<td>Hammurabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mgadha</td>
<td>Magadha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Vīshṇuparaṇa</td>
<td>Vīshṇu Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>grī</td>
<td>grī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Devanumpiya</td>
<td>Devanupiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kālavarṇa</td>
<td>Kālavaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>avarice</td>
<td>avarice and parentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Giger’s</td>
<td>Giger’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Erakine</td>
<td>Erakine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ocean</td>
<td>ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>sceptica</td>
<td>sceptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ms Crindle</td>
<td>Mo Crindle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Gedrolic</td>
<td>Gedrosia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>successor</td>
<td>successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vidharbha</td>
<td>Vidarbha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Predecessor</td>
<td>predecessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Devabhuti</td>
<td>Devabhuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brihaspatimitra</td>
<td>Brihaspatimitra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 DIVERSE LINEAGE</td>
<td>DIVERSE LINEAGE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>cessatio</td>
<td>cessation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>regin</td>
<td>reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kamarupa</td>
<td>Kamarupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Basīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>existence</td>
<td>existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>studica</td>
<td>studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>kṣetra</td>
<td>kṣetra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPINIONS AND REVIEWS

I.—Political History of Ancient India

From the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty

Published by the Calcutta University

Opinions on the earlier editions and on Part I:—

The Hindusthan Review.—It is learned and luminous and is a scientific treatise based on the results of research into the records and materials of ancient Indian history, of which it is a sound and an accurate digest, interestingly put together. It is about the best text-book of the subject it deals with.

Dr. L. D. Barnett. London.—The author treats his materials with a certain degree of originality, but at the same time he preserves throughout a well-balanced judgment and never sacrifices critical caution to the passion for novel theories. This interesting book shews judgment, ingenuity, and learning. And not the least of the author’s merits is that he can write plain English.

Dr. F. W. Thomas.—I have profited by a closer acquaintance with your Political History and other writings, which are really models of sound judgment combined with full knowledge.

Professor Hultzsch, Halle, Germany.—Your valuable work is the outcome of extensive researches and throws much light on the darkest and most debated periods of Indian history. You have succeeded in building up an intelligible account from the stray and imperfect materials which are available to the historian of those times.

Professor Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany.—Your splendid volume What an enormous mass of evidence has been collected and discussed in this work, an important feature of which is the quotation of the original texts along with their translation which makes it easy to control the conclusions arrived at. The ancient geography, not less than the ancient history of India, has been greatly furthered by your researches and much new light has been thrown on some of the most vexed problems of Indian Archaeology and Chronology. The indices are very copious and the study of your work is greatly facilitated by them.

Professor Pelliot, Paris.—Le nom de l’auteur est garant du sérieux du travail.

Professor Jarl Charpentier, Upsala, Sweden.—Professor Ray Chaudhury belongs to a set of young Hindu scholars who, combining the traditional education of a Pandit with a thorough training in English, German or French Universities, have lately been carrying on deep and fruitful researches in the various domains of Indian lore. Even the student, who on essential points does differ widely from the opinions expressed by Professor Ray Chaudhury, must willingly recognize his high merits as a scholar.

Professor A. Schepotieff, Ufa, Russia.—For our study of the history of the Ancient Age your Political History of Ancient India is of very great importance (trans. from original).
C. E. A. W. Oldham (J. R. A. S., 1928, July)—Part I of Professor Ray Chaudhuri's work deals with the period from Parikṣit to Bimbisāra. The author seeks to show, as he tells us in his preface, "that chronological relation of the national transactions before 600 B.C. is not impossible." He has laid under contribution the usual authorities, the Vedic, Puranic, Buddhist, and Jaina texts—though he does not appear to place much reliance upon the last-named (cf. pp. 6 and 72). A vast mass of records has been collated, and the evidence marshalled in a very concise and able, and in some respects original, manner. The apposite quotations from the original texts are useful. Professor Ray Chaudhuri regards Parikṣit I and Parikṣit II, as they are named by the late Mr. Pargiter in his Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, as being probably one and the same king, and as identifiable with the Vedic Parikṣit. By "the great Janaka" he refers to the Janaka of the later Vedic texts, whose court is said to have been thronged with Brāhmaṇas, and not to the traditional first king Janaka, the eponymous founder of the Janakavainiša, or to Janaka Siradhvaja, the reputed father of Sīta. Synchronizing Gunākhya Sāṅkhāyana with Āśvalāyana and the Buddha, he inclines, it seems, to place Parikṣit in the ninth, and the "great Janaka" in the seventh century B.C. though he wisely avoids coming to any positive conclusion as to these debatable dates, and points out that if the evidence of the Purāṇas were accepted we would have to place them some five centuries earlier. If it could be established that Parikṣit came into power at the beginning of the ninth century, or the end of the tenth, this would help to corroborate the approximate chronology suggested by Mr. Pargiter, having regard also to the synchronism between Suhajit Bārhadratha and Adhisimakṛṣṇa. But until more convincing evidence is discovered most scholars will probably agree in the verdict of Vincent Smith that nothing approaching exact chronology is yet available for periods anterior to about 650 B.C.

Much of the matter in Part II will perhaps be familiar to students of Indian history; but it has been arranged in a fresh and scholarly manner, while several important suggestions have been made on different questions. One or two of these may be cited as examples. On pp. 72-73 reasons are set forth for accepting the Ceylon tradition that Śiṣunāga was later than Bimbisāra. The view recorded by Mahāmahopadhyāya (sic) H. P. Sāstri that the ultimate dismemberment of the Mauryan empire was due to a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇas, is vigorously controverted. Whatever other causes may have operated, and Professor Ray Chaudhuri undoubtedly lays his finger on more than one such, Brāhmaṇical influences cannot be ignored. The arguments used for holding that Demetrius,¹ rather than Menander, was the Yavana invader of the Madhyadesa in the time of Puṣyamitra and that Simuka, the founder of the Sātavāhana dynasty, must be placed in the first century B.C., deserve careful consideration.

Since Hoernle made his well-known suggestions as to the identity of Devagupta, mentioned in two inscriptions of Harsāvardhana,

¹ For the latest reading of the Hāthigumpha inscription reference to the Yavana king, see JBORS., XIII, 223.
several writers have attempted to frame the history of the later Guptas of Eastern Malava and Bihār and the Maukharis of Kanauj. The period presents many difficulties, which are not likely to be solved until some further evidence reveals itself. Having regard to the conditions of the times and the bitter enmity of the Maukharis, who were then very powerful, it seems unlikely that the Susthitavarman mentioned in the Aphaṇḍa (sic) inscription of Adityasena as having been defeated by Mahāsenagupta of E. Malava, could have been the king of Kāmarūpa, as the author states. Fleet's suggestion that he was the Maukhari king of that name,1 whom we know to have been contemporaneous with Mahāsenagupta, seems more probable.

Not the least valuable part of the contents of this volume are the numerous comments on the geographical information supplied in the records quoted; and it is a matter of regret that of the five maps entered in the table of Contents (p. xvi), only one, viz., that of “Bhāratavarṣa” appears in the volume before us. As regards this map we are not told what specific period, if any, it refers to. In any case, the positions assigned to the Nisaṇḍas, S. Kosala, Kamboja, and the Riksha mountains seem to call for some explanation. On the other hand, the geographical information given in the text is extensive, and often suggestive, and it indicates that much attention has been devoted to this important auxiliary to ancient Indian historical research. The indexes, both bibliographical and general, have been very well prepared.

Professor A. Berriedale Keith, Edinburgh.—I have read through the work and find it to contain much that is valuable. The author has arrived at clearly cut opinions on many of the chief difficulties in the history of early India; he has formulated them effectively, and as a result, even when they do not commend themselves as final solutions, they will serve to promote the discussion and to facilitate further fruitful research. He observes a due sense of proportion and is well read in the literature. The work accordingly may justly be deemed a most valuable contribution to the subject-matter of which it treats.

Professor Wilh Gelger, Munchen-Neublberg, Germany.—I highly appreciate Mr. Ray Chaudhuri’s work as a most happy combination of sound scientific method and enormous knowledge of both Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical literature. The work is written in lucid style in spite of its intricate subject and affords a mass of valuable evidence, throwing much light on the whole period of Indian History dealt in it. I see with special pleasure and satisfaction that we now are enabled by the author’s penetrating researches to start in Indian chronology from the 9th instead of the 6th or 5th century B.C.

Professor Jackson, Columbia University, New York.—I can see the scholarly research which you have put into the volume, and am glad to have such a work for future reference in my historical studies.

Professor Louis de la Vallee Poussin, Brussels, Belgium.—I believe that the book is well designed and has the twofold merit of collecting a vast amount (and in some chapters, an exhaustive one) of references, and of giving a clear and reasonable exposé of the main

1 No Maukhari king of that name is known (H. C. R. C.).
line of this history. I agree with the author on several controverted points of chronology.

Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids.—Dr. Chaudhuri has made debtors of us all.

S. M. Edwardes (The Indian Antiquary, July, 1927, p. 140).—Professor Raychaudhuri's book forms a solid contribution to the discussion of the various problems implicit in the early history of India.

Professor E. J. Rapson, Cambridge.—My best thanks for the kind present of a copy of the “Political History of Ancient India,” which I am very glad to possess and which I shall find most useful for reference.

Professor Sten Konow, Norway.—The book is a very useful contribution.

Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.—I have to refer to it very often, both for corroboration of historical facts of the epic and for geographical information and the excellent maps included in the volume. It has been always a matter of great gratification to me that you have adopted my views with reference to the Sātavāhanas and at last given them, in a standard history of India the appellation by which they call themselves...rather than accept the doubtful description of them given by the late Purānas.

Professor Nilakanta Bāṣātī.—Your excellent Ancient History of India. I have been using it on every conceivable occasion.

Sitaram Kohli, Lahore.—I have immensely liked your book “Political History of Ancient India.”

C. S. Srinivasachari, South India.—Our author rightly holds the balance between the views of Pargiter which would give excessive value to Kshatriya tradition whose date allowed of manipulation to serve dynastic ends and the value of Vedic tradition whose two strong points are its priority of date and freedom from textual corruption.

W. Charles de Silva, Colombo.—I have the greatest pleasure to express my high appreciation of your very valuable and learned article (Part I of the Political History).

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins.—It is a fine augury for Indian scholarship when native scholars of the first rank take seriously in hand the great problem of untangling the web of Indian history. To this work your book is a valuable contribution.

Professor H. Jacobi, Bonn.—Very suggestive and contains some important details.

Professor F. Otto Schrader.—I have read the book with increasing interest and do not hesitate to say that it contains a great many details which will be found useful by later historians. The portion I enjoyed most is that on the sixteen Mahājanapadas.

II. The Early History of the Vaishnava Sect

Published by the Calcutta University

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, America.—Your book has given me great satisfaction...I am particularly pleased to see an incisive study of this kind in the realm of religious history...Believe me, in the hope of further contributions of this character from your able pen...
Professor A. Berriedale Keith, Edinburgh University.—While I do not concur in your view as to the original character of Kṛṣṇa, I recognise the care with which you have investigated the issue, and value highly the elaborate collation of the evidence which your work contains, and which will render it of much service to all students of this doubtless insoluble problem. The stress laid on the epigraphic evidence and the full use made of it is of special value, while in many details your opinions are of interest and value, as in the case of the date of Paṇini.

Sir George Grierson.—Very interesting and informing. The book is full of matter which is of great importance for the history of religion in India and will form a valued addition to my collection of books on the subject.

F. E. Pargiter, Oxford.—I agree with you in discarding various theories, but I don’t think Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra is the famous Kṛṣṇa, and it seems to me your exposition can stand just as well without the identification as with it. Your book will help to elucidate the whole matter, but are you sure that the cult does not owe something to Christianity?

Professor F. Otto Schrader, Kiel, Germany.—I perfectly agree with your opinion that Chāndogya passage on Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra and his teaching is to be considered as the first historical record of Bhāgavatism. There were, of course, many Kṛṣṇas, but to conjecture that more than one was (sic) also a Devakīputra, is to my mind an unscientific boldness which is the less justifiable as the teachings mentioned in that passage, as you show, perfectly agree with those, e.g., of the Bhāgavat-gītā and the Rk. quoted with the famous तद्विषिष्टं परसं पद.......

Professor Garbe, Tubingen, Germany.—I have read your book with the greatest interest and perfectly agree with you in the main points, as to the personality of Kṛṣṇa and the development of Bhāgavatism. You have brought together much important material and elucidated the dark early history of Bhāgavatism as far as possible.

The Times Literary Supplement, May 12, 1921.—The lectures of Mr. Hemchandra Ray Chaudhuri on the early history of the Vaiṣṇava Sect read almost as would a Bampton lecture on the "Historical Christ" to a Christian audience. They are an attempt to disentangle the authentic figure of Kṛṣṇa from the mass of Puranic legend and gross tradition, from the wild conjectures and mistaken, if reasoned, theories which surround his name. The worship of Kṛṣṇa is not a superstitious idolatry; it is the expression of the Bhakti, the devotional faith of an intellectual people, and many missionaries, ill-equipped for dealing with a dimly understood creed would do well to study this little volume.


Dr. Jules Bloch, Paris.—My Guru Sylvain Levi, who has come back from his travels, told me also of his esteem for that book.
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.—The scope of this small book is rightly expressed in its title. The author who is Lecturer in History in the Calcutta University, has collected and discussed statements, references, and allusions from the early literature to throw light on the position and life of Kṛṣṇa and the growth of Bhāgavatism. He deals with the various theories that have been put forward, and with good reasons discredits the views that Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva was a solar deity or a tribal god or a vegetation deity. He is right in treating Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva as one person, the Vrṣṇi chief, but he unnecessarily identifies him with Kṛṣṇa Devakīputa, the scholar mentioned in the Chāndogya Upanishad...

The Bombay Chronicle, June 19, 1921.—Mr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri of the Calcutta University has collected much valuable material from which he has succeeded in tracing the origin and growth of the Vaishnava creed. The Historicity of Srikrishna—or as the author calls him, Krishna Vāsudeva, is also handled with remarkable clearness...

A. Govindacharya Svamin.—I pay you a most deserved compliment upon your acquaintance with the Azhvars and Sri Vaishnavism of southern India as evidenced in your learned book the Early History of the Vaishnava Sect.

III. Studies in Indian Antiquities

Demy 8vo. Pp. xvi, 211
Published by the Calcutta University

Professor E. J. Rapson, Cambridge.—Dr. Raychaudhuri’s essays on Indian History and Antiquities are always well-informed, thoughtful and suggestive.

E. J. Thomas (J. R. A. S., October, 1933, p. 925).—The study which Dr. Raychaudhuri has already devoted to ancient Indian history is well known. In the present book he discusses some of the geographical problems which still face the historians, as well as Vedic, epic, and specially historical questions.... He has shown that Indian historical scholarship is proceeding on sound lines of its own and achieving independent results.

O. C. Gangoly.—Permit me to thank you for your valuable gift of Studies in Indian Antiquities in which I have read with great profit your article: Vanga Kon Des? It is an excellent contribution to our knowledge of the little known phase of old Bengal. You do not try to prove too much, yet you have given very much based on solid data. It is a pity many scholars do not know of this article—buried in a series of Essays in English.

Opinions on some of the Papers incorporated in the Volume.

Dr. Barnett.—They are very interesting and critically sound.
Dr. Keith.—They are all very interesting, and I am glad to note the very useful information elicited as to Bhoja.
OPINIONS AND REVIEWS

Professor Dr. Sten Konow, Kristiania, Norway.—They are written in a thoroughly scholar-like way, and more especially it seems to me that your paper about the Laksmana Sena era deserves very careful attention.

Professor H. Jacobi.—The verification of the Bhâgavata credo in the Besnagar inscription is a find on which you may be congratulated.

Professor Schrader, Kiel, Germany.—The Antiquity of the Rûg Veda is a sober and useful little piece of research work with which, on the whole, I fully agree. If we follow Jacobi and Tilak we create a gap (which we cannot bridge over) between the Mantras and the Brâhmaṇâs, for the latter are certainly not far removed from early Buddhism. On the other hand, if Hertel were right, the Rûg Veda would immediately precede Buddhism, and there would be no room at all for Brâhmaṇâs and Upaniṣâds.

Your important paper on the inter-relation of the two epics: The opinion held by Macdonell, Winternitz, and others, viz., that the heroes of the Mahâbhârata are unknown to the Râmâyâna, seems, indeed, to be untenable......Again, I find it difficult, as you do, to distinguish between a Pândava story and a Kuru-Bharata Epic.

Professor Jari Charpentier.—The identification of some words in this very important document (the Besnagar Inscription) with a passage in the Mahâbhârata seems to be a most happy find.

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins.—It is certainly a remarkable resemblance which you have established and I should be inclined to agree with your conclusion.

IV. An Advanced History of India

Opinion on the book and particularly on the chapters contributed by the author of the Political History of Ancient India


One of the most hopeful features in the mental life of modern India is its thirst for history. Schools, Colleges and Universities pursue this study with vigour. The favours of Clio are not easy to win: she loves to walk especially in the domain of India's past, though darkling ways.................................But her Indian suitors have urged their quest with courage and often with notable skill, and their labours have borne fruit in a large number of works, many of high merit. In this book three distinguished Indian scholars have collaborated in order to produce for advanced students an outline of their country's history from the earliest ages down to our time, in which are summarized the main results of modern studies. In this
they have been on the whole very successful. Their attitude is generally fair and reasonable, their narrative lucid and straightforward. Naturally specialists, particularly in the realm of ancient Indian annals, on which opinions are very often divergent, will find food for criticism in some of the views presented; but our authors may justly claim a right to their opinions.

It must, however, be acknowledged that in at least one respect their work shows some lack of proportion. They are Bengalis whose studies have been mainly concerned with the history of Northern India; and this has led them to allot a very small space to the annals of the great kingdoms of the South from the decline of the Sātavahanas to the end of the rule of the Calukyas, the Cōla-s, and their epigoni (pp. 172-180 and 188-190). In some minor matters also there is room for improvement. Thus, the account of administration on p. 71 f. seems a little too summary and hardly critical enough; and the statement on p. 81 that “another (highway) stretched from Rājagriha in South Bihar by way of Śrāvasti in Oudh to the banks of the Goeāvari contradicts the facts,1 for the highway ran from Śrāvasti through Rājagriha to the Godāvari. The diaeresic marking length of vowels is so often misplaced that one is led to think that the authors would have done better to have never used it at all. To quote a few examples, we find passim errors such as “Konkān,” “Malābār,” “Peshāwar,” “Māndalay,” “Kattakālai,” “Ali,” “Aivardi” (for “Ilahāvirdi”) “Kāshmir,” “Wāzir,” and both “Qāsim” and “Kāsim,” with other inconsistencies in representing the Arabic gutturals. On p. 71 we note with sorrow the misspelling “diarchy”; on p. 202 f. we regret to see Basava presented as “Vasava,” while on p. 203 Vātsyāyana appears as “Vātsyāyana,” both errors being due to the influence of Bengali pronunciation.2 It is disagreeable also to meet hybrid spellings of names such as “Hyder ‘Ali” and “Omdut-ul-Umarā.”

In a work of this kind there should have been some recognition of Warren Hastings’ enlightened and successful efforts to revive Hindu education and law; absence is to be regretted.

This book, now in its second edition, will surely be soon reprinted; and then, we hope, blemishes will be eliminated.

---

1 Not, it may humbly be pointed out, the facts recorded in some early Buddhist texts (cf. Sutta-Nipāta and its trans. by Faussbühl, 1881, SBE, x, pt. ii, pp. 187-188, 209) which narrate a journey from Pāṭaliputra (on the Godāvari) to several places including Sāvaithi and thence to the city of Magadh and to Pāsanaka cetiya in Magadha.

2 That the errors in spelling are not all due to the influence of Bengali pronunciation will be apparent from the Political History of Ancient India, 4th ed. 1938, p. 339, line 29; and the Ground-Work of Indian History by Sen and Raychaudhuri; seventh edition (1945), p. 112, which gives a brief account of “Basava (not Vasava).” As to “diarchy” for which the authors are criticised attention may be invited to The Universal Dictionary of the English Language, edited by Henry Cecil Wyld (sixth impression, 1946) p. 304 where we have the following: “diarchy ........ the irregularly formed “dyarchy” is common and should be avoided.” The explanation for many of the blemishes will be found in the Preface, especially on p. vi.
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