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Anantalal Thakur
The breeding season

The breeding season begins in April, when the female
season begins with the laying of eggs. The male
season continues until July. The clutch size varies
from three to six eggs. The incubation period is
about 28 days. The young hatched in August and
are able to fly in October. The adults migrate to
southern regions during the winter months.
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EDITOR'S PREFACE

The second part of the Volume I of the Comprehensive History of Bihar is being placed in readers' hands. What has been said in the Preface of Part I stands true for the Part II as well. The scheme of transliteration remains the same. The views expressed in different chapters and the chronology accepted are the views of individual contributors and not necessarily of the editor. There are a number of printing and other mistakes. An errata has been provided at the end, indicating corrections of glaring errors. The non-availability of proofs at any stage for the author or the editor certainly precluded corrections of many typological or other errors in time. The learned readers are, therefore, earnestly requested to bear with this kind of deficiency.

Thanks are due to Shri Srinivas Sharma, M. A., Research Fellow, K. P. J. Research Institute for preparing some bibliographical notes from different Journals which proved quite helpful in preparing the volume and to Sri Ajaya Kumar Sinha, Senior Technical Assistant, Directorate of State Archaeology and Museums Bihar for his help in preparing the Index.

Patna
April 1974.

B. P. Sinha.
CHAPTER XXVII

Gupta Empire

The history of Bihar again unfolds a bright period with the rise of the Gupta dynasty. The dynastic history of the Guptas begins with Śrī Gupta, who, according to the Allahabad Pillar Inscription, is the first historical king and perhaps the founder of the dynasty. His real name appears to have been Gupta with Śrī added as an honorific prefix. The names of kings beginning with Śrī in the above record also lend support to this view, though Smith* gives out his full name as Śrī Gupta. Nothing definite is known about Śrī Gupta and the extent of his kingdom. Whatever little, however, we know about his reign is largely based on I-tsing’s incidental reference to a king Ci-li-Ki-to (Śrī Gupta) who is credited with the construction of a temple for the use of Chinese monks near Mi-li-Kia-Si-Kia-po-no. Generally Śrī Gupta of I-tsing’s account has been identified with Śrī Gupta, the first member of the Gupta dynasty. But in view of the fact that I-tsing (671-695 A.D.) refers to the event happening 500 years before him, it is possible that Śrī Gupta the builder of the temple was not the grandfather of Chandragupta I but his great-great grandfather bearing the same name, as in Gupta family, often the grandfather and grandson have the same name. But Allan* thinks that 500 years ago, is a general expression, may mean even 400 years or so, and so Śrī Gupta, grandfather of Chandragupta I may have been the person responsible for the construction of the monastery. Not only identification of the king Ci-li-Ki-to of I-tsing’s account, but even more the situation of Mi-li-kia-Si-Kia-po-no is a subject of keen controversy. Ganguli and Majumdar,* place this temple near
Murshidabad, while Chattopadhyaya's places in Maldah district of Bengal. Allan located it in Magadha. We suggested that the China Temple lay in eastern U. P. near Sarnath. The question of identification of the geographical position of the temple is interlinked with the question of the original kingdom of the Guptas. Accepting the identification of Śrī Gupta, the grandfather of Candra Gupta I with Śrī Gupta, the builder of the China Temple, we have suggested elsewhere that the original kingdom of the Guptas lay in eastern U. P., from Ayodhya eastwards. Goyel also has come to the same conclusion, as well.

Nothing definite can be said about the extent of the kingdom under Śrī Gupta. It is suggested that the territory from Ayodhya eastward including Prayāga and Sarnath might have been under him. Some scholars like Chattopadhyaya include Magadha in the original Gupta territory. Although from the time of Candra Gupta I there is no doubt that Magadha formed a part of the Gupta empire, there is no positive evidence to include it in the kingdom of the first Gupta king. Who were ruling in Magadha before the Gupta occupation is a controversial problem—the Śakas or the Licchavis or the Maukharis or Koṭa-dynasty or Sundarvarman's family? The oft-quoted Purānic verse referring to the rule of the Gupta really refers to the time of Candra Gupta I and not to that of his predecessors. Śrī Gupta, the grandfather of Chandra Gupta I may have flourished in the later half of the 3rd century A. D. Two seals one with the legend 'Guasaya', and the other with 'Śrī Guptaśya' may be ascribed to the first ruler of the dynasty. There is no evidence that he issued gold coins. Smith has shown that a gold and a silver coin attributed to him do not belong to him and there is no basis except Cunningham's statement that the latter possessed an (unpublished) coin of Śrī Gupta in his cabinet.
Śrī Gupta, however, has been given the title mahārāja in the Gupta records; though the mere use of this title can hardly be taken as such indication of feudatory status or rank, if one takes into account the independent kings of such important dynasties as Bhāraśivas, Vākāṭakas, Licchavis of Nepal and Maghas who are referred to merely as mahārāja. But the Gupta tradition, as rightly pointed out by Chattopadhyaya, is somewhat different inasmuch as in the official Gupta epigraphs the independent rulers are given the title mahārājādhirāja, whereas the subordinate ones are invariably referred to as mahārāja, and on this basis he suggests that early Gupta rulers were not independent potentates. They could be subordinate to the (Śaka) Muruṇḍas or to Maghas.

**GHAṬOTKACA**

The immediate successor of Śrī Gupta, according to the Allahabad Pillar Inscription, was Ghaṭotkaca. Ghaṭotkaca, however, is not to be confused with 'Ghaṭokaca Guptasya' of the Vaisālī seal, as suggested by Bloch on the basis of mere similarity of names. The difference between the two becomes clear enough if one takes into account that in none of the Gupta inscriptions Ghaṭotkaca, the son of mahārāja Śrī Gupta is mentioned with termination Gupta and further the royal title of mahārāja as ascribed to Ghaṭotkaca is hardly applied to Ghaṭotkaca Gupta of the Vaisālī seal. Besides, Vaisālī region did not form a part of the Gupta kingdom during Ghaṭotkaca's time. Ghaṭotkaca Gupta, the issuer of Vaisālī seal, has been called Kumārāmātya in the seal a fact which lends considerable weight to Dr. R. K. Mookerji's suggestion that he was a minister in attendance on prince Mahārāja Govinda Gupta, the son of Candra Gupta II, serving as viceroy at Vaisālī, when the above region actually formed part of his father's kingdom. And it is
not unlikely that he may have been the same person mentioned as governor of Eran in the Tumain inscription.

Interestingly enough, Ghaṭotkaca has been spoken of as the first Gupta ruler in the records of Vākāṭaka queen Prabhāvatī Guptā, and the Rewa record accords him the status of the founder of the dynasty. Although it is hard to explain as to how he came to be regarded as the founder of the Gupta house, especially in certain areas of the Deccan and Central India, but all the same these references, in a way, indicate that he was quite a prominent ruler in many respects. According to Altekar, he arranged the marriage between his son Candra Gupta and Kumāradevi, the Licchavi princess. It has been suggested that as Ghaṭotkaca arranged the marriage between Candra Gupta and Kumāradevi, which ensured the growth of the Gupta to imperial power, the Prabhāvatī Guptā’s inscription refers to him as the ādirāja, or the first king (founder) of the dynasty.

Ghaṭotkaca is not credited with issuing of any coins, though there is a solitary coin bearing the name Ghaṭo. This Ghaṭo (tkaca) may be identified with the son of brother of Kumāragupta I and the issuer of the Vaiśālī seal and the Tumain inscription. Suggestions have also been made to the effect that some of the gold coins of the early Gupta series with the name Kāca on the obverse be attributed to Ghaṭotkaca, but the epithet Sarvarājacchettā on the reverse of the coins, according to Dandeker, poses a serious obstacle.

Nothing definite is known about the extent of kingdom as well as the regnal period of Ghaṭotkaca, though Allan suggests that he must have been ruling between 300 and 320 A. D.

**CANDRA GUPTA I**

Ghaṭotkaca was followed by his son and successor Candra Gupta I. In the Allahabad Pillar Inscription,
Candra Gupta I is the first king of the imperial Gupta dynasty, who is referred to with higher imperial title of mahārājādhirāja, though the first two rulers have been described simply as mahārāja. The use of the above title, which seems to be deliberate, is generally regarded as indicative of higher political status or sovereign power of Candra Gupta I. It is difficult to agree with the suggestion that the title was not of much significance since it had been regularly used by the Kushānas. The significance of the use of the title mahārājādhirāja for Candra Gupta I in contrast to the title of mahārāja for his predecessors cannot be ignored.

The most significant event of Candra Gupta I's life is his marriage with the Licchavi princess Kumāradevī; and this event, he is said to have especially commemorated by issuing a series of coins having on the obverse the standing figures of Candra Gupta I and Kumāradevī, and on the reverse a figure of goddess Lakshmi with the legend Licchavayah. Proof of the union of Candra Gupta I with the Licchavi family is further provided by the fact that Samudra Gupta, the son of Candra Gupta I and Kumāradevī, is invariably referred to as Licchavi-dauhitra in the Guptan records. This is particularly of considerable significance emphasizing as it does the maternal connection in somewhat boastful terms, which is hardly made in case of any other ruler of the Gupta dynasty.

Various suggestions have been made as to the advantages, political or otherwise, that accrued as a result of this matrimonial relationship. According to V. A. Smith, the matrimonial alliance enhanced the political advance of the Guptas in as much as Candra Gupta I "succeeded to the power held by his wife's relations" and established his supremacy in Magadha and neighbouring territories. Smith is inclined to agree with Buhler that the Licchavi
royal family, which gave Candra Gupta his queen was lord of Pāṭaliputra. However, Smith also believed that Śrī Gupta and Ghaṭotkaca’s principality was in the neighbourhood of Pāṭaliputra. Smith further believed that Candra Gupta’s rise in status as mahārājādhirāja from that of a local chief was due to his Licchavi connection. The Licchavi rule over Pāṭaliputra can hardly be proved on the basis of some what tenuous reference in a Nepal epigraph and the drama Kaumudi-mahotsava. As to the view sometimes also mooted by Smith, that Candra Gupta I’s alliance was with the Licchavi house ruling in Nepal, of which the Vaiśālī Licchavis were probably a branch, it may be pointed out that the term Licchavayah on the coins obviously meant either the Licchavi people or the Licchavis having a republican constitutions, though the Licchavi house in Nepal, for all we know, had a monarchical constitution. Further, in the Allahabad record the kingdom of Nepal ruled over by Licchavis is mentioned as a subordinate state under Samudra Gupta which evidently implies, as Chattopadhyaya suggests, that he had no respect for the Licchavi royal house. Taking all this into account, it becomes difficult to say whether Kumāradevi belonged to the Licchavi royal house of Napal or some other kingdom, and is still more difficult to pin-point the region where the Licchavis ruled at this time. Dr. Majumdar, however, considers it more reasonable to suggest that the Licchavis at this time ruled somewhere in North Bihar in the region between Vaiśālī and Nepal and further regards it as most probable that the Guptas and Licchavis were ruling over two adjoining territories. The happy union brought about the unification of both the kingdoms, a point which serves to show that the matrimonial alliance was more important from a political rather then a racial point of view. Allan suggests that “the pride of the Guptas in their Licchavi blood was due to the ancient
lineage of the Licchavis," which in a way serves to emphasize that the Guptas were not of royal origin and the marriage alliance therefore was more valuable from a social than a political point of view. But the fact that the Licchavis have been referred to as Vrātya Kshatriyas in Manu Samhitā, does not show that they were accorded a higher position or status in society at this time. All the same, considering the fact that the Licchavis were a well known republican clan ever since the time of Gautama Buddha, the marriage alliance with that notable tribe, must have proved extremely valuable for the new kingdom both from political and social points of view. Allan is certainly right in observing that "it is evident from the pride with which it is mentioned by his successors that this union marked an epoch in the fortunes of the Gupta family".

Nothing definite is known about the circumstances leading to the marriage between Candra Gupta and Kumāradevi. Was it a result of the victory of Candra Gupta over the Licchavis who had to give their princess (daughter of the chief) in marriage to the victorious Candra Gupta? The facts that Candra Gupta and Kumāradevi are depicted on the coins in a very loving scene and that Samudra Gupta is proud of being the maternal grandson of the Licchavi go against the above supposition. It is certainly significant that in his and later official inscriptions Samudra Gupta is invariably referred to as Licchavi-dauhitra. This does suggest that the Licchavis not as a result of their defeat, but as powerful allies and relations helped in the rise of the Gupta power, and this conclusion is strengthened by the use of the epithet 'Licchavayaḥ' on the Candra Gupta-Kumāradevi type of coins. It is possible that aided by the powerful Licchavi allies Candra Gupta gained Magadha. In this context one may examine the story contained in the drama Kaumudi-
We are informed that Sundaravarman, belonging to the Magadha-kula was king of Magadha and he had an adopted son, Caṇḍa. Later Sundaravarman got a son born of his queen which appeared to dash the ambitions of Caṇḍa who had married a Licchavi princess, even when the Licchavis were enemical to Magadha rule. Helped by his Licchavi relatives he killed Sundaravarman at Pātaliputra and occupied Magadha. Sundaravarman’s son Kalyāṇavarman was taken away to Vindhyan forests, where under his guardian minister Mantragupta, he grew up and with the help of Surasena whose daughter had fallen in love with him, he occupied Pātaliputra. The Kaumudimahotsava was celebrated to mark the occasion. The name Caṇḍa and details of the story do not appear to agree with the epigraphic evidence about Candra Gupta as known from the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. While no absolute reliance can be placed on the drama it may somehow reflect the background of the tumultuous days leading to the rise of Candra Gupta and Samudra Gupta with the help of Licchavis. However, Chattopadhyaya regards it as ‘of little historical value, being a work of fancy’; while to Dandekar, Jayaswal’s conclusions, though ingenious are not at all convincing.

While there can be little doubt about the help of the Licchavis in the rise of the Gupta power, it is very speculative in the light of available evidence to reconstruct the circumstances leading to the marriage of Candra Gupta I, with Kumāradevi. We know that the Vākāṭaka emperor Pravarasena I who must have been contemporary of Ghaṭotkaca and Candra Gupta I had established his paramount position in the Deccan, and the Bhāraśiva Nāgas of Padmāvati had also by then developed into a big power in northern India. Bhavanāga married his daughter to Gautamiputra, son of Pravarasena I. In Rudrasena I, grandson of Pravarasena and daughter’s son of Bhavanāga,
the two powerful kingdom of the Vākāṭakas and the Nāgas of Padmāvatī could unite. The emergence of Vākāṭaka-Bhāraśiva united power must have alarmed the emerging Gupta power and the Licchavi kingdom and this might have made them to come close together by a matrimonial alliance between them. It has been suggested that the Gupta-Licchavi alliance may be taken as the consequence of the Vākāṭaka-Bhāraśiva entente."\(^b\) Allan suggests that the Purānic verses defining the Gupta kingdom refer to the reign of Candra Gupta.\(^a\) But among the Purānic verses, the amended form the verse in the Vāyu Purāṇa and the corresponding passage in the Vishṇu Purāṇa reveal somewhat variant reading. According to the Vāyu Purāṇa,\(^b\) "the kings born of the Gupta race will enjoy all these territories, namely, along with the Gaṅgā, Prayāga, Sāketa (Oudh) and the Magadha (S. Bihar); whereas it is stated in the Vishṇu Purāṇa that "the territory along the Gaṅgā (up to) Prayāga will be enjoyed by the people of Magadha and Guptas."\(^a\) Goyal\(^a\) has argued that as the particular verse in the Vishṇu Purāṇa seeks to distinguish the Guptas and the people of Magadha, so the two were joint rulers of Magadha and the territory between Magadha and Prayāga. He further identifies the people of Magadha with the Licchavis, and holds that Guptas were the sole rulers of the territory west of Magadha up to Prayāga, and thus he supports the view held by V. A. Smith that "at the time of this fateful union the Licchavis were masters or overlords of the ancient imperial city."\(^a\) The Purānic verses, as is well-known, are very corrupt. There is even a different version of the phrase anu-gaṅgā, such as anu-gaṅgam, and Sanskrit scholars have interpreted the relevant passage differently. Chattopadhyaya accepts anu-Gaṅgā, and holds that the passage in the Vāyu Purāṇa means that the Gupta ruled over Magadha and territory along the Gaṅgā extending up to northern West
Bengal, and agreeing with Raychaudhuri he says that Candra Gupta I conquered Kosala (Saketa) and Prayaga. But if the term anuganga at the beginning qualifies the entire sentence, then Saketa cannot be placed along the Gangâ. The term anugangam qualifying Prayaga alone may mean that the members of the Gupta race will enjoy Prayaga on the Gangâ, Saketa and also Magadha. This may suggest that Magadha came last in the dominion of the Guptas, that is in the time of Candra Gupta I. There is no evidence so far that Vaisali was included in his dominion. The corresponding passage in the Vishnu Purâna Anu-Gangâ Prayâgam Mâgadha Guptaś-ca bhokshyanti may yield to an interpretation different from that advanced by Goyal. The passage of the Vishnu Purâna does not say that the Guptas and the Mâgadhas were jointly ruling over the territory along the Gangâ up to Prayaga. The passage may mean that these two peoples (Mâgadhas and the Guptas) were ruling over the territories, may be independently of one another. In our opinion the passage indirectly refers to the time when Magadha was not under the Guptas. Who were ruling Magadha at that precise time as we have seen is not definitely known. R. D. Banerji thought that the Kushânas were ruling over Magadha before it came under Candra Gupta I and, in his opinion, he liberated Magadha by assuming the leadership of citizens of Pâtaliputra and the people against the hated Scythians rulers. The Licchavis rule over Magadha assumed by Smith and strongly supported by Goyal recently is based on the slenderest evidence of a late Nepalese inscription mentioning the birth of Supushpa of the Licchavi dynasty in Pâtaliputra, twenty-three generations before Jayadeva I, in the first century A.D. There is no evidence to prove that the Kushânas continued to rule over Magadha in the early 4th century A.D. According to Chattopadhyaya, Magadha was under the (Saka)
-Murundas. The Gupta kingdom under Candra Gupta I, at first extended, may be from Ayodhyā (Sāketa) in the north-west, to Prayāga, and Sarnath in the east, and Magadha may have been included as a result of the Licchavi help. The status of the Licchavi kingdom of Vaiśāli appears to be under the joint rule of Candra Gupta and Kumāradevi. Most probably with the growth of the power of Candra Gupta I, the Licchavi kingdom of Vaiśāli (north Bihar) must have come more and more under Candra Gupta’s influence. This may be corroborated by the Candra Gupta-Kumāradevi type of coins if believed to have been issued by Candra Gupta I. It may suggest that the Licchavi kingdom and the Licchavi ruling class had not yet completely lost their identity with the Guptas. However, Samudra Gupta, as the Licchavi dauiitra was legally entitled to the sovereignty over the Licchavi kingdom which by then must have formed a part of the Gupta empire. Pathak has rightly pointed out that ‘dauiitra’ in the epigraphs means putrika-putra, one of the 12 subsidiary sons with right of inheritance of maternal grandfather’s property. It is very likely that the Licchavi-chief, father of Kumāradevi died without a male issue, and his dominion naturally passed on to his dauiitra (putrika-putra), Samudra Gupta.

Candra Gupta I is also considered to be the founder of the famous Gupta era. Smith suggests that Candra Gupta I founded the Gupta era in 320 A. D. to commemorate his consecration or coronation, although he ascended the throne some time before 308 A. D. and probably married Kumāradevi in or about 308 A. D. Raychaudhary thinks that Candra Gupta I ascended the throne in 320 A. D., the initial date of the Gupta era and strengthened his position by matrimonial alliance at some stage of his career. The Gupta era, if therefore appears, was founded to commemo-
rate his accession or coronation, though it is also suggested that marriage was no less important an event for starting the Era. Although the basis of fixing the date of the Gupta era, on Al-Beruni’s testimony that the era was separated from the Śaka era by an interval of 240 years, is generally accepted, but as to the identity of the king with whom the era originated is still a matter of controversy. As a matter of fact, claims have been made in favour of Mahārāja Śri Gupta or even Samudra Gupta. All these theories deserve consideration.

Candra Gupta I is also the first Gupta king, nay the first Indian ruler, who is claimed to have issued gold coins. The coins bear on the obverse the names and figures of the king and queen and the legend Licchavayah on the reverse. Allan suggested that gold coins attributed to Candra Gupta I were commemorative medals issued by Samudra Gupta, but this view has been strongly controverted by Altekar and it is now generally accepted that Candra Gupta-Kumarādevi gold coins were issued by Candra Gupta I.

Another significant event of Candra Gupta I’s reign is the selection he made in favour of Samudra Gupta, which probably proved to be the biggest single factor in the interest of the Gupta dynasty.

Candra Gupta I successfully emerged as the ‘proof of promise’ for the Gupta empire. In a reasonably short period he had established the hegemony of the Guptas over the large part of the upper and central Gangetic Valley, including parts of U. P., east of Lucknow, including Ayodhya (Sāketa), Prayāga, Magadha and probably Vaiśāli. While, we do not subscribe to the view that on the basis of the Mehrauli Pillar Inscription Candra Gupta I should be believed to have ruled over territory extending from Vāhlika to Vaṅga, he certainly had succeeded in
laying the foundation of a rich, extensive and powerful kingdom. The annexation of Magadha including the rich mineral resources of Chota Nagpur must have supplied the economic and military base for the exploits of Samudra Gupta. Making the Gupta power dominant in the Gangetic Valley, he had succeeded in posing the greatest challenge to the Nāgas. The smaller kings of North India, of western U. P. and Bengal, under the circumstances, were only waiting for their nemesis at the hands of his successor Samudra Gupta. With the rise of the Gupta imperial power under Candra Gupta I, Magadha again began to play the key-role in the history of India after an interregnum of more than 400 years. With the rise of Magadha the fortunes and glory of India also rose to giddy heights. One cannot but quote R. D. Banerji—"Magadha rose after four centuries of slumber once more to take its place in the vanguard of national armies and its rise again brought independence, self-realisation and glory to the people of Northern India."  

KĀCA AND SAMUDRA GUPTA

Candra Gupta I. according to the Gupta records was succeeded by his son Samudra Gupta. Fortunately, there is a long pārāśasti of this king inscribed on an Aśokan Pillar at Allahabad, which gives a somewhat fuller and precise account of his reign. But the very fact that it is a panegyric composed and executed by his court official requires that the informations contained therein be treated with utmost caution for reconstructing the history of his reign. Still, as the main source of his history, the Allahabad pārāśasti, despite its laudatory character, remains the most comprehensive document. And what is still more significant is that we do not possess a record of this type in case of any other Indian ruler of ancient period save and except the Mauryan emperor Aśoka. As to the other source-
materials throwing light on his reign, the records inscribed on stone and copper, the incidental reference contained in Vāmana’s Kavyālākāra, the happy parallel provided by the Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa and a large number of gold coins issued by him are no less important and significant. According to the Allahabad Pillar Inscription, Samudra Gupta was especially selected by his father Candra Gupta I as the king, though the selection in preference to other princes is also indicated in the expression तत्पदा-पुरिग्ध्ता of Rīṭhapur Copper Plate Vākāṭaka Inscription. The Allahabad inscription, however, clearly suggests that the court (sabhā) was held in a tense atmosphere. The interpretation of the exact passage in the Allahabad prākṣati by Chabra, “Come, Come! Protect thou the whole earth”, almost points to a formal abdication in favour of his son. This interpretation according to Chattopadhyaya is supported by lines 13-14 of the Eran inscription. The declaration made in the open court was hailed by some but received by others of equal birth with melancholy faces. What could be the true explanation of the ‘tense atmosphere’ in the sabhā, and the virtual abdication of Candra Gupta I? Jayaswal argued that Candra Gupta I was ousted from Magadha by Kalyāṇavarman, and had escaped to the Licchavi country. “He was dying either of wounds or of broken heart on his expulsion from Pātaliputra (he) addressed Samudra Gupta, one of his younger sons, with the tears in his eyes, and with the tacit consent and approval of his Council of ministers—‘You now, my noble Sir, be the king (‘protect the kingdom’)) and expired.” According to the learned scholar, Samudra Gupta started his career in very unfortunate circumstances and was ruling over Sāketa only, (his Gayā Copper Plate is issued from Ayodhya), and Ayodhya became a favourite second capital of the Guptas. Samudra Gupta, according to the learned scholar, started his career as a feudatory ruler under the
Vākāṭakas and his Tiger-slayer coins with the title of rājā prove this. But there is no evidence at all to believe in Samudra Gupta’s feudatory status to the Vākāṭakas and Altekar has convincingly proved that the Tiger-slayer type of Samudra Gupta and the title ‘rājā’ do not at all indicate his subordinate status. However, if the story of the Kaumudmāhotsava is given slightest credence, it is possible to believe that the last days of Candra Gupta I were not happy, and his abdication in favour of Samudra Gupta (abdication is generally regarded an exceptional thing) was forced on him due to unfortunate circumstances. This may explain ‘tears in his eyes’, and the tense atmosphere in which the sabhā had met. There is no doubt that Candra Gupta loved Samudra Gupta most and was very happy in nominating him his successor (in the difficult circumstances). But another factor that may have also influenced the decision and the turn of events (as all important events are results of a complexity of factors) might have been the realisation of the trouble brewing in the Gupta court and imperial family. The displeasure felt by the princes has been rightly regarded by some as indicative of some dispute or trouble about succession, and the name of a king Kāca, known from a number of coins resembling closely to those of Samudra Gupta, lends credence to this view, King Kāca, it is suggested, was a brother or a half brother of Samudra Gupta, who headed the rebellion against him and declared his sovereignty as against Samudra Gupta by issuing gold coins.

The limited issuance of coinage and somewhat boastful titles in the legend of Kāca coins are mainly explained in terms of his short reign. It has been suggested that in the court of Candra Gupta I there were rival factions. The marriage of Candra Gupta I with the Licchavi princess might not have been popular with the
militant ruling class of Magadha, or more particularly of U.P., centre of orthodox Brahmanism. The Licchavis had no high social status, and their Buddhist leanings could not have been liked by the orthodox Brahmanical leading groups. Moreover Candra Gupta’s natural love and affection for his favourite queen Kumāradevī might have led to the Licchavi party becoming influential in imperial court and politics, and this must have been for the sake of power-politics, a matter of concern for the powerful orthodox faction. Samudra Gupta as the son of Licchavi Kumāradevī would not naturally be readily acceptable to the orthodox, militant brahmanical party. Candra Gupta in his old age, must have therefore felt concern about the developing situation, specially when he was positively in favour of Samudra Gupta. That may explain why he decided to summon the Sabha and not only announced his nomination of Samudra Gupta but actually got it implemented then and there by abdicating the throne and installing Samudra Gupta as sovereign protector of the realm. This he might have done to assure peaceful transfer of power to Samudra Gupta before the rival factions actually clashed. But the Allahabad Inscription shows that this did not appear to have fulfilled the expectation of the king Candra Gupta. Reading between the first few lines of the inscription appears to suggest that Samudra Gupta had to deal with dispute about his succession, and finally came out successful. This dispute may have occurred even in the life time of the abdicated king or soon after his death. The rival faction opposed to the Licchavi group might have supported Kāca against the Licchavi-dauhītra Samudra Gupta. The use of Cakrādhvaja and/or Garuḍadhvaja by Kāca on his coins was not only a declaration of his Vaishnava faith but also probably of the justification of the trust reposed in him by the orthodox Brahmanical faith. If he is identified with Bhasma, of the HHK, he is said
to be of low intelligence and wicked mind. Samudra Gupta's use of Garuḍa standard on his coins and performance of the āsvamedha sacrifice and declaration of his patronage of dharma and Brahmins was probably motivated by his sincere desire to assume the orthodox section of his bonafides.

It may be thus suggested that the disturbed conditions towards the closing years of the reign of Candra Gupta I could have been caused both by unfortunate political situation due to external cause (Kalyāṇavarman's occupation of Pāṭaliputra?) and by the group rivalry for power in the imperial court. This led to Candra Gupta's abdication and also the war of succession between Samudra Gupta and Kāca. Samudra Gupta being the Licchavi-dauhitra might have claimed to have better claim over the amalgamated kingdom of the Licchavi and the Guptas. Samudra Gupta according to Goyal issued Candra Gupta-Kumāradevi type of coins to emphasize his claims over the joint heritage of the Gupta and the Licchavis. However some deny the very existence of Kāca altogether and hold that Kāca was the original name of Samudra Gupta, and the name Samudra Gupta was taken up by him in allusion to his conquests, a point, Chattopadhyaaya suggests, is strengthened by the description of Samudra Gupta in the Bilsad stone pillar Inscription of Kumāra Gupta I (Sarvarājocchettuḥ .... caturudadhī-salilāsanaḥitayaḥaḥo......). The proposed identification is supposed to gather strength also on the basis of the expression sarvarājocchettu on Kāca coins and the epithet applied to Samudra Gupta alone in the Gupta records. And it may be pointed out that the legend bearing the boastful claims of king Kāca may favourably be compared with the description of Samudra Gupta as exterminator of many kings in the Allahabad Praśasti and similarity of Kāca coins of variety with the standard type of Samudra Gupta, and of the reverse designs or Kāca coins with those of āsvamedha and Tiger-slayer types of
Samudra Gupta have to be noted. It has been further argued that if Candra Gupta I abdicated in favour of Samudra Gupta there is hardly any scope for Kāca’s occupation of throne and Samudra Gupta becoming king after killing him. It has been however, rightly pointed out that the possibility of a rebellion by an elder brother of Samudra Gupta against him in the life time of the father can hardly be regarded as an impossibility in view of many examples in later Indian history. The existence of Kāca as a ruler separate from Samudra Gupta is established on numismatic grounds alone. Gokhale has tried to interpret the numismatic data to support his view. Altekar has discussed the coinage of Kāca in great detail, and after carefully comparing the Kāca coins with the coins of Samudra Gupta, he is inclined to reject the view that Kāca coins were issued by Samudra Gupta before he made his conquests. In his considered opinion Kāca was a ruler different from Samudra Gupta and in the contest of the find spots of Kāca coins, not far removed in time from him. Earlier, the learned scholar had believed that the numismatic evidence however suggests that the coins of Kāca are later than the standard archer types of Samudra Gupta. It was therefore proposed that Kāca may have intervened between Samudra Gupta and Candra Gupta II, and the learned scholar was at first disposed to agree with Bhandarkar that Kāca was Rāma Gupta of the Devcandraguptam and due to a clerical error Kāca was written as Rāma. But this view Altekar himself gives up in face of copper coins of Rāma Gupta found in east Malwa and he finds no instance in numismatic history, that the same king will issue coins in two names in two different metals. Nor would the same king issue gold coins in two names. The Gupta kings while have used different Virudhas on their coins they use only one personal name on the obverse under the arm. So could Kāca be an interloper who had
temporarily eclipsed the Gupta power and issued his coins during his ascendancy? One however finds it difficult to believe that the Gupta power was so completely eclipsed after the death of Candra Gupta I as to render the gold coinage of the interloper impossible. Banerji suggested that Kāca coins, if regarded as commemorative medals, were struck by Samudra Gupta in the memory of his brother Kāca, who lost his life in the war of independence. Banerji is probably referring to the alleged war of Candra Gupta against Scythian or Kushāṇa rulers of Pāṭaliputra. Altekar summarily rejects this idea on the ground that commemorative coins or medals are not, however, known to Hindu traditions. In our opinion the context of the presence of Kāca coins in the Gupta hoards and the typology and variety of the coins of Kāca certainly go to show that Kāca was a Gupta prince. He issued standard type of coins both with and without garuda-dhwaja. The fact that Kāca coins show on the reverse a remarkable variation (goddess standing to the left and holding flower in right hand) and on the obverse a wheel-standard does not necessarily mean that the striking motif on the coins of Kāca was not possible at the death of Candra Gupta I. Candra Gupta-Kumāradeva type of coins show remarkable variation and originality as contrasted with the standard type coins of Samudra Gupta but this has not precluded Dr. Altekar himself in regarding this type an earlier issue by his father. Kāca coins therefore may have been issued earlier than Samudra Gupta’s. Kāca may have assumed the title of ‘saṃrajrocchita’ not in relation to reality, but ‘rather as a hurried boast of an insecure contender contrived more to convey ambition than to recollect actual achievements. It is known that Samudra Gupta did not assume this title, and it was applied to him later by his descendants. That Kāca as a rival brother of Samudra Gupta must have contested the latter can be
easily explained in the light of reading between the lines of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription, which clearly hints at a disputed succession. According to Altekar's verse five of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription, 'probably referred to a war of succession'. Kāca could very well be a brother of Samudra Gupta who opposed the nomination of Samudra Gupta by Candra Gupta I, and the Ārya-Āṇju-Śrī-Mūla-Kalpa refers to a very short rule of (3 days) of Samudra's brother Bhasma, who might have disputed the succession. After nomination of Samudra Gupta by Candra Gupta I, Kāca might have raised the standard of revolt against the assumption of sovereignty by Samudra Gupta. Kāca might have succeeded to hold his own for a very brief period, Samudra Gupta soon overcame him and established his authority over the whole empire.

The Allahabad prāśasti refers to Samudra Gupta's impressive list of conquests achieved through a hundred battles which left scars all over his charming body. The list of conquests as given in the inscription serves as a pointer to the series of military campaigns undertaken by Samudra Gupta across the length and breadth of the country with a view to achieving the universal sovereignty in terms of the Vedic conception, of ekaratā, or cakravartin. It is however interesting to note that the whole of the Allahabad prāśasti especially dealing with the account of Samudra Gupta's conquests is regarded by some as description of events in terms of a chronological order by some giving the lists of different conquests only. A view lately advocated is more prone to a search for motivating factors or immediate causes of different campaigns. A more recent view is that "Harishena has merely grouped the various states, kings and peoples defeated or subjugated by his master in accordance with the four types of policies adopted towards them". In Samudra Gupta's impressive list
of conquests, reference is first made to his complete victory over Acyuta Nāgasena and probably Gaṇapatināga as well as over scion of the family of Koṭa (by army of Samudra Gupta), he was enjoying at a city called Pushpa. Acyuta has been identified as the ruler of Ahicchatra (modern Ramnagar in Bareily district) on the basis of the copper coins bearing the legend Acyu(ta). On the basis of similarity of his coin with some Nāga coins, he has been rightly taken to be a Nāga king. Nāgasena is regarded as belonging to a Nāga family ruling at Padmāvatī (Padam Pawaya near Narwar in old Gwalior state) as testified to by the Nāga coins and the incidental reference in Bāna’s Harshacarita. Allan has pointed that Gaṇapatināga was king of Padmāvatī, and Nāgasena was his contemporary (according to the Allahabad Pillar Inscription). Nāgasena who might have belonged to the Nāga family ruling at Padmāvatī, must have been a cousin or brother of Gaṇapatināga and was ruling over a separate area. Relying on the Kaumudmahotsava Jayaswal believes that Nāgasena was probably the son of Kṛtishena of Mathurā, father-in-law of Kalyāṇavarman, of Magadha and Pātaliputra. Altekar, while inclined to place Nāgasena as king of Padmāvatī, feels uncertain whether he was ruling at Padmāvatī, and the learned scholar observes that while coins of Gaṇapatināga are still common in Mathurā, marked coins of Nāgasena have not been found in the hoards of Nāga coins. According to the Scholar Gaṇapatināga very probably belonged to the Mathurā dynasty. However the Purāṇas refer to Nāgasena as ruling over Padmāvatī and Mathura. As to the king of Koṭa-Kula, the coins bearing the word Koṭa from Delhi and East Punjab areas have been attributed to him and the dynasty may have held sway in the upper Gangetic valley. Koṭa coins resemble the ‘Śruta coins’ attributed to a rule of Śrāvasti. Jayaswal thinks that the Koṭas were ruling in Pātaliputra and he identifies Koṭa-Kula with Magadha
Kula of the Kaumudimahotsava. Taking into account the location of these kingdoms, it has been suggested by Fleet and Majumdar that the city called Pushpa where he took pleasure after his military campaign, possibly points to Kānyakubja, also known as Pushpapura in ancient times. However Pushpapura also happened to be one of the ancient names of Pāṭaliputra. Although nothing definite can be said as to the possible connection of this city with Samudra Gupta’s victory over the three rulers, it has been suggested that Samudra Gupta had to face the combined attack of Acyuta, Nāgasena and others in his own capital city Pāṭaliputra, while some hold that Pāṭaliputra was taken by Samudra Gupta after defeating Koṭas who ruled over Pāṭaliputra. Some have tried to explain Samudra Gupta’s first campaign in North-India in terms of a war waged against immediate neighbours, who might have taken advantage of Samudra Gupta’s internal troubles caused by Kāca’s rebellion.

The first campaign in northern India, was followed by Samudra Gupta’s engagements in the south where he defeated a number of kings but reinstated them all in their respective kingdoms. In his military campaign to the Deccan Samudra Gupta must have been not only motivated by his desire to universal suzerainty of an Indian sakravartin, but to acquire a share in the vast accumulating riches of the Eastern coast kingdoms due to their extensive foreign trade with S. E. Asia and the Roman Empire. Among the kings of the south who bore the brunt of Samudra Gupta’s might and whose kingdoms could be identified are the Mahendra of Kośala (Raipur, Bilaspur and Sambalpur districts), Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntārā (Jeypore forest region of Orissa), Mahendragiri of Pīšṭapura (Pithapuram in Godāvari district), Hastivarman of Vengi (modern Peddavegi in the Ellore taluka of Godāvari district), Ugrasen of Palakka (Nellore
District), Vishnu Gopa of Kāncī (Conjeevaram in Chingleput district), Damana of Eraṇḍapalla (probably Eraṇḍapalli town near Chicacol in Vizagapatam district) and Kubera of Devarāśṭra (Yellamanchitaluka in Vizagapatam district), though the kingdoms of four other namely Mantrarāja of Kaurala, Svāmidatta of Kottura, Nilarāja of Avamukta and Dhanañjaya of Kusthalpura, cannot however be located with certainty. What lends particular interest to the southern expedition is the route followed by Samudra Gupta. It is held by some that Samudra Gupta after leaving the Yamunā valley passed through Jabalpur and Rewa regions and attacked the king of South Kośala, but such a view would imply Samudra Gupta’s encounter with the Āṭavikarājya before his southern campaign. The Āṭavika states, for all we know on the basis of the Allahabad record, were conquered by Samudra Gupta in the second Āryāvarta campaign. Jayaswal’s view, therefore appears to be more reasonable that Samudra Gupta passed through Sambalpur and Bilaspur and attacked the king of Kośala. Thereafter he moved to the forest tracts of Orissa and from there turned to the south-east and after conquering various kingdoms finally reached Kāncētpura. It has, however, been suggested that Samudra Gupta did not go far south, and he was met by a confederacy of kings headed by Vishnu Gopa of Kāncī and Hastivarman of Vengi and that he was obliged to relinquish his conquests and return rapidly to his own state. This view is hardly borne out by the inscription.

Samudragupta’s policy towards the Southern rulers has been likened to the procedure followed by Rāghu in the same region as described in the Raghuvamśam of Kālidāsa. Samudra Gupta may have adopted this policy keeping in view the difficulties involved in holding such distant regions under his direct control in the then existing
meagre communication facilities. But it has been suggested by Gokhale and Chattopadhyaya\(^{112}\) that the immediate provocation for the liberal policy may have been the threat of disturbance in the north. But possibly he was also guided by the principle of *dharma*\(^{113}\) according to which the defeated kings were to be restored to their kingdoms. Moreover in those days of undeveloped communication and particularly bad roads of the Deccan, referred to by Faïsien it would have been impossible to annex the distant kingdoms of the Deccan which throughout Indian history, have shown obdurate resistance to North Indian invasion or conquest. Samudra Gupta therefore thought it wise to be satisfied with the wealth that he could get from victories in the south and also some amount of recognition of his sovereignty which might have assured the Gupta empire of a share in foreign trade, and also facilities of communication with the neighbouring islands of S. E. Asia and Ceylon. However, it is to be noted that there is no corroborative evidence of Samudra Gupta’s Deccan *dignijaya* from any South Indian source-material.

Samudra Gupta, according to an interpretation of the Allahabad *Praasti*,\(^{114}\) in a (second) campaign in northern India after his expedition in Dakshiṇapatha, violently exterminated the nine kings of Aṟyāvarta. They are mentioned in the inscription as Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Candravarman, Gaṅapatī Nāga, Nāgasena, Acyuta, Nandi and Balavarman. Interestingly enough, Acyuta Nāgasena, and Gaṅapatināga (?) as discussed earlier have been referred to for the second time in the inscription. In the first instance they are referred to as having been uprooted now together with the other kings they are said to have been violently exterminated. It is difficult to differentiate between the meanings of the two words. If they mean the same thing then how they, once uprooted, could be
exterminated again. This does cast doubt on the supposition of actually two campaigns in the Aryavarta with interval of time, unless we hold that in first campaign they were uprooted from their kingdoms, and in second campaign they were killed, probably because they may have joined other hostile kings. Gaṇapati Nāga\(^{117}\) has been identified as the ruler belonging to the Nāga house of Padmāvatī (Padam Pawaya) on the basis of the coins found at Narvar and Besnagar. Coins of Gaṇapati Nāga have also been found at Mathurā which may point to his being a master of Mathurā as well. Majumdar and Altekar\(^{118}\) probably on this ground, appear to take him as a king of Mathurā family of the Nāgas. Since Mathurā was an important centre of trade and pilgrimage, it cannot be necessarily inferred from the mere finds of the coins that Gaṇapati Nāga was a ruler of Mathurā, although it is likely that his empire may have included Mathurā as well.\(^{119}\) According to Bhāva Sataka,\(^{119}\) Gaṇapati Nāga was an important ruler and was over lord of Dhārā (Malwa). He might have been the leader of revolt against Samudra Gupta but in view of the fact that it is a late text, its authenticity has been doubted.\(^{120}\) Candravarman may be identified with the king of the same name whose record has been found at Susunia in Bankura district of Bengal.\(^{121}\) He cannot be identified with the unknown king Candravarman of Pushkarna (Rajasthan) as suggested by Banerji\(^{122}\) and H. P. Shastri as scion of the Varman family of Mandasore. Chattopadhyaya thinks that like other kings of the list, Candravarman may also have ruled west of Allahabad.\(^{123}\) There is no reasonable ground as believed by Jayaswal\(^{124}\) to take this Candravarman to be a king of Jalandhara. Matila has been identified with the Mattila of the seal found in Bulandshahr,\(^{125}\) though Chattopadhyaya\(^{126}\) appears to agree with Allan\(^{127}\) that as it has no honorific title, it is a private seal and not of any royal personage. Raychaudhuri
states that there are many instances where princes have been mentioned without any honorific. Matila has been identified with a prince of the Kota family. He is also taken to belong to the Naga family. Rudrada has been identified by Dikshit, Jayaswal and others with Rudrasena I of the Vakataka dynasty but this identification seems to have been rejected by Altekar, Chattopadhyaya and others, mainly because the former was a king of Aryavarta and the latter of the Deccan. Chattopadhyaya is inclined to identify him with Rudrada whose coins have been found at Kosam. The fact that he is mentioned first among the Aryavarta kings lends an added significance. Rudrada must have been therefore an important enemy of Samudra Gupta. The proposed identification of Rudrada with a King of Kausambi by Chattopadhyaya is untenable because Prayaga was already included in the ancestral kingdom of Samudra Gupta, and could not have a ruling dynasty other than the Gupta at that time. Some have identified Rudrada with Sakya king Rudradaman II or his son Rudrasena III but this is most unlikely as there is no evidence of any part of the western Kshatrapa territory being annexed to the Gupta empire by Samudra Gupta. Goyal has recently supported the identification of Rudrada with Rudrasena I, the Vakataka king. He points out that Rudrasena I being mentioned as Bharasvada must have held some part of Bharasiva-Naga dominion, north of the Vindhyas, and so he could be included in the list of the kings of Aryavarta. His defeat by Samudra Gupta meant only loss of the central Indian territory of the Vakataka king Rudrasena I. Goyal points out that the description of Rudrasena as Rudrada is not a hurdle in the proposed identification. R. K. Mookerji also thinks that Rudrada Vakataka was defeated by Samudra Gupta and deprived of his territory between the
Jamunā and Vidiśā. In an inscription shows that Samudra Gupta annexed a part of Malwa from the Vākāṭakas. However, there is no adequate answer to Altekar’s query that if Rudrasena of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription was as great and important as being the ruler of a part of north India as well as the paramount ruler of the Deccan, he is mentioned without any special consideration with eight other much smaller kings, while the full imperial titles of the subordinate Kushāṇa kings are mentioned in the Allahabad prašasti. Moreover, with Gaṇapati Nāga and Nāgasena there is hardly any place for a Vākāṭaka king holding any part of the Nāga dominion in central India. Rudrasena I, Vākāṭaka as is known, could not inherit even the Vākāṭaka dominion undivided. The identification of Rudradeva is therefore uncertain. Nāgadatta and Nandin may have been Nāga rulers but nothing definite can be said about their kingdoms. Balavarman was identified as a king of Kāmarūpa. This is obviously wrong. Kāmarūpa is mentioned as a vassal state later in the inscription. Chattopadhyaya takes Balavarman to be a Nāga king. Jayaswal takes him to be the unnamed Koṭa ruler of Pāṭaliputra captured by Samudra Gupta’s army who is left unnamed in the inscription. Goyal thinks that he was a relation of Candravarman of Bengal, who might have led the revolt against Samudra and was worsted. But this is patently wrong. Both Balavarman and Chandravarman are mentioned in the same line and it is absurd that after Candravarman being violently exterminated and his kingdom annexed. Balavarman would be there to raise a standard of revolt. In the manner in which the kings are mentioned in the Allahabad inscription it is obvious that they ruled over separate kingdoms annexed by Samudra Gupta in course of his second war of Āryāvarta. What is particularly notable about Samudra Gupta’s campaign in Āryāvarta is that all the kings mentioned in the inscription
were violently exterminated, a point which goes to show that the kingdoms of the defeated rulers were annexed and administered directly by Samudra Gupta. Samudra Gupta ruled over a portion of Madhya Pradesh, a greater part of U. P. and north-western portion of Bengal. The immediate provocation for the first North Indian conquest, may be that Acyuta, Nāgasena, Gaṇapati Nāga and the Koṭa king alarmed at the rise of the Gupta power in the middle Gangetic Valley might have helped directly or indirectly Kāca against Samudra Gupta just to fish in troubled waters; and this made Samudra Gupta fall heavily on these powers of the upper Gangetic valley and Central India. After enjoying peace for some time he advanced into the Deccan, and his absence from northern India, encouraged the rulers, mostly of Nāga family, to rise against Samudra Gupta who therefore felt provoked enough to wage a total war of extermination and annexation against these. Taking into account the majority of the nine kings of Āryāvarta killed in the Āryāvarta war being of Nāga family, it has been rightly suggested that the Nāgas must have posed a serious threat to the Gupta power, which may probably have necessitated the war of extermination. The adoption of Garuḍadhvaja by Samudra Gupta may indirectly suggest the inherent enmity of the Guptas towards the Nāgas. Goyal also suggests without any basis that the Śaiva Nāgas and Vaishnava Guptas had religious cause of conflict also. Besides these immediate causes Samudra Gupta as a believer in orthodox Brahmanical political ideals of a Cakravartin was like a traditional Hindu conqueror always intent on conquest. His supreme mission to become dharanībandha (unifier of the earth) by his military power impelled him to wage wars. Samudra Gupta believing himself to be superior in strength to his prospective enemies following Kauṭīlyya’s dictum decided to wage
war. With parts of Bengal, whole of Bihar and Eastern U. P., under him, his military campaigns were naturally directed to the upper Jamuna-Gangetic valley and lower Gangetic valley. His attention was directed towards the west because of the entrenched position of the Nāga ruling families, some of whom were allied with the powerful Vākāṭakas. It has been well observed, "Therefore in any scheme of the Gupta expansion the first stage was to be dominated by the struggle against the Nāgas." While his victory over the Nāgas gave him absolute power over the reaches of the Jamnā and the Gāṅgā, his victory over Candravarman gave him large parts of Bengal. Kāmarūpa and Samatāṭa, as we shall see, were frontier vassal kingdoms. It has been often demonstrated in the history of India, that any power worth the name, ruling in central or upper Gangetic valley has naturally felt impelled by geographical advantage of extensive undulating plain and by strategic necessity of protecting his dominion in the open land-mass from all sides to bring the entire Doab and the Gangetic valley under one political authority. Samudra Gupta did the same what Bimbisāra, Ajātaśatru, Mahāpadma Nanda and Candragupta Maurya did before, and Isānavarman and Śarvavarman, Harshavar- dhana and Śaśāṅka, Mihirabhūja, Mahendrapāla and Dharmapāla did later. Goyal has rightly suggested that economic advantages, mainly, trade and consideration of control of inland and oversea trade routes also might have indirectly exerted some influence over Samudra Gupta's planning of conquest of the Gangetic Valley including Bengal. His conquest of Eastern Malwa (Eran), might have been influenced by his desire to round off his territory vis-a-vis that of the Vākāṭakas and to keep watch on the forest tracts of Bundelkhand and Malwa. Jayaswal and Goyal have argued at great length in favour of Samudra Gupta's war against the Vākāṭakas in the field of Eran.
However, as we have seen, Rudradeva of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription cannot be identified with Rudrasena I the Vākāṭaka king with any certainty. More firm evidence would be required to believe in Samudra Gupta's victory over the Vākāṭakas.

All these impressive victories raised the prestige and power of Samudra Gupta and his reputation as a powerful ruler and conqueror reached distant corners. It is no wonder, therefore, that the frontier rulers and even tribal republics were anxious to accept feudatory status by paying all kinds of taxes and even personal obeisance to Samudra Gupta. The five kingdoms which offered subservience were Samataṭa, Ḍavāka, Kāmarūpa, Nepal and Kārtṛpura. Samataṭa,138 Kāmarūpa and Nepal are regarded as corresponding to south-east Bengal, Assam and modern Nepal, Ḍavāka is identified with modern Dabok in Nowgong district of Assam139 and Kārtṛpura according to some has been identified with Kartarpur in Jalandhar district, or the region comprising the Katuriaraj of Kumaon Garhwal and Rohilkhand.140 Among the tribal republics, the Mālavas140 are regarded as occupying the territory around Mewar, Tonk and Kotah in eastern Rajasthan, the Yaudheyas141 on the banks of the Sutlej near the borders of Bhawalpur State; the Madrakas141 between the Ravi and the Chinab with the capital at Śākala (Sialkot) and the Ārjunāyanas,141 although not identified with certainty, are placed near Jaipur. The other tribal republics namely Śāṅkānikas,141 have been placed around Bhilsa, the Ābhīras14a between Bhilsa and Jhansi but according to Banerji14a and Jayaswal in western India. The areas of the remaining three republics cannot be identified with certainty but they could not have been far away from Bhilsa area. It can be said that subordinate republics existed in southern Punjab and northern Rajputana.
Jayaswal\textsuperscript{146} rightly points out these republics were made autonomous states, and had become parts of the Gupta empire by agreeing to pay all kinds of imperial taxes and obeying imperial orders. According to the learned scholar "the Gupta power struck the republican system in Rajputana, though the Guptas however rose to imperial position by their alliance with the Licchavis".\textsuperscript{145} The inscription does not refer to the destruction and consequent merger of the republics. They might have continued to exist as republics enjoying subordinate status. But there is no doubt that loss of status, and prestige, and the proof of their weakness against a monarchical expansionist imperialism, as in 5th-4th century B.C., almost fatally affected the republics. It is of some significance that "Malava tribal coinage suddenly comes to an end at the end of the 4th century," and so also the Yaudheya coins.\textsuperscript{146} The campaign against the tribal republics in the north west was of great consequence in as much as these republican states could no longer act as buffer for the Ganga valley against possible foreign invasion. This is at least testified to by the easy march of the Hunas through the north west during the time of the later imperial Guptas. The independence-loving republics had tired out Alexander's army and had contributed later to the break up of the foreign Kushana empire. After Samudra Gupta they were no longer there to act as shock absorbers and to offer stubborn resistance to the Hunas, who thus could attack the Gupta empire directly.

The Allahabad \textit{pra\r{s}asti} then refers to another category of rulers who are described as Devaputra Shahi-Shahana-shahi,\textsuperscript{147} Saka-Muru\r{u}\rn{a}, Sinhala and inhabitants of (other) islands. There is a distinct reference to the homage performed by these states by personal attendance in court, offering daughters in marriage, seeking permission for the
possession of a royal Charter with Garuḍa (imperial Gupta) seal for the enjoyment of their territories. Majumdar, however, suggests that one cannot say whether such an attitude of subservience by the powers mentioned above was due to a military defeat or to a mere diplomatic move to avoid a worse fate. But the Kushāṇa types of coins with the name Samudra Gupta and Candra and the use of the Gupta type of coins by the Scythian rulers in the west, do serve as a pointer to the over all suzerainty exercised by the Gupta emperors over these kingdoms. The identification of the rulers is not without difficulty. Jayaswal regards the territories under Devaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi as compressing the Mleccha state consisting of the Valley of the Indus and the Candrabhāgā, Kashmir and Kaunti (Cutch) as depicted in the Vishṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas. In his opinion the words 'Devaputra' and Shāhi added to Shāhānushāhi were just to distinguish the Kushāṇa ruler with the Sasanian emperor whose title was Shāhānushāhi. The Kushāṇas at that time were in close alliance with the Sasanians, and had issued Kusano-Sasanian coins with the title Shao-Nano-Shao in Afghanistan. However the Kushāṇa ruler of the Indian territory without depending on the Sasanian support thought it wise to accept Samudra Gupta’s overlordship to avoid possible annexation of their (Mleccha) state. According to Jayaswal, the personal submission of the Kushāṇa Shāhānushāhi naturally prevented Samudra Gupta from pursuing a policy of aggression. According to Chattopadhyaaya and Mookerji the Kushāṇa contemporary of Samudra Gupta was Grumbates the king of Chionate. McGovern regards the Chionate as ‘a group of the Huns’. Smith identified the Shāhānushāhi with Shapur II of Persia, or the king of Kushāṇas on the Oxus. Allan regards him as king of Kabul, “the Kushāṇa king whose kingdom stretched from the Indian borders to the Oxus”, as, “there is no evidence of inter-
course between the Gupta and the Sasanian empires at this time.” Daivaputra-Shahi-Shahānushahi is now taken to mean not three separate entities as believed by Fleet, Allan and Aiyanger, but one entity. Goyal thinks that the compound means two entities, Daivaputra-Shahi, and Shahānushahi. However at the present state of our knowledge nothing definite can be said. According to Goyal Daivaputra Shahi was Kidāra the Kushāna chief, who had defied the Sasanian overlordship and set up an independent kingdom in Peshawar region. Samudra Gupta might have helped him and in turn Kidāra might have sent him presents and acknowledged the former’s help, which the scribe of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription easily interpreted as proofs of subordinate status. McGovern thinks that Kidāra fled from Bactria due to the Ephthalite pressure and succeeded in carving out a new kingdom for himself in the northwest India. Martin has proved that Kidāra flourished in the middle of the 4th century A.D. (JRASB XLVII (NS) pp. 23 ff), and so can very well be a contemporary of Samudra Gupta, a possibility not accepted by Smith and Allan before, because they believed with Cunningham that Kidāra flourished in the 5th century A.D. Kidāra may have settled down in Gandhāra by 356 A.D., and for a time may have recognised Shapur II’s sovereignty, but later, between 359 and 369 A.D. because independent of the Sasanian control, probably with the help of Samudra Gupta. It has been suggested that Devaputra-Shahi was Kidāra Kushāna king of Gandhāra, and Shahānushahi was the Sasanian Emperor Shapur II, who was defeated by Kidāra more than once, and so Harishena may have taken the Iranian emperor to be his masters vassal. Saka-Muruşdas refer to the Scythian-Kushāna kings of the central Punjab such as the Shiladas and the Gadaharas who accepted Gupta suzerainty. In our opinion, Saka-
Murundas should not be taken to refer to Western Kshatrapas who came into conflict with the Guptas in the time of Candra Gupta II. Samudra Gupta probably aware of the Ephthalite conquest of Bactria and their mounting pressure also welcomed the offer of submission with a view to win the friendship of the Kidara Kushanas and Saka rulers of the Punjab, both with a view to have an extended friendly line of defence and also for having some share in the profits from the great commercial route to China and Rome. However the non-annexation of these territories, as will be shown later, did not prevent the barbarian floods of invasion. As to the inclusion of Sinhala and other islands in the same category of vassal states, it may be pointed out that we cannot be sure about the type of relationship as mentioned in the Praasasti, unless it is supported by positive evidence as in case of the Scythian rulers. According to a Chinese text,** Ceylon under king Meghavarna had sent a mission to Samudra Gupta and had sought the permission of the king to build a monastery and rest-house for the benefit of the pilgrims from Ceylon. But this could hardly be termed as a tribute. The inhabitants of 'islands' may refer to Andamans or Maldives or countries of South-East Asia, which by this time had developed into large Indian kingdoms with extensive contacts with India. Samudra Gupta might have shown greater interest in this area because of great economic advantages. The extension of maritime trade of India with China and S.E. Asia in the Gupta period might be explained by some special relationship that existed between the Gupta empire and the S.E. Asian kingdoms, established by Indian immigrant families. It is not necessary to believe that Ceylon and all other islands were reduced to vassal status and sent their daughters to imperial court, personally attended the imperial court and ruled their territories under authority of the imperial seal.
It only means that these countries had relationship with Samudra Gupta, some might have visited him, some might have entered into matrimonial alliance as well, to which Harishena makes a vague reference. However it would need more firm evidence, than available, to hold that "the inscription is not a vague record of accidental visits from Ceylon and other islands, but is a record of the results of a conscious imperial policy".\(^{160a}\) R. C. Majumdar’s observation "The reference to the homage paid by the peoples of these islands cannot therefore be dismissed as mere rhetoric, but may be based on, actual relationship the exact nature of which cannot be determined (Classical Age p. 11), appears to be more acceptable. On the basis of the occurrence of the epethet Dhanada varunendranlakasacae in the Allahabad Inscription, Raychaudhuri suggests, some control over the islands in the neighbouring seas (PHAI. p. 547, note 1) by Samudra Gupta.

Being a vigorous follower of Brahmanical way of life, it was natural for a great conqueror like Samudra Gupta to perform a horse-sacrifice, which happened some time after the Allahabad Pillar Inscription was engraved, as it is not mentioned in it Samudra Gupta's aśvamedha type of memorial coins were issued on that occasion. It is true that the horse-sacrifice by Samudra Gupta was not an event after a long interval.\(^{150b}\) It has been suggested by Pathak\(^{150e}\) that 'cirotsanna' meant 'elaborate' and not that was long in abeyance. According to the Poona plates of Prabhāvati Gupta,\(^{150d}\) Samudra Gupta was the performer of many horse sacrifices (anekāśvamedhayājī). Chatto-padhyaya sees its corroboration in two different legends on the obverse of the two aśvamedha types coins.\(^{150b}\)

Samudra Gupta is credited with the issue of gold coins of as many as of five types. The coin types include, the Standard type, Archer type, Battle-axe type, Tiger type,
Lyrist type and Asvamedha type. The standard type is the most common of Samudra Guptas coins representing almost a close copy of the Kushâna type. But the Archer and Battle-axe types show a clear advance in the process of Indianization. Among the five types of coins, the three types reveal him in a military garb when he is shown fully dressed holding a bow and arrow or a battle axe or depicted as trampling on a tiger.

Samudra Gupta is decidedly one of the most forceful personalities in early Indian History. He was a great conqueror, and brought about large parts of North India under his direct control. A still more extensive parts of north and south India acknowledged his sovereignty. We do not know of any military defeat suffered by him and the title ‘Indian Napoleon’ appreciatingly suggested by Smith, really does not fit him, as Napoleon suffered defeats and ended his life in misery. Samudra Gupta’s versatility is proved by the fact that besides being a successful soldier and a courageous hunter as clear from coins, legends and inscriptions, he was a musician, a poet and a patron of letters. He maintained relations with countries like Ceylon and other islands. He bequeathed to the posterity not only the promise but the actual outlines of the Gupta political eminence and cultural excellence. It is in this sense that he may be regarded as real builder of the Gupta Empire and civilisation, the foundations of which were laid by Candra Gupta I. Samudra Gupta injected the infectious virus of vigour in his successors and his assumption of the titles of Parâkrama and later Vikrama shows that hence forth vigour and prowess were to be the imperial creed. It has been well observed that Samudra Gupta “was a visible embodiment of the physical and intellectual vigour of the coming age which was largely his own creation. After the death of Candra Gupta Maurya and Aśoka, almost after more than 500 years, we have an
Indian king inspired by the ideal of an all India empire and wedded to the full realisation of the Hindu way of life. The national regeneration movement heralded by the war of independence against the Greco-Parthian and Śaka-Kushāna rule for centuries, was given a tremendous leap forward and almost reached its desired end during his epoch-making reign. Freedom (from foreign rule), Peace (religious toleration and good administration) and Progress (of civilization in all aspects) became henceforth the keynote of Indian history under the Guptas.

Samudra Gupta's eventful and long reign came to close sometime before 375 A.D. We know it for certain on the basis of the Mathurā Pillar Inscription that Candra-Gupta II came to throne in 375 A.D.

HISTORICITY OF RĀMA GUPTA

According to the Gupta epigraphs\textsuperscript{151}, Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Candra Gupta II as his successor. On the testimony of the play the Devi-Candraguptam, it is suggested that Rāma Gupta succeeded Samudra Gupta. Unfortunately the above work, written by one Viśākhadatta\textsuperscript{152}, is now lost; but a few passages from it quoted in the Nātyadarpaṇa give out, as follows, the events following the death of Samudra Gupta. According to the story of the drama, Rāma Gupta, was so worsted in a battle against the Śakas that he agreed to surrender his queen Dhruvadevi to the Śaka chief. This enraged his younger brother Candra Gupta and in order to save the honour of his brother's wife, he went in the guise of the queen Dhruvadevi to the Śaka king and finally killed the king. Incidentally, the disguise forms the essential part of the incident and possibly lends the name Devi-Candraguptam to the play. Candra Gupta's action, it is suggested, must have been hailed by his people and more particularly by
the queen Dhruvadevi, who according to the story, had developed a feeling of disgust for her husband on account of his cowardice. Possibly this must have caused some estrangement between the two brothers, and the story that Candra Gupta had to feign madness in order to save himself lends credence to this view. Candra Gupta, according to the story of the drama, finally succeeded in killing his brother Rāma Gupta, ascended the throne, and married Dhruvadevi.

Taking into account the above evidence as deduced from the passages of the play Devī-Candraguptam, the scattered references in the literary texts and inscriptions of later period as well as the copper coins of a king Rāma Gupta from Bhilsa region, some scholars have tried to establish the historicity of Rāma Gupta, as a possible Gupta king between Samudra Gupta and Candra Gupta II.

We may pause to discuss the subject—historicity of Rāma Gupta. The story of the play Devī Candraguptam gains an added significance and colour on account of the name of the queen Dhruvadevi, a name also borne by the queen of Candra Gupta II in the Gupta epigraphs, and the fact of Candra Gupta II’s campaign against the Śakas. Bāna’s Harsha Carita refers to Candra Gupta having killed the Śaka king lustful for another’s wife in the disguise of a female. Rājaśekhara’s Kāvyamimāṃsa refers in a verse to the surrender of Dhruvasvāminī. An Arabic work translated into Persian in 1226 A. D. and christened as Majmalut-Tawarikh narrates the story of Rawal and Barkamaris, wherein Rawal faced with the invasion of his kingdom agreed to surrender his wife, but Barkamaris in the disguise of a female killed the enemy-king. Rawal has been identified with Rāma Gupta and Barkamaris with Vikramāditya Candra Gupta. The story also discloses another additional
information that Dhruvadevi was betrothed to Candra Gupta first and she was married to his elder brother much against her wish. Of the three Rāṣṭrakūṭa epigraphs, one refers to the donor of Gupta lineage, who after killing his brother, seized his kingdom and wife; whereas the other two refer to one Śahasāṅka who killed his brother and married his widow. But there is not any reference whatsoever about the Śaka-king in the above accounts. Among the literary sources discussed alone, Bāṇa’s Harshacarita is the earliest record and this work mainly highlights the two obvious facts; namely the killing of the Śaka chief in his own city by Candra Gupta in the disguise of a female and Śaka chief’s lust for another’s wife. Bāṇa does not mention Rāma Gupta or Dhruvadevi. However Śāṅkara the commentator of the Harshacarita gives the added information that the female in whose disguise Candra Gupta entered the enemy’s camp was Dhruvadevi, the wife of his brother Rāma Gupta.

Placing together these incidental literary and epigraphic evidences, mutually non-corroborative scholars have sought to buttress the story given in the Devī-Candra-guptam and Majmalū-t-Tawarikh and hold that the story on the whole is based on historical incidents. However many scholars such as H. C. Raychaudhuri and R. C. Majumdar do not believe in the theory of historicity of Rāma Gupta. Numerous objections against the theory have been advanced. Rāma Gupta is not known from any Gupta inscription. No seal or gold coin of Rāma Gupta has been found so far. The absolute lack of a single coin of Rāma Gupta in the Bāṇa Hoard, which had coins of even, Kāca points to the extreme unlikeness of Rāma Gupta being an imperial Gupta ruler; almost all Gupta kings who ruled even for a very short time e.g. Ghatotkaca, issued gold coins. It is argued that it is hard to believe that the immediate succe-
ssor of the great Samudra Gupta would be reduced to such a pitiable condition as to agree to surrender his wife to the Śaka enemy. The story of the Devī Candraguptam is not corroborated, as shown above, in main details from other literary and epigraphic evidences. No absolute reliance can be placed on such late authors like Viśäkhadatta and the author of Majamalu-t-Tawarikh. It is no doubt true that copper coins of a Rāma Gupta have been found in Eran, but they cannot be definitely ascribed to a Gupta king of this name. It is also pointed out that Candra Gupta, the patron of Hindu culture, could not be expected to murder his brother and marry his widow. Widow re-marriage was denounced in society. If Candra Gupta was selected by his father to succeed him (tatparigṛhīta), then Rāma Gupta must have seized the throne and then Candra Gupta must have opposed and Rāma Gupta must have been defeated.

These objections have not silenced the protagonists of the theory. Many arguments in favour of the historicity of Rāma Gupta continue to be advanced. Śaka opposition to Gupta imperialism was not completely routed by Samudra Gupta. While Samudra Gupta had received the homage of Śaka-Muruṇḍas (of the north), it is not impossible that they or the Western Kṣatrapas had exhibited hostile posture immediately after his death, and Rāma Gupta might have been cornered by the Śaka King. According to Banerji,103a, he may be identified with the successor of the Great Kushāna king Gupta (AIG. p. 30). It is also likely that the plan of world conquest by Candra Gupta II might have partly received its urgency due to immediate past incident, relating to the Śakas. Though the Harshacarita does not refer to Rāma Gupta or Dhruvadevi, the reference to the killing of the Śaka chief lustful of other's wife by Candra Gupta in the disguise of a woman certainly indirectly supports the story made explicit by its commentator Śaṅkara. It is clear that when Candra
Gupta disguised as a female killed the Saka king, the former could not have been on the Gupta throne. He could only have been a prince. The Harshacarita is a historical biography and there is no reason to deny totally the truth of the incident which happened less than three centuries ago. The Candra Gupta in female disguise could enter (easily) the Saka camp that strengthens the suspicion that a woman of high status was being expected by the Saka king. This indirectly again, purports to support the story that Dhruvadevi (queen was being expected, and Candra Gupta (the prince?) could pass on as a queen probably because of his beauty and young age. Marrying a widow of the dead brother was not as much a taboo in very ancient times as to-day. The Vedas refer to the younger brother being taken as her second husband by the widow. Banerji suggests that widow re-marriages were prohibited later than the 5th century A.D by Parasara and Narada. There is no reason to regard the reference to the tradition of murdering his brother and taking his widow as queen by Sahasanka (Candra Gupta II), as recorded in the Rashtrakuta inscriptions, as unbelievable. For royalty and women, things more undesirable have occurred in the dynastic history of many ruling families in ancient or medieval India. The non-availability of gold coins of Rama Gupta certainly poses a serious obstacle. But it is not beyond the realm of possibility that one or two coins of his could have been melted away before the Bayana Hoard could be salvaged. Of course it would be a fortuitous concidence. Moreover, no gold coin can be indisputably attributed to Pura Gupta who is known by Gupta inscription as an imperial sovereign. Now a fairly large number of copper coins with lion or Garuda emblems strengthens the hypothesis that the issuer Rama Gu(pta) was an imperial Gupta king. There is no reason to disbelieve the possibility that he might have originated the
issue of copper coins on the basis of copper coins prevalent in the region from before. K. D. Bajpayi after carefully examining all the issues involved in the discussion of Rāma Gupta’s coins, observes in one of his latest statements on the subject: “In view of a very large number of coins of several types bearing the name of this ruler in the early Gupta Brāhmī characters, and also taking into consideration the stratified evidence of coins at Eran, there does not appear any doubt now in the historicity of Rāma Gupta whom I have identified with the elder brother of Candra Gupta I.” Earlier Altekar, after discussing the possibility of these copper coins of Rāma Gupta of being of local Mālava rulers or the Nāgas, concluded “We can identify Rāma Gupta of these copper coins with the elder brother of Candra Gupta II mentioned in the Devī-Candra-guptam”. The plausibility becomes a near certainty when we take into account the discovery of three inscribed Jaina images dedicated in the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Rāma Gupta. It becomes impossible to believe in any non-Gupta imperial ruler in eastern Malwa in this period. Rāma Gupta appears to have become king with full imperial titles after Samudra Gupta and certainly controlled eastern Malwa region.

All this does suggest the plausibility of the main theme of the story. Viśākhadatta, the author of the drama, is the author of the Mudrārākṣasa also. While the details of the later drama cannot be vouchsafed as truely historical, there is no doubt about actual historical background—Kauṭilya, Candra Gupta, Nanda his ministers being involved in the political revolution. In the same context all the details of the drama Devī-candra-guptam need not be accepted as true. If Kumāra Candra Gupta of the Nālandā inscription of Samudra Gupta is to be identified with Candra Gupta II, then it would be difficult to believe in Candra
Gupta being so young in age when Rāma Gupta was on the throne, as to be able to pass as a young lady in the guise of Dhruvasvāmint. However the genuineness of the record and the interpretation of its date is highly debatable. It is possible to believe that Rāma Gupta had ascended the throne immediately after the death of Samudra Gupta to the utter chagrin of Candra Gupta, who took himself as the favourite of his father. Rāma Gupta’s misfortune and unseemly conduct helped Candra Gupta to occupy the throne and win the affection of his brother’s widow. Some significance has to be attached to the use of the word ‘tatparīghtta’ about Candra Gupta II, in relation to his father Samudra Gupta; the phrase appears in the Mathūrā stone inscription of Candra Gupta II and in the Bhitari Stone-pillar inscription of Skanda Gupta. This has been followed in the Bihar stone pillar inscription of Puru-Gupta. It may be that Candra Gupta might have been chosen by Samudra Gupta for succession, but his elder brother Rāma Gupta not only occupied the throne but also married the betrothed lady of Candra Gupta.

Candra Gupta II’s unique Cakra-Vikrama type of coins showing him as a special favourite of Vishnū and receiving from Vishnū a directly three-fold royal power might have been issued, to impress on the populace of his being chosen favourite of the titular deity of the family, and to persuade them to ignore the manner of his becoming king after disposing off his elder brother.

It is also possible that Samudra Gupta had appointed Rāma Gupta as the governor of East Malwa. Samudra Gupta might have selected Candra Gupta to succeed him (tatparīghtta), but Rāma Gupta ignored the selection, declared himself emperor in Airikena. However, he was soon involved in war against the Sakas and subsequent
misfortunes. So he might not have found time to issue gold coins or rule from Pātaliputra. That may explain why his copper coins are taken to belong to a local ruler of Malwa, where actually Rāma Gupta ruled and lived. The author of Devi-candraguptam takes him to be the Emperor of the Gupta Empire and points the hero Candra Gupta as a mere prince. But in actual practice Candra Gupta II was the selected successor of Samudra Gupta and Rāma Gupta was an usurper, and his rule in practice was confined to Eastern Malwa. After the conquest of Malwa, by Samudra Gupta a clash between the Gupta and the Western Kshatrapa was inevitable and imminent. Rāma Gupta might have taken the offensive or was attacked in his hill-fort by the Śakas with the result as broadly indicated in the drama. Candra Gupta II restored Gupta prestige, killed Rāma Gupta and made Dhruvadevi his chief queen.

However, the historicity of Rāma Gupta cannot be said to have been proved. This has to wait until gold coins of Rāma Gupta (Budha Gupta’s gold coins were discovered recently), and any inscription of Rāma Gupta about his being a member of the imperial Gupta family have been discovered. Moreover the name is referred to as Rāma, or Sarma Gupta in different sources. Chattopadhyaya observes, “In fact earliest record on the subject is the Harshacarita which gives us two facts, that the Śaka king was possessed of lust for another’s wife and that Candra Gupta killed him in the guise of a female. Later on, details were added to the story.” But the story is not without some element of probability. Not long ago Budha Gupta was considered a local king of Eastern Malwa.

CANDRA GUPTA II

Of the many sons and grandsons of Samudra Gupta, Candra Gupta II, also called Devarāja, Devagupta, and Deva-Sri, came to the throne in 375 A.D. The
Mathura stone-pillar Inscription\textsuperscript{14} is particularly significant because it is actually the first dated record mentioning the year 61 of the Gupta era, which, on Alberuni’s testimony\textsuperscript{15}, corresponds to 380 A.D. And the regnal year given out therein, although read prathame by some and pañcame by others, would place the date of accession of Candra Gupta II either in 380 A.D. or 375 A.D. The latter reading, however, is now regarded as more probable. The above record also reveals the use of titles bhūṭāraka and mahārājārajādhērāja, though the latter title appears to be an exact replica of the Kushāna title of mahārāja rājātirāja borne by the Kushāna kings, a point which led Bhandarkar\textsuperscript{16} to suggest that the Mathurā region was probably wrested from the Kushānas during the reign of Candra Gupta II. But we know it on the definite evidence of the Allahabad praśasti that the Nāga kings were defeated by Samudra Gupta and the provenance of one of them known on the basis of coins from Mathurā regions would at least point to the presence of Nāgas and not Kushānas in the Mathurā area during the time of the Guptas. There is little doubt that Mathurā region form a part of Samudra Gupta’s empire.

It appears, however, that the Nāgas were still a force to be reckoned with and it may not be without reason that Candra Gupta II entered into a matrimonial alliance with a Nāga-House by marrying one Kuberaṇāgā, a princess of Nāga lineage (Nāga-kulasambhūtā).\textsuperscript{17} Candra Gupta may have married Kuberaṇāgā soon after his accession in 375 A.D., as her daughter Prabhāvati Guptā\textsuperscript{18} was married to Vākaṭaka prince Rudrasena II before 395 A.D. It is possible that with a view to strengthen friendly relations with the Vākaṭakas, who could not have been certainly pleased with Samudra Gupta’s war of annihilation against their Nāga relatives and his march into the Deccan,
Candra Gupta might have sought to soften the Vākāṭaka aggrieved feelings by his marriage with a Nāga princess who might have belonged to the Bhavanāga family related to the Vākāṭakas. And what is still more significant that he gave his daughter named Prabhāvati Gupta born of the Nāga queen, in marriage to the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II. These marriage alliances must have been forged with some definite end in view and more especially the matrimonial relationship with the Vākāṭakas, who according to Smith were so placed geographically as to be of much service or disservice to the northern invader of the dominions of Śaka satraps of Gujarat and Surāśṭra. This marriage alliance must have given an excellent opportunity to the Gupta emperor Candra Gupta II to plan and lead with confidence his campaign in western India possibly against the Śakas. This area was vitally important not only from the point of view of obviating dangers to the Gupta empire from the foreign potentates of the western borders, but more so because of the definite economic advantages in term of easy access of trade with the Mediterranean world. This could be ensured only through a political control of the above region and of the port towns of the Western coast. If Samudra Gupta had brought Tāmralipti on the Bay of Bengal under him, Candra Gupta's ambition to bring the western seacoast or ports under him was natural. If viewed in this background, Candra Gupta II's military campaign in western India for which he is greatly famous, gains an added significance. It is also not unlikely that Candra Gupta was inspired by a noble patriotic motive to liberate a part of the motherland still under foreign rule as his namesake Candra Gupta Maurya earlier had liberated the country from the yoke of the Greek servitude. The expansion of the Gupta power in eastern Malwa under Samudra Gupta had brought the Gupta territory close to the Western Kshatrapa dominion. As we have
seen above, a serious clash may have occurred in the time of Rāma Gupta. His dicipiture must have induced Candra Gupta to make prolonged preparations for the final round against the Śakas. It is in this context that his matrimonial alliance with the Nāgas and subsequently with the Vākāṭakas has to be appreciated. Prabhāvatī Gupta must have been married to Rudrasena II, son of the Prthvishena I near about 395 A. D. Prthvishena died in about 400 A. D. and was succeeded by Rudrasena II. This appears to have coincided with Candra Gupta's march against the Western Kshtrapas. Rudrasena II died some time about 405 A. D. Prabhāvatī Gupta became the regent of her minor sons. This must have facilitated still further Candra Gupta's protracted war against the Śakas. Candra Gupta II initiated his military campaign in western India with his base of operations in the region of eastern Malwa. This is testified to by the Udayagiri cave inscriptions No. 2, found on the Udayagiri hill near Bhilsa, which clearly states that he (Candra Gupta II) came here in person accompanied by one Vīrasena Sāba of Pāṭaliputra, his minister of peace and war, seeking to conquer the whole world. Another inscription from the same locality of the year 82 of the Gupta era mentions the name of his feudatory Sankāṇika; and the third one from Sanchi of the year 92 of the Gupta era refers to one of his feudatory (anuṣṭot) named Āmraśaṅkara who had won fame from victories in many wars. These three inscriptions taken together besides pointing to the presence of a minister, a feudatory and a military officer in the same region which may have been necessitated due to the protracted nature of the campaign, may be taken to mean that the campaign started in about 400 A. D. and was over by 411 A. D.

The Gupta emperor's successful campaign in western India directed against the Śaka-Satrapas, though, is not vouchsafed by epigraphic records; the annexation of the
The earliest date recorded on the silver coins of Candra Gupta II bear the date 90 of the Gupta era, whereas the latest dates on the Śaka Satrap coins do not go beyond 388 A.D., a point which goes to suggest that the protracted war between the Śakas and the Gupta emperor might have continued for 20 long years and finally the Śaka dominions of Surāśṭra and Gujarāt were annexed to the Gupta empire.

Candra Gupta II’s brilliant success over the alien rulers, the Śakas, is likened to the legendary king Vikramāditya of Ujjain. It has even been suggested that Candra Gupta II assumed the title of Vikramāditya in imitation of this legendary hero. It is, however, difficult to maintain, as Majumdar suggests, that the Vikramāditya legend evolved out of this king, although it is quite likely that some of the traditions like liberality and patronage of learning as associated with Vikramāditya may have originated with this king (Candra Gupta II). The famous poet Kālidāsa, one of the nine gems of Vikramāditya court, it may be safely believed, graced the court of Candra Gupta II. The annexation of Malwa and Surāśṭra actually rounded off the empire of the Guptas. Like the Mauryas before and the Afghans and the Mughals later, the Guptas after completing their conquest of the Punjab and the Gangetic valley, had turned their attention to central India and western India. The success over the Śakas not only vindicated the national honour and freed the important part of the country from alien rule, but it also opened the heart of the Gupta empire to brisk trade with the west. Much of the glory and splendour of the reign of Candra Gupta II, to an appreciable extent, owed to the wealth that poured into the country through western ports, having lion’s share of the trade with the Roman empire and this continued even after the sack of Rome by Alaric.
Apart from the campaign against the Western Kshatrapas, Candra Gupta II is also credited with conquests in farther north-west as well as in eastern India, on the basis of identification of Candra Gupta II with king Candra of the Mehrauli Iron-pillar Inscription. The Mehrauli Pillar Inscription of king Candra, however, has given rise to a host of suggestions as to possible identification, although the one in favour of Candra Gupta II is based on the ground that the name Candra occurs for Candra Gupta II on some of his gold and copper coins, and both of them, as the records show, were Vaishnavas. On palaeographic grounds and also in term of the language and style of the stanzas, the record could as well be ascribed to the period of Candra Gupta II. Further, the place where it has been found also formed a part of the Gupta empire. But even the above view on the proposed identification is not regarded as certain in the absence of any corroborative evidence and many different identifications have been proposed from time to time. King Candra has been identified with different kings including Candra Gupta I or Candra-varman. If Candra is presumed to be identical with Candra Gupta II it would evidently give credence to the view that Candra Gupta II conquered territories in north-west as well as in Eastern India, which is not unlikely. It is mentioned in the Mehrauli record that the king conquered the country of Bahlika after crossing the seven mouths of the river Sindh. But there is a controversy as to the area it denoted and more especially about the identity of the ruler who bore the brunt of Candra-Gupta’s arms. The term Bahlika is generally accepted as denoting the country of Balkha (Bactria); but Chhattrapadhya relying on Ptolemy suggests that in this period the term Bahlika came to be used as synonym for the land of the five rivers. As to the identity of the ruler of the above region, he is inclined to the view that the Sakas and not Kushāṇas
actually held way over the lower Indus Valley and the Punjab, and Candra Gupta II, after his victory over the Western Kshatrapas who held lower Indus Valley since the time of Rudradāman I, went north to the Punjab from Sindh, the former being under the Šakas. However, Altekar suggests that Candra Gupta attacked the Kidāra Kushānas. But in the situation then prevailing it is not impossible that Candra Gupta really invaded Balkh or Bactria referred to as Bāhlōka in the inscription. We have seen that Bactria was occupied by the Epthalites in about 350 A.D. (Kālidāsa refers to the Hūṇas on the Oxus) and thus had led to the eventual conquest of Gandhāra by Kidāra by 356 A.D., the contemporary (Daivaputtrashāta of Samudra Gupta). After Kidāra, his successors were known as little Yue-chi. As we have seen Samudra Gupta was satisfied with the offer of submission of Kidāra, and he also claims to have received the submission of Shāhānushāhi (the Sassanian emperor), mainly to consolidate his conquests in the country, and to have some share and control over the famous Silk-route. The Hūṇas in Bactria were not a peaceful community and because a danger to both Iran and India, and they might have tried to pursue Kidāra or his successors in Gandhāra, and Fa-hsien refers to Epthalite king trying to remove Buddha’s bowl from Purushapur. This may indicate Hūṇa inroad in Gandhāra some time before Fa-hsien concluded his travels in India. It is held that Kidāra towards the end of the 4th century had to proceed N.W. against the Hūṇas leaving his son Piro at Peshwar. It is possible that Kidāra might have received some help from the Gupta emperor. It is therefore possible that Candra Gupta II led an expedition to Bactria through Gandhāra against the Hūṇas, and this may be referred to as his crossing of the seven rivers of Sindhu and conquering Bāhlōka in the Mehrauli Pillar Inscription. This event may be placed towards the
end of the 4th century A.D. The new expedition was in nature of a raid and there is no evidence that Gandhāra and the Kabul valley came under Gupta administration. It is also possible to believe in Candra Gupta II’s war against kings of Bengal (Vaṅga). Samudra Gupta had brought different parts of Bengal under his overlordship. Taking advantage of the misfortunes of Rāma Gupta and the difficulties of initial years of Candra Gupta II, feudatory rulers of Bengal might have revolted. Candra Gupta defeated these hostile kings and incorporated Bengal into his empire.\(^{10}\)

Candra Gupta’s association with Pāṭaliputra as the capital of the empire, is not specifically mentioned in his inscription. But there is reference to one Virasena Śāba of Pāṭaliputra, his minister of Peace and War, and also an allusion to Pāṭaliputra in the inscription. Interestingly enough, the Kuṇṭalā chief claiming descent from Candra Gupta Vikramādiṣṭya, refer to him (Candra Gupta II) as Pāṭalipuravaraḍhiśvara (Lord of Pāṭaliputra).\(^{11}\) Fa-hsien\(^{10}\) has given a much more detailed and appreciative account of the city of Pāṭaliputra unlike any other city he visited and he also refers to the king and the administration in the same context. This does suggest that Pāṭaliputra was a much more important city than any other, may be the capital city.

Candra Gupta II, unlike his predecessors, is credited with the issuance of silver and copper coins besides the gold ones. The gold coins of Candra Gupta II mainly include Archer type, Couch type, Lion-slayer type, Chattrā type and the Horseman type but the variations made therein are especially significant. The Lion-slayer type shows the slaying of a lion instead of a tiger with the legend Simha-Vikrama. Do they suggest his conquest (by valour) of Saurāśṭra, famous for lions? The Chattrā-type shows
him standing, with his left hand on the hilt of the sword and a dwarf attendant is shown holding the chattrra over his head. The Horseman type shows him riding on a fully caparisoned horse. The Couch type shows him holding a flower instead of a lyre with the legend rūpakṛt. The Lion-slayer and Horseman types are indicative of his personal valour, the Chattrra type of his universal power and sovereignty, and the Couch type showing him holding a flower may be regarded as representing artistic sensibility. The silver coins ascribed to Candra Guta II are in close imitation of the Śake Satrap coins with the Cāitya symbol replaced by the Garuḍa symbol. The copper coins, however, show the figure of the king on the obverse and Garuḍa on the reverse.

Candra Gupta II’s long period of reign came to an end some time between 413-415 A. D.; because his last known date is 412-413 A. D., as known from Sanchi inscription, and the Bilsad Pillar Inscription of Kumāra Gupta I shows Kumāra Gupta I as mahārājādhirāja in 415 A. D.

The Gupta empire reached its zenith in his time in all respects. The territorial limits of the empire were attained. The empire extended from the Punjab (if not Bactria) to Bengal in the east, from the Himalayas in the north to the Narmadā on the south, and from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal in the east. Malwa and Gujrat were brought under the Gupta soveriegnty. With the death of Rudrasena II, the Vākāṭaka king, and during the regency of Prabhāvati Guptā, his daughter, Candra Gupta II exercised tremendous political influence over the Vākāṭaka court. The Gupta-Vākāṭaka relations underwent many phases. While Samudra Gupta did not directly come into conflict with the Vākāṭakas, his suzerainty over the forest tract of central India (Mahākāntāra), then under Vyāghhrarāja, and his victory over the Nāga house of
Bhavanāga must have indirectly adversely affected the Vākāṭakas. The recognition of Samudra Gupta’s suzerainty by kings of South Kośala and eastern Deccan was a substitute for Vākāṭaka sovereignty over these areas. We have seen that Candra Gupta II befriended the main Vākāṭaka house by marrying his daughter to the Vākāṭaka king. While it is not known if the Vākāṭakas rendered any positive assistance to Candra Gupta in his wars against the Śaka satraps, there is no doubt that the marriage alliance ultimately proved beneficial to the Guptas. Gupta ambassadors and officials dominated the Vākāṭaka court. The Poona Plates of Prabhāvatī Gupta refer to her father’s family and mentions Candra Gupta II as mahārājādhirāja. They were drafted by a Gupta officer, imported from Pāṭaliputra. Kālidāsa is said to have been sent as a tutor to Pravarasena II, who is identified with the king of Kuntala. Candra Gupta also established friendly relations with the Kadamba ruler Kākutsthavarman, and this could have led to infiltration of Gupta influence in Vanavāśi region. This indirectly might have been claimed as extension of his power over the southern ocean as mentioned in the Mehrauli Iron-pillar Inscription. Moreover, Samudra Gupta’s overlordship over the south eastern India must have continued down to Candra Gupta’s reign, and the claim made in Mehrauli Iron Pillar need not be thus mere boastful.

**KUMĀRA GUPTA I**

According to the Bilāsad Stone Pillar Inscription, Candra Gupta II’s son Kumāra Gupta I, born of the queen Dhruvadevi, ascended the throne before 415 A.D. Nothing definite is known whether Kumāra Gupta I was especially selected by his father as his successor, although the epithet *tat-pād-anuddhyāta* ascribed to him in genealogical account, points to his being the rightful heir and imme-
diate successor to the throne. The Vaisālī seal, however, refers to Dhruvasvāmini as the queen of Candra Gupta II and mother of mahārāja Govinda Gupta. Govinda Gupta of the Vaisālī seal is taken to be identical with Govinda Gupta of the Mandasor record dated in the Mālava year of 524; the reference in the record of "Indra being suspicious of Govinda’s power", has given rise to conflicting views. On the basis of the above record, Bhandarkar regards Govinda Gupta as identical with Kumāra Gupta, Jagannath accepts Govinda Gupta as a possible Gupta ruler between Candra Gupta II and Kumāra Gupta I. Raychaudhuri is also inclined to agree that Govinda Gupta was a rival of Kumāra Gupta, and Chattopadhyaya appears to be similarly inclined and sees in the reference to Indra being suspicious of Govinda Gupta an allusion to Kumāra Gupta I, on account of latter’s titles, Śrī Mahendra and Mahendravikrama on the coins. It is, however, difficult to accept the above views in the light of the clear testimony of the Mandasor record of the year 435 A. D. = 493 of the Mālava era, wherein Kumāra Gupta is referred to as ruling the earth, a point which goes to suggest that Kumāra Gupta I was the supreme ruler, and Bandhuvarman ruling at Daşapura as mentioned in the record, was evidently a feudatory ruler under the overlordship of Kumāra Gupta I. Indra being suspicious of Govinda’s power as mentioned in the later Mandasor record, according to Bhandarkar, purported to mean that Govinda was the supreme ruler. This point, however, has been chiefly utilised to suggest that Govinda Gupta possibly revolted against his brother Kumāra Gupta I, although the fact of the rebellion on the part of Govinda, even if conceded, could not have taken place before 436 A. D., the date of the Mandasor record. And it may be argued that after this revolt Mandasor region might have become a completely
independent unit, a fact also vouchsafed by the second part of the latter Mandasor record bearing the year 529 of the Mālava era, which does not even refer to any Gupta king.318

However, the possibility of Govinda Gupta intervening between Candra Gupta II and Kumāra Gupta I, is almost nil. We have no coins, gold, silver or copper, of Govinda Gupta, and we have no reference to Govinda Gupta as an important ruler in any official Gupta inscription. No significance can be attached to the non-use of the Gupta era in the inscriptions from western Malwa, where the Mālava era or Kṛta era was popular since long before the Gupta era, and continued to be used by the vassal kings even when Gupta suzerainty prevailed over the region. Mandasor Stone Inscription of the time of Naravarman is dated in the Mālava year 461 (=404 A. D.)216, by which date Candra Gupta II’s suzerainty over Malwa and Gujarat must have been established. Another inscription of Naravarman’s time is also dated in Mālava year 474 i.e. 417317 A. D. and another of Viśavavarman from Rajasthan dated in Mālava year 480 =423318 A. D., when certainly Kumāra Gupta I was the Gupta suzerain. There is, therefore no reason to infer in the (temporary) loss of Malwa in time of Kumāra Gupta I after M. E. 493 =436 A. D. The references to Govinda Gupta, in the Mandasor stone inscription of Prabhākara dated in Mālava year 524 (=467 A. D.)319 and ‘of Indra’s fear for Govinda Gupta’ do not mean that Govinda Gupta was the supreme ruler. Sircar rightly regards this assumption as unwarranted.320 It appears that while other feudatories like the Ucchakalpa and Parivrājaka families used the Gupta era, the Aulikara feudatories of western Malwa did not generally use the Gupta era but continued the Mālava era. This might have been due to indulgence of the Gupta overlords to the popular tradition of the use of Mālava era in that
region or due to the Aulikara feudatories being treated with special respect. Govinda Gupta was a son of Candra Gupta II and Mahādevī Dhruvasvāmini. Kumāra Gupta was probably the elder brother. While the latter stayed at the capital, Candra Gupta appears to have appointed his younger son Govinda Gupta as governor of Vaishāli. Mahārāja Govinda Gupta is referred to as the son of Dhruvasvāmini. Later Kumāra Gupta appointed his brother as viceroy of Malwa, where Govinda Gupta must have given proof of his valour and promise. It is not impossible that the rumblings of Pushyanimtra's rebellions were being heard even before its actual break-out later, and Govind Gupta might have successfully resisted them for a while. The non-mention of the name of the Gupta king in the second part of the Mandasor Stone Inscription of the Mālava year 493 and 529 does not mean that there was no Gupta overlord of Malwa in 529 (472 A.D.). We have shown elsewhere that as Kumāra Gupta II was ruling then, the statement in verse 13, line 28 'Kumāra Guptaḥ pṛthivin praśāsaṭi' stands for both Kumāra Gupta I and Kumāra Gupta II, who was ruling in 473 A.D., as known from the Sarnath image inscription. So in our opinion there is no need to believe in the rebellion and short reign of Govinda Gupta in the time of Kumāra Gupta I. The use of phrase pādānudhyaṭa about Kumāra Gupta in relation to Candra Gupta II in his own and his successors inscription goes to strengthen the view that Kumāra Gupta's accession was immediate, legitimate and unchallenged.

Among the Gupta emperors, Kumāra Gupta I alone is credited with the issue of a fairly large number of coins and inscriptions. There are as many as thirteen inscriptions ascribed to his reign and his coins have been found as far as Bhavnagar and Ahmadabad in western India, although the mere occurrence of his coins at Satara in south-western Deccan, raises an interesting problem. But the most signi-
Gupta Empire

significant are the inscriptions preserving the names of viceroys and feudatories, which in a way indicate the extent of the empire ruled by Kumāra Gupta I. The Dāmodarapur records bearing the dates 124 (= 441 A.D.) and 128 (= 447 A.D.) of the Gupta era refer to Kumāra Gupta I’s viceroy Cīrātadatta and also the name of the emperor with higher imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. The other two records from Dhanaidaha and Baigrama are of the years 113 (= 432-3 A.D.) and 128 (= 447 A.D.) respectively of the Gupta era. But the Baigrama record does not refer to the name of any ruler, though it has *bhājāraka-pādamudhyata* evidently meaning the Gupta emperor and the date shows that he must be Kumāra Gupta I. In the western part of the empire, one Ghaṭotkaca Gupta, possibly the son or brother of the emperor, was the viceroy of eastern Malwa covering the region around Tumbavana (Tumain), about 50 miles north-west of Eran. As to western Malwa, Govinda Gupta might have been governing for sometime. The feudatory Bandhuvarman ruling at Daśapura appears to have accepted the emperor’s overlordship but enjoyed some special status. There is no reason to doubt that Kumāra Gupta’s sway continued uninterrupted in Gujarat. His coins have been found in Ahmadabad, Valabhi, Junagadh and Morvi. Gujarat was certainly under him as Skanda Gupta is seen as the sovereign here as early as 136 G.E., Kumāra Gupta maintained the empire in tact and might have even extended Gupta dominion south of the Narmadā. Kumāra Gupta I’s Tiger-slayer type of coins bearing the legend Vyāghra-bala-parākrama, have been viewed by some as indicative of his southern campaign in the tiger-infested country beyond Narmadā. 1395 coins found in the Satara district strengthen this hypothesis. Chattopadhyaya is inclined to the view that since his coins resemble Traikūṭaka coinage, it is quite possible that he may have made some conquests in this region. Kumāra Gupta I
performed a horse-sacrifice, which is clear from his āsvamedha type of gold coins. This might have meant some new conquests in the south. It is suggested that after the death of Pravarasena II and during the weak reign of Narendraśa the Vākāṭakas suffered reverses at the hands of the Nalas. According to Altekar, Kumāra Gupta I was not in a position to help Narendraśa.2516 Goyal on the other hand believes that the Nalas' victory over the Vākāṭakas was due to the help of Kumāra Gupta I.2517 But, according to Mirashi, the ruler of Mekala, Bharatabala was his vassal. From the Balaghat inscription of Prithvīśeṇa II we learn that Kosala, Mekala and Mālava recognised his overlordship. This must have been during the last years of Kumāra Gupta I's reign when he was in trouble. Nala's invasion of the Vākāṭaka dominion should also be placed during the later part of Narendraśa's reign (450-70 A.D.).2518 It is therefore very uncertain if Kumāra Gupta could have any effective control over the region round and south of the Narmadā. His authority over the Gangetic provinces is proved by Mankunwar Buddhist image inscription,2519 Karamḍanḍa Inscription,2520 Bilsad Inscription2521 and by his silver coins of the Peacock type. Circulation of the Garuda type of his silver coins suggest continuity of the Gupta rule in the western province. Silver plated coins with a copper core probably circulated in Valabhi area, and coins of small thick fabric resembling Traikūṭaka coinage were apparently struck in Gujarāt.2522 Damodarpur, Baiagaram and Dhanaidaha Plates prove that North Bengal was included in his empire. Kalaikuri-Sultanpur Stone-Inscription of the G. E. 1202523 suggest that Rajshahi Dt. was under him. Eastern and Western Malwa's inclusion is made certain by Tumain and Mandasor inscriptions. Kumāra Gupta appears to have enjoyed a long and pros-
perous reign. This is clear from the fine quality and large variety of his coinage.

The closing years of Kumāra Gupta I’s reign was marked by a serious crisis. The enemies were the Pushyamitras. Whether the reference in Bhitari Inscription be read as Pushyamitrāṁś = ca, or Yudhy-āmitrams or simply amītras, the fact remains that they gave a rude shock to the empire. The exact identity of this group of people cannot be established. The Purānic text refers to a people called Pushyamitras, Putumitras, Durmitras as associated with the region of Mekala near the source of the Narmadā, and the Jain Kalpasūtra also refers to Pushyamitika-Kula. The Vākāṭaka inscriptions as well as Bāna’s Harshacarita allude to the war-like-activities of Mekala and Kośals Kingdoms. But in view of the uncertain reading of the expression in the Bhitari Inscription, it cannot be definitely established that the hostile groups or people belonged to the above tribe or group. There is no basis at all for taking the Pushyamitra as first wave of the Hūpas to reach the plains of the Punjab. Recently Bajpai has suggested that the Pushyamitras were the descendents of the Śūngā-Mitra houses and had taken shelter in the Amarakaṭṭaka region in the forest tract near the source of the Narmadā probably after the Āryāvarta campaign of Samudra Gupta and now when the Hūpas were knocking at the door in the west, they gathered wealth and power and challenged the old king Kumāra Gupta I. The Bammala Hoard found 24 miles south of the Narmadā shows disturbed state of affairs during the late years of Kumāra Gupta I’s reign. It has been suggested that the Mekala region came under Vākāṭaka suzerainty. It was with the encouragement of the Vākāṭakas that Pushyamitra could become powerful and challenge the Gupta empire. The Pushyamitra of the Bhitari Pillar Inscription has been identified with the
Pāṇḍava ruler of Mekala the subordinate ally of Narendrasena the Vākāṭaka. Chattopadhyaya identifies Pushyamitrás as a branch of Nāga race. It cannot however, be denied that the hostile forces had proved to be a real menace to the empire. As a matter of fact, the Bhitari Pillar Inscription refers three times to the 'ruined fortunes of the family', which may help us to gauge the seriousness of the reverses suffered in course of the grim battle. And Skanda Gupta by his sheer heroic qualities turn the scale in his favour and gave a crushing defeat to the enemies.

It was suggested that use of the title 'mahārāja' instead of 'mahārājādhirāja' for Kumāra Gupta I in the Mankunwar Stone-image Inscription dated in G. E. 129 shows that at this time he had lost imperial status. While, as pointed out by Sircar, the use of the title mahārāja in a non-official inscription has no significance, the fact that Kumāra Gupta is referred to with full imperial titles in the Damodarpur copper plate dated 128 G. E., almost cuts at the root of the theory. Scholars, on the basis of the obverse of the Apratīgha coins of Kumāra Gupta I suppose that Kumāra Gupta I was determined to abdicate the throne and the theory may be indirectly supported by the stories of the Kathāsaritsāgara and the Candraṅgarbhaparipṛcchā. Unfortunately the interpretation of the obverse scene has been most controversial. Kumāra Gupta I's last days might also have been made unhappy due to foreign invasion from the north-west. It has to be conceded with R. D. Banerji that Kumāra Gupta made no attempt to strengthen the north-west frontiers defences against the impending Hūpa inroads.

The Hūpas are referred to in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription of Skanda Gupta who claims to have completely defeated them. The Junagarh Rock Inscription refers to the Mlecchas, whose pride was broken down to the very
roots by Skanda Gupta. The Mlecchas have been generally identified with the Hūnas. Chattopadhyaya takes the Mlecchas to be a mixed horde of the Yavana and the Persians. Neither from the Bhitari Pillar Inscription nor from the Junagarh Rock Inscription it is clear that the Hūnas invaded India before the death of Kumāra Gupta I. But from the story of the Candra-agarbhapatiprecha it appears that the 'Yavanas', Bahlitas and Śakunav in concert invaded India, occupied Gandhāra and countries to the north of the Gaṅgā. King Mahendrasena's (Kumāra Gupta's) son Duḥprasahahsata (Skanda Gupta ?) defeated the invaders. Somadeva's Kathasaritsāgara also appears to suggest that Mahendrāditya (Kumāra Gupta I) favoured his son Vikramāditya (Skanda Gupta) It refers to Mlecchas, Hūnas and Pāraśikas. So the word Mleccha included the Hūnas besides other foreign tribes who might have joined the invading army. It is not unlikely that the Hūnas had invaded the Gupta empire in the time of Kumāra Gupta I. Though Samudra Gupta had been recognised as overlord by the Kushāna and Śaka lord of the North-West and Candra Gupta II had invaded the country of Bahlika, there is no doubt that these were military raids only and no effective control or defensive measures were taken by the Gupta emperors to guard the north west passes against foreign invaders. Skanda Gupta successfully met the danger. The Hūnas were defeated on the bank of Oxus.

However, there was no actual loss of the territory of the empire under Kumāra Gupta I, whose copious coinage shows the internal peace and prosperity that prevailed during his reign. Among the gold coins, significant are the Aṣvamedhā type of coins which indicate that he performed a horse sacrifice, although it is somewhat strange that it is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions attributed
to him. His gold coin-types besides the Asvamedha ones, include the Archer, Swordsman, Horseman, Lion-slayer, Tiger-slayer, Kārtikeya and Elephant-rider. Elephant-Rider-Lion-Slayer type and Rhinoceros-slayer types. It may be said that while the Rhinoceros and Tiger-slayer types represent his authority over the Gangetic valley and deltaic region, the Lion-slayer type shows that Kathiawar region was still under him. His silver coins represent an extension of coinage introduced by his father Candra Gupta II. The silver coins may be placed under four groups, but the silver-plated coins with a core of copper, which form a separate type, deserve special mention. On the silver coins, however, the Garuḍa symbol has been substituted by the peacock. Copper coins of Kumāra Gupta I are fewer in number but show two distinct types. The one type shows the king standing on one side throwing incense with the right hand and the other side shows: Garuḍa symbol with the legend Kumāraguptaḥ. The other type shows an altar with the legend Śrīku on one side and goddess Lakṣmī seated on lion-couch on the other.

Kumāra Gupta I’s latest date, as known from his silver coins, is 455 A. D.\textsuperscript{346}

WAR OF SUCCESSION AND SKANDA GUPTA

The succession after Kumāra Gupta I is controversial. According to the Bhitari Pillar Inscription,\textsuperscript{347} Kumāra Gupta was succeeded by his son Skanda Gupta. But according to the Bhitari and Nalanda seals\textsuperscript{350} Puru Gupta, son of Kumāra Gupta and Mahādevī Anantadevi succeeded Kumāra Gupta. The view that Puru Gupta and Skanda Gupta were identical\textsuperscript{349} has been shown to be untenable.\textsuperscript{349} There is no evidence to show that any Gupta king issued inscriptions or coins in two names. Even when Candra Gupta II had a second name, Deva Gupta,
this is not used in any of his coins or in any official genealogical Gupta inscription. Puru Gupta issued either coins with the name Puru or viruda Prakāśāditya while Skanda's viruda was Kramāditya. Equally improbable is the suggestion\(^\text{98}\) that the empire was divided into two branches led by Skanda Gupta, Kumāra Gupta II and Budha Gupta on the one hand, and Puru Gupta, Narasimha Gupta and Kumāra Gupta III on the other. The Nalanda seal\(^\text{99}\) shows that Budha Gupta was a son of Puru Gupta, and it is established that he (Budha Gupta) ruled from Malwa to Bengal, over the entire length of the empire and not over a part of it. Now the question boils down to this—who was the immediate successor of Kumāra Gupta, Puru Gupta or Skanda Gupta? Many scholars\(^\text{100}\) hold the view that Skanda Gupta immediately succeeded Kumāra Gupta I, and was succeeded by his half-brother Puru Gupta followed by Narasimha Gupta, Kumāra Gupta II and Budha Gupta. The last known date of Kumāra Gupta I is 136 G. E.\(^\text{101}\) The Junagarh Inscription of Skanda Gupta\(^\text{102}\) also contains the date 136 G. E. Therefore, it is held that there is to be no interval of time between the death of Kumāra Gupta I and the accession of Skanda Gupta.\(^\text{103}\) But this view does not take into account the significance of certain epigraphic data. The Junagarh Rock Inscription of Skanda Gupta\(^\text{104}\) refers to the trembling fortunes of the Gupta dynasty and competition among royal princes (\textit{manuṣyendrā putrān}) for the possession of Lakshmi, the sovereignty of the kingdom. We are further informed that Lakshmi the Goddess of prosperity rejecting other claimants for her hand selected Skanda Gupta as her Lord. Bereft of poetic embellishments the only natural inference appears to be that Skanda Gupta emerged successful amongst his rivals for sovereignty. It is difficult to agree with Raychaudhuri\(^\text{105}\) that 'trembling of dynasty's fortune' was only due to outsiders not belong-
ing to the Gupta line—the Hūnas and the Pushyamitras. This does not explain the significance of the rejection of other royal princes in favour of Skanda Gupta by the Goddess Lakshmi. We have elsewhere explained in detail the significance of the deliberate absence of the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta as Mahādevī in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription where the names of his grandmother, great-grandmother and great-great grandmother as Mahādevi of their sovereign lords are mentioned. To ignore this fact is shutting one’s eyes to a very important clue to the solution of the problem. The reference to the name of Kuberanāgā as Mahādevī in the non-Gupta inscriptions of Prabhāvatī Guptā, the daughter of Kuberanāgā and the non-mention of Yaśomatt’s name as mother of Harshavardhana in latter’s inscriptions are not strictly relevant to the issue. Kuberanāgā is not referred to as mahādevī in any official royal Gupta inscriptions, and mahādevī Yaśomattī who was mother of Rājyavardhana need not have been mentioned again as she was the mother of Harshavardhana also. Raychaudhuri’s point that seal and ordinary prāśasti should not be compared does not cut much ice because the Bhitari Pillar Inscription is a royal document giving the genealogy of the dynasty down to Skanda Gupta and thus should be given as much weight as a royal seal. It appears that no official Gupta scribe would have put the non-mahādevī mother of Skanda Gupta in the line of the preceding mahādevīs of his ancestors. Kumāra Gupta like his father may have had more than one queen of whom Anantadevī was the mahādevī. We suspected that Apritīgha coins of Kumāra Gupta had on the obverse Kumāra Gupta I with his two queens. It is not certain as to who was the mother of Skanda Gupta. Allusion to Devakī in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription has been taken to mean that Devakī was the name of his mother. She might have been related to the Pushyamitra
leader of the Mekala region and had become a great threat to the Gupta empire. He was defeated by Skanda as in the same way as Kaṁsa, maternal uncle of Kṛṣṇa was defeated and killed by Kṛṣṇa. Thus the allusion to Devakī in the inscription is sought to the explained. Basham has suggested that the mother of Skanda Gupta was a Śūdra concubine (BSOAS XLVII p. 368-69). P.L. Gupta also believes that Skanda Gupta's mother was a Śūdrā (JIH XL. p. 247). Reference to his mother in this official inscription is just cryptic and there is nothing to suggest that Skanda Gupta refers to her very proudly in the verse 6 of the Bhātari record which only refers to his mother receiving him with tears. However, in our opinion while Skanda's mother was not a mahādevī, there is no evidence to show that she was a Śūdrā, or that Skanda was ashamed of her. D. Sharma is right when he says that 'Ārya' was a cultural word and not ethnographic (JIH XLII pp. 49 fn.). The scrupulous non-mention of the phrase tatpāṇudhyāta to express the nature of succession from Kumāra Gupta to Skanda Gupta in the same inscription where in this phrase is used in relation to his predecessors is also meaningful especially in the context of non-mention of his mother as mahādevī in the same inscription. The term pāṇudhyāta is not used in describing the succession of Skanda Gupta after Kumāra Gupta. The Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription in which the word pāṇudhyāta is used to express the relationship between Kumāra Gupta I and his successor has been shown to belong not to Skanda Gupta but to Puru Gupta, a view not accepted by D. C. Sircar. In view of this, our stand that Skanda Gupta was not a legitimate successor of Kumāra Gupta I, as the latter was of Candra Gupta II remains unchanged. It may also be pointed out that in inscriptions of his time Skanda Gupta is always credited with having earned his empire and fame by the force of 5—II
his own arms. All these facts when taken together tend to support the view that Skanda Gupta came to possess the empire as a result of his success over his rival kinsmen, and that his claim to the throne was not based on undisputed right of inheritance. Dr. Sharma has argued that the 'Vikramanā Kramenā' in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription, of 'Kramenā buddhyā' in the Junaggarh Rock Inscription mean that Skanda Gupta was king both by his right of inheritance and by his valour and wisdom. It has been said that 'Krama means succession to a kingdom by inherited right. This is why he is said to have assumed the title of 'Kramāditya' besides that of 'Vikramāditya' to emphasize his right to the throne by inheritance and also because of his valorous deeds. The argument loses its force when we find that Ghatotkaca also assumed the title of Kramāditya. No one unless his claim is disputed is anxious to declare repeatedly to the effect that he has the right of inheritance. The very fact that Skanda is said to have repeatedly emphasized his claim to succession by right of inheritance according to the interpretation of Sharma himself, should raise reasonable doubt that Skanda Gupta's right of inheritance was actually disputed and when he became successful in the war of succession he must have emphasized his right of inheritance, but as actually it was due to his valour in war against his rivals, he could not but lay equal rather more stress on his own strength of arms for his success in winning the empire or saving it from disappearance in the face of internal and external enemies. P. L. Gupta rightly observes, 'no rightful successor to the throne had ever felt the necessity of publishing and proclaiming that he had come to the throne by his right of inheritance'. While there is no positive evidence that Skanda Gupta was nominated by his father to succeed him, the stories in the Kathāsaritsāgara and the Candragarbhaparampariprcchā may suggest that Kumāra had confidence in Skanda
Gupta's abilities and might have favoured him. In the use of the words and the purpose of the Bhitari Pillar Inscription which records the dedication of a Vishnu image by Skanda Gupta for the religious merit of his father shows that Skanda must have had good reasons to be grateful to Kumāra Gupta. Sharma may be right in interpreting the verse 15 of the Bhitari Pillar Inscription to mean that Kumāra Gupta was also highly impressed by the greatness of Skanda Gupta’s military and diplomatic achievements. He was therefore selected as the commander-in-chief of the army against the Pushyamitrās and the Hūnas. He could be a hot favourite of Kumāra Gupta I as we believe. But there was probably no actual nomination as in the case of Samudra Gupta or Candra Gupta II. The stories of KSS and Candragarbhaparipṛccchā, certainly much later than the supposed events, might have included this idea of nomination by Kumāra Gupta of Skanda Gupta as an after thought in view of the great achievement of Skanda Gupta remembered long after. He is not referred to as ‘svabhujajanaśatavāryah’ in the Junagarh Rock Inscription, as Gupta Viṁśatikavṛṭah ‘bhujabalavijñātāriyāh pratishṭhāpyabhuyāh jitaṁhitī’ in the Bhitari Pillar Inscription.

The numismatic and epigraphic data also strengthen our stand. We have coins of Ghaṭo (tkaca) Prakaśāditya Candra Gupta III (?) Vikramāditya. A gold coin of Samudra Gupta weighing 136 grains (may have been of 144 grains originally) have been discovered. Due to its heavy weight it cannot be attributed to Samudra Gupta. Aletkar was disposed to suggest that it may belong to Samudra Gupta II one of the contenders for the throne after Kumāra Gupta I. But the learned scholar also thinks that it may be an ancient forgery. These Gupta monarchs who issued gold coins to announce their sovereign status cannot be placed later than Kumāra Gupta II, and have therefore to be placed between Kumāra Gupta I and Kumāra
Gupta II. Ghaṭotkaca who was probably a Kumārāṃṭya in Vaisālī under Mahārāja Govinda Gupta, son of Candra Gupta II, is later referred to as governor of Airikina, and he later appeared to have assumed sovereign title. The situation towards the end of the reign of Kumāra Gupta I may be thus reconstructed. Kumāra Gupta's son or brother Ghaṭotkaca was governor of east Malwa, Skanda Gupta might have been put in charge of the western provinces. Puru Gupta was in the capital, and Candra Gupta III might have been in charge of some other province, may be Tirabhukti. In view of the highly elegant terms in which Ghaṭotkaca and Govinda Gupta are referred to in the Tumain and Mandasor Inscriptions, it is obvious that royal princes as governor of distant provinces were almost being looked upon as actual kings or protector. It would be overshooting the mark to state that Ghaṭotkaca Gupta was then trying to be politically independent by severing all loyal connections which he owed in his capacity of a provincial governor to his sovereign in Magadha. The Tumain Inscription clearly refers to Kumāra Gupta as ruling king and the Mandasor inscription of Prabhākara also refers to the fact that the territory conquered by Candra Gupta continued to be so bound at the time of Govinda Gupta. But there is no doubt that the powers of prince-governors were on the increase. Though there is no evidence that internal dissensions among the scions of the Gupta royal family started even during the time of Kumāra Gupta I, it is very likely that Kumāra Gupta I would not have been happy at these developments. He might have in disgust decided to abdicate as may be inferred from the Apratīgha type of coins. But his coins also demonstrate that he actually continued to be the sovereign. Later on probably basing on this incident the author of the Kathāsaritsāgara wrote about his abdication in favour of Vikramāditya
(Skanda Gupta?). The situation was further complicated by the rebellion of the Pushyamitras and the invasions of the Hūṇas. These serious difficulties were successfully tackled by Skanda Gupta. But just at that time Kumāra Gupta I died (455 A.D.) and the scramble for imperial throne began. Skanda Gupta being a successful military leader must have been supported by the imperial military group. Puru Gupta who was the son of Mahādevī Anantadevi, was probably the nephew (sister's son) of Anantasena, who as it appears from the Bihar Stone-Inscription of Puru Gupta was a high Gupta dignitary, might have been minister in the time of Kumāra Gupta I. Thus Puru Gupta might have been backed by the ministerial party led by Anantasena, brother-in-law of Kumāra Gupta I. Skanda Gupta was away and Puru Gupta was in the capital. This must have enabled the latter to declare himself the successor of Kumāra Gupta I. Being the son of Mahādevī and backed by the strong ministerial party, he felt secure enough to issue gold coins with the title of Prakāśaditya. Skanda Gupta, darling of the army, and highly successful against heavy odds reacted strongly. He also claimed to be the favourite choice of his father and must have lost no time in asserting his sovereignty. He might have declared himself sovereign in the western provinces not long after the death of Kumāra Gupta I. His immediate task was to appoint a governor of Saurāshṭra enjoying his full confidence before he could march north to deal with other rivals. So probably in the same year 455-56 (136 G. E.) he appointed Parṇadatta as governor of Saurāshṭra. Skanda Gupta also appears to have issued gold coins on the higher standard closely following the standard of weight of Kumāra Gupta I's coins. These coins are Archer type and King-and-Queen or King-and-Lakshmi type. They may be taken as belonging to King-and-Queen-Mother type. As the Lakshmi is already on
the reverse there appears to be no particular reason why she should also appear on the obverse. One of the strongest points against Skanda Gupta's right to the succession must have been the fact that his mother was a commoner, a secondary wife of Kumāra Gupta I. Skanda Gupta must have been thoroughly piqued at this and as a reaction he put the figure of his mother on the coin and depicted her giving him the fruit of sovereignty. This very generous act of Skanda Gupta must have overwhelmed his mother, who received him with tears in her eyes. The proclamation of sovereignty by Skanda Gupta and Puru Gupta at about the same time encouraged other prince-governors. One of them was Ghaṭotkaca, who was quite close to Skanda Gupta in eastern Malwa and in full possession of the trend of the situation. He also declared himself sovereign and issued gold coins with the title Kramāditya. Ghaṭotkaca is to be identified with the Ghaṭotkaca Gupta of the Vaiśālī seal and the Tumain Inscription. He was most probably a son or brother of Kumāra Gupta I. At the time of the death of Kumāra Gupta, he might have been the governor of east Malwa, and proclaimed his suzerainty by issuing gold coins. As the entire episode was over almost within a few months only, his coinage is scanty. Puru Gupta, we have already seen, proclaimed his suzerainty and assumed imperial titles. Prakāśāditya who issued Horseman-Lion-slayer type of beautiful gold coins may be identified with Puru Gupta. These coins bear striking similarity with Rhinoceros-slayer type of Kumāra Gupta. On the basis of purity of the fabric and the scenes on the obverse and reverse, it is clear that Prakāśāditya is to be placed close to Kumāra Gupta I. The manner of the depiction of the feet of the goddess on the reverse of the coins of Prakāśāditya has been followed by Skand Gupta on some of his coins. In Bharasar hoard Skanda Gupta Prakāśaditya were the latest Gupta emperors. It appears very plausible
that Prakāśaditya (Puru Gupta) soon after the death of Kumāra Gupta I declared himself sovereign in the home provinces. His tenure was short and he issued only gold coins, that also of one type alone. It has not been easy to identify Prakāśaditya. Allen had suggested his identification with Puru Gupta, but he appears to have changed his view as he held that Puru Gupta issued coins with the viruda Śrī Vikramah. However, the discovery of two gold coins of Budha Gupta exactly similar to the disputed coin in British Museum assigned to Puru Gupta has certainly again raised a serious doubt whether we have any gold coin of Puru Gupta with Śrī Vikrama title. Altekar after discussing the problem fully is deposed to accept the identification of Prakāśaditya with Puru Gupta. We are disposed to agree with him now. Puru Gupta (Prakāśaditya) probably exercised his suzerainty in the central Gangetic valley. It is of some significance that the kings descending from Puru Gupta have in their coins a letter between the feet of the king. This practice appears to have been started by Prakāśaditya (Puru Gupta). His successors followed him. This also strengthens the hypothesis of identification of Prakāśaditya with Puru Gupta. Coins numbering 30, 31, 32, in the Indian Museum Catalogue assigned to Candra Gupta II bearing the legend Candra on the above and biruda Śrī Vikramah and weighing more than 140 grains cannot be attributed to Candra Gupta II, because had he issued coins on the suvarṇa standard his successors particularly his son Kumāra Gupta I must have imitated it. The solitary coin of the Horseman type weighing 148.5 grains in Bodleian collection and attributed to Candra Gupta II by Smith, most probably, according to Altekar, belongs to Skanda Gupta. Smith has argued that the coins belong to Candra Gupta II who may have issued it in later years of his reign. He further observed that there are coins on
heavier standard bearing distinctly the legend Candra and he showed that these belong to Candra Gupta II. In his opinion, this coin is definitely earlier than Skanda Gupta. In our opinion in the context of the situation prevailing at the death of Kumāra Gupta I, these coins should be attributed to one Candra Gupta III. But if the reading is Kramāditya, as suggested by Altekar, then this particular coin may belong to Skanda Gupta. According to Allan, this coin clearly resembles the Horseman type of Kumār Gupta I and the legend Kramādityah suggests that it probably belongs to Skanda Gupta. Though the legends on the coins No. 31-32 read by Smith are indistinct, there is no sufficient reason to doubt that these belong to the same ruler who issued coin No. 30, on which 'Candra' is clear. The presence of a peculiar mark on the obverse between the king's head and Garuḍa standard also places these coins to a date much later than Candra Gupta II. V. A. Smith observes "of the coins bearing the name of Candra, the weight of three are known, the average being 145.66 and the highest."

Thus the situation immediately after the death of Kumāra Gupta I, was not very different from that which followed the rumour of the death of Shahjahān. As then, so in the 5th century A.D. also the prince who was in-charge of the most distant province (Aurangzeb in the Deccan and Skanda Gupta in Malwa and Saurāshṭra) came out ultimately victorious. Starting from the west, Skanda Gupta must have quickly nipped in the bud the ambition of Ghaṭotkaca in eastern Malwa, whose coinage is very scanty, (only one coin is available so far). He must have then marched to home provinces, and backed by the strong military party, he overthrew Puru Gupta, and went to see his mother, who felt elated and happy (after going through, possibly some degree of humiliation) and so received him with tears in her eyes. Skanda Gupta thus became the
unchallenged ruler of the vast empire by the force of his own arms. It was his valour and ability rather than his birth in the Gupta family which gave him the imperial diadem. The disturbed conditions in the Gupta empire at the end of the reign of Kumāra Gupta I can be inferred from the discovery of Bamnala hoard (Madhya Pradesh) which contained coins of Samudra Gupta, Candra Gupta II and Kumāra Gupta I only. It also contained a gold bar. Thus it is clear that the empire, during the last days of Kumāra Gupta, was in a very unstable condition and so the hoard was buried by some fleeing citizen.

We suggested elsewhere that Puru Gupta being the legitimate heir on account of being the son of the emperor and his chief queen ascended the throne immediately on the death of Kumāra Gupta in 455 A.D., but was soon after elbowed out by his half-brother Skanda Gupta. These events appear to have occurred within the Gupta year (136 = 455 A.D.) as discussed above. However, on numismatic grounds an objection has been advanced that as the coins of Puru Gupta are on swarga standard (46 gr.) and the coins of Skanda Gupta are on both swarga, and lighter standard it is more reasonable to assume that Skanda Gupta at first followed the old standard, and later adopted the swarga standard which soon became universally acceptable by all the later imperial Gupta kings including Puru Gupta; and therefore Skanda Gupta was followed and not preceded by Puru Gupta. As we had anticipated this objection, and as a counter-argument we had suggested that Puru Gupta might have revived the indigenous swarga standard and Skanda Gupta after adopting the prevalent imperial standard (130 gr.), later due to popularity of the swarga standard (long in disuse and now revived by Puru Gupta) was obliged to issue his coins also on the swarga standard. As we have pointed
out, it was also possible that lighter standard coins circulated in western parts of the empire and ārvāṇa standard in Magadha and U. P. where it has already been revived by Puru. Moreover, as has been shown above, the assumption of sovereignty by Puru, Skanda, Ghaṭotkaca and Candra Gupta III was almost simultaneous. If it is argued that Skanda Gupta must be later in time than Puru Gupta because if the former issued both lighter and heavier standard, then how to explain the heavier standard coins of Ghaṭotkaca and Prakāśāditya and Candra Gupta III. In the context of the dynastic history of the Guptas, Ghaṭotkaca and Candra Gupta III cannot be placed later than Skanda Gupta. So when all the three or four—Puru, Prakāśāditya, Ghaṭotkaca and Candra Gupta III—issued coins on ārvāṇa standard and ruled for a few months only then where is the difficulty in putting Puru Gupta earlier than or simultaneously with Skanda Gupta who following Kumāra Gupta I issued his first coin type on lighter standard, may be in the western India immediately after the death of Kumāra Gupta I. Thus there is no compelling numismatic grounds to assume any interval of time between the accession of Puru and that of Skanda Gupta. It has been argued that in view of the Junagarh Rock Inscription of Skanda Gupta being dated in 136 G. E. there could be no interval between the death of Kumāra Gupta I and accession of Skanda Gupta. We had suggested that it was possible to hold that Skanda Gupta came to the throne after 136 G. E. when the dam burst. But Basham and Sharma have strongly criticised our suggestion on the ground that the verses beginning with ‘atha-krameṇa’ would mean that the dam burst while Parṇādatta and Cakrapālita were well-settled in their offices in the time of Skanda Gupta. We still adhere to our view that the verses beginning with ‘atha’ really mean break with narrative and start the story of the bursting of the dam as a fresh or new
matter. However, in the light of our reconsideration of the situation at the time of the death of Kumāra Gupta I, there is no compelling reason to believe in any interval of time between the death of Kumāra Gupta I and declaration of sovereignty by Skanda Gupta during the war of succession. His declaration of sovereignty in western India and the bursting of the dam could be almost simultaneous with the declaration of sovereignty by Puru Gupta and other princes. At the same time it is to be noted that serious doubts have been raised about the reading of the date 136 on the silver coin of Kumāra Gupta.\(^{79}\) So the last known and certain date of Kumāra Gupta is 135 G. E. on a silver coin.\(^{29}\) Thus there is an interval of one year between the last known date of Kumāra Gupta I and the earliest date of Skanda Gupta if it is held that he was already king in Gupta Year 136. It is of some significance that probably the earliest inscription of his time is found in the Gujarat and it refers to his anxiety\(^{30}\) in appointing a suitable governor of the province in view of the suspected loyalty of other vassals or governors during the period of dispute over succession.

Skanda Gupta soon asserted his authority over the entire empire. His inscriptions have been found in Indore, Bhitari, Kahaum (in U. P.) and Junagarh (Gujarat). The Bull type silver coins suggest his hold over the Cambay coast. It is claimed that he won the empire by his own strength which may not be an empty boast. He had defeated the great revolt of the Pushyamitras.\(^{31}\) But his greatest achievement was the repulse of the Hūṇas.\(^{32}\)

When did the Hūṇas invade India? Bhitari Pillar Inscription, which refers to his victory over the Hūṇas, is not dated. If the Mlečchas of the Junagarh Inscription are identified with the Hūṇas, then the Hūṇa invasion must have happened and the menace removed by or before
G. E. 138 i. e. 457-58 A. D. The war appears to have been taken into the enemy's camp and in the countries of the Mlecchas (Hūnas?), the fame of Skanda Gupta echoed. According to Allan, "the Bhitari Pillar Inscription must have been erected early in the reign, as Skanda Gupta would presumably lose no time in erecting a memorial to his father". Allan has identified the Mlecchas with the Hūnas, and believes in the early date of the Hūna invasion. Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara also suggests that Skanda Gupta (Vikramāditya) immediately after accession routed the Mlecchas (the Hūnas). The story contained in the Candragarhāparipṛcchā purports to say that during years of the reign of Mahendrasena (Kumāra Gupta I) the foreign powers the Yavanas, Bālhikas and Śakunas invaded the country to the north of the Gaṅgā, and Mahendresena's son (a young boy of 14?)—Skanda Gupta defeated them. The source speaks of 12 years war with the foreign enemies, which merely means, if true, that after the main invading army was repulsed, some Hūna chiefs might have continued to resist longer. However, if we include the Hūnas among these foreign enemies, it is clear that the Hūna invasion had occurred towards the end of the reign of Kumāra Gupta and that it was finally repulsed before 457-58 (the date of the Junagarh Inscription) in the early years of Skanda Gupta's reign. The fact that only one coin of Kramāditya (Skanda Gupta) was found in the Bayana Hoard also suggests disturbed condition in the beginning of his reign. This identification of the foreign enemies with the Hūnas receives some weight from the Bhitari Pillar Inscription itself, wherein (though the relevant lines are very much damaged) there is an allusion to the roaring of the Gaṅgā in connection with Skanda's war against the Hūnas. We have already seen that the Candragarhāparipṛcchā refers to the foreign enemies occupying Gandhāra and country north of the Gaṅgā. The war might have been fought on the
northern bank of the Gaṅgā. McGovern has conclusively shown that the Hūṇas who raided Persian Empire and India were not exactly the Hūṇas known to the Chinese and Europe but were Epthalites (white Hūṇas), distinct from the Hūṇas in many ways and probably distantly related to the Yuechis. A great deal of the Hunnish blood doubtless flowed in Epthalite veins.\footnote{301a} In about 356 A.D., Chionites, a branch of the Hunnish family, threatened the northern frontiers of Persia.\footnote{301b} Probably it is somewhere in this region that Kālidāsa refers to Raghu’s war with the Hūṇas. However not the main Hūṇas but the Epthalites (white Hūṇas) appeared on the Persian frontier during the reign of the Sassanid emperor Bahram V and raided the empire down to Tihran in 427 A.D., but were eventually completely defeated by Bahram. The Epthalites were thrown on defensive but Yazdigard, the Sassanid monarch, “suffered an overwhelming defeat” in 454 A.D.\footnote{301c} It is probably then, encouraged by this victory and propelled by the desire to punish Kidāra Kushāṇas and encouraged by the troubles facing the Gupta empire during the last days of Kumāra Gupta I, that the Epthalites invaded India, and RAIDed even the heart of the empire up to the Gaṅgā. But Skanda Gupta, as we have seen, defeated them. The view of McGovern that soon after the boast of Skanda Gupta about his victory over the Hūṇas, the Epthalites’ main branch again appeared on the field, and the Gupta monarch experienced a long series of defeats, should not be placed in the time of Skanda Gupta as believed by the learned scholar,\footnote{301d} but in the time of some later Gupta emperor.

What is certain is that Skanda Gupta severely defeated the Hūṇas and thus “saved India from the scourge of a cruel and barbaric foe”.\footnote{301*} There is no doubt that the Hūṇas dared not again set their feet on the time of Skanda Gupta. Vincent Smith\footnote{302} and R. D. Banerji\footnote{301} believe in more than
one Hūṇa invasions in his time, and in the opinion of Banerji, the second Hūṇa invasion was parried with difficulty and Skanda Gupta was compelled to debase the gold coinage. The Hūṇa invasions, according to the author, continued and Skanda Gupta lost his life in trying to stem the mighty flood of the third Hūṇa invasion. This theory of repeated Hūṇa invasions in the time of Skanda Gupta was mainly based in the belief that some gold coins of Skanda Gupta were debased. This has been shown to be wrong by the report of the British Museum Laboratory on both types of Gupta gold coins of Skanda Gupta.

It has been argued that Skanda Gupta also had to fight the Vākāṭakas. According to Goyal, the Pushyamitra rebellion was indirectly due to the designs of the Vākāṭaka king Narendraścena who claimed suzerainty over Kośala, Mekala and Malwa which were originally under the Guptas; and Skanda Gupta soon reasserted his sovereignty over these regions. Dandekar believes, on the other hand that Narendraścena’s attempt to create difficulties for Skanda Gupta in the disturbed condition in his early years of rule, were set at naught by Skanda Gupta who caused the fortunes of the Vākāṭaka family to sink, and it was only after Skanda Gupta’s death that Narendraścena aided by his son Prthvisheña II asserted Vākāṭaka sovereignty over Mekala, Kośala and Malwa as suggested by the Balaghat Plates of Prthvisheña II. Chattopadhyaya also thinks that Narendraścena won some success against the Guptas after the death of Skanda Gupta. Altekar, who does not believe that Narendraścena snatched Malwa from the Guptas by siding with the Pushyamitras, was inclined to hold that the Gupta feudatory of Malwa might have temporarily shifted his allegiance to Narendraścena from the Gupta emperor Kumāra Gupta I who was in trouble due to Pushyamitra rebellion, but soon Malwa was
brought back under Gupta sovereignty by Skanda Gupta.\textsuperscript{308} The Mandasor Inscription of Prabhākara dated 467 A. D.,\textsuperscript{308a} which does not contain the name of the Gupta overlord nor is dated in the Gupta era, may be taken to suggest that Malwa was lost to the Guptas in 467 A. D. immediately after the death of Skanda Gupta and the Balaghat Plates of Prthvitsuṣṇa II may refer to this time. But as we have shown West Malwa remained under Gupta sovereignty in the time of Kumāra Gupta II and there is no ground to believe in any loss of territory in the time of Skanda Gupta. The rulers of Mandasor, even when subordinate to the Gupta emperors, continued to use Mālava era and also do not invariably mention their overlord. Mandasor Inscription of Prabhākara does not say that the Gupta sovereignty was diminished. In view of uncertainty about the date of Narendrasena,\textsuperscript{309b} it is difficult to come to any definite conclusion about the Vākāṭaka-Gupta clash in the time of Skanda Gupta.

Skanda Gupta was thus the man of the hour.\textsuperscript{310c} By overcoming the terrible rebellion of the Pushyamitra, after a bitter struggle, Skanda Gupta saved the Gupta empire and its prestige. By severely defeating the aggressive Hūnas, he averted a national calamity atleast for some time. This achievement can be well appreciated if one remembers that the Hūnas leader Attila was able to send equal defiance to the courts of Ravenna and Constantinople.\textsuperscript{310} "It was a great achievement for which Skanda Gupta may well go down in history as the saviour of India".\textsuperscript{311} There was no loss of territory in his reign, and he rightly assumed the title of Vikramāditya. By his achievements he can be easily placed in the line of Candra Gupta Maurya, Samudra Gupta and Candra Gupta Vikramāditya. The author of the MMK regards him as the best, wise and religious king in that low age."\textsuperscript{312} He
inherited very difficult situation but successfully met the crises overtaking the empire and the dynasty. Skanda Gupta was a great conqueror and defender of the nation and the restorer of the pride of the Guptas. Goyal\textsuperscript{13} has in effect, needlessly tried to minimise the value of Skanda's victory over the Epthalites (white Hūṇas) by suggesting that the wave into India was a feable and late one. Skanda is naturally regarded as the banner of his race and the most eminent hero in the lineage of the Guptas.\textsuperscript{13} He gave stability to the tottering empire and trembling dynasty. He can be very well regarded as a national hero. According to R. D. Banerji, "he was the last great hero of Magadha."\textsuperscript{14}

KUMĀRA GUPTA II

The last known date of Skanda Gupta is 148 G. E. (= 467-68 A. D.).\textsuperscript{15} He might have lived for two to three years more, and was succeeded by Kumāra Gupta II. We know from a votive image inscription from Sarnath that Kumāra Gupta was ruling the earth in 154 G. E. (= 473 A. D.).\textsuperscript{16} The non-use of any royal epithet need not be taken to mean that Kumāra Gupta was then not a full independent sovereign.\textsuperscript{16} Budha Gupta who is not given any royal title in the Sarnath inscription dated 157 G. E. is referred to as mahārājādhirāja in the Vārāṇast Pillar-Inscription dated G. E. 159.\textsuperscript{16} Many scholars\textsuperscript{17} have identified Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath inscription with Kumāra Gupta, son of Narasīmha Gupta Bālāditya and grandson Puru of Gupta. We have elsewhere examined the problem in detail and have conclusively shown, on the basis of epigraphic and numismatic evidence, and on consideration of relative chronology that Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath inscription is different from Kumāra Gupta of the Bhitari and Nālandā seals.\textsuperscript{18}
Their identification would lead to the inevitable conclusion that three generations (Skanda Gupta, Narasimha Gupta, Kumāra Gupta II) passed away in course of five years i.e. between 468 and 473 A.D. and this led Banerji to believe that when Kumāra Gupta came to the throne, he was ‘an infant in arms’. However we know that he was dead before 476 A.D., when Budha Gupta was on the throne. But we know from the Nālandā seal that Kumāra Gupta was succeeded by his son Vishnu Gupta. How could an ‘infant in arms’ leave a son to succeed him? Moreover Budha Gupta is known to be a son of Puru Gupta, and so was a grand-uncle of Kumāra Gupta, who was, according to numismatic and epigraphic evidence, succeeded by his son Vishnu Gupta. Thus one has to believe that the grand-nephew Vishnu Gupta was succeeded by his grand-uncle in of before 476 A.D., and the latter ruled for about 20 years at least. This is highly unlikely. Moreover the gold coins listed under the name of one Kumāra Gupta II (?) in the British Museum on account of difference of weight, purity, fabric and legend, belong to two Kumāra Guptas separated by reasonable distance in time.

Thus, Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath inscription, is to be regarded as Kumāra Gupta II to whom the variety (a) gold coins of the Allan’s Catalogue are to be attributed. The relationship between Kumāra Gupta II and Skanda Gupta is not known. He may have been his son or a son of Puru Gupta, in later case some violent capture of throne by Kumāra Gupta cannot be ruled out. Nothing definite is known about him. He may be identified with the Śakrāditya who laid the foundations of the Nālandā monastery according to Hsuan Tsang. His reign must have come to an end before 476 A.D.

Kumāra Gupta II appears to have maintained the empire more or less in tact. The Maitrakas of Valabhi 6-11.
were emerging as practically independent power but might have continued to recognise formal Gupta suzerainty for some time. However, there is clear evidence that Malwa remained under Gupta suzerainty. The Mandasor inscription dated in Mālava years 493 and 529 refers to Kumāra Gupta as the imperial suzerain. We have shown that Kumāra Gupta in the inscription means both Kumāra Gupta I for the M.E. 493 and Kumāra Gupta II for the Mālava year 529. The passing away of many kings between M.E. 493 and 529 and neglect of the temple does not mean that the Hūnas had raided or damaged the country or the Gupta overlordship over Malwa was suspended.

**BUDHA GUPTA**

In 157 G. E. ( = 476 A. D.), Budha Gupta was ruling the earth; according to a votive image inscription found at Sarnath. Budha Gupta was a son of Puru Gupta. He ruled over the entire length and breadth of the empire. Inscriptions referring to his rule are found in Eran in Madhya Pradesh, in Sarnath and Vārānasī in Uttar Pradesh, in Bihar, and in Damodarpur (Bengal). His silver coins of the Peacock type, specially issued for circulation, in the central and western provinces of Malwa and Gujarat show that he continued to be overlord of west Malwa and Gujarat. As a matter of fact, Gupta suzerainty over Valabhi was recognised at least until 502 (NHI, VI, p. 107). The gold coin with the *viruda Vikramah* attributed by Allan to Puru should be now assigned to Budha Gupta. Budha Gupta was the Vikramāditya and he was followed by his brother Bālāditya. Could Budha Gupta Vikramāditya be the patron of Vasubandhu and teacher of the crown prince, brother of Budha Gupta? This should bring down the date of Vasubandhu still more, while there is a view that he flourished in the 4th century A. D. Budha Gupta
appears to be the last Gupta emperor to have reigned in almost full glory over the extensive empire. He also built monasteries in Nālandā. After him the golden days of the empire appear to be passing away. His reign must have come to an end soon after 495-96 A.D.

**NARASIMHA GUPTA BĀLĀDITYA**

Budha Gupta was succeeded by his younger brother Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya. For a few years Bālāditya might have enjoyed peace, and to the period may be attributed the finer gold coins of greater purity bearing his name. But he soon had to face the serious Hūṇa invasions. The Hūṇas under Toramāṇa and his son Mihirakula overran the Punjab and attacked the western part of the Gupta empire. While Mātrivyṣṇu the vassal ruler of Eran was under Budha Gupta, former’s younger brother Dhanyavīṣṇu who had followed his brother after latter’s death, changed his allegiance to Mahārājādhirāja Toramāṇa. Thus the Hūṇa occupation of eastern Malwa must have occurred towards the end of the 5th century A.D. or early years of the 6th century A.D.

The Hūṇas were no doubt crushingly defeated by Skanda Gupta but the great hero following his predecessors had not taken any effective steps against the future invasion of the Hūṇas from across the Indian border. McGovern rightly observes that being satisfied by the offer of tributes and not completely subjugating the Kushāṇa kingdoms of the north-west which continued to control a large part of the Indus basin, besides Afghanistan and Kashmir, the Gupta dynasty was cut off from all direct intercourse with Central Asia, and thus was prevented from exerting the same influence upon this region as did the Sassanid Empire of Persia. The Ephthalites had won a convincing victory in 484 over Firuz of the Sassanian emperor. Though Persia was able to maintain her independence, all thoughts
of conquering and destroying the Epthalite kingdom had to be definitely abandoned. The Epthalites could therefore look towards the Indian border-land, and it was seen that the Epthalites did not continue their violent attacks upon Persia because they had been deeply involved in Indian affairs. However, there is no basis to hold that the Hūnas were making sporadic raids on Gupta territories and that Kumāra Gupta II stubbornly resisted them before 473 A.D. The death of the last powerful Gupta emperor, Budha Gupta, in or immediately after 495-96 A.D., opened the gates for the Hūnas' advance into the Gupta empire. The Epthalites swooped upon the Indian borderland, destroyed the Kushāṇa kingdoms in the northwest and appointed a special official a Tegin or prince-viceroy to rule over their Indian domain. McGovern rightly observes, "Before long, however, this official so extended his conquest in India as to become one of the greatest monarchs of the age, and by his glory completely overshadowed his nominal suzerain, who remained the semi-barbarous ruler of Central Asia." It appears that Toramāṇa belonged to a section of the Epthalites who had settled in Zabulistan, and became a viceroy of the Epthalites who had conquered Gandhāra two generations ago, according to Sungalin who visited Gandhāra in 520 A.D. This shows that Toramāṇa might have ruled Gandhāra from about the last years of the 5th century A.D. After capturing eastern Malwa, Toramāṇa could probe defences of the Gupta empire in the east into the Gangetic-Jamuna valley and towards the west into Valabhi. Its ruling chief finding the disappearance of Pax Guptaica had begun to assume gradually independent status. The Valabhi ruler might have resisted the Hūna push. To secure Valabhi's allegiance at this crucial hour when the Gupta Empire was under the attack, Narasimha Gupta, successor of Budha Gupta, dashed to Valabhi to consecrate
Mahārāja Droṇa Simha and thus acquiesce in the rise of his status. In our opinion the Gupta emperor is the paramount sovereign (akhilabhuvamanandalesvara-svāmī), mentioned in the Maitraka inscriptions, who is said to have personally invested Droṇa Simha with the title of Mahārāja in 182 G. E. This could be seen as a clever move to boost the prestige of the Gupta empire and to gain the allegiance of a rising power on the western frontier of Hūna kingdom in central India. We may here note that an embassy to China was sent by king of India (Kento) in 502 A. D. In our opinion the king was most probably Narasimha Gupta, and not Budha Gupta as believed by Cunningham. But notwithstanding all these, the Hūnas could not be held back, and if Hsuan Tsang is to be believed Bālāditya had become a vassal of the Hūna invader and had at first agreed to pay tribute. The discovery of two seals at Kauśāmbi is a clear evidence to the fact that the Hūnas under Toramāna had overrun the Gangetic valley. Thus the story of the MMK about the powerful śūdra king from the west (rightly identified by Jayaswal with Toramāna), occupying the bank of the Ganges up to the east is confirmed. Toramāna (Hakāra) is claimed to have occupied Nandapura (Pātaliputra) and having gone as far as Gauḍa (Bengal) in the east and for a time resided in Vārāṇasī in Kāśi country. In this context we may consider the position of Vainya Gupta. A copper plate inscription found at Gunaighar in the Tipperah district (Bangla Desh) refers to Mahārāja Śrī Vainya Gupta and Mahāsāmanta Vijayasena. It is dated in year 188 G. E. = 507 A. D. The title 'Mahārāja' need not suggest that Vainya Gupta was a subordinate ruler as his Mahāsāmanta is also a mahārāja. This Vainya Gupta is to be identified with Vainya Gupta of the Nalanda Seal in which he is given full imperial titles; though the seal is broken at the vital portion, the contents and the
style of the inscription and its discovery with other imperial Gupta seals leave no doubt that he was a member of the imperial Gupta family. He also issued gold coins with the *viruda* Dvādaśāditya. The weight of the coins 144.5 to 148 grains; (144.5 or 144.7 may be the result of being worn out). On the basis of the metrology of the imperial Gupta coinage his position should be close to Narasimha Gupta. MMK refers to a king of Gauḍa called Dvādaśa, who is said to have lived for (or ruled) for a few months. The coins (of Dvādaśāditya) are of Archer type and the weight and the fabric of the coins clearly connect them with the coinage of the later imperial Guptas. He was a devotee of Śiva (Mahādeva-pādānudhyāta) but is referred to as Paramabhisagacita on the Nālandā seal and his Gauḍa standard on his coins. He appears to have been put in charge as viceroy in eastern India, by the Gupta emperor, and taking advantage of the Hūṇa conquest of Malwa and their raid into Bihar and Bengal, he set himself up as independent sovereign may be with the connivance or help of the Hūṇa invader after Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya’s defeat. He thus ruled as independent sovereign over parts of Bihar and Bengal and might have put up Mahārāja Vijayasena as Uparika (governor) of Bengal. He ruled for a short time. What relationship does Vainya Gupta stand in the imperial Gupta family is not certain.

Toramāṇa nominated his son Mihirakula (Graha) as his successor and died soon after. Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya made peace with Mihirakula and agreed to pay tribute. He resumed his rule over Bihar. Vainya Gupta disappears from the scene soon. Restored Bālāditya appears to have shown much interest in Buddhism as is clear from the combined testimony of inscriptions, MMK and Hsuan Tsang.
The death of Toramāṇa might have encouraged resistance to the Hūnas. The Hūna occupation of eastern Malwa was not welcome. It appears that Goparāja, the daughter's son of the Šarabha king fought a very famous battle in the company of Śrī Bhānu Gupta who was brave as Pārtha. We are informed that Goparāja fell in the battle and his wife became a satt. The inscription is dated 191 G. E. = 510-11 A. D.\textsuperscript{355} It has been generally assumed that the very famous battle (Yuddham smanhat-prakāsam) refers to war between the Guptas and the Hūnas. This event must have happened in or shortly before 510-11, and the Hūnas were successful. It is clear from the Gwalior Stone Inscription of Mihirakula, that the Hūna hold over Malwa continued long after 510-11 A. D. and was overthrown only near about 532-33 A. D. by Yasodharman. Who was rājā Bhānu Gupta? D. C. Sircar thinks that it is not impossible that when Vainya Gupta was ruling the eastern part of the old Gupta empire, Bhānu Gupta was ruling the western part, and another line of rulers had control over the central part.\textsuperscript{40} Raychaudhuri\textsuperscript{47} suggests that Bhānu Gupta may be identified with Bālāditya, the contemporary of Mihirakula. According to us, this is very unlikely. Bhānu Gupta in this inscription is referred to without any imperial title, and then no coin of Bhānu Gupta is available so far, when we have coins of even such Gupta kings whose rule was much shorter than that of Bhānu Gupta Bālāditya, as suggested by Raychaudhuri. It is most likely that Bhānu Gupta had taken advantage of the confusion created by the Hūna raids and death of Toramāna, and declared himself a ruler (locally). He might have had some relationship with Šarabha king of central India, and Goparāja could have come to help him against the Hūnas. It is likely that with the defeat and death of Goparāja, Bhānu Gupta also lapsed into obscurity. We find no reason to modify
our earlier view that at best ʿBhānu Gupta may have been distantly connected with the imperial Gupta line and during those critical years may have succeeded in carving out a fortune for himself before 510-11. A. D.\textsuperscript{358}

The plundering Hūṇa raids and the loss of Malwa to the Hūṇas, and Valabhi to the Maitrakas had very much economically ruined the Gupta empire, which had suffered loss of prestige as well. It is to this period that the heavier and more debased coins of Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya have to be attributed.\textsuperscript{359} It is also possible that Bālāditya took recourse to the heavy debasement of coinage as he needed gold to make preparations for an eventual renewal of hostility with the Hūṇas. And this was not long delayed. Mihirakula ordered persecution of the Buddhists,\textsuperscript{360} Bālāditya, himself a patron of Buddhism, and king of Magadha, traditionally a strong centre of Buddhism and Buddhist influence, naturally resented this order. This led to the invasion of Magadha by the vast cavalry under Mihirakula. Even the capital (Paṭaliputra) was stormed,\textsuperscript{361} and Bālāditya had to retire with his army into the Gangetic deltaic region.\textsuperscript{362} The Hūṇa chief Mihirakula pursued him and ultimately was surprised by Bālāditya’s men who captured him and brought him before Narasimha Gupta. The master (Mihirakula) and the servant (Bālāditya) had changed place and ultimately Mihirakula was set free.\textsuperscript{363} In Central India also (Malwa) the Hūṇa rule was overthrown by Yaśodharman Vishṇuvardhana sometime before 532 A. D.\textsuperscript{364}

It is not possible to be definite about the exact sequence of events. From the undated Mandasor Stone Inscription of Yaśodharman we learn that Mihirakula whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save the God Sthāṇu..., was now for the first time bent low down by the strength of
his (Yaśodharman’s) arms in the act of compelling obeisance. On the basis of this it may be suggested that Yaśodharman’s victory over Mihirakula is to be placed before that of Bālāditya. But in the same inscription it is said that Yaśodharman conquered more territories than the Gupta overlords and the Hūṇas. This may on the other hand suggest that Yaśodharman’s digvijaya was to be placed after Bālāditya’s victory over Mihirakula (Yaśodharman’s known date is 532 A. D.). To obviate the difficulty some scholars have suggested that Mihirakula was defeated by a confederacy of Yaśodharman and Bālāditya, and as a result the Hūṇas were defeated and overthrown both in Malwa and eastern India. Mihirakula’s rule over Punjab and Kashmir may have continued.

Bālāditya appears to have renounced the throne. He went to live in Nālandā monastery, according to Hsuan Tsang.

**KUMĀRA GUPTA III**

Narasiṃha Gupta Bālāditya was succeeded by his son Kumāra Gupta III whose seals with full imperial titles have been found at Nālandā (Bihar) and Bhitari (eastern U. P.). Though the Hūṇas as a political menace had disappeared, their plundering raids and oppressive rule had damaged the political prestige and the economy of the empire. Kumara Gupta III had to issue still heavier and more debased coins. Saurāshṭra and Gujarāt were already lost to the Maitrakas. In Malwa the great popular leader Yaśodharman had emerged as a powerful personality and a conqueror. He defeated Mihirakula and liberated Central India from the Hūṇa yoke. Thus the Gupta empire was a very much shrunk kingdom. Parts of Bengal, Magadha and eastern U. P. continued under Gupta rule. The fiction of the Gupta sovereignty was retained in the Baghelkhand and Bundelkhand regions of
Central India down to 198 G.E. (517-180 A. D.), Hastin was using the Gupta era, and Betul and Khoh Plates of Samshobha are dated in 199 and 209 G. E. However Kumāra Gupta appears to have suffered defeat at the hands Yaśodharman who claims in course of his campaigns to have scored victories over a mighty king of the east, who may be Kumāra Gupta III. This Kumāra Gupta III may be identified with Vajra, who constructed a monastery in Nālandā.

**VISHṆU GUPTA**

Kumāra Gupta III was succeeded by his son Vishṇu Gupta Candraditya whose seal with full imperial titles has been found at Nālandā. Heavy gold coins of Archer type with debased metal with the viruda Candraditya have to be assigned to him. These coins are from Kalighat Hoard. Yaśodharman’s conquest were euphemeral. The Gupta emperor continued to exercise his suzerainty over Bihar and Bengal. The fifth Damodarpur copper plate, dated 214 or 224 G.E. (533 or 534 A.D.) may refer to Vishṇu Gupta as the paramount ruler. However the empire had really passed away. The Maukharis, the Vardhanas, and the Gauḍas had emerged as political powers acting almost independently of the Gupta monarch. Even in Magadha since the attack of Mihirakula on Pāṭaliputra, the later Gupta family under Kṛṣṇa Gupta had been coming into prominence and power. The fiction of the Gupta emperor and empire remained and it was sought to be used for psychological advantage by both the Maukharis and the later Guptas. The emperor Vishṇu Gupta Candraditya like Shah Alam II of the Mughal dynasty was almost a mute witness to this power-struggle. The marriage of Upa Gupta, probably his sister, with Iśvaravarman, the Maukhari chief, gave to Iśānavarman, his son, the chance to claim the Gupta imperial heritage and paramount title
after the death of Vishnu Gupta in cir. 550-1 A. D. Thus the imperial Gupta dynasty passed away after 231 years, as mentioned by Jinasena."
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CHAPTER XXVIII

Gupta Administration

The paucity of Gupta coins and inscriptions in Bihar may suggest that at least in the later stage their capital was not situated in this State. Pushpa, where Samudra Gupta passed his days of pleasure¹, was most probably Pushpapura, which is another name for Pātaliputra. This would imply that under this great conqueror, Pātaliputra was the capital of the Gupta empire. If we rely on the geographical information supplied by the spurious Nālandā Copper Plate of Samudra Gupta, it would appear that Nandapura², probably a place near Nālandā, was a victory camp of that emperor. Whatever may be the location of the Gupta capital, there is no doubt that the modern divisions of Patna, Tirhut and probably Bhagalpur, formed integral parts of the Gupta empire, and were governed directly by their officers and not by feudatories owing allegiance to them. The Tirhut Division was known as Tirabhukti, from which the modern term Tirhut is derived. The bhukti had its headquarters, as the finds of numerous seals show, probably at Vaiśāli, modern Basarh. The Patna Division was known as Magadhabhukti and possibly called Nagarabhukti towards the end of the Gupta period. We do not know the Gupta administrative name for the Bhagalpur Division, the north-eastern fringe of which may have been included in Pundravardhanabhukti.

The bhukti, which seems to have been the largest administrative unit under the Guptas, was placed in charge of an uparika.³ The exact connotation of this high officer is obscure; probably in origin it had something to do with the realisation of uparikara, an additional impost on the
peasants in addition to the fixed annual share of the produce. The officer was undoubtedly a governor appointed by the Gupta king, but the literal meaning of the term bhukti suggests that the territory placed under his charge was intended to be enjoyed rather than governed by him in its own interest. It is a pity that we have no information regarding the functions of the head of the bhukti.

The bhukti was divided into vishaya or districts, whose number in Bihar is not known. The vishaya of Rājagṛha, Pāṭaliputra and Gaya were included in Magadhabhukti. If we believe the geographical details in the spurious Nālandā grant of Samudra Gupta, this bhukti also included Kṛmilāvishaya, roughly corresponding to the modern Monghyr district and extending over both the north and south of the Ganges. In Tirabhukti, Vaiśāli was important enough to be the headquarters of a vishaya, although it is mentioned as such in only one seal, and here too the reading is doubtful. The vishaya was in charge of either the vishayapati or kumārāmātya. The office of the latter is repeatedly mentioned as existing in the headquarters of bhuktis of Magadha or Nagara, and Tīra. We also hear of kumārāmātyas attached to the emperor or to the heir apparent. In the case of the Pañcanagarī vishaya in Bengal we learn that the district was presided over by a kumārāmātya, probably appointed by the upapika. Towards the last days of the Gupta empire some of the kumārāmātyas seem to have asserted their independence. This was the case with kumārāmātya mahārāja Nandana, who made a land grant in the Gaya district in his own right. The kumārāmātya therefore seems to have been the counterpart of the Maurya amātyas, from whom were recruited all kinds of officials by the Gupta emperors. But the Maurya amātyas, when appointed to specific offices, were known by their new designations: on the other hand, although the kumārāmātyas, functioned in
different capacities, they continued to be named as Kumārā-mātyās, and not by posts they held.

The vishaya was divided into viṭhis of which we have very little knowledge in regard to Bihar. We know, however, of Nandavithi, whose headquarters lay 2 miles to the north-east of Surajgarha in south Monghyr. The lowest unit was the village; several of these are mentioned in Gupta inscriptions and seals from Bihar. The leading part in managing the affairs of the village was taken by its elders known as the mahattama, mahattaka or mahattara from which designation has been derived the term mako prevalent in many parts of Bihar and still understood in some areas as the head of the village. In north Bihar the head of the village was important enough to have his seal. In north Bengal no land, even for religious purpose, could be sold without the consent of the mahattaras and of the local officials who lived in the adhikaraya or headquarters of the vishaya. This also seems to have been true of the neighouring bhuktis in Bihar, and indicates that in spite of the royal power to grant land, individuals could not freely dispose of their land without the approval of the leading man of the local community.

The above territorial units seems to have been mainly fiscal, and the main function of the officers placed in their charge was to assess and collect revenues, which was probably one sixth of the produce. The villagers also paid certain customary miscellaneous dues, which could be measured, but were not specified. They also paid certain hirayya or gold, but what it actually meant cannot be said. The artisans also had to pay some imposts, and traders customs on commodities of trade, which were levied and collected by the customs officer, known as saulkika. Probably he had to deal with the corporation of bankers, merchants and artisans which was active in Vaiśāli and may have functioned
in Magadha also. Many villages, granted as agrahāras for religious and educational purposes, were exempt from taxes. In fiscal and possibly in other matters too they were governed by the agrahārikas, to whom they were granted.

The seals found in Basarh, which was evidently the headquarters of Tirabhukti, give us some idea of the machinery for the maintenance of law and order and administration of justice in that division. The police work was performed by the dandaśika\textsuperscript{17} whose office (adhikaraṇa) is mentioned; the judicial function was performed by the vinayasthitisthāpaka\textsuperscript{18} who has certainly his office in the headquarters of Tirabhukti, and was possibly posted in other headquarters of the Bihar bhukti.

Probably Vaiśāli formed an important military headquarters of the Guptaś, for here we find the seals of the chief commander (mahādandaśanaṇyaka\textsuperscript{19}), the office of the head of the military store (tāravayabhandagurādhikaraṇasya\textsuperscript{20}), of the office of the commander attached to the royal heir-apparent\textsuperscript{21} and of the head of the infantry and cavalry (bhaṭāsvabati).\textsuperscript{22} The head of the palace guard (mahāpratikara\textsuperscript{23}) also may have been a military functionary, although his chief duty was to regulate entrance to the palace. The fact that the seals of all kinds of civil and military officials as well as those of a Gupta prince and queen have been found at Vaiśāli shows that the place was a great centre of Gupta political power. Here the seals seem to have been used for official purposes, and not as votive offerings, as at Nālandā.

Most seals at Nālandā seem to have been offered by the votaries from outside Nālandā as memorials, but some of them were probably issued by officers stationed at this place. Two seals containing the term dharmādhikaraṇa (in one case the name Śrī Śiladitya is also mentioned\textsuperscript{24}) seem to be of this type and indicate that Nālandā was the headquarters of some kind of civil court.
We have some idea of the officials working in the district or nishaya in connection with land transactions. Thus the officer known as pustapāla maintained records of land sale, and the village account and (grāmakṣapata talādikṛt) preserved records of land in the village. It is difficult to make out the meaning of paditarika, who is addressed in the Bihar grant of Skanda Gupta, but the gaulmika mentioned therein was a minor military officer in charge of a small detachment of soldiers. Probably he stood by the civil authorities in times of disturbances caused by peasants or unsocial elements. The agrahārika was another important functionary in the district, but it is difficult to say whether he was a religious grantee enjoying revenue-free villages or an officer looking after such grants. Since we hear of a Brāhmaṇa agrahārika being granted some land in south Monghyr, the former interpretation seems to be plausible. Apparently the agrahārika maintained some staff for realising various dues from the inhabitants of the gift villages, although even the two forged grants of Samudra Gupta do not allow any administrative functions to the grantees in Magadhā as is the case with religious grants made by the feudatories of the Guptas in Madhya Pradesh. The jurisdiction of the agrahārika in Bihar was far more limited than that of his counterpart in Central India. An important condition imposed on him was that he would not introduce any tax-paying peasants and artisans from another village in his agrahāra otherwise it would constitute an infringement of the endowment. The beneficiary of the agrahāra enjoyed a free hand in the management of the affairs of the village so granted to him for in one case it is laid down that no trouble should be caused to him by the descendants of the grantee.

In Bihar, Vaiśāli is the only town about whose administration we get some idea in Gupta times. The most
numerous seals, as many as 274, found there, are those of the nigama of the (bankers) sreshthis, (merchants) sārthavāhas and (artisans) kūlikas.31

The nigama has been compared to the modern Chamber of Commerce,32 but the inclusion of artisans shows that it was a somewhat different and wider body which carried not only economic activities but also the administration of the town, at least as far as its members were concerned. We do not possess any precise information about the constitution of the nigama, whose members seem to have been the leading persons from every profession either elected or hereditary. The titles dāsa, datta, nandin, pāla, sana, sīnha etc., show that all kinds of people were admitted into the guild. The nigama probably performed municipal functions in regard to bankers, traders and artisans whom it represented, and also in relation to the employees of various civil and military offices whose headquarters were situated in Vaiśālī. We learn from a contemporary law-giver that the nigama framed its own rules known as saṃayās,33 and that the king was under the obligation to maintain the usages settled among them both in rural and urban areas.34 This suggests that nigamas in Vaiśālī enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. Conditions were perhaps different in Pātaliputra. A passage from the Mudrārākshasa suggests that the political status of the artisans (śilpinah) was not high in that city, where they were distinguished from citizens (paurāḥ), headed by their elders (mukhyāḥ).35

Some kind of parishads functioned in the neighbouring towns or villages of Vaiśālī. We here of a parishad flourishing in Udānakupa.36 But it cannot be said whether it was a panchayat managing the affairs of that village or a council of learned Brāhmaṇas concerned with the interpretation of the laws laid down by the Dharmasastras. Yajñavalkya, a lawgiver of Gupta times, enjoins the king to make the
people obey the laws of their families, castes, guilds, associations, or villages \((jānapadān)\), and Manu takes into account such laws. All this indicates that the \(jānapadas\) in the Nalanda region had their own laws, which were respected by the king.
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CHAPTER XXIX

Religion and Philosophy

(275-550 A.D.)

Contributing largely to the varieties of religious experiences and speculative thoughts Bihar enriched the intellectual activity and efflorescence of culture in the Gupta age. The horizon of Buddhists was widened by the philosophical ideas of Āryadeva, Vasubandhu, Buddhaghosha and Diinnāga. Inscriptions and seals found in Bihar testify to the phenomenal growth of Vaishnavism, Śaivism and Śaktism during the Gupta age. These religions and philosophical schools drew their sap of vitality from the ancient tradition and developments in the pre-Gupta period. In the period under survey there was a restatement of the values of life and affirmation of the gospels of the Purāṇas, which never denied the authority of the Vedas and held the Śruti as the infallible source of religion.

An outcome of the greater intellectual activity was the controversies between the rival religious movements and philosophical schools. Mahāyāna Buddhists assailed not only the views of the Hinayānists but also of the Sāṃkhya and other philosophical systems of the Hindus. A Ceylonese Buddhist Mahānāman II, who erected a temple at the exalted Bodhimandapa or site of the Bo-tree, believes that it was because of Buddha that “the heretics”, who obstructed the path of beatitude, could be “broken to pieces”, “assailed with the weapon of logic.” In spite of such differences, there was a spirit of toleration. According to Hsuan Tsang the Bodh-Gaya temple was built by a Śaivite Brahmin minister. Anantavarman Maukhari set up the images of
Krṣṇa, Bhūtāpati (=Śiva) and Devī (Pārvatī) and Kātyāyānī in the Barabar and Nāgārjuni hills in the Gaya district. There were also some common ideals and mutual borrowings. The evolution of Mahāyāna ideas betray the influence of the doctrine of bhakti, which was the original contribution of the Vaishnava. Whether a follower of the Brahmanical religion or of the Buddha, each believed in the possibility of elevation of mankind. An illustration of the unrecognised influence of Buddhist thought can be detected in the final wish of Harishena, when he prays that his composition of the prāṣasti of Samudra Gupta may be 'sarva-bhūtahita-sukhāya' (let it be for the welfare and happiness of all existing beings).

A. VAISHNAVISM, ŚAIVISM, ŚĀKTISM AND OTHER MINOR RELIGIOUS SECTS

I. Vedic Sacrifices and Studies

The followers of Vaishnavism, Śaivism and Śāktism have never defied the Vedas. Many rulers, whose inscriptions have been found in Bihar, celebrated the Vedic sacrifices. The Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription of Skanda-Gupta² informs us that Samudra-Gupta, who according to other inscriptions was a Vaishnava, restored the aśvamedha sacrifice, that had long been in abeyance.³ It also records the erection of a yāpa or sacrificial post by Skanda-Gupta, a Parama-bhūgavata. The Maukhari rulers of Gaya also took pride in the Vedic sacrifices. Inscriptions of Anantavarman in the caves of the Nāgārjuni hill tell us that his grandfather Yajñavarman possessed ‘greatness arising out of celebration of copious sacrifices’ and god Indra was constantly invoked to come down to the earth to accept the oblations offered by Yajñavarman.⁴ As for the study of the Vedas by the people of Bihar we know that the Brāhmaṇa donees of the Nandapur and Amauna Copper Plates dated Sam. 169/489 A. D. and Sam. 232/551-552 A. D.
respectively were versed in the Vājasaneyi and Chāndogya texts.

II. Purānic Mythology

The pursuit of the Vedic studies need not necessarily mean that the people of Bihar were very fond of Vedic mythology. Inscriptions rather convey the impression that the people in general, were acquainted with Paurāṇika myths. The prowess and qualities of the kings have been expressed through Paurāṇika analogies. Thus Samudra-Gupta has been described as equal to the gods Dhanada, Varuṇa, Indra and Antaka, and who was the very axe of the god Kṛtānta. The inscriptions of the Maukharis who ruled in the Gaya region in the first half of the sixth century A. D. frequently allude to the Purānic deities. The grand charities of Sārdūlavarmman, son of Yajñavarman, earned for him the distinction of a veritable kalpa-taru. Anantavarman described his father Sārdūlavarmman as one who, “charming the thoughts of lovely women resembled (the god) Smara (Cupid)”. Anantavarman is himself described as having a body like Smara. The Purānic legends also occur in inscriptions of another branch of the Maukharis. A seal of Avantivarman described the earliest king of the family, Harivarman, as resembling the god Cakradhara (Vishṇu) in employing the sovereignty for regulating the different castes and stages of religious life.

It is difficult to find out of the relative strength of the adherents of the Paurāṇika religions and Buddhism at the end of the period under review. If Hsuan Tsang’s accounts be of any help, it appears from his statement that the Deva temples were more numerous in Vaiśāli, Vṛjī, I-lan-na-po-fa-to and Kājangala (Rajmahal) areas. He found above fifty Buddhist monasteries as compared to some tens of Deva temples in Magadha. It would be wrong to conclude here that the Hindus were in a minority
in modern Patna and Gaya districts. The Chinese traveller himself found Patna in wilderness and Gaya with few inhabitants. Further, Hsuan Tsang gives the credit of the erection of the Mahābodhi temple to a Śaivite Brāhmaṇa. III. Vaishnavism

Candra Gupta II and Kumāra Gupta I have been described in their inscriptions and coins as Paramabhāgavata. The Bhitari Pillar Inscription shows that Skanda Gupta installed an image of Śaraṅga (Vishṇu). Samudra Gupta though not called Paramabhāgavata, was undoubtedly a believer in Vaishnavism. The personal religion of these three Gupta emperors and those of Budha Gupta, Narasimha Gupta, Kumara Gupta III and Vainya Gupta, whose royal seals have been found at Nālandā, must have helped to increase the influence of Vaishnavism in Bihar. The Basarh seals prove the popularity of this religion in north Bihar. Some of the seals discovered at Basarh in 1912 show names like Vishṇumitra, Nāraṇa, Nārāyaṇa, Vishṇudāsa etc. A terracotta seal found in that place has the legend Śrī-Vishṇupādasvāmi-Nārāyaṇa, which means Nārāyaṇa, the lord of the illustrious Vishṇupādā. Bloch thus remarks on this seal: “The looks as if the seal came from the authorities of a temple of Vishṇupādā, perhaps the famous shrine at Gayā. If I am right, the seal would prove the existence of this temple in the fourth century A. D. Thus though the Mahābhārata does not mention Vishnu-pāda yet it can be safely held that the Vishnu-pāda had become a sacred place of pilgrimage in Gayā in or before the fourth century A. D. Panigrahi has suggested that there was a Vaishnava shrine of Nārāyaṇa till the middle of the fourth century A. D. on the Munḍesvarī hill (in Shahabad district, near Bhabua). The existence of the Vishnu-pāda, a Nārāyaṇa temple on the Munḍesvarī hill, the discovery of a sixth century colossal
image of Vishnu at Masarh (Sahabad)\textsuperscript{17} and the installation of an image of Kršna in the Pravaragiri hill (Barabar hill, Gayā) by Anantavarman Maukhari about the sixth century A. D. prove the provenance of Vaishnavism in Gayā and Shahabad districts. The find-spot of an image of Vishnu, riding on Garuḍa, belonging to the Gupta period, in Rajgir (now preserved in the Nalendā Museum)\textsuperscript{18} and the effigy of Garuḍa on royal seals of Budha Gupta, Narasiṁha Gupta and Kumāra Gupta III, found at Nalendā, confirm the prevalence Vaishnavism in Bihar during the Gupta age.\textsuperscript{19} It is rather strange that at Nalendā, where many Brāhmaṇical images have been found, not a single image of Vishnu, Nārāyaṇa or Kršna, belonging to the period under review, has as yet been discovered.

Dr. D. C. Sircar maintains that though Samudra Gupta was a Vaishnava, yet there was some doctrinal difference between his faith and Bhāgavatism. That Emperor followed some other form of early Vaishnavism "like the original worshippers of the Vedic Vishnu and of the deified sage Nārāyaṇa who was first identified with Vishnu and later with Vāsudeva."\textsuperscript{20} We do not have sufficient evidence to find the form of early Vaishnavism in which Samudra Gupta believed. This much, however, can be said with certainty that the preachings of the Bhagavad-gītā had definitely gained currency at the beginning of the fourth century A. D. The Allahabad prāsasti says that Samudra Gupta was the acintya-purusha or Inscrutable Being and whose heart could be won over simply by devotion and obeisance and he caused the production of the good and destruction of the evil. These ideas are but an echo of the teachings of the Bhagavad-gītā IV, 7-8 and XI. 32.\textsuperscript{21} It is also because of Bhāgavatism that the worship of avatāras had become an all-India phenomenon in the Gupta age. During the period under review the people of Bihar are known to have worshipped at least three avatāras or
incarnations of Vishnu, Varaha, Nrsimha and Krsna. The representations of Varaha and Nrsimha can be seen on Basarh seals, labelled Numbers 54 and 191 (ASIAS 1913-14, pp. 126, 133). Dr. J. N. Banerjea describes the figure of Nrsimha on the seal as seated in the lalitasana pose, his right arm raised and the left one resting on hip. He agrees with the remark of Spooner that "it provides us with our oldest datable representation of the deity Nrsimha in India." The installation of the image of Krsna in the cave of the Barabar hill by Anantavarman has already been mentioned earlier.

A few other problems connected with Vaishnavism in Bihar may now be studied. First, a fourth century Basarh seal Number 31, according to Bloch, shows the emblems of Vishnu "ornamental trisula in the centre", sankha and solar disc on the right and moon and ornamental wheel on the left. Dr. J. N. Banerjea rightly argues that Bloch was wrong in finding a trisula on the seal. He identifies it with a trinbasa mark and "an ornate variant of the much simpler one which is sometimes described as 'naga' symbol."

The worship of the foot-print of Vishnu at Gaya led Barua to suggest that it "symbolically represents the stepping of the Vaishnava deity on the Stone of Virtue pressing the upper part of the body of Gayasura" just as the Barhut artists depicted the descent of the Buddha from the Tushita heaven.

Dr. D. C. Sircar, though accepting the resemblance between the Dharma-cakra of the Buddhists and Vishnu's Sudarshana-cakra, yet maintains that the Buddhists may have borrowed the concept of adoration of footprints from the Vaishnavas. Secondly, the inscriptions of the Gupta age do not indicate the independent worship of the siva in any part of India. The Mahabharata, however, refers to the caturynaha-vada. As the Mahabharata was redacted by the fourth century A. D. and since then it has remained the 'Book of Life' it is very likely that the people of Bihar
may have been acquainted with the *vyāha-vāda*. Thirdly it is because of lack information that we cannot determine the nature of Kṛṣṇa cult in in Bihar. But it is certain that the association of Kṛṣṇa with Gopīs or Rādhā was unknown in Bihar. Lakṣmī was widely represented and she appears on a large number of seals of the Gupta period dug up at Basarh. Most of them show the Gaja-Lakṣmī type. The association of wealth with Lakṣmī is conveyed by these seals. On seal No. 6 the Lakṣmī is attended by Yakṣas and Kuberās, as, was supposed by by Bloch. Seal No. 93 dug up at Basarh by Spooner depicts a goddess, obviously Lakṣmī, standing on a high pedestal placed in something like that of a barge. It is interesting to find a naturalistic *āṅkha* or conch on the left side of our goddess in Basarh seal Nos. 93 and 200, the latter being the official seal of the office of the *Kumāramātṛya* at Vaiśāli. Thus the main features of the Vaishnavism of the Gupta period were present in Bihar.

IV. *Sāivism*

Aniconic, aniconic-iconic forms and representations of Śiva have been found in a number of places like Basarh, Baiskaran in Bhagalpur, Nālandā and Gaya. Bloch discovered a seal at Basarh bearing on it a Śivalinga with a *triśūla* or trident and legend below read Āmrātakēśvara. He inferred from this legend that the letter to which the seal was attached must have been despatched by the custodians of the temple of Āmrātakēśvara. Āmrātakēśvara was one of the eight *guhya-lingas*, situated in Avimukta (Banaras) according to the *Matsya Purāṇa*. The trident symbol also occurs in other Basarh seals, bearing Nos. 369, 422 and 574, which were discovered by D. B. Spooner. Amongst the representations of Śiva two seals of Basarh are interesting. Spooner found a fragmentary sealing of the early Gupta period showing *"a very roughly
sketched bullock running to right serves as device and there is a crescent moon above. It is really a representation of Śiva with his crescent moon in his theriomorphic form (Nandin). The Candraśekhara or Śaśānkaśekhara images of south India show a Śiva with the crescent moon on his jata. The iconography of the other seal (No. 764) can be properly understood if we combine the interpretations of Spooner and Banerjea. There is a representation of the Ardhanārīśvara aspect of Śiva, in which the left half figure is that of tall female standing figure of Umā and the right half that of Śive himself, extending his hands in the varadāmudrā. The staff in the right hand, the longish coil of jata placed on the right side of the head, the prominence given to the left breast, the right breast being smaller than the left one belongs to a male figure, and the probable ardhaulīga feature, all taken together reveal Ardhanārīśvara Śiva. It may be mentioned here that the Maukhari chief Anantavarman caused the installation of the images of Bhūtapatī and Devī in the Nāgārjuni hill. Fleet took the image to be of Ardhanārīśvara Śiva. Dr. D.C. Sircar is of the opinion that either there were images of Bhūtapatī (Śiva) and Devī (Durgā) or probably a joint image styled Ardhanārīśvara. A four-faced Mahādeva of the Gupta period was discovered in the village of Kamman Chapra, near Basarh.

The realistic emblems and images of Śiva, belonging to the late Gupta period, have been unearthed at Nalanda. The seal of an office in the district of Šopa-doab has the figure of a Śiva-līṅga with a crescent on its top and flanked by a female attendant on either side. The devices on the seals issued by the Purikā-grāmājanapada and the Caturddīśārya bhikshusānga at Nalanda and the Kālapinākagrāma have two-armed and four-armed figures of Śiva respectively.
Bloch discovered an oval seal at Basarh bearing the legend *Naṁ Paśupateḥ.*\(^{11}\) This legend cannot be interpreted as a definite evidence of the existence of the Pāśupata school in Bihar during the Gupta age. Similarly the evidence of the Nirmand Copper plate Inscription of Samudrasena, regarding the installation of the image of Kapāleśvara does not prove the advocacy of the doctrine of the Kāpālika school in Bihar.\(^{12}\)

Cunningham found at Bais-karan ridge (near Sultan-
ganj, Bhagalpur) a pair of foot-prints below which was written *Rudra-mahālā* that is, *Rudra-Mahālaya* or Śiva the Supreme Lord in boldly cut Gupta letters.\(^{13}\) The importance of this short inscription is that possibly like the Vaishñavas, the Śaivites of the Bhagalpur region also aspired for the abode of Śiva.\(^{14}\)

**V. Śāktism**

The inscriptions and images in the Barabar hills give us an idea of the nature of the Śākta form of worship. The Nāgārjuni hill cave-inscription of Anantavarman Maukhari indicates that the Devī was also called Kātyāyant and Bhavānti and she killed the Buffalo demon Mahishāsura. We are told in picturesque language that the feet of the Devī, "which, surpassing in radiance all the beauty of a full-blown water-lily, was disdainfully placed, with its tinkling anklet, on the head of the demon Mahishāsura".\(^{16}\) This Mahishāsuramardini form of the goddess shows that the people of Bihar were thoroughly acquainted with the *Devīmāhātmya* section of the Mārkandeya Purāṇa, which refers to destruction of the demons, Mahishāsura, Raktbhija, Śumbha and Niśumbha, Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa by Caṇḍi.

Amongst the iconic representations of the Devī, the most popular one in south Bihar was the mother aspect of Durgā. The only difference in variant images is the number of hands and the mount. Beglar noticed a four-
armed goddess seated on a lion and below a legend in Gupta characters  

The monastic sealings of Nalanda of the late Gupta period show four or eight armed Devi riding on a lion\textsuperscript{11}, six-armed Devi riding on a buffalo.\textsuperscript{12} She is also seen riding on alligators or iguanas (godha).\textsuperscript{13} Dr. J. N. Banerjea has given us a number of icon motifs of Paravati or Durga associated with iguana, one of which is as early as the Candra-gupta Cave facade at Udayagiri (Bhilsa), dated in the first or second year of the fifth century A. D.\textsuperscript{14}

During the Gupta age not only the cult of Durga but also the worship of the Mothers had become popular in different parts of India, including eastern India. The Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription of Skanda Gupta refers to the Mātrībhīṣ or Divine Mothers.\textsuperscript{15} The late Gupta Nalanda seals portray (a) a Devi with four hands, having sword and a wheel (cakra) in her upper right and left hands, and a trident in her lower right and an uncertain object in the lower left\textsuperscript{16}, (b) a six-armed goddess riding on a bull,\textsuperscript{17} (c) a seated goddess with a noose (pāsa), a trident, a lotus bud and a water-vessel (kamandalu) respectively in her four hands,\textsuperscript{18} and (d) a skeleton goddess, having sunken belly, haggard look (nirmanśa) holding in her four hands a skull cup (kapāla), a sword (?), a scythe (kariṣṭa) and a trident.\textsuperscript{19} The goddesses of the above-mentioned second and third seals have been identified with Māheśvari, a Śakti of Śiva and one of the Mātrīkās, and Brahmāṇī.\textsuperscript{20} The deity on the fourth seal mentioned above has been identified with Gāmuṇḍā (by J. N. Banerjea, for she is seated facing right on a dead body (pretāsana) and not Mahākāli (MASI, No. 66, p. 48), as pointed out by Hirananda Sastri. About the identification of the goddess of our first seal (MASI, No. 66, S. I. 547) Banerjea observes: "She also does not look like Vārāhi and the emblems held by her hands are indicative of cult amalgam."\textsuperscript{21} This observation is per-
fectly a correct one, because there is hardly any unanimity in the list of Yoginis. We may here allude to the Chaushat Yogini temple at Bheraght (near Jabalpur) where the names of all Yoginis are not canonical. Some of them were derived from cults other than Śakti and some were corrupt forms of Brāhmaṇic originals.

VI. Saura Cult

The discovery of two seals at Basarh bearing the legends Ravidāsa(h) (the slave of the Sun) and Bhagavata Ādityasya and an image of Sūrya (of late Gupta age), unearthed at Barauni and now preserved in the G. D. Collage Museum, Begusarai, show that the people of north Bihar worshipped the Sun. The existence of the votaries of the Sun in Gayā, Shahabad and Bhagalpur regions can be proved by the representation of the Sun at Bodh-Gayā, a temple of the Sun at Deo-Baranark (Shahabad) much before the incising of the inscription of Jivitagupta II and a rock-cut figure of Sūrya at Baiskaran with a legend in early Gupta characters.

Taking into account the rarity of an image of Sūrya, it seems that the Sun-god was widely represented by symbols in Bihar in the Gupta age. A temple seal of Basarh shows a fire altar with probably a solar disc above it and the inscribed words, Bhagavata Ādityasya in Gupta characters. The association of sun and fire is due to the influence of the eastern Iranians, who migrated to India. The relief at the old stone railing (prācinasilāprākāra) at Bodh-Gaya presents the picture of the Sun God on a one-wheeled chariot drawn by four horses. Sūrya is represented here not by a human figure but by a big disc which is seen behind the charioteer. He is attended on either side by two females, Ushā and Pratyūṣhā, presonifying the arrival of dawn and dispelling darkness. Cunningham rightly identified the relief as a representation of
Sûrya, but he committed a mistake in stating that the side figures were of two males and the artist "imitated" the well-known classical representation of Phoebus Apollo in his chariot, drawn by four horses". R. L. Mitra and later on B. M. Barua rightly controverted the hypothesis of Cunningham.

These two symbolic representations show that there was a blending of indigenous and foreign elements in the Sûrya cult in Bihar. The early Iranians used to represent the Sun by a solar disc or a wheel. The later Iranian Mithra of course has a human form. But never had the Iranians conceived of the Sun God drawn in a chariot and flanked by Ushâ and Pratyûṣhâ, as imagined by the Indians.

VII. Gaṇeśa and other minor Deities

The figure of a four-armed Gaṇeśa on a sealing of the Udumbaraka village in Nâlandâ proves the existence of the Gânapatyas in south Bihar. Amongst the other Brâhmaṇical deities worshipped were Kârttikeya or Skanda, "Sarasyâti" and Agni. A Basarh seal (No. 722) has a small naturalistic Šakka, below which is the legend (Śrî)-Dhanadâksya. The other name of Dhanada is Kubera. The worship of Nâgas and Yakshas, two of the vyântara devatâs, continued as can be ascertained from their images at Manyar-math and Nâlandâ.

VIII. Hindu Philosophy

None of the Hindu philosophers of the Gupta age is known to have been associated with Bihar. A few philosophical ideas, however, can be gathered from the inscriptions of those rulers, who ruled in Bihar. The veneration of the foot-prints of Vishnu and Śiva at Gayâ, Basarh and Baiskarâgan ridge show the influence of the doctrine of bhakti. The cult of bhakti means that the universe is a fraction of God and human beings should earn His grace by complete
surrender. An indirect evidence of the influence of these ideas can be proved by the Allahabad Inscription. Samudra Gupta has been described as the \textit{Acintya-purusha} (Incomprehensible being), who caused the production of good and destruction of evil, who being merciful had a tender heart that could be won over by \textit{bhakti} and obeisance, who gave protection to the miserable, poor, helpless and the afflicted and who was the glorified personification of kindness to mankind. The Jaunpur Stone Inscription of Īśāna-varman Maukhari (c. 550-576 A.D.) refers to \textit{Ātmabhū} (i.e. ‘the self born one’, an epithet of Śiva, Vishnu and Brahmā) and as the inscription runs that the King himself by means of compassion and affection allayed the troubles caused by the cruel people and brought happiness to mankind. In these two inscriptions may we not find the influence of the Nyāya-Vaiśeshika theory of existence of God, who is not only infinite, eternal, impartial dispenser of the fruits of our actions, but also an architect of the ordered Universe? It may be argued that when the Sāṅkhya philosophers held that there was no evidence of God and hence there was no question of invocation of benediction of God, it is likely that the kings and their composers of inscriptions of our period, did not subscribe to such propositions of the Sāṅkhya system.

The Buddhist philosophers like Āryadeva, Bhāvaviveka and Candrakīrti, who flourished in Bihar in the Gupta age, have criticised the Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeshika and Mīmāṁsā schools. So it is likely that all the systems of orthodox Hindu philosophy were known in Bihar at that time. Āryadeva’s criticisms have been directed against the Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeshika schools. He devotes three chapters of his \textit{Catuḥśataka} on refutation of the Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeshika speculations. In the \textit{Ṣataśāstra} he rightly points out that the Vaiśeshika school believes in six kinds of positive
realities, an eternal and all-pervading ātman and eternity space, time and atoms. This Buddhist scholar not only criticised the asat-kāryavāda, that is, there is no effect in the cause, of the Nyāya-Vaiśeshika but also the satkāryavāda of the Sāṅkhya school. He sums up the Sāṅkhya theory that the effect must be pre-existent in the causal stuff thus: "the effect pre-exists in the cause on account of the existence of the cause."17

However, the doctrines of bhakti and belief in the existence of God were so widely prevalent that even in a Śākta inscription of Anantavarman in the Nāgārjuni hill (Gayā) we read that: "May the foot of the Devi, fringed with the rays of (its) pure nails, point out the way to fortune, endowing with a (suitable) reward for your state of supplication which is such as befits the expression of sthira-bhakti or firm devotion."18

B. JAINISM

Paucity of epigraphic records relating to Jainism and lack of the literary works of Jainas do not enable us to determine the religious ideas, practices and philosophy of the Jains of Bihar during the period under survey. We have no evidence of the effects of the Councils of Jains at Mathurā and Valabhi17 in the fourth-fifth century A.D. How many of the canonical literature prior to the classification of books after the Second Council were accepted by the Bihar Jains cannot be determined.

The find spots of Jain images and the evidence of Hsuan-tsang, however, give some clue to the extent of influence of Jainism during the period under review. Dr. A. M. Ghatage does not seem to be correct when he observes that in Bihar, "the country of its origin", the Jain religion had lost much of its influence.19 There is no doubt that the Jains continued to flourish in Basarh and Rajgir areas. Dr. Y. Misra informs us that a Jain image, presumably
of the Gupta period, found in Bariarpur (P. S. Sakra, Muzaffarpur) is preserved in the Chandanpaṭṭi Museum in the Muzaffarpur district. R. P. Canda refers to a black basalt image of Neminātha, the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara, fixed on the wall of the ruined temple on the Vaibhāra hill, Rajgir. On the basis of the mutilated inscription referring to (Ma)hārājadevi (pr)ājā Śrī-Candra in early Gupta characters, he comes to the conclusion that the image is of the time of Candra Gupta II. There are also three standing Tīrthaṅkara images in the same shrine, belonging to the Gupta age. On the same Vaibhāra hill there is also a fine figure of Mahāvira with an indistinct inscription of about the fifth century A.D. on its pedestal. On the basis of an inscription of the third or fourth century A.D. on the outer wall and carving of six figures of Padmaprabhu, Pārśvanātha and Mahāvira on the southern wall of the western and eastern Sonbhandar caves respectively, Sri M. H. Kuraishi and A. Ghosh are of opinion that the Sonbhandar caves are Jain in origin and were excavated by a Jain ascetic. These writers have rejected the identifications of Cunningham and Beglar, who regarded the Sonbhandar caves as the caves of the Buddha and Ānanda. The above-mentioned inscription runs thus: "The sage Vairadeva of great lustre (?), the jewel (?) among teachers, caused to be made for the purpose of attaining salvation and for liberation two auspicious caves worthy of ascetics, in which were placed the images of arhats." A few images of Tīrthaṅkaras, including those of Rṣabhanātha and Pārśvanātha, possibly of the early Gupta period, unearthed at Chausa, are now preserved in the Patna Museum.

If we believe in the accounts of Hsuan Tsang relating to Jainism, it seems that during the period under review, the Jains occupied the areas once held by the Buddhists, in at least Vaiśālī and the Vipula mountain at Rajgir. That Chinese traveller tells us that at Vaiśālī though there were
some hundreds of Buddhist establishments, yet with the exception of three or four, the rest were dilapidated and deserted and the "Brethren were very few. There were some tens of Deva-Temples, the various sects lived pell-mell, and the Digambaras flourished." With regard to a tope (stūpa) on the Vipula mountain, he says: "on the spot where the Buddha once preached; many Digambaras now lodge here and practice austerities incessantly; they turn round with the sun, watching it from its rising to its setting." Thus the assumption of another writer that there was a decline of Jainism in Bihar is without any foundation.

C. BUDDHISM

I. Historical Survey

The age of the Imperial Guptas was a critical period for the Buddhists of Bihar. On the one hand they were confronted with numerous schools within the two main systems, Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. The Hinayānists of Bihar were at least subdivided into four schools, Mahāsāṃghika, Sthaviravāda, Sarvāstivāda and Saṁmaitiya. Within Mahāyāna the Mādhyamika and Yogācāra became separate and independent schools of thought. On the other hand, at times there were difficulties in locating older Buddhist sites. A few sites, about whose identifications the foreign Buddhists and Buddhaghosha have given varying accounts, are indicated here. Li Tao-yuan in his Shui-ching-chu (Commentary on the water Classic) remarks on the location of the Grīhadūta at Rajgir that "several accounts are in disagreement and the distances are different too". So there was uncertainty about the location of Grīhadūta already in the fifth century A. D. Modern scholars too are not unanimous about the position of Grīhadūta. It has been identified with modern Sallagiri by Cunningham, with Chatthagiri, east of Rajgir by Marshall, Kuraishi and A. Ghosh, with Udayagiri south-west of old Rajgir by B. C. Law and with
Ratnagiri by L. Petech, whose view is the latest one. There is also no unanimity in the identification of the Pippali-guhā or Pipphali-guhā, where Buddha used to practice meditation and which was a favourite resort of Mahākassapa. While the Mañjuśrī-mulakalpa locates it on the Varāha mountain, Fahsien and Hsuan Tsang on the Vaibharagiri, and in some other Chinese accounts in the Vulture-peak mountain. Another disputed side in Rajgir is the stūpa built by Ajātaśatru. Dr. B. C. Law holds that whereas the stūpa has been located in the Mañjuśrī-mulakalpa and by Hsuan Tsang on the eastern side, and Buddhaghosha in the Sumangala-vilāsini places it on the south-east quarter of the city. Uncertainty equally prevails about some localities in Bodh-Gaya. While Hsuan Tsang refers to the Jewel-house-shrine (Ratnaghara-cetiyam) as situated to the west of the Bo-tree, the Jātaka locates it on the north-west of the sacred tree. Again, Fahsien places the bathing spot of the Buddha (when Sujātā offered the gruel) to the west of the place where the latter was engaged in penance for six years. But the Shih-shih-Hsi-yu-chi puts it as east. Petech tells us that the account of the Lalitavistara agrees with the direction given in the Shih-shih-Hsi-yu-chi. This Italian scholar has also pointed out the mistakes committed by the author of the Waikuo-shih (written during the Chin dynasty 265-420 A. D.) by applying the name of Dharmaranya hermitage to the Gayāśīrsha hill, Bodhi tree as located to the north of Bodh-Gaya instead to the south, etc. Similar uncertainty hangs round the location of the house of Vimalakirti in Vaiśāli as described in the Chinese travel books.

A comparative study of the accounts of Fa-hsien and Hsuan Tsang would show that the once famous Buddhist sites were falling gradually into oblivion. The Waikuo-shih of Chih Seng-tsai says that the house of Vimalakirti in Vaiśāli
was destroyed and its foundations was only visible.\textsuperscript{88} Fa-hsien does not enumerate this house, but Hsuan Tsang describes it as a ruined one.\textsuperscript{89} In the time of Fa-hsien Paṭaliputra was, if not a flourishing city, at least not a deserted one, having a famous monastery where this pilgrim had resided for three years. But Hsuan Tsang found it desolate and notes that the "city had long been a wilderness". Fa-hsien found New Rajgir and Gaya empty and desolate.\textsuperscript{90} The place where the Buddha practised austerities for six years was surrounded with forest. More than two centuries later Hsuan Tsang found Gayā "strongly situated but had few inhabitants "and Rajgir inhabited by only 1000 Brahmin families.\textsuperscript{91} The reason for the desolation of Rajgir may be the recurrence of plague, which has been referred to as ahivāta roga in the Vimānavatthu Commentary.\textsuperscript{92} Buddhaghosha however, ascribes the reversal of the fortune of Rājagṛha to the seizure by the Yakshas.\textsuperscript{93}

But desolation of cities and dilapidation of buildings and monasteries should not be construed as the decay of any religion. Chinese and Ceylonese pilgrims visited important sites, installed images and meticulously noted even the events connected with the history of Indian Buddhism. King Meghavarna of Ceylon (c. 352-379 A.D.) caused the erection of a monastery and a rest-house for Ceylonese pilgrims in Bodh-Gayā. Within about three centuries the monastery grew into a grand establishment, having more than 1000 priests and Hsuan Tsang has left a glowing account of its grandeur and decorations. Bodh-Gayā also witnessed increasing number of monasteries and images. Fa-hsien saw three monasteries in all in which the monks were residing. He also tells us that the people around these supplied sufficient and abundant quantities of goods required by the monks. The great Bodh-Gayā temple had not come into existence in the fifth century. By the time of Hsuan Tsang not only that Mahābodhi temple had come
into existence, but also there were other constructions in the sacred area of the Bo-tree. Hsuan Tsang tells us "The sacred traces are very close together; stoves or shrines have been raised, as memorials, by sovereigns, high officials, or nobles of India, who were pious Buddhists." A close study of his account may lead us to think that the Mahā-bodhi temple was constructed by a Śaivite Brahmin minister long before Śaśāṅka. Dr. Barua presumes that "Śaiva Śaśāṅka is the benevolent king of Bengal under whose auspices the temple was built." It is difficult to accept Barua's presumption, because Hsuan Tsang has recorded some acts of oppression committed by Śaśāṅka against the Buddhists in Bihar. Śaśāṅka is described as having caused the throwing of the foot-prints of the Buddha in the Gangā at Pāṭaliputra, cutting of the Bodhi tree and having ordered the removal of the image of the Buddha and replacement by that of Śiva in Bodh-Gayā. However, the number of monasteries went on increasing in other parts of Bihar. Fa-hsien mentions of 8 monasteries, two in Vaiśālī and three each in Patna and Rajgir. He does not mention of the famous Nālandā Mahāvihāra, the Hamśa, and another monastery near Rajgir, the monasteries at the Rajmahal area and Campā (Bhagalpur) which have been referred to by Hsuan Tsang. It is obvious therefore that these monastic institutions must have been built or become famous after the departure of Fa-hsien.

Fa-hsien gives a graphic description of the procession of twenty cars, carrying images, on the eighth day of the second month of every year in the Middle Kingdom (Pāṭaliputra). He also tells us that "on the day mentioned, the monks and laity within the borders all come together; they have singers and skilful musicians; they pay their devotions with flowers and incense. The Brāhmaṇas come and invite the Buddhas to enter the city. These do so in order, and remain two nights in it. All through the night
they keep lamps burning, have skillful music and present offerings. This observation about the participation of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas in a festival and the evidence of worship of the foot-prints of the Buddha at or very near Pātaliputra, which were seen both by Fa-hsien and Hsuan Tsang enable us to determine the character of the Buddhist religion during the period under survey. Buddhism is no longer the austere and disciplinary code of rules followed by the Hinayānists. Buddhism has developed strong theistic tendencies. The concept of the Buddha has changed. The ideals of a Hinayāna Śrāvaka and Mahāyāna Bodhisattva are widely different.

II. Buddha and the doctrine of Trikāya:

Hinayānists believed in Gautama Buddha as a historic person, endowed with superhuman and super-divine powers and qualities. The Atthasālinī of Buddhaghosa refers to his first and last words, his renunciation, enlightenment and many other miracles performed by him. In the Visuddhimagga we read “That Bhagavā, who is possessed of a beautiful rūpakāya adorned with eighty minor signs and thirty-two major signs of a great man, and possessed of a dharmakāya purified in every way and glorified by āla, saṃādhi etc. full of splendour and virtue, incomparable and fully awakened.” Here rūpa-kāya means the beautiful body and dharmakāya means the collection of his doctrines and disciplinary rules. But Kāya is metaphysically explained by Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsāṃghikas. The Mahāsāṃghikas and their followers like the Vetulyakas propagated that the Buddha was transcendental (lakottara) and his corporeal body (rūpakāya) had no limits, because he had the magical power of appearing anywhere in any form (ādhishthānika ādhi). Buddha is always in the state of deep spiritual meditation. Such ideas about Buddha could be conceived of because they assert that Śākyamuni and
even his son Rāhula were self-born (upapādūka).\(^{108}\) These ideas are taken up and re-explained by the Sarvāstivādins. Vasubandhu believes in the power of self-birth possessed not only by Buddha but also by Bodhisattvas. He tells us that with two objects in view Buddha chose birth in a womb (Jārāyu).\(^{109}\) These are that the people may not take him to be a magician, god or demon, and that he may leave the relics of his corporeal existence. Thus the historic personality of Buddha, as conceived by the Theravādins, is partially denied by the Mahāsāṃghikas and Sarvāstivādins. The conception of transcendental Buddha started by the Mahāsāṃghikas is so firmly established that the Sarvāstivādin and Mahāyāna philosophers have no difficulty in giving currency to the Trikāya doctrine.\(^{109a}\)

It has already been stated that the Sthaviravādins, as represented in the writings of Buddhaghosha, knew of the rūpa-and dharma-kāyas of Buddha, of course not in the sense of the Mahāsāṃghikas. Nāgārjuna refers to these two kāyas.\(^{110}\) The concept of Sambhogakāya is introduced by the Mahāyānists, particularly the yogācārins at a later period. The existence of an earthly Buddha is not denied by any Buddhist school. The Mahāsāṃghikas, Sarvāstivādins, Yogācāra and Mādhyamika schools held that when Buddha assumes an earthly form, being born of a mother and suffering all the consequences of karma, we should say that Buddha has a rūpakāya (material body) or nirmānakāya (created body). Though Vasubandhu\(^{110a}\) refers in his Vijñāpatimātratāsiddhi to the Nirmānakāya of the Buddha, yet he remarks that such a conception was meant for the Śrāvakas Pratyekabuddhas (both of whom are Hīnayānists), common men (pṛthagjanas) and those Bodhisattvas, who had not entered in the path of spiritual progress. Buddha assumes a refulgent form in his dharmanakāya. To the Mahāsāṃghikas, Sarvāstivādins, Mādhyamikas and Yogācārin, dharmanakāya
does not mean the rules of the Vinaya or anicca, dukkha and anatta, as explained in the Nikayas, Dīvyavadāna and works of Buddhaghosha. Nāgārjuna and his followers point out that the dharmakāya is inexpressible and unknowable. Vasubandhu also similarly explains it metaphysically. The Trīśikā affirms that one attains dharmakāya after getting rid of klesāvaraṇa and jñeyāvaraṇa. In short, the two main schools of the Mahāyāna system equate dharmakāya with the real Tathāgata and Tathatā, having no form and no voice and eternal. The third kāya is sambhogakāya, which is mentioned in the Lāhkāvatārasūtra and Vījnaptimātratāsiddhi and not in Nāgārjuna’s works. Vasubandhu in his Vījnaptimātratāsiddhi describes the subtle body of Buddha as Parasmabhogakāya, which can only be seen by the Bodhisattvas. It is distinguished from the Svāsambhogakāya, which is denoted by the term dharma kāya in the Abhisamayālaṃkārakūrikā. Here it may be mentioned that though this third kāya, sambhogakāya or parasmabhogakāya was introduced in the Mahāyāna and Yogacāra schools of thought, yet all Mahāyānists believe that there are only two bodies, gross and subtle, of Buddha. Buddhists may have individual sambhogakāyas but all Buddhhas have one dharmakāya. Dr. N Dutt observes that the conception of the svāsambhogakāya of the Vījnaptimātratāsiddhi “shows a tendency of the Yogacāra school to posit something like the Īśvara of the Upanishads behind the phenomenal universe.”

III. Conception of Bodhisattva

The Mahāyānists believe that Buddha can not render service to living beings. A Bodhisattva, who can become a Buddha, does not exclude himself into nirvāṇa. It is Bodhisattva who fulfills the notion of parivarta or the doctrine of turning over of one’s own merits to others. In this concept we find the difference between the two systems of Buddhism. Though the Mahāsāṅghikas mention of this
concept, yet the Hinayānists in general do not see any need of it. The Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas believe in strict individualism and self-emancipation. But the Mahāyānists hold out the promise that not only monks but lay householders, by awakening the Bodhicitta (through firm resolution to attain bodhi, to fulfill pāramitās and become a buddha) and cultivating the pāramitās, can become a Bodhisattva. Nāgārjuna, founder of the Mādhyamika school, describes Bodhicitta as free from all determinations, not included in all the categories of five skandhas, the twelve āyatana and eighteen dhātus. A similar metaphysical description is given by Sthiramati, an abbot of Nālandā, belonging to the Yogācāra Vijñānavāda school. In his Discourse on the Non-duality of the Mahāyāna Dharmadhātu he equates Bodhicitta with Nirvāṇa, Budda, Dharmakāya, Tathāgata and Tathāgata-garbha and Paramārtha. Vasubandhu, the spiritual preceptor of Sthiramati, describes the process of awakening of the Bodhicitta in his Discourse on the Awakening of the Bodhicitta, which was translated by Kumārajiva in Chinese in the beginning of the fifth century A.D. However, the Buddhists of Bihar in the Gupta age believed in Bodhisattvas and worshipped their images. The Bodh-Gayā image-inscription dated Sam. 64-142 or 382 A.D. refers to the installation of two lion-vehicle stoned images of Bodhisattva. Hsuan Tsang saw the worship of images of Avalokiteśvara and Maitreya in Bihar.

IV. Spiritual practices of the Hinayānists and Mahāyānists.

Inspite of differences in the attitude and introduction of the concepts of Bodhisattva, Bodhicitta and Trikāya by the Mahāyānists, there was a good deal of similarity in the spiritual practices of the Mahāyānists and Hinayānists. The letter, in general, recognise four stages (bhumi) of spiritual progress sotāpati, sakadāgāmi, anāgāmi and arahatta for attainment of the pudgalasānaya. Buddha-
ghosha describes all these stages in detail in his Visuddhi-
magga. The Mahāyānists recognise all these stages (Vasu-
bandhu in his Abhidharmakosa, VI. 34 ff. also refers to these
stages) and also introduced six other stages, which enable a
Bodhisattva to realise the dharmaśāyata. The doctrine of
the six pāramitās, which evolved in the third or second
century B.C. and originally introduced by the Mahāsāṃghiki-
as and Sarvāstivādins, was adopted modified by the
Theravādins and Mahāyānists. The pāramitās, dāna (libera-
ity), sīla (moral precepts), kshānti (forbearance or endur-
ance), vīrya (mental strength), dhīyanā (mental concentration)
and prajñā (knowledge of the truth) are quoted in the
Śikṣāsamuccaya of Śāntideva,119 who lived in Nālandā in the
earlier half of the eighth century A.D.

It is difficult to state the contents and nature of the
Vinaya of the Mahāyānists of our period due absence of
extant literature.119a The Bodh-Gayā inscription, dated Sam.
64 of the reign of Trikamala, refers to the setting up
of two stone images of Bodhisattva in the Amāṭya-dhura-
vihāra by a monk who was upholder of the Vinaya
discipline.119 Dhūra is technical term which signifies way
of study (gathadūra) or way of meditation (vipassanādūra).
It is difficult to ascertain whether the monk was a
follower of Mahāyāna or Hinayāna, because though he
was conversant with the Vinaya discipline, yet he set up
the images of Bodhisattva. Of course, though in the later
phases of Hinayāna, one finds the conception of Bodhisattva,
yet the images of Bodhisattva are the contribution of
Mahāyāna. However, from the accounts of Fahsien it
appears that many of the Vinaya rules of the Hinayānists
were observed by the Mahāyānists.119 That Chinese traveller
found a copy of the Vinaya, containing the Mahāsāṃghika
rules in a Mahāyāna monastery at Pāṭaliputra. He also
got a transcript of the rules of the Sarvāstivādins in the
same monastery.
There was, therefore, no rigid separation between the two systems of Buddhism during the period under survey. But Mahāyāna with its altruistic tendencies and the propagation of the belief that mortals are Bodhisattvas and the abstruse metaphysical speculations of a galaxy of writers like Āryadeva, Vasubandhu, Sthiramati and Diṇāga caused the rapid decline in the number of Hīnayānists during the succeeding period. Tāntrikism had not yet made its full appearance in Bihar.

V. Buddhist Philosophy

The eternal message of ancient Greeks and Indian philosophers was “Know Thyself”. In this quest of knowledge the Buddhist philosophers, like their Hindu counterparts, tried to trace the destiny of man and the highest truth. The Upanishads and the systems following the Brahmanical tradition believe in an immutable atman and substance-view of reality. But the Buddhists of Bihar found that there is no atman, because there is no truth in substance view of reality. Whatever is existent is momentary (kṣaṇika). The so-called individuals are like impermanent waves of a stream. As knowledge is the process of enquiry the Buddhist philosophers did not have a similar opinion on philosophical speculations and metaphysics. The Sāmmitīyas, Sarvāstivādins, and Sthaviravādins within the fold of Hīnayāna differed from one another, just as the Mahāyānists were divided into Mādhyamika and Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda schools. It was due to the differences in the methods of argument between Buddhāpālita and Bhāva-viveka, both of whom were contemporaries at the end of the fifth century A.D., that the Mādhyamikas were subsequently sub-divided into Prāsaṅgika (reductio ad absurdum of Buddhāpālita) and Svātantrika (direct reasoning of Bhāva-viveka) schools. The prominent philosophers of Bihar in the Gupta period are Vasubandhu, originally a Sarvāstī-
vādin, Diṅnāga,Śthiramati and Guṇamati, all of whom were abbots of Nālandā and belonged to the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school, Āryadeva. Māṭṛceṭa, Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka belonged to the Mādhyamika school and Buddhaghosha to the Theravāda school. Āryadeva, the disciple of Nāgārjuna (c. first century A.D.), became the abbot of Nālandā and Āryadeva’s disciple Māṭṛceṭa, wrote such works as were recited by the monks of Nālandā. Dr. N. Dutt observes: “between Āryadeva and Samgharakṣhitā about two centuries elapsed, during which period no contribution of note seems to have been made by the intervening teachers to the Mādhyamika system.” Buddhaghosha (c. 409-431 A.D.), probably born in Bodh-Gaya, translated the Aṭṭhakathās from Ceylonese into Māgadhī language, and from Ceylon he came to Bodh-Gaya to pay homage to the sacred Bodhi tree.

Buddhists criticised the theory of soul (ātmanava) and the immutables, space, time and atom on the basis of their doctrines of universal flux and unsubstantiality. Existence is flux and permanence of a thing is an illusion. There is no continuity of movement in any entity. So Āryadeva writes “Nowhere is there the existence of anything that is not dependent (related to other thing) any time. The permanent does not thus exist anywhere.” He points out that space, and time are unsubstantial, because, they are not objects of perception. Space is also not all pervasive, because it has limit and has parts. Time cannot be a permanent unchanging entity, because, the division of time into past, present and future, can be understood only in a relative sense. As a non-relative present or future is not possible, time cannot be taken as real and permanent. Time cannot be a cause. A cause cannot produce the effect unless it itself is transformed. “Disparity between cause and effect is not proper.” The argument against the immutability of ātman is that when according to
Sāṅkhya school it is changeless and all-pervasive (sarvagata) and cause of everything. Āryadeva argues that as the ātman is not active (nishkriya) it cannot be an agent (karta). So ātman can not bring about a synthesis and coordination between the different state and thereby can not actuate a material thing like the mind, body and sense-organs. Bhāvaviveka in his Prajñāpradīpa also argues that when ātman is not active and non-existent as a skyflower, it can not be the cause of others. If ātman is self-identical it can not transform. Dīnāgā of the Vijñānavāda school describes space, time, inner, outer and all other elements, conditioned and unconditioned, as equally unsubstantial. In short, in both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna systems of our period, the term anātman means the non-existence of any real substance called ātman or individuality. Changeability is the most essential feature of life. So Mahāyānists hold sarvam anityam, sarvam tūnyaṁ, sarvam anātman (all is transitory, all is void, all is without ego).

Theory of dharma

Excepting the Vātsiputṛiyas (Sāṃmitṭiyas) the Buddhists do not believe in the existence of a pudgala. What we call individuality is the aggregate of impermanent and momentary elements. Our personality is but the result of dharma and saṁskāra. Dharmas or elements are subjectively classified into skandha, āyatana and dhātu. Vasubandhu as a Sarvastivādin, presents a list of 75 dharmas, of which 72 are conditioned phenomena (saṁskṛta) and 3 unconstituted noumena (a-saṁskṛta) in his Abhidharmakośa. The five skandhas (aggregates) are rūpa (material body or bodily factors), vedanā (sensation or sense-impression), saṁjñā (conception), saṁskāra (conative disposition) and vijnāna (pure awareness). The six āyatanas are eye, ear, touch, taste, smell and the mind. Dhātus are 18. In the objective classification the dharmas are 75. They are subdivided into five classes, namely rūpa
(11 types of matter), citta (consciousness), cetasika (46 types of mental states and characteristics), citta-viprayukta-saṃskāra (14 types of forces, which are neither mental nor material but common to both) and the a-saṃskṛta (3 types of unconstituted elements). The Sautrāntikas reject a number of them and draw a list of 43 elements. There are also differences about the number of each category of element. While the Vaibhāshikas mention three kinds of unconstituted noumena (the three a-saṃskṛta dharmas are the space (ākāśa) and two types of cessation (nīrodha). The Sautrāntikas reject all of them and the Theravadins accept only one (nirvāṇa). The Yogācārin s mention as many as six space, two kinds of cessation, stable (acala) catalytic ecstasy (saṃjñā-vedayitṛ-nīrodha) and thatness (tathatā). The classification of citta or vijñāna is also not unanimous. The Vaibhāshikas put it as 6, Theravadins 89 and Yogācārins 8 kinds. In short, the combination of the material body, sensation, deeds, consciousness and conception makes a sentient being. The combination of the constituent elements occurs according to the law of karma. The difference between the Vaibhāshika and Mādhyamika points of view regarding the mode of combination of elements (saṃskṛta dharma) is that the latter criticise the rigid nature of entities held by the former. Chapters VII of the Mulamadhyamakakārikā of Nāgarjuna and XV of the Catuḥṣataka of Āryadeva are devoted to the criticism of saṃskṛta. According to the Mādhyamikas of Bihar all momentary entities are mutually dependent.

Praśñyasamutpāda or Law of dependent origination.

The relative existence of all worldly things is due to the formula of causation. Praśñyasamutpāda is the second and third of the Āryaśatyas (i.e. samudaya, origin of misery and nīrodha cessation of misery). All the schools of Buddhists in Bihar believed that truth can be attained through the
comprehension of this causal law. So both the followers of Hinayâna and Mahâyâna hold that "he who realises the causal origination of things sees the Truth; one who sees the Truth sees the Buddha." But all the schools of our period do not give the same interpretation for Pratītyasamutpāda. Hinayânists utilise this formula for proving that all constituted things have a preceding cause and condition. The Theravâdins view the twelve links in the causal chain as explaining the cycle of worldly existence (bhavacakka). Buddhaghosha in his Visuddhimagga states that there is no uniformity in the order of links in that chain. Though anicca (nescience) is the first link, yet taṇhā (craving) can be the starting point of the causal chain. The starting point in the causal chain depends on the requirements of the disciple, which differ from disciple to disciple. The theory of causality has been utilised by Buddhaghosha to substantiate the theory that kamma or intellectual and moral habits of the previous life can be the condition of the succeeding life. In other words, though there is no spatio-temporal continuum, yet future is determined by the past event. Buddhaghosha explains this feature of causality with the help of analogies. The relation between consciousness-continuum and the psychical complex is like that of milk and curd. There is a causal continuity when the milk turns into curd. But the curd is not identical with the milk. A sound produces the echo but the echo is not a reproduction of the sound. So continuity is not absolute identity.

The Mahâyânists believe in the pratītyasamutpāda, but not in the manner of the Theravâdins or as detailed in the Nikâyas. They hold that the necessity of this law is only for a limited purpose, that is to prove that things and events are all relatively dependent and they appear and disappear on account of some causes and conditions. Nâgârjuna as well
as the Yogācārins have exposed the hollowness of causality as a metaphysical reality. They assert that the Law should be universally applicable. The Yogācāra school goes so far as to assert that the causal law of the Hinayānists is a parikalpita truth or belong the domain of imagination. When Nāgārjuna says that "the denial of the law of causality will lead to the abrogation of the four Noble Truths "in the Vighaha-vyāvartanī," it should be noted he is actually proposing the foundations of his theory of Śūnyatā.

The Sarvāstivādins and Sautrāntikas give greater emphasis on the causal factors. No one single cause can give rise to perceptual cognition. Hetu is the direct cause and the three other causes or conditions (pratayahas) are ālambana (object-condition), samanantara (immediate antecedence), and adhipati (dominant condition) in the Sarvāstivāda literature. The Mādhyamikas criticise the theory of four pratayahas and dub them as inconsistent and contradictory. They observe that causation cannot be rationally explained, because "causation cannot obtain between entities which are identical with or different from each other." So Āryadeva remarks that origination, existence and destruction are of the nature of dream, māyā and mirage.

Avidyā:

All schools of Buddhists of Bihar have devoted considerable attention not only to the law of causation but also to avidyā. Avidyā has been uniformly believed to have caused sufferings. Buddhaghosha has given a long list of the results of avidyā, as for example, it covers things which ought to be known, drives beings in the various forms of existence in the kāma, rūpa and arūpa worlds without cessation, blinds one to the realisation of the law of dependent origination etc. The Mahāyānists say that avidyā causes klesāvaraṇa as well as jñeyāvaraṇa (obscuration caused by
passions, obstruction of ignorance with regard to the true nature of the real). Vijnanavadin also observe that the monistic knowledge being obstructed by nescience appears quite different from what it really is, as a magic show, "just as (what is dreamt in) a dream does not attain its aim (when one awakens) the same happens with it." Nescience has the capacity of making to appear as real what in reality does not exist. Thus Diinnaga says that under the influence of avidya, whatever does not exist appears as existent.

The Buddhists are however divided about the contents of avidya. To the Vaibhavikas avidya is satkayadhrsti, that is, endowing the discrete momentary entities with permanence and substantiality. The Vijnanavadins hold that the attempt to objectify (bhya or vishaya-drshti) and the appearance of the object as an entity without consciousness is avidya. The Madhyamikas go the farthest limit and say that conceptualisation is avidya. It is a positive entity, neither absolutely real nor absolutely unreal.

Nirvana

Behind all the controversies about the nature of avidya, pratityasamutpada, theory of anatmanava, consciousness-continuum lie the efforts of the Buddhist philosophers to determine the nature of nirvana as the highest truth. Nirvana was regarded by the Buddha as the panacea of all ills and sufferings of existence. But he refused to discuss its metaphysical implications.

Where the Buddha declined to give a positive explanation, his followers have tried to ascertain the nature of nirvana. During the period under review the problem is whether it is cessation of passions and sufferings or total annihilation of all conscious and unconscious existence. In the Majjhima Nikaya we read "He knows Nibba as (an object) nibba; having so known, he thinks of it; thinks (that he) is in it or away from it; that it is his and that
it is worth praising. The Pubbaseliyas are wrong in their inference, because that passage refers to earthly Nirvāṇa and not to the real Nirvāṇa. Buddhaghosha in his turn believes that nirvāṇa is not a material substance, but as the Kathāvatthu says that it is an eternal state without origination and decay and beyond all description. On the complete destruction of impurities one realizes the nirupadhisēṭha-nirvāṇa. In the Visuddhimagga nirvāṇa has been described as asaṁskṛta, having no origin, decay and change, inexpressible, but eternal and blissful.

Vasubandhu’s analysis of nirvāṇa tallies with Buddhaghosha’s views to a large extent. The Abhidharmakośa shows that Vasubandhu believes in the positive existence of nirvāṇa and not the state of annihilation of elements of existence in nirvāṇa. Nirvāṇa means realisation of both the nirodhas (pratisaṃkhya-niruddha and a-pratisaṃkhya-niruddha) which prevent dispersion as well as non-emergence of impurities (klesas). It is visamyoja or deliverance but at the same time it is a vastu, which means that it is neither the product nor the cause of any other dharma. The comment of Prof. Poussin on Vasubandhu’s concept of nirvāṇa as a vastu or dravya is interesting. He maintains that pratisaṃkhya-niruddha or nirvāṇa is a dravya which the arhat enjoys in his life time in the highest trance and which continues to remain even when the arhat dies. Dr. S. Mookerjee does not agree with this view, because, the Vaibhāṣikas deny absolute extinction of any element of existence and in nirvāṇa there is only cessation of ideation and feeling in the highest trance.

Mahāyānists agree with the Hīnayāna view, as proposed in the Kathāvatthu or Visuddhimagga, that the nirvāṇa is indescribable, has no origin, no decay, no change, cessation of individuality. But the former criticise the Vaibhāṣikas’ theory by pointing out illogicalities. Nāgārjuna observes that nirvāṇa cannot be a bhūva and asaṁskṛta at the same
time. When the Vaibhāśikas maintain that the discrete existences are changed into inopportune existence, Nāgārjuna dialectically proves that there is change in our outlook only and not in reality. Āryadeva gives an outline of the concept of Mahāyāna nīrūpaṇa in his Sātuśāstra. He does not agree to the views of non-Mahāyānists that nīrūpaṇa is the non-existence of impurities (kleśas) and that non-existence is eternal. His argument is that thereby nīrūpaṇa being the result of the practice of the mārga (kleśaniruddha) would be kṣatradharma and therefore, non-eternal, non-external, and non-existence cannot be eternal, as it is a negative notion. When the ‘unbeliever’ puts the following question to Āryadeva that ‘how with words only do you say that there is attainment of liberation, when really there is no attainment of liberation?” Our philosopher replies: “On account of the absolute purity. On account of the refutation of the ātman, there is no individual. On account of the refutation of nīrūpaṇa, there is no liberation; how is it possible to say that man obtains liberation? (We say that) there is liberation only according to the worldly truth.” So nīrūpaṇa of the Mādhyamikas is transcendental, abandonment of considerations of the real and beyond thought-determinations (bhāvabhāvaparāmarśakṣaya nīrūpaṇaṃ-Mūlamadhyamakārikas) of Nāgarjuna (Bib. Budd. IV, p. 524).

The Mādhyamikas and Yogācārinś add another class of nīrūpaṇa—the apratishthita-nīrūpaṇa. These schools take nīrūpaṇa to the realm of metaphysics when they interpret it as advaya (non-duality). Thus on the one hand by the concept of apratishthita-nīrūpaṇa the Mahāyānists link up the concept of nīrūpaṇa with the belief in the dharma-kāya of the Buddha and a Bodhisattva living for altruistic activities. On the other hand by their description of nīrūpaṇa as advaya or paramārtha they identify nīrūpaṇa with the Absolute, which is transcendent and can be realised through non-empirical intuition called prajñāpāramitā, lokottarajñāna. Even Bhāvaviveka,
the founder of the Svātantrika-Mādhyamika school, which has been criticised by the Prāṣṭāgika-Mādhyamikas, defines the aparyāyaparamārtha as "above every possible determination and it is neither existent nor non-existent, (nor both at once, nor neither)." The opening verse of the Prajñā-pāramitā-piñḍārtha of Diinnāga, a Vijñānavādin, describes Prajñāpāramitā and Tathāgata as advaya, which transcends the subject and object. Earlier than Diinnāga, Vasubandhu the co-founder of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school, identifies parāvr īti with nirvāṇa. In verses 28 and 29 of the Viññāptimātratāsiddhi (Trimśikā) he tells us that "when the knowledge does no more perceive the object it makes its stay in viññāna only. There is (then) no more receiving for the absence of objects to be received. This knowledge is mindless, perception-less and supra-mundane. There is then the parāvr īti of the recipient—āsvayasya parāvr īti, through elimination of two kinds of troubles". So nirvāṇa in Mādhyamika and Yogācāra thoughts is not nihilism not annihilation, neither positive nor negative. Mystics alone can, therefore, realise the state of blissfulness in nirvāṇa. There cannot be any higher knowledge than the realisation of the Absolute as consciousness and bliss in any philosophy, be it Vedānta, Saiva, Vaishnava or Buddhist.
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CHAPTER XXX

Economic and Social Condition under the Guptas

(i) LAND SYSTEM

The Gupta economy in Bihar was predominantly rural. Land was the main source of subsistence. The peasants in Bihar, as in other parts of the empire, held land on condition of paying a fixed share of produce and some other taxes to the king. In all probability they had no right to dispose of their land freely. A copper plate grant of A.D. 488 from south Monghyr, although couched in the same terms as the land transactions of North Bengal refers probably to a land transaction in Monghyr effected in favour of a local donee. It seems that the jurisdiction of the vishayapati who made this grant was limited to the area around Nanda-vithi, to which the donee belonged and of which Nanda-vithi was a part. The fact that he does not mention the name of his vishaya shows that being local it was taken for granted by those who were concerned with the land transaction. The present grant shows that it was not easy to alienate and purchase fallow land even for religious purposes. For this the district officer (vishayapati) Chattamahā had to approach the district office (adhikaraya), Brāhmaṇas, other important householders, and inhabitants of the village.° Apparently the village community as a whole enjoyed some voice in the disposal of land, which could not be transferred without their assent.

The above copper plate gives us some idea of the value of fallow land in south Monghyr as well as land measurements. Here land was sold at the rate of 2 dināras a kulyavāpa, roughly an acre, and was thus priced less than fallow land in North Bengal where it sold at the rate of
three dināras a kulyavāpa. It is difficult to determine the modern value of a dināra; Altekar thinks that it was something like Rs. 25.5

Land was used and cultivated in individual plots, measured by $8 \times 9$ cubits rods, according to the cubit length of Darvyikarma, who may have been a surveyor of some distinction, for his hand served as standard cubit not only in Bengal but in the neighbouring areas of Bihar. Land was demarcated by permanent marks of chaff, charcoal, etc., apparently according to a provision laid down by the law books of the period.

We have no information about the forms of tenure on which land was held by peasants in Bihar. But agrahāra land, given away by the emperors and his officers, was held by the grantee according to the akshayantvi tenure, which implied that it could be enjoyed in perpetuity. The only condition was that the holder shall not introduce tax-paying peasants and artisans from outside. The fact that the two spurious plates of Samudra Gupta, both found in Magadha, lay down this condition shows that peasants and artisans were confined to their respective villages so that their self-sufficient economy might not be disturbed. In other words, tax-paying producers could not desert their villages and migrate to new ones, so that the grantee could not increase his income and influence by attracting peasants from outside. The whole thing gives the impression of a stagnant economy. It shows a state of affairs different from Maurya times when śūdra peasants and surplus population from over-populated areas were drafted to found new settlements and bring virgin land under cultivation.

But in one case a village was granted as an agrahāra in Gaya district according to the bhūmicchidra tenure, which would literally imply that the idea was to bring the whole of the village under cultivation. Hence in their case
it would not help production if land was granted for religious purpose. But in south Monghyr the four kulya-vāpas (nearly 4 acres) granted were undoubtedly virgin soil,7 and the object was to bring it under the plough by granting it to an agrahārika Brāhmaṇa, who possessed sufficient resources for the purpose. This again was different from Mauryan policy, according to which the state granted certain concessions to ordinary peasants who would reclaim the virgin soil with their individual labour. On the other hand the Gupta policy of granting villages to Brāhmaṇas began the process of the creation of a class of religious landed intermediaries between the State and the actual tillers of the soil. The inhabitants of the agrahāras were asked to obey the grantee and pay him all dues.8 This conferred on the grantee not only economic power but also political influence. We have, however, no evidence of such a development on the secular side. Secular land transactions are conspicuous by their absence in Gupta times.

(II) CRAFTS AND COMMERCE

It is difficult to determine the extent of either urban economy or trade and crafts in Bihar during Gupta times. But we have certain indications that Vaiśāli, modern Basarh, twenty-four miles from Muzaffarpur, was an important urban centre. As many as 274 seals of the corporation of bankers, merchants and artisans,7 found there, clearly show that they carried on important industrial and trading activities. This impression is strengthened by the seals of the guild of bankers and artisans.9 Many individual seals belong to artisans (kulikas), who evidently formed a considerable and influential part of the population of Vaiśāli.

We have very little indication of the arts and crafts in which Vaiśāli specialised. Of course seal-making, pottery, brick-laying, and building were some well-known crafts.
Working in copper was another important craft, as would appear from the discovery of two copper dishes\(^{11}\) and some other articles\(^{16}\) from Vaiśālī. The discovery of three copper plates from south Bihar and the copper statue of the Buddha from Sultanganj shows that this craft was cultivated widely in other parts of Bihar. But archaeological remains do not disclose anything more. Similarly we have no idea of the articles in which the merchants of Vaiśālī and other cities of Bihar traded in Gupta times.

Pāṭaliputra, Gayā and Nālandā seem to be other important urban communities of the period. Pāṭaliputra known as Pushpapura or Kusumapura was a town of no mean importance, as can be inferred from the material remains of Gupta times in Kumhrar.\(^{19}\) It was probably noted for its craft of gem-cutting, which, as would appear from the term manikāra īreshthin applied to Candanađāsa of Pāṭaliputra in the Mudrārākshasa\(^{11}\), was organised into some kind of guild. But the buildings, made of brickbats rather than of complete bricks, show that materially the town was in a state of decline. Judging from its numerous seals and other finds of Gupta times, from the 5th century Nālandā had become an important town, although it owed its prominence more to its religious and educational than to economic activities. The fact that high dignitaries and common people from different parts of Bihar and outside visited the place to pay their respects to the Buddha presuppose a large urban population which catered to their needs.

We have no definite information about the medium of exchange in the economic transactions of Gupta times in Bihar. A copper-plate grant refers to the valuation of land in terms of dināras in south Monghyr, but since dināra was a gold coin its use may have been limited to only costly transactions. The villagers of the agra-
hāras were obliged to pay hiranyā to the grantee, but what exactly it means we do not know. So for only two hoards of Gupta coins have been discovered in Bihar; one in Hajipur, containing 22 coins and the other in Banka containing 4 coins only. We know of two copper coins ascribable to Gupta times from Vaiśāli and 19 copper coins of the Candra Gupta II from Kumrahāra, but even all taken together do not provide sufficient evidence of the widespread use of money in Gupta times. And the statement of Fa-hsien that in day-to-day transactions cowries were used also holds good of Bihar under the Guptas, for cowries have been recovered in large numbers from Vaiśāli.

The material remains of Gupta times, so far unearthed by the spade of the archaeologists in Kumrahāra and Vaiśāli, are not flattering to those who describe the Gupta period as the golden age of Indian history. At both places houses were made of brickbats, and equipped with pots of coarser fabric. We find less and less of whole pots which give way to easy breakage and increase the number of potsherds. The Gupta survivals known so far in Bihar show that the average house in the town had a better standard in Kushāna times than in Gupta times. This is counter-balanced by the account of Fa-hsien, who, while describing Pāṭaliputra and Magadha, points out that the cities and towns of Magadha were the greatest of all in the Middle Kingdom. He adds that the inhabitants were rich and prosperous, and competed with one another in the practice of benevolence and righteousness. Whether this represents the view of a favourable visitor or the actual state of affairs we have no means to verify.

(iii) SOCIAL LIFE

In certain respects the fourfold varṇa system was not very rigid in Gupta Bihar. The title gupta, according to
the Dharmaśāstras, suggests that the Guptas were Vaiśyas in origin, but Candra Gupta I married the princess Kumāradevi from the Licchavis, who were kshatriyas of long standing although in the law book of Manu the latter are described as Kshatriyas fallen from their code of conduct. The Kaumudīmahotsava condemns the Licchavis as Mlecchas, and Caṇḍasena, probably identical with Candra Gupta I, as a kāraskara. If Guptas were taken as Vaiśyas in origin, such a marriage would be condemned as one in the reverse order (pratisloka) by the Dharmaśāstras, but apparently the Guptas were improvised into Kshatriyas which was accepted by orthodox opinion, and the issues from this union become the rightful heirs to the Gupta dominions. The social union between the Guptas and Licchavis proved to be of great political significance and laid the foundation of the Gupta power.

The Brāhmaṇas were identified by their gotras, of which Kāśyapa, Bhāradvāja and Gārgya are mentioned in the grants. The common title of the Brāhmaṇa grantees is svāmin, which literally means lord or master. The title suggests that they were becoming conscious of their pre-eminent position in society. Some of them owed their status to their learning. Since agrahāras were meant for religious and educational purposes their beneficiaries may have been learned. In one case the grant was made to a co-student (saṃrahmacārīn). Again the Brāhmaṇas who were granted land to perform the five great sacrifices had to be learned. Among the branches of Vedic learning which they cultivated are mentioned the Chāndoga school of the Sāmaveda, Vājasaneyi and Bahvṛca. Some of them seem to have mastered the three Vedas, and hence belonged to the Vedic branch known as Traividya. The schools of Vedic study to which the Brāhmaṇas belonged formed the basis of later caste sub-divisions among the Brāhmaṇas.
Generally the Brāhmaṇas followed Vedic and Purānic religious practices, but they had no antipathy to Buddhist rituals. Fa-hsien informs us that the Brāhmaṇas invited the Buddhhas taken in procession to enter their city, and made offerings to them. We are told of a great Brāhmaṇa, Kādhāsvāmi, who was a professor of the Mahāyāna sect at Pātaliputra.

The Brāhmaṇas who received grants seem to have been local, for their original home is not mentioned. The Guptas did not find it necessary to adopt any deliberate policy of Brāhmaṇisation in Bihar, as was the case with their feudatories in Central India. This was because by this time Bihar had been considerably sanskritised. We do not know whether in Gupta times Ttrabhukti was the stronghold of the Brāhmaṇas, although post-Gupta grants refer to many Brāhmaṇas emigrating from this region to Bengal and Orissa.

Fa-hsien informs us that in Pātaliputra and other cities the heads of the Vaiśya families established charitable houses and hospitals to take care of the poor, orphans, widows and sick persons. Of the ordinary Vaiśyas we have very little information. We come across the names of some śresṭhis (bankers) in the seals of Vaiśālī. One, like the śresṭhi Candanadāsa of Pātaliputra mentioned in the Mudrārākṣasa, bears the little dāsa, which, according to the Dharmaśastras, is prescribed for a Śūdra. This shows that either a Śūdra had risen to the position of a Vaiśya or a Vaiśya had adopted the title of the Śūdra. In any case the Dharmaśāstra rule was not strictly followed, and the approximation between the Vaiśyas and Śūdras was going ahead. In another case the title of the śresṭhi is given as datta, which was borne by the governors (uparika) of Punḍravardhanabhukti or North Bengal. The name of a sārthavāha (caravan leader) is also mentioned, but his title
is not given.35 The title gupta also occurs in one seal, but nothing is known about the profession of its bearer Hari.36

In Vaiśālī most individual seals belong to kulikas or artisans, who generally may have been Śūdras. But here also the titles do not always indicate service, as is enjoined for the Śūdras by the law-books of the period. Of the titles used by the Kulikas of Vaiśālī we find one dāsa,37 three dattas,38 one pālita,39 one sena40 and one bhṛṭṭa.41 Dattas enjoyed a higher status, for they functioned as governors; Senas emerged as kshatriyas at a later stage in Bengal; and bhṛṭṭa was a Brāhmaṇa title. All this cannot be easily explained on the assumption that artisans included both Vaśyas and Śūdras, who according to the Dharmaśāstras, enjoyed the same position in this period. We can only say that the Dharmaśāstra rules regarding titles or professions were not strictly observed in the town of Vaiśālī.

The seals and inscriptions of this period give us some idea of the nature of family in Gupta Bihar. The Kshatriyas took pride in their ancestry, and the Bihar records of the period mention as many as 8 earlier generations of Kumāra Gupta II42 in contrast to the epigraphic records of Aśoka who does not refer to his ancestors in his records. On the other hand there is no attempt to trace the origin of the family from solar or lunar dynasties—a practice peculiar to some post-Harsha dynasties. Some artisans mention their father.43

In the royal family matriarchal element seems to be not less important than the patriarchal element. For the Nālandā seal of Kumāra Gupta III mentions his six female ancestors, including his mother and five successive generations of grand mother.44 Some of these queens seem to have functioned as joint rulers with their husbands. This certainly was the case with the Licchavi princess Kumāra
Devi, who was married to Candra Gupta I and whose name was mentioned along with Candra Gupta I in the coin issued by the latter. We do not know the exact position of Dhruvasvāmintī, who describes herself in her Vaiśālī seal as the great queen, the wife of the mahārājādhirāja Candra Gupta II and the mother of the mahārāja Govinda Gupta. But the fact that she possessed her individual seal indicates that she played some part in the politics of her times. Significantly enough, seals of women have not been found in Nālandā, Vaiśālī or Kumhrar; and the seals of men, excepting those of the royal family, do not mention their mother.

We have some idea of the festivals celebrated in Pātaliputra in Gupta times. Of those observed in the royal court and higher society the Kaumudi Mahotasava seems to be important. At Pātaliputra it was held at the end of the month of Āśvin. So far as the common folk of the town are concerned, they took out a grand procession of the Buddha images in about twenty cars through the thoroughfares of the city in the month of Vaiśākha. The festival was held a week before the full moon day, on which fell the birth, enlightenment and Nirvāṇa of the Buddha. We cannot say whether there is any historical connection between the ratha-pātra festival celebrated at Patna in the rainy season at present and its Buddhist precursor of Gupta times, but popular tradition dies very hard and the possibility cannot be ruled out.
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CHAPTER XXXI

Education, Science and Literature in the Gupta Age

(i) EDUCATION

There is no definite information regarding the system of education imparted in the Gupta age. However, it appears that monastic system of education was prevalent in this State at the advent of the Gupta rule. Originally these institutions were meant for the monks only but later on they were gradually thrown open to the public and in course of time, they became the most important centre of education where non-Buddhists were also admitted. In the words of Sankalia, "...by the 5th century A.D., they had completely turned themselves into veritable houses of learning."

Realising that the Buddhist system of education ever since its rise, was continuously undergoing transformation and was most organised, and as such, was most suited for imparting education to the country, the Guptas encouraged it in many ways. The Gupta rulers liberally gave large donations in cash and in kind to these monasteries for spread of higher standard of education. For example, the rise of Nalanda Saṅghārāma was due to the generosity of Śakrāditya (a Gupta ruler) who was its founder according to Hsuan Tsang. Other Gupta kings like Buddha Gupta, Tathāgata Gupta and Bālāditya built monasteries here. Promotion of education and culture was always regarded as one of the important duties of kings in ancient India. The Gupta rulers, though followers of Brāhmaṇic religion, would have thought it useful to contribute to the advancement of Buddhist monasteries as educational centres when a large number of their subjects was Buddhist by faith and looked upon Buddhist monasteries as their religious and cultural centres.

12—II
Fa-hsien does not mention Nalanda as a centre of advanced studies and researches in Buddhist and other branches of learning. One of the most prominent centres of learning in his time was Pātaliputra⁴ where he saw one Mahāyāna monastery "very grand and beautiful”, and another of Hinayāna. The two together contained six or seven hundred monks. "Shamanas of the higher virtue from all quarters, and students, inquirers wishing to find out truth and the grounds of it, all resort to these monasteries".⁴ This shows that these monasteries served as centres of advanced instruction for mature monks.⁵ This was due to having as their residents several teachers of great renown. One of them was "a great Brähmana, named Rādhā-svāmi, a professor of the Mahāyānas, of clear discernment and much wisdom, who understood everything, living by himself in spotless purity. He might be more than fifty years old, and all the kingdom looked up to him......By means of this one man, the Law of the Buddha was widely made known".⁶ The other distinguished teachers seen by Fa-hsien was also a Brähmana named Mañjuśrī "whom the Śramaṇas of greatest virtue in the kingdom and the Mahāyāna Bhikshus honour and look up to".⁷ In Rājagṛha, there was also another monastery, distinguished as a centre of Buddhist education.⁸ It was also seen by Hsuan Tsang.⁹

At Gayā, the place where the Buddha attained enlightenment, Fa-hsien¹⁰ found three monasteries, in all of which monks were residing. He praised the efficiency of these monasteries or institutions. The disciplinary rules were strictly observed by them. "The laws regulating their demeanour in sitting, rising, and entering when the others are assembled, are those which have been practised by every saint since the Buddha was in the world down to the present day.”¹¹ These monasteries were centres of learning, but
had not yet developed into organised universities like Nalanda and Vikramashila which came into prominence after Fa-hsien.

(II) LITERATURE

The period witnessed the progress of literature, which flourished under the patronage of king and there courtiers. Many of the Gupta emperors were literary men themselves. For example, in the Allahabad Prasasti,\(^\text{12}\) it has been stated that Samudra Gupta was a poet himself, although no work of his appears to have survived him. One of his titles was, "One who established (his) title of the king of poets by various poetical compositions that were fit to be the means of subsistence for learned people." Candra Gupta II Vikramaditya is said to have had nine gems in his court, Kālidāsa being perhaps the most celebrated among them.\(^\text{13}\) It is found that during the Gupta age, it is Brāhmānical literature which flourished much.

It is difficult to define the Purānas or give an exact idea of their contents. They are a storehouse of traditions, legends, myths, dogmas, rituals, moral codes and religious and philosophical principles. In fact, in the words of Winternitz,\(^\text{14}\) "they offer us greater insight into all aspects and phases of Hinduism—its mythology, its idolworship, its theism and pantheism, its lore of Gods, its philosophy and its superstitions, its festivals and ceremonies and its ethics, more than any other work". According to well-established traditions the Purānas are eighteen in number,\(^\text{15}\) but we actually find a large number of texts in addition to the Upa-purānas and supplementary works. They were, according to Pargiter,\(^\text{14}\) originally written in Magadha. He writes, "Such accounts were composed in or near Magadha more particularly, which was one of the chief centres of political life and thought in those times and was famous for its bards and minstrels." The Purānas
were re-edited during the Gupta period—perhaps by the fourth century A.D.17 The principal object of the re-edition of the Purāṇas in this period was to introduce the sectarian doctrines which had come into prominence by that time. As the Imperial Guptas were Vaishnavas, extensive chapters on Hindu rites and customs were added into the Purāṇas under their patronage.

The period also witnessed a development in the Dharmaśāstra literature. Vyāsa, Devala, and Kātyāyana are assigned to this period. However, there is no information about their homes and about the actual authors who wrote their treatise on the names of their ancient sacred teachers. Therefore, we have no clear knowledge about any writer of Bihar who might have contributed to the Dharmaśāstra literature during this period.

The Nītsāra of Kāmandaka may be taken as Bihar’s contribution to the literature on Polity, if identification of Kāmandaka with Śikharasvāmin (proposed by Jayasval), the minister of Candra Gupta II (as mentioned in the Karmadanda Inscription), is considered correct.18

The period not only produced valuable literature on Dharma and Artha, but it also witnessed a marked development of literature on the science of love and sexology, i.e., Kāma, the third aspect or aim of human life. On this subject Mallanāga Vātsyāyana is credited to have written a book whose date is assigned to the fourth century A. D.19 According to Sastri,20 he belonged to Pāṭaliputra and wrote his treatise there.

The philosophical works of the period are many and varied in character. The philosophical ideals of the Hindus took their roots from the hymns of the later Rgvedic literature and developed in the Upanishads and finally grew into six systems of philosophy, namely—Vaiśeshikā, Nyāya, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā and Uttara-Mīmāṁsā. What was
the contribution of Bihar to the field of philosophy of this period is not definitely known. However, one philosopher who flourished during this period in Bihar, was Vātsyāyana. According to Sastri, Vātsyāyana’s ancestors lived in Magadha. His real name was Pakshilasvāmi Vātsyāyana. He wrote a commentary, known as Vātsyāyana-Bhāshya, on the Nyāyasūtra of Akshapāda or Gautama, the early exposition on Nyāya. He is said to have lived in the middle of the fourth century A. D.∗∗

Kālidāsa stands foremost amongst the writers of secular literature of the period. He is taken to be the most brilliant luminary in the literary firmament of the Gupta age who had shed lustre on the whole of Sanskrit literature. He is regarded as the greatest poet and dramatist that ever lived in India. His works are marked with high reputation and popularity throughout the ages. It is curious that nothing is known with certainty regarding his home and the period in which he flourished. His works are all that we know definitely about him. There is a keen controversy regarding the date of Kālidāsa. Scholars like Bhandarkar, Smith, Keith, Max-Muller, and a host of others have placed Kālidāsa in the fourth or fifth century A. D., but in recent years this date has been challenged and some of the historians have placed Kālidāsa in the first century B. C. One of the greatest supporters of the latter theory is Pandey.∗∗

Without entering into details of the controversies about the date of Kālidāsa, who existed in Vikramāditya’s court, we hold the view that Kālidāsa did exist in the fifth century A.D. This theory of ours is mostly based on epigraphic and numismatic evidences. It has been found that descriptions of dresses and ornaments described by Kālidāsa have been faithfully depicted on the coins and images of this period found in this state. References to
Vikramāditya are found in the archaeological finds such as coins and epigraphs from the fifth century onwards.

The detailed descriptions of some of the important places of Bihar in different works of Kālidāsa naturally indicate that this poet was very thoroughly acquainted with the state. He has described some of the important places as well as rivers of Bihar. Magadha has figures prominently in the Rāghuvaṃśa. Similarly Ānga has been mentioned conventionally and was conterminous with Magadha. The next important place mentioned by him is Mithilā or Videha. Gaṅgā is frequently mentioned by Kālidāsa at many places, and in reference to it he has also mentioned the confluence of the two rivers, the Gaṅgā and the Soṇa. For instance, at one place he refers to the wildness of the region and describes how the Soṇa succeeds in checking the Gaṅgā being flooded during the rains. Even the Kosi, one of the oldest rivers of Northern India and specially of Bihar, was well known to Kālidāsa. He refers to the Mahākośiprapāta.

Besides Kālidāsa, the period claims a large number of poets and dramatists. Of course, many of them did not belong to the state, barring a few like Harishēna, Vīraśeṇa (Śābā), Vatsabhaṭṭa, and Viśākhadatta, who were certainly closely associated with Bihar. The name of Harishēna, Vīraśeṇa and Vatsabhaṭṭa are known to us through the epigraphic records of the Gupta rulers. The foremost among them is undoubtedly Harishēna who was a general and foreign minister under Samudra Gupta. His panegyric (Praśasti) of Samudra Gupta inscribed on a pillar at Allahabad is a poem of great merit. Vīraśeṇa, also known as Śābā, is known to us through an inscription from Udayagiri caves. He is said to have “Known the meaning of words and logic and the ways of mankind.” He was a native of Pāṭaliputra, belonged to the Kautsa
gotra, and was a devotee of god Šambhu. He was a poet but unfortunately no work of his has survived. The prasasti of the Mandasor Inscription is said to have been composed with particular care by Vatsabhaṭṭa who was an officer in the court of Kumāra Gupta I. These inscriptions alone would suffice to prove abundantly the existence of a developed poetry (Kāvya) and prose during the period of the Gupta rule. Besides the above-mentioned writers of prose and poetry, the names of Vijjikā and Viśākhadatta are handed down to us through their literary works. Vijjikā was a dramatist and she is known by her book ‘Kaumudimahotsava’ which, according to Jayaswal, describes the political situation of Magadha at the advent of the Gupta supremacy. He called her Kiśorikā and assigned her date to the time of Samudra Gupta, and stated that the book must have been written about 340 A. D. But the style of the play indicates that the writer has borrowed not merely the ideas, but also the language and the metre of the verses of Kālidāsa. Thus according to Mankad, on the evidence of style, the book may be dated much later than the time of Samudra Gupta, and the theme may be regarded as romantic and imaginative rather than historical. Vijjikā probably belonged to South India.

Viśākhadatta is another noted playwright of the period. The plays ‘Mudrārākshasa’, ‘Abhisārikāvamcitaka’ and ‘Devi-Candraguptam’ are attributed to him. There is a controversy among the scholars regarding his date. Some place him in the fifth century A.D. and regard him as a contemporary of Candra Gupta II, while others basing their conclusions on the mention of Avantivarman in his work, assign to him seventh or ninth century A. D. But De writes, “From the critical study of Hillebrandts edition, however, it appears that the variant Avantivarman is most
probably a later emendation and if this is so the theories based upon name lose much of their force." Thus according to De, Viśākhadatta belonged to the older group of dramatists who succeeded Kālidāsa, either as his younger contemporary or at some period anterior to the ninth century A.D. His play, Mudrārākhsha, dramatises the revolution which placed Candragupta Maurya on the throne of Magadha. Devi-Candraguptam describes how prince Candra Gupta killed the Śaka king in the guise of his sister-in-law and eventually ascended the Gupta throne. Court history of Magadha is the subject matter of the work.

In the field of Lexicography, Amarasimha’s Nāma-lingānuśāsana also called the Amarakośa is one of the earliest texts on it. His ascription to the fifth century A.D., however, rests on nothing better than the tradition that he was a jewel of Vikramāditya’s court.

We have no information about books on medicine written in this period. The accounts of Fa-hsien, supported by archaeological evidence give us an idea of well-organised and well-managed hospital at Pāṭaliputra attached with the Buddhist monastery. Sastri has referred to one Vatsyāyana as a physician, who belonged to this period and was the offspring of the Vatsyāyana family of Magadha.

In the field of Mathematics and Astronomy, Bihar found a Newton in Āryabhaṭṭa, who is called the father of scientific Astronomy and Mathematics of the Hindus. He was born at Pāṭaliputra in c. 76 A.D. and wrote his works in about 499 A.D. He wrote a number of works on astronomy which are known only through quotations from his writings given by Brahmagupta and other subsequent astronomers. It is, in general, through these citations that Āryabhaṭṭa was known to be an eminent astronomer anterior
to Brahmagupta in the beginning of the sixth century A.D. From the quotations by Brahmagupta we learn that Āryabhaṭṭa believed in the diurnal motion of the earth round its axis. "The starry sphere", he affirms, "is stationary and the earth making a revolution produces the daily rising and setting of stars and planets". He found out Sine functions and utilised them in astronomy. As pointed out by Kaye, Āryabhaṭṭa appears to have kept in touch with Greek astronomy, which influenced his works. But this view of Kaye has been sharply criticised by Das, who has held that Kaye's interpretation of the passage is faulty. Āryabhaṭṭa's Daśagitikā consists of ten verses in the gitikā metre which is a modification of the ārya. His other works, the Ārya-Siddhāntikā, consists of 108 verses and is divided into three sections, Kālakriyāpāda, Golapāda and Gaṇita-pāda. In these works, the extent of which does not jointly go beyond 118 verses, Āryabhaṭṭa has explained the whole system of Hindu Astronomy. Āryabhaṭṭa was the first to use mathematics in the study of Astronomy. Āryabhaṭṭiyam is his famous work. Problems of Mathematics are only incidentally dealt with in this important work. Besides dealing with the rules of involution and evolution, it deals with the Arithmetical progression, both of numbers and of their squares and cubes. In the realm of Geometry, the work describes several properties of the circle, discusses questions connected with projective geometry and gives a value for π, far more accurate than any suggested till then. In Algebra, simultaneous equations with four unknown quantities have been solved, and the problem of finding a general solution of the interminates of the first degree is successfully tackled. Trigonometry was also being developed at this time. This becomes clear from the use of the Sine functions made for solving the problems of astronomy. Āryabhaṭṭa had many students and his next successor, Lalla, was one of his pupils.
Varāhamihira, another astronomer who, according to Bhaṭṭotpala, a late commentator, was a Māgadha-dvīja. Varāhamihira’s most valuable work is the Paṇca-Siddhāntikā. This book gives a summary of all the Siddhāntas current in his time. They were five in number such as Paulisa, Romaka, Vāśisṭha, Paitāmaha and Sūrya-Siddhānta. He himself mentions that of these five Siddhāntas, Paulisa and Romaka had been already explained by Lādādeva⁶⁶. The ‘Gaṇaka-taraṅgini’ has given a list of Varāha’s works and among them the ‘Bṛhat-Saṁhitā’ is the best. It is encyclopaedic in nature. It treats not only of Astronomy and Astrology but such subjects as gardening, agriculture, architecture, sculpture, strīlakṣaṇa, purushalakṣaṇa, the science of Meteorology, Chemistry, Metallurgy, etc.

Buddhist Literature also flourished during this period. It was in the time of Nāgārjuna that the term Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna gained currency in India and thus he is credited to be the founder of the Mādhyamika school in Buddhism. According to Vidyābhūṣaṇa⁶⁷, Nāgārjuna’s latest date is assigned to 401 A.D. But according to Tāranātha⁶⁷, he was one of the early patrons of the University of Nālandā which came into existence after 400 A.D. There are some who believe that he flourished towards the end of the second century A.D.⁶⁸

Āryadeva, a follower of Nāgārjuna, was the next writer on the Mādhyamika philosophy. Though born in south India, he resided for a long time in Nālandā, where he was a Paṇḍita.⁶⁸ He was a contemporary of Candra Gupta II and the lowest limit of his date is 401 A.D.,⁶⁸ when his biography was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva. He discussed Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeshika and twenty other heretical schools in a work called ‘the explana-

ation of Nirvāṇa’ by heretical and Hīnayāna schools,
mentioned in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra. His another work 'Ṣataśāstra' has been published by Tucci. In addition to the above mentioned books, he wrote following on the Mādhyamika philosophy, such as Śata-śāstra, Brahmmaprathamanyukti-hetu-siddhi, etc., all of which bear evidence to his knowledge of Logic.

This period also witnessed a large volume of literature on Vijnānavāda or Yogācāra philosophy. It is not definitely known who the founder of Yogācāra school was. In the Tibetan and the Chinese books, the Laṅkāvatara-sūtra, Mahāsamaya-sūtra, Bodhisattvacārya-nirdeśa and the Saptadasabhūmi-śāstra-yogācāra have been mentioned as the prominent old works on the Yogācāra system. Among the later writers the greatest of the Vijnānavāda school was Asaṅga who was at first an adherent of the Hinayāna. Later on, he adopted Yogācāra philosophy of the Mahāyāna and is said to have lived for some time at Nālandā as a Pāṇḍita. His date is assigned to about 450 A. D. To him are attributed the following books: Saptadasabhūmi-sūtra, Mahāyāna-sūtra-upadeśa, Mahāyāna-samprāti-graha-śāstra etc.

Another writer on Yogācāra philosophy was Vasubandhu, a younger brother of Asaṅga. Formerly he was a liberal Sarvāstivādin, but was converted to Vijnānavāda late in his life by Asaṅga. He wrote in his early life the great standard works of the Sarvāstivāda. He is said to have commented upon a number of Mahāyāna-sūtra, such as Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Prajñāpāramitā, Śrīmālāsūna-nāda, and compiled some Mahāyāna-sūtras, such as Vijnānamātra-siddhi, Ratnatraya and Mahāyānasamprāti-grahavyākhyā. His Abhidharama-kośa, represented his views on the Mahāyāna. Sugīra has ascertained from Chinese sources that in the seventh century A. D. while Hsuan Tsang was in India, he saw three other works on logic attri-
buted to Vasubandhu, which are called in Chinese Ronki, Ronshiki and Ronshin, respectively. Hsuan Tsang has translated his few books into Chinese, which are as follows: Vijñānamātrasiddhi, Madhyānta-vibhanga and Viṁśikā-prakaraṇa.72 According to Takakusu,73 Vasubandhu flourished in the period 420 to 500 A.D. This fact further gets support by the statement of Tāranātha, who tells us that both Asaṅga and Vasubandhu were great Paññītas of Nālandā.74 Thus their dates coincide with the date of the rise of the Nālandā University which came into existence after 400 A.D. as Nālandā was a mere village when the Chinese pilgrim, Fa-hsien came to visit India.

Another great Paññīta of Yogācāra at Nālandā was Acārya Diṅnāga. He composed many dialectical śāstras. The Pramāṇa-samuccaya75 is one of the greatest literary works of Diṅnāga. The Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti is a commentary on the Pramāṇa-samuccaya by Diṅnāga himself. Nyāyapraveśa or Nyāya-praveśo nāma-pramāṇa-prakaraṇa is another excellent work on logic by him. Next comes his small treatise on logic entitled Hetu-Cakradamaru Pramāṇasastra-praveśa, Ālambāṇa-parīkṣā and a commentary on the Ālambana-parīkṣā named Ālambana-parīkṣā-vṛtti and Trikālaparīkṣā are also attributed to him.76 He belonged to South India from where he was called to Nālandā to combat the Hindu dialectics and later on became the Head of the Nālandā Monastery. There is a difference of opinion as to when he lived. According to Keith77 he lived in about 400 A.D. but Keith’s conclusion is questionable in view of the fact that Diṅnāga came after Vasubandhu. Since Vasubandhu has been placed from 420 to 500 A.D. the most probable period of Diṅnāga appears to be between 500 to 550 A.D.

According to Tāranātha, Diṅnāga was succeeded by Jayadeva and Candrakīrti but their names are not mentio-
ned either by Hsuan Tsang or I-Tsing even though they have given a list of names of the famous paṇḍitas of Nālandā, Tāranātha writes about Candrakīrti that he was a great master of masters, and composed commentaries upon Mādhyamikamūla, Mādhyamikavicāra and upon the First Principle. Perhaps, the interregnum marked in Tāranātha’s history was filled up by Hsuan Tsang’s mentioning the name of Guṇamati and Sthiramati. The latter has been described by Hsuan Tsang as the founder of a monastery at Valabhi. Tāranātha mentions a treatise called Abhidharmakośabhāṣhayaṭikā-tattva which he ascribes to Sthiramati. Besides, he undertook the revision and correction of the Tibetan works, such as Saḍāṅga-yoga, Lakṣaṇābhidhānodbhāt-ṭhā-aghu-tantrapiṇḍārtha-viṣṇunāma, Śrī Bud- dhakapāla-mahā-tantra-rāja-ṭīkā-abhaya-paddhaṭi-nāma. He is said to have flourished in the latter half of the fifth century and the first half of the sixth century A. D.
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CHAPTER XXXII

Art and Architecture in the Gupta Period
(320 to 750 A.D.)

ROCK-CUT ARCHITECTURE

Rock-cut excavations represent an aspect in Indian architecture that has its origin in the Mauryan period in about third century B.C. and the earliest extant examples are known from Bihar at Barâbar and Nâgârjuni Hills in Gaya district. There we have a group of caves, which are attributed to Asoka and his grandson Daśaratha. This tradition flourished in the subsequent periods chiefly in western India and little is known of their existence elsewhere.

It is not generally realised that experiments in this form of architecture continued in Bihar at least in our period. A single chamber 16'9"×11'3" with a small porch 6'×5'6" in front is situated at the Nâgârjuni Hills on its northern side in a low rocky ridge and is known as Vâpi or Vâhiyaka cave. It is attributed to the Mauryan king Daśaratha on the evidence of the inscription on the left side of the porch of the cave. But little attention has been paid to another inscription on the side-wall of the same porch, which is in Gupta characters of the fourth-fifth century A.D. and reads as Videśa Vasusya kṛtiḥ i.e. the work of Videśa Vasu. This undoubtedly suggests that some part of the cave was excavated by him in the Gupta period. To us it appears that only the porch was excavated in the time of Daśaratha and the chamber was added to it later in the Gupta period.

Most likely, those two caves at Rajgir, which are excavated on the southern face of the Vaibhâra hill, facing the
western portion of the valley, also belong to our period. These caves are adjacent to each other. The western one is called Son-bhāṇḍāra i.e. "treasury of gold". This consists of a large chamber $34' \times 17'$ and is provided with a doorway and a window. The door has the sloping jambs, the width at the top is about $6''$ less than the width at the base, which is $3' 4''$ while the height is $6' 6''$. The roof is arch-shaped with a rise of $4' 10''$, making the total height of the chamber $11' 4''$. This is generally attributed to the Mauryan period. Archaeologists like Cunningham, Beglar, Aurel Stein, John Marshall and others had tried to identify this and the adjoining cave with the famous Saptaparni caves of the Buddhist tradition, where the first Buddhist Council was held during the reign of the king Ajātaśatru. But this view is hardly acceptable; not their attribution to the Mauryan period. The cave has a number of short inscriptions on the inner walls, the door jambs and on the front wall. One of them is in shell characters. Others are mostly obliterated; but the one to the right of the door was read by T. Bloch. According to him, the caves were excavated and Jain images were installed there by Muni Vairadeva. This inscription is assigned to the third-fourth century A. D. on palaeographical grounds.

The adjacent cave is in a more ruinous state. It consists of a rock-cut chamber $22'6'' \times 17'$. A part of the front has fallen. It had once a built-up verandah in its front as seen in the existing traces of a platform and courtyard built of bricks. The roof of the verandah was supported on wooden beams as seen from the holes in the outer wall, wherein they were originally placed. The cave and its front are on a lower level and above it are the traces of another storey built of bricks, which was once approached by the flight of rock-cut steps, existent even now. Apart from the Gupta inscription of the adjoining
cave, we have another indication for attributing the cave to the Gupta period in the beautiful images of Vishnu riding on Garuda, which is now in the Nalanda Museum. It was found in the verandah of this cave and is undoubtedly a product of the Gupta period.

Seven rock-cut caves are known in the Patharghata Hill, about eight miles north-east of Kabalgaon (Colgong) in the Bhagalpur district, situated facing the river Gangā, just where the river resumes its easterly course. These caves have found hardly any attention from the archaeologists and scholars. One of the caves, which we may call as the finest, has a gateway flanked by two carved pilasters with inverted lotus capital. Its ceiling was originally covered with a beautiful ornament in relievo; but most of them is now lost. This cave may be placed in about the sixth century A. D. The other six caves also belong to this period; but they are plain excavations with very little ornamentation. Three of these caves are known as Patalapuri, Batesvara and Bhairava caves.

At Kabalgaon (Colgong), an attempt was made in the late seventh century or the beginning of the eighth century A. D., to cut rocks into the relief of a temple, a form which is known only in the South in the Pallava tradition of Mamallapuram (Mahabalipuram) and Ellora (Kailasa temple). This rock-cut temple was carved out of a single boulder of granite rock surrounded by the river Gangā. The shrine chamber inside is only 4' deep, 1'10" broad and 2'6" high. Externally, it is 12'×11' and 20' high with its roof imitating the horse-shoe vault as seen in the Mamallapuram rathas, with gable ends formed by the side walls, which rise higher than the roof and are shaped like pediments. The side-walls bear leaf-shaped decoration surmounted by krtimukha motif. In front of the shrine is a similar small porch 3'1"×1'5" and 3' high.
The interior and the exterior of the temple are undressed; so, it is suggested that the work is incomplete. This finds support in the fact that no image has been found inside the temple.

**STRUCTURAL BUILDINGS**

*Monasteries and Stūpas:* The remains of a quite large Buddhist monastery of quite an early period was exposed in about 1864 at Sultanganj in Bhagalpur district, when a quadrangular brick mound 1200' × 800' was dug away to provide brick ballast for the railway line. It probably consisted, in plan, of a court-yard lined with small cells or cloisters on all the four sides. Remains of a large gateway with side pillars were also disclosed, which may have formed an entrance to the court-yard. The cells or the chambers measured 12' × 10'6" to 14' × 12' and perhaps had concrete and lime floors. In front of the cells there may have been pillared verandah opening out into the court-yard. The verandah floor was also laid with concrete and lime and was painted in fresco of a light ocher colour. Inside the court-yard were the traces of drains consisting of water-pipes of granite. The building was surrounded by a thicker compound wall, traces of which could then be noticed on the western and the southern sides.

Adjacent to the monastery was a brick-built stūpa about 90' in diameter built on an octagonal plinth about 94'6" in diameter. The top of the stūpa was found to be 48' × 43' with a height of 28' above the floor level of the monastery. At the bottom of the stūpa, inside was found another smaller brick stūpa 8' in diameter, standing in the midst of a square apartment, the intervening space being filled with earth. Inside the small stūpa was discovered an earthen vessel containing the seven *ratnas* viz. (i) gold (ii) silver (iii) crystal (iv) sapphire (v) ruby (vi) emerald
and (vii) jacinth or zircon. Two silver coins, one of Mahākṣatrapa Svāmī Rudrasena (?) son of Mahākṣatrapa Satyasena (?) and the other of Candra Gupta II were also found inside the vessel. The earthen vessel was kept on a brick, which when removed disclosed a cavity 9" × 6" in which was found a bone imbedded in some fine red clay. This was a real relic stūpa, which could be definitely dated towards the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century A. D.” It is however, not clear from Cunningham’s report whether both the larger and the smaller stūpa were of the same date or the larger one was built later; but a few stucco heads and pieces of sculptures that were found there, stylistically belonged to the early Gupta period. The whole of the exterior of the Stūpa was thickly plastered and divided into compartments by pilasters; each compartment was filled with a figure of the Buddha with various attendant figures.

A huge brick-built stūpa, polygonal or star-shaped at the base, with a height of more than 80 feet in its ruined state was discovered in an excavation at Lauria Nandangarh in Champaran district. At the base it measured about 500' across the centre; the main four sides facing the cardinal points, were 104' in length and at a distance of 266' from each other. The space between the two sides in each of the four quadrants was covered by 28 smaller sides, showing 14 re-entrant angles and as many as 13 corners. In its existing state, it consisted of five terraces, raised one above the other. On the three of the terraces there was a passage for circumambulation. But strangely enough, no stair-case could be traced to provide access for these procession paths. The only decoration on the facade of the structure was a horizontal band of a course of moulded bricks, with rounded edge running all along the faces of the wall. In the shaft dug out in the centre of the mound, at the depth of 14 feet was found the remnants of an altar.
Farther down at the depth of 35 feet from the top, was found the top of an intact miniature stūpa, complete with a surmounting square umbrella. This stūpa was 12 feet in height and was polygonal like the big stūpa, at the base. By the side of the stūpa was found a copper vessel, which contained a long strip of birch-leaf manuscript of a Buddhist text written in the characters of the early fourth century A.D. This leaves no doubt that the huge edifice was constructed some time in the fourth century A.D. An edifice of such stupendous dimensions is perhaps unparalleled in the entire range of the monuments of the Gupta period.

On the Ratni or Kunwa hill near the village Dharawat in a low pass for an approach to the Barābar hills, Cunningham had found the ruins of two small temples, a stūpa and three masonry basements or platforms. He explored the stūpa thoroughly and found it to be 30 feet in diameter built of bricks (15" × 9½" × 3") with a height of only 18" feet having survived at the time. Every brick of the stūpa was marked with a figure of stūpa, either traced in out-line or impressed in relief. Inside the stūpa were found besides other things, two seals in the Gupta characters, which showed that the stūpa was built in about fourth century A.D.¹⁰

Kumhrar, the site of ancient Paṭaliputra, was excavated by Spooner in 1913-14. Then he had found there the ruins of some brick-built buildings, whom he assigned to the Gupta period from the antiquities found associated with them.¹¹ But strangely enough he says nothing about their architectural and other features. However, in the excavations, conducted on the site in 1951 by Altekar, were found the remains of a Buddhist establishment, which flourished there in the Gupta period. Among them was a monastery called Ārogya-vihāra, known from a sealing found there in the Gupta characters reading Sri-Ārogya-vihāra.
bhikshu-sanghasya. This Ārogya-vihāra monastery was a little different from the plans that is usually known for such buildings. The building could not be fully exposed. What was exposed was merely a wing about 100' in length. Since the area to the either sides of the rooms were heavily robbed, it was not possible to say if the rooms had any verandah in their front. The rooms that were exposed were of more than one dimensions. They measured 14' × 10', 21' 6" × 10', and 10' 8" × 10'. Most likely the smaller rooms were meant for living and the bigger ones were probably halls for prayer or for dinner congregation or for the hospital beds.¹³

Some time in the middle of the fifth century A. D., the foundation of the great institution of learning and monasticism was laid at Nālandā in the time of Skanda Gupta, as is suggested by the statement of Hsuan Tsang. He says, “A former king of the country named Śakrāditya (i. e. Skanda Gupta)¹³ selected by augury a lucky spot and built here a monastery.” The excavated ruins as seen today are just a mess of structures, mostly stūpas of various dimensions, over-lapping and crossing into each other and clinging round the great central mass of building, designated as the Main Site No. 3 by the Archaeological Survey of India. A closer examination shows that it is a product of development of numerous changes and additions from a small stūpa to a gigantic temple. This development might have taken at least three centuries. In the beginning the process was to encase the ruined stūpa within a new enlarged stūpa. After the ruin of the sixth stūpa, a gigantic temple was built, which is described below. Of the six stūpas encased in the base of this temple, the first four were not of much significance from the architectural point of view. But the fifth stūpa brought a characteristic change both in form and dimensions. This stūpa was quite extensive in
proportion and was provided with four corner towers, which along with the facades were decorated with rows of niches containing well moulded stucco figures of the Buddha and Bodhisattvas. It was surrounded by a motley of votive stūpas, which yielded bricks inscribed with sacred Buddhist texts datable to the sixth century A.D. This enables us to date the stūpa in that period. This is also confirmed by the art of the stucco figures. In view of this dating, the innermost little stūpa i.e. the first and the most ancient stūpa may be said to belong to the beginning of the Gupta period i.e. of the fourth century A.D.

Temple: A sun temple of the early Gupta period existed at Deo Banārak in the Shahabad district (now the Bhojpur District). According to an inscription of Jīvita Gupta of the Later Gupta dynasty, it was known as Varuṇavāsin; to it, he had continued the grant of a village. Most likely the temple was the same, on a pillar of which, the inscription is engraved. The temple consisted, in plan, of a shrine chamber 9'1" square internally and a large pillared hall in front 25'×21' with four highly ornamented pillars in the centre for the support of the roof. As seen by Cunningham, the walls of the shrine, as well as its double storyed spire were built of bricks. The roof of the ground floor of the shrine was square at the base, reduced above to eight sides by overlapping stone slabs, which in turn was reduced to sixteen sides, over which again was arranged a second square, which was similarly reduced to sixteen sides, the last opening was closed by a single slab. The roof of the upper storey was however a brick-built vault. Most likely, the brick-walls of the shrine and of the hall and the brick-built spire over the shrine were later additions. Some scholars doubt that the temple too, is not the original one. According to them, the original temple would have been built some where near the
tank and not at a distance. They think that the material of the original temple had been used for the temple mentioned by Cunningham. But even then, there are reasons to believe that the original early Gupta temple would not have been materially different.

No other remains of Early Gupta temples are known so far. The few, that may be assigned to the period under review, are dated in the sixth-seventh century A.D. Of them the most peculiar type of temple of this period is the cylindrical brick structure known as Maniyāra Maṭha i.e. the shrine of Maṇi Nāga, standing almost in the heart of the old city of Rājagṛha. Excavations have revealed that the present structure is the result of successive accumulations of ages. One of the strata of the building undoubtedly falls within our period. This stratum shows a circular wall with shallow projections at the four cardinal points. The cylindrical form of the edifice, is the result of following the alignment of the earlier building, which was hollow cylinder made of 4' thick wall and had a projection at each of the cardinal points closely resembling the Āyakas of early stūpas of the Āndhra-daśa. It has an entrance door-way on the north. The outer wall was decorated with fine stucco sculptures. They existed at the time of the excavations; but now almost all of them are lost. These stucco figures were on an average 2 feet in height and represented Hindu deities like Viṣṇu, Gaṇeśa, Naṭarāja and the figures of Nāgas and Nāginis. The artistic styles of the stucco figures could well be compared with the images of the same material found at the Main Temple site No. 3 at Nālandā and placed in the same period.

The great Mahābodhi temple at Bodh-Gaya was restored and renovated so many times that it is difficult to determine its original architectural form. As it exists now, it
consists of the main shrine chamber $47'3'' \times 48'8''$ externally and $20'4'' \times 13'$ internally, with a narrow passage through the thickness of the wall, an ante-chamber and a portico on the east. The portico in front, is evidently later than the original temple. The temple is built on a slightly raised terrace paved with granite stone slabs with large-size bluish bricks plastered all over the surface. It has a high straight-edged pyramidal sikhara, surmounted by a fluted amalaka and angle-amalakas at the corners indicating different stages. Each of the four faces of the sikhara are ornamented with horizontal tiers of niches done in plaster, every one of which, most likely, had stucco figures of Buddha or Bodhisattvas. The front face has a tall lancet opening for the light into the sanctum. Miniature replicas of the main sikhara are placed on the four corners of the base of the sikhara. The sanctum inside is double-storeyed and has a vaulted roof plastered over and ornamented with the rows of panels each containing a small Buddha figure. Along its western wall is a raised pedestal of black basalt 4' high 5'9'' broad, for the enshrined image of Buddha, with granite-paved floor in front. The floor-slabs bear carvings of figures of pilgrims, on their knees, facing the pedestal and holding flags or offerings. The ante-chamber in front of the sanctum and the entrance portico have both of them, vaulted roofs. The total height of the temple from the basement floor to the top of the sikhara is about 160 feet.

This existing form of the temple almost corresponds with the description of the Mahábodhi-vihāra given by Hsuan Tsang. If he meant this very temple, then it shows that the temple existed in the seventh century A.D. in the very form as it exists today with all its essential elements. The construction of the temple in brick, the straight contour of the sikhara, the tall lancet opening in front, the caitya-niches on the four sides of the sikhara with the figures of the
Buddha, have close parallels in the Bhitargaon (Kanpur district) temple, to which the Bodh-Gayā temple is probably coeval.

Hsuan Tsang also describes the great temple at Nālandā, erected by Narasimha Gupta Balāditya, as being over 300 feet in height and resembling the tower of Bodh-Gayā temple. It is believed that the massive remains of the basement over the stūpas at the Main Temple Site No. 3 represents this very temple. This basement is about 60 to 80 feet from the ground, with a mighty flights of steps. It shows that the external dimensions of the building at the base were more than 120' square. The plan has not been satisfactorily made out. Traces of an oblong shrine-chamber with colonade porch in front are the only remains of the building. However, it may be surmised that the original building would have been most imposing. Its lofty śikhara would have commanded the view of the country for miles around.

From the Shahpur Inscription of a balādikṛta of the reign of king Ādityasena, appears that a Hindu institution or at least a temple existed at Nālandā as early as the seventh century A.D. The remains of a Hindu temple has actually been found there at Site No. 2. The excavated remains of the temple show a squarish plinth 4' 2'' high, built of stone, measuring externally 118' x 102' and having a flight of steps on its east, projecting 17' beyond the wall. On this plinth were found the traces of a large temple having a sanctum about 52' square and a small porch with a small recess on its both sides. The dado of the plinth consisted 211 sculptured panels over the moulded basement, surmounted by two (or at places three) decorative cornices. These panels are arranged systematically, 20 appearing on each side of the entrance on the east and 57 each on the remaining sides. Each panel is defined by decorative
pilasters on both sides with a carved niche in between them, containing in relief sculptured subjects inside. The carvings include scenes from Hindu mythologies, such as those from the lives of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa and representations of deities Śiva-Pārvatī, Kārtikeya, Sūrya, Gaja-Lakṣmi, Kubera etc. These carved panels may well be assigned to the sixth or seventh century A. D.

The remains of the finest specimen of the temple architecture of the late Gupta period i.e. of the seventh century known today, is that of the Śaiva temple of Maṇḍapalēśvara (now called Muṇḍēśvarī), situated on a 800 feet high top of a hill at Ramgarh, about seven miles from Bhabhua in the Shahabad district. It is octagonal in plan 40' in diameter externally and 20' internally, made of dressed stone slabs. It possibly had a pillared porch in front of the main entrance, which no longer exists. On the four sides facing the cardinal points, the temple once had four entrances with exquisitely carved door-frames, bearing on the lower portions of door-jambs, the figures of Gaṅgā and Yamunā on the eastern side, two figures of Śiva on the western side, two female figures (most likely Pārvatī on the northern side and a pair of dvārapālas (door-keeper) on the southern. On each of the rest of the four sides of the octagon, on the exterior are three carved niches, flanked by elaborately ornamented pilasters having ‘vase and foliage’ designs and caiṭya arch decorations. Images would have originally existed in these niches; but they are now empty. The original roof of the temple was probably pyramidal with āmalakas at the corners and at the top. It is now lost.30

There was another beautiful temple of this period, related to Vishṇu, at Āphsad in the Gayā district. According to an inscription, found there, it was constructed by Koṇadevi1, the wife of King Ādityasena of the later Gupta
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dynasty.\textsuperscript{11} The remains of this huge mound that awaits the
The basement of a Śaiva temple a little earlier, is known on
of Barabar Hills called Surajgad. The temple is built a quite late temple in worship.\textsuperscript{12} A temple of Mer existed at Mangraon, district of Vishnū Gupta of the late an inscription found there.\textsuperscript{13} of this period were noticed by in Saran district, Mer in the in Hazaribagh district and in district,\textsuperscript{14} but no details are available.

Within Bihar, Bloch has of the brick-buildings that ancient Vaiśāli) in Muzaffarpur known as Rāja-Bisāla-kā-garbhag of he has not defined them. that those buildings were most of rooms and chambers a few larger rooms he found that he exposed were of common oblong in size up to 16' in fact that he discovered about they were roofed with tiles.\textsuperscript{15} materials at the ancient site. The tiles that he found there rill on each longer side near another below. This showed his other. The tiles had a small most likely to fix the tiles roof.
temple are now buried under mounds of the archaeologist. 

of this period or probably one of the peaks in the range of Koka. Over this ancient base are Siddheshwaranatha and is Pratapa-Keśava or Subhadresvara and Shahabad during the reign of Gupta dynasty according to the ruins of some other temples the archaeologists at Belwa. Shahabad district, Satagaon" in the Singhbhum were available about them.

vaguely suggested that some were exposed at Basarh (the four district from the mound were secular in nature. But has only vaguely referred by irregular in plan and remarkably small size. Only here. The floor of the buildings were or paved with bricks, length. The most interesting about these building was that The discovery of the roofing in India are extremely rare. were oblong and flat, with a thick edge, one above and the tiles were joined together, close to the rounded top, in the wooden planks of the
STONE SCULPTURES

The Gupta art showed the qualities of mature refinement, rhythmic balance, sensitive modelling, aristocratic detachment and spiritual glow in the domain of sculptures. A subtle sensuousness and emotional warmth added charm to it. But unfortunately, dated or definitely datable sculptures of the early Gupta period are few and far between; but the few that we have, help us in determining, howsoever roughly, the beginning and the early stages of the evolution of the Gupta plastic conception.

So far the extant examples go, Gupta plastic conception seems to have originated at Mathurā, where were produced in the early centuries of the Christian era, massive Bodhisattvas of extraordinary strength and energy. Mathura exported its sculptures to Śrāvastī, Kauśāmbī and Sārnāth and most likely to many other places also, including Magadha. This export seems to have been continuing in the beginning of the present period. We find Mathurā inspiration working at Bodh-Gayā. Bodhisattva from Bodh-Gayā dated in the year 64 of Mahārāja Trikamala is the earliest known example of the plastic art that may be placed in the Gupta period. He is shown in the characteristic seated pose with a conspicuous protuberance over the head covered with short snail-like curls, his countenance reflecting wisdom and meditative calm. Structurally and iconographically, it clearly belongs to the Mathurā school of the first-second centuries A.D.; but the heaviness that is seen there, is found here under the discipline of modelling having firm outline and geometrical composition.

To this early Gupta period may also be placed a few railing components from Bodh-Gayā. Two of them are the coping-stones with lively and forceful reliefs of animal figures—buffalo, tiger, bull etc. on one side and a band of lotus-petals on the other. One of them is in the Patna
Museum and the other in Berlin-Delham Museum. A part of cross-bar with the medallion having a kinnara figure on one side and a lotus medallion on the other, is another piece of this period in the Patna Museum.

The plastic art under the Guptas developed a new form at Sarnath having a soft and delicate modelling, gentle gliding, smooth flow and subtle lines. The sculptors of Magadha had before them in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., the process and the experience of both the schools—Mathurā and Sarnath. They adopted both these matured traditions with depth and intensity and adjusted according to their local conditions—ethnical, social and religious.

The bas-reliefs on the pillars from Chandimau (near Giriak, district Gaya; now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta) datable to the fifth century A.D., depicting the scenes from Kiratārjuniya episode are more local in their affiliation and more variegated in character than the schematic reliefs from Sarnath of the same period. Quite different aesthetic impulse and social experience appears in them. The figures are concentrated in height and roundness and are poised in lively movements. The decorative embellishments wind their curly way in a rhythmic and capricious manner. They reveal the liking for contrasting light and shade, vivacious narration, wide appeal and homely charm.

A Buddha head from Kumhrar (Patna) in the Patna Museum, a little known Buddha head in fine-grained micaschist from Sultanganj (district Bhagalpur) in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, two small figures of standing Buddha (1' 10½" and 1' 5" in size) carved in relief from the same site (now lost), the stucco reliefs of Maniyar Math (Rajgir) representing Gaṇeśa, Vishṇu, Nagas and Nāgis also belong to this period. They all follow the vision and
idioms of Sārnāth and reflect subtle delicacy and spiritual refinement and at the same time their poise and balance, soft and luminous texture, melting outline and the emotional appeal show that they are different from Sārnāth.

The stucco figures of the Buddha and the Bodhisattvas in various mudrās (postures)—meditating, preaching, offering gifts and protection—that embellish the facades of the stūpa of the fifth period at site No. 3 at Nālandā, are the elegant products of the sixth century A. D. and present delicate and sensuous modelling.

The stucco figures with traces of red paint carved in the niches of an exposed part of the plinth of the ruined Vishṇu temple at Apsad in the Nawada district betray the same skill in modelling in clay figures with all vivacity and expressions of a narrative as in Nālandā figures and they have to be placed in 7th century A. D. (Ed.)

The figure of Vishṇu seated on Garuḍa from Rajgir now in the Nālandā Museum, may also be mentioned as the creation of this period. Two Caturmukha lingas (one of them is inscribed) and the image of Kārtikeya from Vaiśālī are other good examples of the period. The Kārtikeya, which is placed in a local temple, is shown seated on peacock and is very much similar to Bhumra Kārtikeya in form of its attributes and ornaments. The serenity of the face is remarkable. Another image of Kārtikeya, slightly later than the Vaiśālī one, hails from the Shahabad district and is in the Patna Museum. It bears a close similarity with the well known figure of the same god of Sārnāth School in the Bārāt Kalā Bhavan, Banaras Hindu University; but differs from it in its peculiar bicornate head-dress. It is an impressive piece of Gupta Art.

An unusual piece of sculpture of great interest depicting two graceful dancing poses full of rhythm, one on each
side of a cakra has recently been acquired by the Patna Museum from the village Maharama in the Gayā district. Apart from its artistic merit, the fact makes it most important that dancing poses in sculptures of such an early period and from this part of the country was so far unknown.

The art movement of the fifth and the sixth centuries in Bihar had its contributions not only in the form of individual sculptures but also in rock-cut panels, which is unknown elsewhere in north India. The rock-cut sculptures in Bihar are known exclusively on the banks of the river Gaṅgā and in the district of Bhagalpur. Just opposite the town of Sultanganj, the find-place of the early Gupta sculptures mentioned above and the bronze Buddha image described below, are the two hillocks known as Jahangira and Murali or Vyāsakarṇa. The former is a solid mass of granite in the mid-stream of the Gaṅgā, rising about seventy feet above the bed of the river; at the top of it is a Śaiva temple called Ajagaibinātha. Two hundred yards to the west of this hillock is the other hillock about hundred feet in height and jutting boldly into the river. In these hillocks are carved a number of Vaishnava, Śaiva and Saura (Solar) images and also a Buddha and a Jain Tirthankara. The sculptures carved here date from the early Gupta period to post-Gupta period and are interesting artistically as well as iconographically. But unfortunately little attention has been paid to them and they are decaying rapidly ravaged by nature.

Another group of rock-cut sculpture are known at Patharghata Hill, eight miles north of Kahalgaon (Colgong), just where the Gaṅgā resumes its easterly course. The sculptures are carved at various places on the hill viz., on the isolated rocks and below the summit, facing the river towards the north. The sculptures on the isolated rocks
represent Gaṇeśa, Hara-Gauri, Pārvati etc. and the group near the summit is a continuous array of figures and scenes covering a length of 49' 9" and a height of about 5 feet over an irregular vertical face of the rock. This is locally known as Caurāśtmuni (eighty-four sages); but they are mostly the representations of the Vishṇu and his various incarnations. A few scenes from the life of Kṛśṇa viz. Kṛśṇa amongst the cows and cow-herd boys and girls (Gopas and Goṁpīs), Kṛśṇa’s fight with Cāṇūra are also believed to have been depicted amongst them. But the sculptures have so much deteriorated that it is not possible to identify them properly. In the identification of the scenes from Kṛśṇa’s life could be substantiated, then this group of sculptures would prove to be most important, being the early representations of its kind. All these sculptures may be placed in the sixth-seventh century A. D.

The flow of the art continued in the seventh century; and an excellent example of the early period may be seen in the door-jamb piece from Rajmahal in the Patna Museum, showing a lady with the bird. The refined elegance and poise, flowing outline, warm sensuousness and human charm reminds the Nāgī from Rajgir and the Gaṅgā-Yamunā from Dāh Parbatīya (Tezpur, Assam). The Mahishāsura-mardini image in worship at Muṇḍeśvarī temple, with its delicate contour and the feminine grace, is another notable example of this period. Apart from its artistic merit, it is also iconographically interesting. The goddess is riding on the buffalo and is twisting its horns and thus is an unusual representation.

Some of the images that are known of the late seventh century A.D. from the Vishṇu temple of Koṇādevī at Apsadh in Gayā district, mark the high tide of the period. Two of them are now in the United States of America. One is the figure of Vishṇu and is in the Rockefeller
Collection, New York and the other is the Cakra-purusha and is in the Cleveland Museum. These are least known to our scholars. A third image, in situ, is a large image of Varāha made of grey sandstone. It is very much similar to the image of the same god of this very period from Eran in Madhya Pradesh. Here the Pīthivī is represented as a female and on the body of the god are shown the figures of sages in adoration. A few other examples of this period known are in the Patna Museum. Among them the colossal image of Vishṇu (height: 10' 9'') is from Masarh (Shahabad). The figure of Agni in high relief in buff sandstone from Shahabad district, Kalyāṇasundara mūrti from Gayā and a six-handed dancing Gaṇeśa from Eksari (district Saran) are the notable examples.

But the creative vision of the sculptors had begun to decline in this period. They retained the Gupta tradition and adopted the forms; but they lost its vitality, deft, tenderness and the fluidity of the outline. They confined themselves to formulae. The result was an all round coarseness of treatment and meaningless heaviness of forms. This tendency is apparent in most of the sculptures at Nālandā and amongst the sculptures that are scattered around the Muṇḍeśvarī temple. So is the case with the images from the Gayā and the Shahabad districts in the Patna Museum. They are iconographically interesting but artistically they are heavy and drowsy. A local school is noticed in this period at Benisagar (district Singhbhum), where we find the figures squat, sculptured into plaques of not very deep thickness.

In the eighth century, however, Nālandā seems to have given a brake to the process of disintegration. A few images of Avalokiteśvara of this period retain the Gupta ideal and they are light and more animated with crisp modelling and firm outline.
BRONZE IMAGES

Only a few metal images, all cast, are so far known from Bihar belonging to the period under review. And in their form hardly any variation is noticed in these images from those of the stone. The earliest known metal images, from this area are those, that were found at Chaura in the district of Shahabad and are now in the Patna Museum. Almost all of them are the Tirthankara images in kāyotsarga pose. They are there for a long time; but no proper study has yet been made. Any way, they appear very much similar to some of the Jain sculptures from Mathurā in their style and execution and may be assigned to the late Kushāṇa or early Gupta period. If not all, at least a few belong to the beginning of our period.

Definitely datable metal image of the early Gupta period i.e. fifth century A.D. is that which is now in the Birmingham Museum and was discovered in about 1864 in the precinct of the monastery at Sultānganj, described above. It is a colossal copper statue of standing Buddha in the attitude of protection (abhaya-mudrā) 7'3" in height. It is cast in two layers. The inner one in segments on an earthen core and held together by thick iron bands. The casting of the face down to the breast was effected in one piece, the lower parts down to the knee in another, and then the legs, feet, hands and back in several pieces. The sculpture in itself is unique in the realm of Indian art and a monument to the artistic genius of the ancient sculptors of Bihar. Spirituality, divine assurance, compassionate grace and the serenity of expression on the face of the image are remarkable.

But then only after a gap of about more than a century we have some metal Buddha images from Nalanda and Kurkihar. They belong to seventh century onwards and begin the tradition of the images of their type that
culminated in the Pāla period. While several images from Nālandā in the Nalanda and Patna Museums may be identified as the products of the seventh century, among the Kurkihar images, we have only one, which may be placed in the early eighth century. In these images, remarkable is the manner of showing the sanghāṭī (upper garment) of the Buddha. It leaves the right shoulder and breast uncovered, and on the left shoulder it is gathered so that folds appear tucked beneath one another. This is indicated by a kind of bifurcation of the ridge-lines suggestive of folds. They sweep in diagonal and shallow curves as far as the waist line, where the under-garment is closely tied around the body. The sanghāṭī also appears as tucked in, at the back at the height of the waist, and from this second point of gathering the folds fall more horizontally than from the shoulder, but in the same way. The simplifications of the foldless robe or the unbroken fall of lengthening curves from the neck indicate that the earlier traditions have been given up for a new experiment. Thus pre-Gupta attempts at rendering the garment are taken up again, but with an economy in execution inherited from the Gupta phase. The manner in which the garment is switched upwards at the hem-line is a lax recapitulation of the earlier convention, so sharply delineated in the Sultanganj Buddha. The mobility, which is imparted to the garment also gives a peculiar character to the stance of the figure. The great rhythm that sweeps all through the figures of the Gupta period is absent; at the same time it is not all hemmed in fixed places, as seen in the later Pāla images. It has a movement, which sways forward and backward and gives a form of its own.

**TERRACOTTAS**

Like the sculptors of stone and metal, the artists in clay also produced charming forms; but they relieved
themselves from the iconographic injunctions and religious dictates. They used the soft and pliable material, easily available in our riverine plains, with easy sensitiveness of their fingers and palms and worked with their intense playful and joyous freedom of imagination and action. They produced figures and figurines portraying men and women from every walk of life, commoners and the aristocrats, courtly and fashionable ladies, mendicants and beggars, dancers and acrobats, dwarfs and grooms, amorous couples, foreigners with their distinctive facial types, dresses and hair decorations. They presented male and female of their time with rich decorative coiffures, curled attractively in spirals or twisted in short crisp ringlets or arranged in curely hanging loops, so picturesquely described in the contemporary poetry and romances. Charming feminine types in unsophisticated dresses and ornaments, full of warmth and sensuousness move before us in an unending series in these terracotta figurines. Animal and birds, real and fantastic were equally favourite theme of the clay-artists. They did not ignore the gods and goddesses; they too found place in their studio, but they were not their main concern. Whatever be the themes, the artists in clay presented them in vigorous action; each of them testify to a very high standard of the plastic art in the Gupta period.

Small in size, these figures and figurines were produced from single or double moulds—mostly from single ones in quantities and were carefully finished. They reveal a high skill and efficiency of baking and burning. Traces of colour, seen on a few specimens, suggest that they were often coloured. A slip of natural clay was laid before colouring and the colours used in them were white, yellow, red, ochre and pink. These terracotta figurines were toys; but in many cases they might have decorated mentles and niches in the drawing rooms and sleeping chambers. Sometimes they could be hung on the walls like pictures and
paintings. Such figures and figurines are known from almost all ancient sites yielding remains of the Gupta period during excavations. Mention may particularly be made of Vaishali.

Big terracotta plaques with figures in high relief, comparable with those in stone, were also produced during the period for the decoration of the outer faces of the temples, religious establishments and not unlikely the residential and secular buildings. They depict gods and goddesses, scenes from the Epics and the Puranas, animals and divine beings. Examples of such plaques have been found at Kumhrar (Patna), Chausa (Shahabad) and Belwa (Saran). A plaque from Chausa, in the Patna Museum, depicting a scene from the Ramayana is fascinating.

While speaking of the artists in clay, it would not be out of place to say a few words about the pottery that the potters made during this period. The pottery of this period is mostly red with red or brownish slip; some of them also show a highly polished red ground. Generally ordinary clay is used in them; but at times mica dust is found mixed. Mostly the pots are wheel-made; but at time mould-technique was also employed in their manufacture. Whatever the type or variety—jars, bowls, dishes, basins, caskets, lids—all are finely finished and on them are incised or impressed in relief beautiful designs—lotuses, rosettes, vegetal and geometrical patterns, spirals, zig zags, nandipadas and the like that they had in their imagination.

PAINTINGS

No paintings of the Gupta period survive today in Bihar; but their could be no doubt that it was then in general practice and in popular demand. The literature of the period—creative and technical both—show that in those days painting was taken to be an essential social
accomplishment. Vatsyāyana in his Kāmasūtra has mentioned paintings as one of the sixty-four fine arts (kāla) and enumerated paints, brushes and drawing boards amongst the essentials of the personal apartment of Nāgaraka. It suggests that painting was popular not only amongst the princes and nobles and ladies, as we find referred in romances of the period, but also amongst the commoners. The Vishṇudharmottara, a text of the Gupta period, has discussed in details the cannons of painting. It appears that different kinds of paintings were painted for religious buildings, palaces and residential houses. Contemporary literature reveal that the walls and the ceilings of the palaces and houses of the rich were decorated with mural paintings and some of them also had picture galleries (citrasālās).

In view of these facts, it may be assumed quite conveniently that painting would have been popular in Bihar too, like the other parts of the country; and the same tradition of painting, that we find at Ajanta, would have been prevalent in this part also. The Ajanta tradition flows into the miniatures that we find illustrated in the palm-leaf manuscripts of the Buddhist texts like Prajñā-paramitā produced in this part of the country during the Pāla period and are dated. This was only possible when this tradition would have been in vogue in the earlier period.

JEWELLERY

Various kinds of jewellery are described elaborately and vividly in the contemporay literature of our period; and the sculptures and terracotta figurines of the period exhibit the various forms of the jewellery then prevalent. They display pearl-necklace, pendants, Kuṇḍalas, Keyūras, bracelets, waist-bands etc. in various designs and fashions. They reveal that the jewellers' art was brought to a very high standard of simplicity, refinement and elegance.
Beads of semi-precious stones of various shapes and sizes belonging to this period are found in excavations and they suggest their utility. Though not in large numbers, they throw considerable light on the technique of their manufacture and their importance in the society.

A few gold jewellery of this period are also known from Vaiśālī (district Muzaffarpur) and Sultanganj (district Bhagalpur). Among them the most interesting are the repoussé plaques with pipe soldered at the back. From Vaiśālī we have three, one is shaped like S, the other is a pair of couchant bulls and the third shows figure of standing yaksha elaborately dressed. Sultanganj has yielded one, showing a female figure probably representing Lakshmi. A similar repoussé ornament showing a standing couple, identified by Jayaswal as Śiva-Pārvatī, of a slightly earlier date was found at Patna city in the compound of the Qila House and was in the Jalan Collection. Similar three repoussé are known from the excavations at Taxila. They show Aphrodite, Eros and Psyche respectively and represent the Gāndhāra art. Thus they show that this type of ornament was used in the country far and wide. They were fastened somewhere on the body with the help of string passed through the pipe at the back. Thus their purpose was somewhat like that of brooch. The figures depicted on them suggest that these were most likely religious than secular. Whatever might be the purpose, they throw quite an interesting light on the technique employed by the goldsmiths of ancient days. A few stone-moulds depicting similar figures have been discovered from Uttar Pradesh and they help us in understanding the technique used in these figures. The gold-sheets were hammered into the cavity of the moulds either direct with the hammers of soft material like wood, horn or copper; or more likely through the medium of force, a method common today. In the latter process the gold-
sheet is placed over the mould and over it is set a strip of lead and then the lead is hammered into the mould carrying the gold with it. In this method the mould is protected from the direct blow of the hammer and at the same time the details are faithfully reproduced.

Along with the repoussé ornaments, some common ornaments were also found at both the places. While the Sultanganj ornament is an ordinary finger-ring, Vaisālī yielded two interesting types of ear-ornament. One is a ear-ring with clamp (lurkt) mostly worn by men and the other is the lobe-rod—a hollow cylinder with bosses at both the ends (dholnā)—worn by women. They give some idea of the ornaments but not enough to throw detailed light on the goldsmiths' art.

**COINS AND SEALS**

Not many gold and copper coins of the Gupta emperors have been found in this part. Yet, it may reasonably said that many of the coins found elsewhere in the country would have been the products of the capital mint at Paṭaliputra. A large number of sealings i.e. seal-impressions on clay, have been found from Vaisālī, Nālandā, Paṭaliputra and other places and they are undoubtedly local in their nature. They are the excellent examples of the engravers' art of the period. They reflect the tenderness and delicacy with which the engravers of those days were cutting dies and seals in bone, ivory, stone and metal. They are marked by clarity and elegance of design and lettering, uniformity of shape and forms and precision and refinement of execution. Rich varieties of designs and decorative patterns drawn from various sources including mythology as well as flora and fauna, may be seen amongst the sealins. In figuration as well as in artistic form—human and animal both, their treatment closely follow the stone sculptures and terracotta figures.
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CHAPTER XXXIII

Political History of South Bihar
(550—750 A. D.)

The break-up of the Gupta empire about the middle of the sixth century A. D. was followed by the rise of several independent States in Northern India, two of which were founded, respectively, by the Maukhariis and the Later Guptas, both of whom exercised political authority in South Bihar or parts of it.

The Maukhariis were an old family or clan whose existence in different parts of northern India may be traced during the first five centuries of the Christian era, if not earlier still. Their association with Magadha may be inferred from a clay-seal, found at Gaya, with the legend Makhaliyam, written in Brāhmī characters of Maurya period. Later, we find a Maukhari family ruling in the same region, as feudatory of Imperial Guptas, probably during the first half of the sixth century A. D. But the family which was destined to raise the Maukhariis to the high water-mark of power and glory flourished in U. P. Harivarman, the founder of the Maukhari ruling dynasty of Kanauj, and his two successors, Adityavarman and Īśvaravarman, were probably, like the three Maukhari rulers of the Gaya region, also feudatories of the Imperial Guptas. But Īśvaravarman's son and successor, Īśānavarman, threw off the allegiance of the Guptas. This is proved by the royal seals which refer to Īśvaravarman, and his two predecessors as merely Maharājā, whereas his son is styled Maharājadhirāja, and this higher title is given to the next to kings, Sarvavarman and Avantivarman. A more positive evidence is furnished by the fact that all these three rulers issued coins
a prerogative enjoyed by independent sovereigns whereas no coin of first three rulers has yet come to light. Isanavarman not only asserted his independence but carried his victorious arms far and wide. In verse 13 of an inscription, found at Haraha, in the Barabanki District (U. P.), Isanavarman is said to have defeated the Gaudas, the Andhras and the Sulikas. As Isanavarman was a ruler in U. P. he could not, one might argue, have conquered the Gaudas (of Bengal) and the Andhras without overrunning South Bihar. But, as will be shown later, Isanavarman fought probably in Gauda as a feudatory of the Imperial Guptas who were ruling in Magadha. This conclusion is borne out by the verse, referred to above, if we interpret it to mean that his conquests mentioned therein were made before he occupied the throne.\(^3\)

The Maukharī rule in Magadha has also been inferred from two casual references in epigraphic records. A stone Inscription of the time of Mahāśīvagupta Bālārjuna, found at Sirpur in the Raipur district (Madhya Pradesh), refers to “the pious king Sūryavarman”, “born in the unblemished family of the Varmans great on account of (their) supremacy over Magadha.” It has been suggested by some that this Sūryavarman was the homonymous son of Isanavarman, mentioned in the Haraha inscription. This son is, however, not known to have ruled, and there are other objections to the proposed identification which have discussed in the Appendix. But if it be accepted, the family of the Varmanas exercising supremacy over Magadha can only refer to the Maukharīs.

A far more definite evidence is furnished by an inscription found at Deo-Barnark, a village about 25 miles south-west of Arrah in the Shahabad (now Bhojpur) district (Bihar) i.e. very close to the border of U. P. It records the grant of a village (most probably the same village where
it was found) by Jīvitagupta II of the Later Gupta dynasty, but incidentally mentions that the village was formerly granted, for the same purpose, by Bālādityadeva. Šarvavarman and Avantivarman. The first undoubtedly refers to the Imperial Gupta king Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya and the second and the third, respectively, to the two Maukhari kings mentioned above.

But while the occupation of a fringe of South Bihar by the Maukharis is proved beyond doubt it may be regarded as certain that there central seat of power roughly corresponded to modern U. P. This is proved by the find-spots of their coins and inscriptions and there is a general consensus of opinion on this subject. The village granted by Šarvavarman and Avantivarman was just across the present border-line between U. P. and Bihar, and it may be easily presumed that the Maukharis ruled over this narrow fringe of South Bihar also, though at a later date it was conquered by the Later Guptas. There is, therefore, hardly any justification for the statement that the collapse of the Imperial Guptas about the middle of the sixth century A. D. "left the Maukharis in practical possession of large parts of Bihar and U. P." implying that they therefore ruled over Magadha.

Far different was, however, the case with the Later Guptas. Two inscriptions, one found at Apsad and another at Deo-Baranark, both in Bihar, supply a list of eleven kings belonging to this dynasty as shown in the following genealogical table:

1. Kṛṣṇa-gupta.
2. Harsha-gupta.
5. Dāmodara-gupta.
7. Mādhava-gupta.
8. Ādityasena
10. Vishnu-gupta.

There is no doubt that the last four kings of this dynasty ruled in Magadha and it was their central seat of authority, for all their records have been found in this region. As to the first seven kings, there is no definite information regarding their original home. The only clue is furnished by a passage in the Harsha-carita in which Mādhava-gupta, a playmate or attendant of Harshavar-dhana is referred to as the son of the king of Mālava (Malwa). Assuming that this Mādhava-gupta is identical with king No. 7, who is expressly referred to in the Apsad inscription as having a "desire to associate himself with the glorious Harshadeva," it has been held by many scholars that Mahāsena-gupta, the father of Mādhava-gupta, was a king of Mālava. This is undoubtedly a very plausible suggestion. But the further inference that all the first six kings of the Later Gupta dynasty were also rulers of Mālava alone and had nothing to do with Magadha is beset with serious difficulties. The question has been dealt with in detail in an appendix to this chapter. The more probable view seems to be that Magadha was the original home of the Later Guptas, though, for reasons to be stated later, Mahāsenagupta was driven from Magadha and forced to take refuge in Mālava which also formed a part of his dominions. The reconstruction of the history of the Later Guptas in this chapter is based on this hypothesis.

The very fact that a line of kings with names ending in Gupta (with a single exception out of eleven) was ruling
in Magadha immediately after the supremacy of the Imperial Guptas came to an end in that region, naturally gives rise to the presumption that the two were connected in some way. This presumption gains additional force if we hold that the suzerainty of the Later Guptas of Magadha extended over Mālava in the west, as suggested above, and also to Gauḍa in the east as will be shown later. For, it would then follow that they came into the possession of, or at least claimed suzerainty over, those parts of the Gupta empire which are not known to have been formed into independent kingdoms; and they were, so to say, the residuary legatees of the Gupta empire. This fact, added to the common name-ending 'Gupta' and three common names of kings in the two families, namely, Kumāra Gupta, Deva Gupta, and Vishṇu Gupta, Undoubtedly favours the presumption of relationship between the two, and it has been actually suggested that Krṣṇa Gupta, founder of the Later Gupta dynasty, was identical with Govinda Gupta, mentioned as the son of Candra Gupta II in an inscribed seal found at Basarh (ancient Vaiśālī) in Muzaffarpur district. But this identification is purely arbitrary, and the facts stated above cannot be regarded as convincing evidence of any close relationship between the Imperial Guptas and the Later Guptas. It is very noteworthy that not even the slightest hint is given in the records of the Later Guptas about their relationship with the Imperial Guptas, and Krṣṇa Gupta, the founder of the new line, is simply described as a king of good descent. It is difficult to believe that the royal officials who drew up the records of the Later Gupta kings would have refrained from referring to their illustrious lineage if there was any basis for such a claim.

But howsoever that may be, there is no doubt that the first two or three kings of the dynasty, like the
early Maukhari rulers of U. P., were feudatories of the Imperial Guptas. For Mādhava Gupta, who was a contemporary of Harsha and more or less of the same age, was sixth in descent from Kṛṣṇa Gupta, the founder of the dynasty. Even assigning 20 years to each generation, the date of Kṛṣṇa Gupta falls in the last quarter of the fifth century A. D.\(^{11}\) when the Imperial Guptas were powerful to such a degree that we cannot think of an independent ruling dynasty either in Magadha or in Mālava. But while there is no doubt that the early rulers were feudatories, it is not possible to find out which member of the family first set himself up as an independent king. The first two kings seem to have little claim to this honour. It is true that the Aphisad inscription refers to Kṛṣṇa Gupta as ṛṣṭha (king) and as “victorious over countless foes.” But, the epithet ṛṣṭha is applied to even feudatories, and apart from the vagueness of the other expression—no particular enemy having been mentioned—the fights, if any, might have been fought by him as a feudatory of the Imperial Guptas. Harsha Gupta, the son and successor of Kṛṣṇa Gupta, is also referred to in the same inscription in equally vague terms. We are simply told that he “was always displaying a glorious triumph, the written record, as it were, of terrible contests.” The Aphisad inscription attaches greater importance to the next king Jīvita Gupta. Whereas his two predecessors are simply ‘ṛṣṭha’ (king) and ‘dava’ respectively, he is described as “Kṣhittga-cāḍāmaṇī” i.e. “best or most excellent (lit. crest-jewel) among kings.” He is further said to have carried victorious campaigns as far as the Himalayas (on the north) and the sea (on the south). The reference here is undoubtedly to North and South Bengal. It is somewhat singular that the Maukhari king Iśānavarman also claims to have forced the Gauḍas (people of North Bengal) to take refuge in the sea. Iśānavarman was a unionj contem-
porary of Jitvita Gupta, for the son of the later fought with the former. It is not unlikely therefore, that both have reference to the self-same campaign, carried on by the Gupta Emperor, supported by his Maukharis and Later Gupta feudatories. Whatever we might think of this, there is no doubt that Jitvita Gupta was the first important ruler of the family, But whether like IsanaVarman, he also asserted independence cannot be determined with certainty.

There is, however, little doubt that Kumara Gupta, the son and successor of Jitvita Gupta, was an independent sovereign. For, we have no evidence of the existence of any Gupta emperor about this time, and the Aphsad inscription refers to the fight between Kumara Gupta and IsanaVarman, without any reference to any suzerain.

It has been suggested that Harsha Guptā, the grandmother of IsanaVarman, was a sister of Harsha Gupta, the grandfather of Kumara Guptā. This view rests solely upon the similarity of the two names, and no great weight need be attached to it. But even if there were any such matrimonial alliance between the Maukharis and the Later Guptas, the bond was not sufficiently strong to prevent the political rivalry between the two. In any case the two came into conflict. The Aphsad inscription expressly says that Kumara Gupta defeated the Maukharis king IsanaVarman. The reason of such a conflict is not far to seek. Both the kings rose to power on the ruins of the Gupta Empire, when there was no central authority to check their ambition or aggressive spirit, IsanaVarman's victorious campaigns against the Andhras and Sulkas was a menace to the safety and security of the Later Gupta king and set an example of imperialist ambition which the other was not slow to imitate. So the inevitable clash followed and Kumara Gupta came out victorious. The Aphsad inscription compares Kumara Gupta came out victorious. The Aphsad inscription
compares Kumāra Gupta with the Mandāra mountain, and the army ofĪṣānavarman with the milk-ocean, the churning of which by the former brought Lakṣhmī or the goddess of sovereignty out of the latter. This may be a mere poetic expression, but may also contain a hint that it was by defeatingĪṣānavarman that Kumāra Gupta came to possess the supreme power. The Apsad inscription further tells us that Kumāra Gupta went to Prayāga (Allahabad) and died there. This probably means that he advanced as far as Prayāga in course of his victorious campaign against the Maukharis. It is not unlikely that Prayāga formed part of his dominions, but this cannot be regarded as certain.

The struggle for supremacy between the two rival powers continued in the next generation. For, according to the Apsad inscription, Dāmodara Gupta, the son and successor of Kumāra Gupta, broke up "the proudly-stripping array of mighty elephants belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūnas." Unfortunately, the peculiar wordings of the inscription leave us in uncertainty regarding the result of this second contest. We are told that in course of this battle, Dāmodara Gupta became unconscious (saṃmāēchita), but was revived by the touch of the hands of the heavenly damsels. Some scholars take it to mean that he was defeated and killed but went to heaven, presumably because of his heroism. Others hold that he won victory and merely swooned not died in the battlefield, but shortly regained consciousness. The second view seems preferable, for a court poet is not likely to record the defeat of his patron king. The defeat and disconsuluture of the Maukharis was probably due, at least partly, to their entanglements with the Hūnas to which a pointed reference is made in the Apsad inscription.

For the time being the Maukharis were humbled and the Later Guptas turned their attention to their
eastern neighbour. Mahāsena Gupta, the sun and successor of Dāmodara Gupta proceeded as far as the Lauhitya or the Brahmaputra river and defeated Susthitavarman, king of Kāmarūpa, another state that had declared independence after the weakening of the power of the Imperial Guptas. The fight was renewed after the death of Susthitavarman, leaving two young sons Supratishthitavarman and Bhāskaravarman. According to the Doobi Plates of the latter, he and his elder brother were defeated by the Gauḍa army and taken captive. They were shortly released, presumably after they had acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gauḍa king. Supratishthitavarman, however, died after a short reign and was succeeded by Bhāskaravarman.

The Doobi Plates do not mention the name of the Gauḍa king who defeated the two brothers and took them captive. As Mahāsena Gupta is known to have defeated Susthitavarman on the banks of the Lauhitya or Brahmaputra, and the Gauḍa army invading and conquering Kāmarūpa is described as strong in the water, it may be suggested that the second invasion was also led by Mahāsena Gupta, or might have even been a further stage in the first campaign. The epithet 'Gauḍa' army in that case, requires some explanation. Gauḍa (Northern and Western Bengal) might have been included in the dominion of Mahāsena Gupta, and even if that were not the case, he could not have reached the Brahmaputra river without either conquering Gauḍa, or as an ally of its king. In either case the description of the invading host as Gauḍa by the court-poet of Kāmarūpa would not be inappropriate. But the reconstruction of his history of the Later Guptas would be considerably different if we accept the one view or the other.

It is a well-known fact that the king Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa, early in his reign, was very eager to conclude
an alliance with Harshavardhana against Śaśāṅka, king of Gauḍa. It is not unnatural to suppose, therefore, that the Gauḍa king who defeated and captured Bhāskaravarman was really Śaśāṅka. This however, raises another problem how and when Śaśāṅka became king of Gauḍa.

Although Śaśāṅka became a very powerful emperor early in the seventh century A. D. and extended his kingdom up to Kanauj in the north-west and southern border of Orissa on the south, his early life is very obscure. The only possible clue to it is furnished by a seal-matrix cut in the rock of the hill-fort of Rohitasgarh in Shahabad district, Bihar with the words “Śrīmahāsāmanta Śaśāṅka” i. e. the illustrious great feudatory chief Śaśāṅka. It is generally held that it was this feudatory chief who ultimately became the great emperor. As Rohitasgarh was an important defence-post of Magadha, it may be presumed that Śaśāṅka was a feudatory of Mahāśena Gupta. We may then easily believe that he accompanied his master in his expedition against Kāmarūpa and being left in charge of his eastern dominions, ultimately made himself independent ruler of Gauḍa.

This is undoubtedly a mere hypothesis, but seems to be a very plausible one. Śaśāṅka, enriched by the conquest of Kāmarūpa, might easily have made himself an independent ruler in Gauḍa. Mahāśena Gupta was evidently unable to assert his authority, and the loss or weakening of his power in the east might have been either the cause or the effect of the rise of Śaśāṅka to imperial power.

There is no doubt, in any case, that Mahāśena Gupta’s phenomenal success, leading to his triumphant march to the Brahmaputra was followed by a complete collapse of his power towards the close of the 6th century A. D. He was driven from Gauḍa and Magadha, and forced to take refuge in Mālava. Finally he lost Mālava, and his two
sons, Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta had to live in the court of king Prabhākaravardhana of Thānesvara, as attendants\textsuperscript{17} of his two sons Rājyavardhana and Harsha-
vardhana. It has been suggested that Mahāsena Guptā, the mother of Prabhākaravardhana, was a sister of Mahā-
sena Guptā,\textsuperscript{18} and in that case the two young sons of the latter, being very near relations of Prabhākaravardhana, would naturally be welcome to his court as place of refuge.
This relationship, however, is no more plausible than the analogous case of Harsha Guptā, the Later Guptā king, being a brother of Harsha Guptā, the Maukhari queen mentioned above. It is, however, worthy of note that we do not possess a single actual instance in ancient Indian History of a brother and sister having the same name. The protection offered by Prabhākaravardhana to the two princes of Mālava might have been due to humanitarian feelings or diplomacy, and need not be taken to imply a close relationship.\textsuperscript{19}

The reversal of Mahāsena Guptā's fortune was perhaps due, to a large extent, to the political situation which he had to face. Magadha and the surrounding regions became a prey to foreign invasions. The Cālukya king Kṛttivarman, who ruled from A. D. 567 to 597, is said to have defeated, among others, the kings of Aṅga, Vaṅga and Magadhā.\textsuperscript{20} The powerful Tibetan king Srōṅ-btsan who ruled between A. D. 581 and 600 led a victorious campaign to central India, the usual designation of a large part of India including Bihar, and sometimes also U. P.\textsuperscript{21} If we regard these invasions as actual facts, and not merely vain boasts, we may find an explanation of the successful coup by Śaśāṅka against Mahāsena Guptā and the latter's loss of his eastern dominions of Magadhā and Gauḍa. As a further evidence of the political disintegration of Magadhā, reference may be made to the Māna dynasty having established a kingdom in the hilly region between Midnapur and Orissa.\textsuperscript{22}
The crisis was accentuated by happenings in Mālava where Mahāsena Gupta evidently retired to seek help or find shelter. The Maitraka king Śīladitya I Dharmāditya of Valabhi, and probably also his predecessor, whose reign-periods covered the last quarter of the sixth century A.D. ruled over Mālava or its western portion. The Kalacuri king Śaṅkaragaṇa was in possession of Ujjayini, the capital city in West Mālava, in A.D. 595. To make matters worse there were internal dissensions in the royal family. For while, after the discomfiture, and probably death, of Mahāsena Gupta, his two sons were forced to take refuge in the court of Thānesvara, we find a new ruler in Mālava, in alliance with Šaṅāṅka. This king was most probably Deva Gupta, and the name-ending makes it highly likely that he belonged to the royal family, and took advantage of the reverses of Mahāsena Gupta, both in the east as well as in the west, to usurp the throne of Mālava. This would explain the alliance between Šaṅāṅka and Deva-Gupta who had a common enemy in Mahāsena Gupta. The two usurpers joined hands in destroying the power of the Maukharis of Kanauj another common enemy. For, the Maukhari king was married to the daughter of Prabhākaravardhana who had espoused the cause of the sons of Mahāsena Gupta, and the allies dreaded an alliance between the courts of Thānesvara and Kanauj. Besides, Šaṅāṅka, who had become ruler of Magadha, inherited as a legacy the age-long rivalry and hostility with the Maukhari neighbours on the West.

The outline of history, sketched above, cannot be established in all its details on the basis of such evidence as would be regarded as conclusive. It is at best a hypothesis that satisfactorily explains all the known facts, and this is all that we can do with the available evidence. Our knowledge becomes more definite with the rise of Šaṅāṅka.
to power, ushering in a short period of glory for Gauḍa, which comprised both North and West Bengal. His capital city was Karpasuvarnā, in the modern Murshidabad District, and he was fired with the ambition of founding an empire. He succeeded in achieving this object to a large extent. Although the different stages of his progress are not known with certainty, we get a clear picture of his achievements. He extended his authority over Magadha. He defeated the Māna ruler and made himself master of Daṇḍabhukti, Utkala and Kongoda, corresponding roughly to Midnapur and northern and southern Orissa. It was probably after these achievements that he turned to his western campaigns against the Maukharis. For this purpose he probably first extended his authority up to Banaras. Further, as noted above, he formed an alliance with the ruler of Mālava probably Deva Gupta. The details of the fight with the Maukharis are not known, but the success of the allies was at first almost complete. This is gathered from the fragmentary reports contained in Bāṇa’s Harshacarita. As the Maukhari king Graha- varman had married Rājyaśri, the daughter of king Prabhākaraavardhana of Thaneśvara, that royal court was interested in this contest, and Rājyavardhana and Harsha- vardhana, the two sons of Prabhākaraavardhana, were directly involved in it. The account of the invasion of the Maukhari kingdom therefore finds a prominent place in the biography of Harshavardhana (Harshacarita) by his court-poet Bāṇa. But it is very meagre, and the details are unconnected, being written solely from the points of view of Thaneśvara court. Nevertheless, it has preserved the memory of the strange episode in which Śaśānika played an important role on behalf of the Gauḍa-Magadha kingdom by dealing the final blow to the Maukhari power.

The first report of the conflict was conveyed to the court of Thaneśvara by a messenger from Kanauj almost
immediately after the death of Prabhākaravardhana. It is thus condensed by Bāṇa.

"So, on the very day on which the king's death was rumoured, His Majesty Grahavarman was by the wicked lord of Mālava cut off from the living along with his noble deeds. Rājyaśrī also, the princess, has been confined like a brigand's wife with a pair of iron fetters kissing her feet, and cast into prison at Kāṇyakubja. There is, moreover, a report that the villain, deeming the army leaderless, purposes to invade and seize this country as well."

It is thus quite clear that the serious illness of Prabhākaravardhana, followed by his death, gave the allies the requisite opportunity and the Mālava king, by a sudden raid upon Kanauj, defeated and killed its ruler Grahavarman, and imprisoned his queen Rājyaśrī. Immediately on receipt of this news Rājyavardhana, the elder son and successor of Prabhākaravardhana, started with ten thousand soldiers against the Mālava king. It is difficult to follow the sequence of subsequent events, but three facts emerge clearly from the account in the Harshacarita.

In the first place, Rājyavardhana defeated the Mālava king and captured a part of his army. Secondly, he was killed by Śaśāṅka before he could relieve Kanauj and rescue his sister Rājyaśrī. Thirdly, after the death of Rājyavardhana and the capture of Kanauj by a man named Gupta, Rājyaśrī "burst from her confinement, and with her train entered the Vindhya forest."

The sequence of the first two events is not difficult to understand. It would appear that Rājyavardhana attacked the Mālava king before the latter was joined by Śaśāṅka and obtained an easy and decisive victory. But then, as Rājyavardhana, flushed with victory, proceeded further with his depleted forces, he met Śaśāṅka, and was killed. Whether there was any fight between the two and what
part, if any, treachery played in the great tragedy cannot be determined.

But the third event mentioned above is somewhat puzzling. Kanauj had already been seized by the Mālava king, and it is not easy to understand why or how a man named Gupta seized it again. Further, how or why should Rājyaśrī, released from prison, go to the Vindhya forest, far away from Kanauj, instead of proceeding to her brother at Thāneśvara? The only hypothesis that explains both these facts is that after his defeat at the hands of Rājyavardhana, the Mālava king retired to his own kingdom, taking the captive queen Rājyaśrī with him. She somehow escaped and entered the Vindhya forest, quite close by, in order to avoid arrest. Fresh arrangements were also made by Śaśānka for the security (or recapture) of Kanauj by one of his officers, named Gupta, who had probably some hand in facilitating the escape of Rājyaśrī.

As soon as Harshavardhana heard the news of his brother’s death, he took a solemn vow that unless “in a limited number of days” he could clear the earth of the Gauḍas he would hurl himself “like a moth into an oil-fed flame”.

So he started with a vast army to punish Śaśānka. On his way he was met by the messenger of king Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa who proposed an offensive and defensive alliance to which he readily agreed. Undoubtedly this was directed chiefly against Śaśānka who was now their common enemy. Proceeding still further, Harsha learnt how his sister Rājyaśrī had fled to the Vindhya forest. So, leaving the army in charge of Bhanḍi with instructions to proceed against Śaśānka, Harsha went in search of Rājyaśrī and, after rescuing her, joined the army on the bank of the Gaṅgā.

No definite information is available regarding any actual contest between Harsha and Śaśānka. According
to the *Ārya-маnjuśrī-mulakalpa*, a late Buddhist chronicle, Harsha proceeded as far as the capital city of Śaśāṅka in North Bengal and defeated him. But the account is full of vague statements and cannot be regarded as reliable. There are, however, good evidences to show that Śaśāṅka ruled over an extensive kingdom long after the expedition of Harsha against him, referred to above, which took place in 606 A. D. For we find the Śailodbhava king in Orissa acknowledging the suzerainty of Śaśāṅka in A. D. 619. We learn from Hsuan Tsang that shortly before he was travelling in the Gaya region (637-38 A. D.), Śaśāṅka was still ruling there and Pūrṇavarman, "the last of the race of Aśoka-rāja" ruled after him as king of Magadha. There is no reference to Harshavardhana’s rule in or suzerainty over Magadha. The Chinese encyclopaedist Ma-twan-lin says that Harsha assumed the title of King of Magadha in A. D. 641. It is thus very likely that Harsha could not score any success against Śaśāṅka, and it was only after the latter’s death that he renewed his eastern campaign and advanced as far as Orissa.

Hsuan Tsang’s reference to Pūrṇavarman as king of Magadha can only mean that he reigned during the short interval between the death of Śaśāṅka and the conquest of Magadha by Harsha. It is difficult to believe that Pūrṇavarman was a descendant of Aśoka, as stated by the Chinese pilgrim. Pūrṇavarman is, however, otherwise unknown and might have been a local noble who claimed a Maurya descent and managed to seize the throne of Magadha during the confusion caused by the death of Śaśāṅka.

In or shortly before A. D., 641 Magadha was conquered by Harsha, and presumably remained a part of his empire till his death. But we find his contemporary, the Later Gupta King Mādhava Gupta ruling in Magadha.
Reference has been made above to the Aphasad inscription. It was engraved in the reign of Adityasena, the son of Madhava Gupta. It traces the history of the Later Gupta from the very beginning, and practically all that has been said above regarding the earlier king from Kṛṣṇa Gupta, the founder of the dynasty, to Mahasena Gupta is based on that record. "It does not refer to any break in the rule of the dynasty after Mahasena Gupta, though it is almost certain that the family exercised no sovereign authority for a fairly long time during which Deva Gupta was ruling in Malava, and at first Sāsāṅka, then Pūrṇavarman, and lastly Harshavardhana were ruling over Magadha. As mentioned above Madhava Gupta and his elder brother Kumāra Gupta were living in Thāneśvara court as companions of Rājyavardhana and Harshavardhana. There is a casual reference in the Harshacarita to the anointment of Kumāra (as king) by Harshavardhana. This Kumāra has been identified with Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa. But as the latter was an independent ruler, and had ascended the throne before Harsha, this view is hardly acceptable. The probability is that Kumāra Gupta was anointed sovereign by Harshavardhana. If this supposition be correct, we must hold that Madhava Gupta succeeded his brother, though there is no mention of it in the Aphasad Inscription. On the other hand, it is equally likely that when the death of Harsha was followed by a scramble for power, either Madhava Gupta or his brother seized the opportunity to make himself master of Magadha."

We do not learn anything from the Aphasad Inscription about Madhava Gupta except the fact, noted above, that he was eager for the company of Harsha. This is a valuable information, for it enables us to identify him with Madhava Gupta, the friend and companion of Harsha in
his boyhood. Mādhava Gupta must have been advanced in age when he became an independent king in Magadha after Harsha’s death, and he had probably a very short reign. His son and successor, Ādityasena, is the only ruler of the family of whom some details are known. He “assumed the imperial title of mahārājādhirāja. An inscription, engraved in a temple at Deoghar (Santhal Parganas), refers to his conquest of the Cola country and performance of several sacrifices, including three Asvamedhas. The characters of this inscription, are, however, of much later date, and it seems to be the copy of a record originally set up at Mandar hill, near Bhagalpur. It is difficult to place much reliance on it, and we shall not be justified in assuming, on the basis of this record alone, that Ādityasena really carried his victorious arms to the Cola country.”

Much less importance attaches to the description of Ādityasena, in the same record as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the seas. Some scholars have held on the basis of this conventional expression that he ruled over Bengal, specially the southern and western parts of it, which touch the sea.” This is, however, not a valid presumption. We have learnt from the Nepal inscriptions that Ādityasena’s “daughter was married to the Maukhari Bhogavarman, son of the sister of king Amśuvarman of Nepal ; and Bhogavarman’s daughter Vatsadevi, the grand-daughter of Ādityasena, became the queen of Śivadeva, king of Nepal.” The express reference to these marriage alliances in the official records of Nepal seems to indicate that the Later Gupta kings enjoyed high political and social status in Eastern India.”

In addition to the two inscriptions mentioned above, we possess three other short records belonging to the reign of Ādityasena, all found in South Bihar. Two of these found in the Mandar Hill in Bhagalpur district record the
excavation of two tanks by Kṣṇadeva, the dear wife of the Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Maharajādhīraja, the glorious Ādityasena-deva. These imperial titles are, however, absent in the third record, found at Shahpur⁴³ in the Patna district, where the king is simply referred to as Śrī Ādityasena-deva. It records the religious gift of a private individual at Nālandā, in the year 66. The reading of this date as well as its reference to the Harsha era, commencing in A.D. 606, though generally accepted, is doubtful. But the resulting date, 672 A.D., would be very suitable; for, being the son of a contemporary of Harshavarman, who survived him, Ādityasena must have ascended the throne in the third quarter of the seventh century A.D.

The Deo Baranark Inscription, mentioned above, gives us the names of the three successors of Ādityasena. It is interesting to note that his mother, like his queen, is given the imperial titles of paramabhaṭṭārīka, and it is likely, therefore, that Mādhava Gupta, the father of Ādityasena, also assumed imperial titles. In any case, all the three successors of Ādityasena, like him, assumed imperial titles. Of his son Deva Gupta we know nothing." His son and successor Vishnū Gupta is also known from another inscription found at Mangraon⁴⁴ in the Shahabad district (South Bihar), dated in the 17th year of his reign. While the record establishes the minimum duration of his reign it does not refer to any achievement of the king. But though no direct evidence is available, indirect evidence of the great power of these Later Gupta kings has been inferred from contemporary records. Thus we know that the Āḷukya king Vinayāditya (680-696) defeated a paramount ruler of the whole of Uttarāpatha, which in a vague way may refer to North India, though strictly speaking applicable only to the central part of it. It has been suggested that this unnamed Paramount Lord of North India was
probably Ādityasena or his son Deva Gupta." But this is a mere guess.

Vishṇu Gupta’s son and successor, Jivita Gupta II, issued the charter, mentioned above, renewing the grant of the village Vārunīkā to the temple of the holy god Varuṇavāsin. As several lines of the record are damaged it is difficult to understand properly the purport of the whole record, but it appears that the village in question was successively granted to the same temple by Bālāditya-deva Śravavarman and Avantivarman. It may be reasonably argued that the border village and the adjacent area, which for some time formed part of the Maukhari dominion, had passed into the hands of Jivita Gupta. The Charter was issued from the victorious camp situated near the Gomatikoṭṭaka. If, as has been suggested, this was situated on the Gomati or Gomti river," Jivita Gupta II must have carried his victorious arms right into the heart of U. P.

Jivita Gupta II is the last known ruler of the family. If we assume that Ādityasena ascended the throne shortly after 650 A. D. i. e. within a few years of the death of Harsha, his father’s contemporary, we may place the reign of Jivita Gupta II in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D. It was about this time that Yaśorvarman, king of Kanauj, set out on his victorious campaign in the east. An account of this has been preserved by his court-poet Vākpati in his famous Prākṛta poem the Gauda-vahō (slaughter of Gauḍa, i. e. the Gauḍa king). The relevant facts narrated in the poem may be summed up as follows:—

"At the end of the rainy season, Yaśorvarman proceeded with his army on an expedition of conquest (vijeyayāṭra). Passing through the valley of the Son, he reached the Vindhya mountain, and propitiated the famous goddess
Vindhyavāsinī (a form of Kālī) residing in one of its caves. Proceeding further he met the king of Magadha, who fled in terror. But the vassal kings who accompanied the latter felt ashamed of their conduct and immediately returned to fight Yaśovarman. A great battle ensued, and the blood of Yaśovarman’s enemies reddened the field. The lord of Magadha was pursued and slain by Yaśovarman who then proceeded to the sea-coast and conquered the king of the Vaṅgas. The Vaṅgas were powerful and in possession of a large number of warlike elephants, but they submitted to Yaśovarman and acknowledged him as their suzerain."

"It is curious that no mention is made of the king of Gauḍa in the course of this narrative of the world conquest, though the poem is entitled Gauḍa-vaha or slaying of the king of Gauḍa. The event is incidentally alluded to in a single verse towards the end of the poem. An old commentator, Haripāla, took the lord of Magadha, defeated and killed by Yaśovarman, to be the king of Gauḍa. This is at best an assumption, but even this would hardly justify the title, as the number of verses devoted to the particular episode is very few, indeed fewer than those relating to other kings."

The most probable view, therefore, seems to be that the poem is incomplete, and the main theme—the death of the Gauḍa king was not touched upon by the poet, either on account of his premature death or for some other reasons. The view that the king of Magadha was the same as king of Gauḍa is now generally accepted, and this king is identified with Jīvita-Gupta II. This would, of course, give a satisfactory explanation of the end of the Later Gupta Kingdom after that king. But there is one inherent difficulty. Even if we accept the view that Gauḍa and Magadha were ruled by the same person it is legitimate
to infer from the name of the poem *Gauḍa-vahō*, that he was primarily the ruler of Gauḍa who held Magadhā under his sway, rather than vice-versa. But Jīvita Gupta II, so far as we know, was the king of Magadhā rather than Gauḍa. On the other hand, we know of a king of Śaila dynasty who established his authority in North Bengal known as Gauḍa, some time about 725 A. D. Two other branches of this family ruled in Vārānasi and the Vindhya region. It is not unlikely that this Śaila King of Gauḍa conquered Magadhā after the death of Jīvita Gupta II (or by defeating him), and he or his successor was defeated by Yaśovarman.

In any case, the victorious campaign of Yaśovarman brought Magadhā and other countries under his sway. This probably took place in the third or fourth decade of the eighth century A. D. But Yaśovarman's empire was shortlived and perished with his defeat (and probably death) in the hands of Lalitāditya of Kashmir. Lalitāditya, in his turn, undertook a digvijaya, like Yaśovarman, and proceeded to the eastern ocean. The King of Gauḍa undoubtedly submitted to him and Magadhā must have done the same.

The two successive invasions of Magadhā by Yośovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya of Kāshmir completed the political disintegration of Magadhā and Gauḍa, some time about the middle of the eighth century A. D. But not long after the death of Lalitāditya (c. 760 A. D.), or perhaps even before it, his empire perished like that of Yaśovarman. And out of the ruins of these two shortlived empires arose the Pāla Kingdom which once more united Gauḍa and Magadhā Bengal and Bihar and rose to the height of a great empire.
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CHAPTER XXXIV

Political History of South Bihar

(750-1200 A.D.)

Yaśovarman's invasion of Magadha and Gauḍa was a prelude to other subsequent recurring raids, of Lalitā-dityajayāpīḍa and a Śaila prince. The Bhagdattas also raided the fair provinces. The Gauḍa political system consisting of the then Bihar and Bengal was absolutely disrupted and the region was divided into tiny states ruled by petty rulers. In such a situation the common people must have suffered terribly and actually there was lack of government. This anarchy or mātsyānyāya was too much to be borne with patience for long. It was to end this state of affairs that Gopāla came to power. It is stated by Tāranātha and in the Pāla inscriptions that Gopāla was elected king by the people to put an end to mātsyānyāya. While the details about the election of Gopāla are lacking, it can be said that the rise of Gopāla to power was backed by popular support and must have been organised by the leaders who mattered.

The Tibetan historian, Tāranātha, refers to election of Gopāla as king and about his birth in some supernatural conditions. A similar story is also told by another Tibetan historian, Bu-Ston. While it is impossible to believe in any of these stories, they do show that the origin of Gopāla was not well known and it is quite possible that his descent was not purely legitimate. There is controversy about the caste of Gopāla. In a colophon of the commentary of the Ashṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā by Haribhadra belonging to the reign of Dharmapāla, the latter is described as Rājabhūṣādīvamsa-patita. There has
been controversy among scholars about the actual import of this phrase. Probably it only means that Dharmapāla belonged to the dynasty of a warrior. But the word "Patita" may suggest illegitimacy. The father and grand-father of Gopāla appear to be ordinary persons. Dayita Vishnu is grand-father. He is noted for his learning, while his father Vāpyaṭa was a pious person who built temples and defeated enemies. Gopāla was the first member of the family to assume royalty.

**WHAT WAS THE ORIGINAL KINGDOM OF GOPĀLA**

This is a subject still obscure. In the Rāmacarita the janakkāhā of the Pālas is Varendrī, north Bengal. Mahīpāla I is said to have won back his patrilinear kingdom which has been snatched away by people who had no claim to it. This may relate to Mahīpāla's re-conquest of northern Bengal from the Kāmbojas. It thus appears that Varendrī and not east Bengal was the original kingdom of Gopāla. According to Tāranātha, Gopāla was born at Puṇḍra-vardhanā but was elected king of Bhringalā, which may be east Bengal. The Pāla kings are referred to in the inscriptions as kings of Vāṅga or Gauḍa. Thus it is not certain as to whether the original kingdom of the Pālas was north Bengal or east Bengal. But it was certainly somewhere in Bengal.

Gopāla laid the firm foundation of the Pāla Empire. He not only ended the state of political anarchy in Bengal but also extended Pāla dominion in Magadha and hereafter Magadha became the radiating centre of Pāla imperialism.

Gopāla was a Buddhist and he is credited with the foundation of many Buddhist monasteries including Odantapuri identified with the modern town of Biharsarif, and another monastery near Nālandā.
Gopāla appears to have ruled for a pretty long time. But Tāranātha’s statement that he ruled for 45 years appears to be somewhat exaggerated. The Ārya-manju-śrī-mūla-kalpa assigns a period of 27 years to him which appears to be more or less correct. Gopāla appears to have come to the throne in about 750 A. D. and his rule may have ended near about 780 A. D.

**DHARMAPĀLA**

Gopāla was succeeded by his son, Dhārmapāla. He came to the throne at a very critical juncture when important events were happening on the political horizon of India. The Gurjar Pratihāras had risen to power in Central India and were trying to establish their influence over the Gangetic valley. In the Deccan the Rāshtrakuṭas had consolidated their possessions and were looking forward across the Vindhyas to give scope to their ambitions and energies. Thus Dharmapāla was destined to play an important part on the political chess-board of northern India. The Pālas, the Pratihāras and the Rāshtrakuṭas emerged serious political rivals contending for the prize of hagemony of northern India specially of the Gangetic provinces. This was the back-ground of the tripartite struggle which continued for generations and constitutes the most important thread in the political history of the Madhya Deśa. The Gurjar Pratihāras and the Pālas appear to have entered the arena first. We know from the Radhanpur Copper Plate that Vatsarāja defeated the Gauḍa king and had carried away the two white umbrellas of Pāla’s sovereignty. But Dhruva, the Rāshtrakuṭa defeated Vatsarāja and captured the white umbrellas of the Pāla’s from Vatsarāja who fled into the Maru country.

It is not easy to determine the actual course of events and the field of battle where the Pāla and the Pratihāra army clashed. But most probably the battle must have been
fought somewhere near Prayāga. However, the Pratihāra’s victory proved to be transitory and they were deprived of the prestige and military gains recently won, by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruva. However, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas did not care or had no time to consolidate their gains in northern India. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king with his army retired and left the field again opened to the Pālas. It is suggested by some scholars that Dhruva had also defeated Dharmapāla following his victory over Vatsarāja.11 But there is no clear evidence of such an actual clash between the Pāla king and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler.

However, the retirement of Dhruva to the Deccan and the discomfiture of the Pratihāras who had not yet recovered from the shock of defeat, gave to Dharmapāla the much desired opportunity to realise his imperial ambition. The Khalimpur copper plate inscription of Dharmapāla12 informs us that he was coronated as emperor of Kānyakubja to the delight of the leaders of Pañcāla and with the submission of the Bhoja, Mātya, Madra, Kuru, Yādava, Yavana, Avanti, Gandhāra and Kīra kings. However, Dharmapāla put his protege Cakrāyudha on the throne of Kanauj and defeated his elder brother Indrāyudha.13 Indrāyudha should be identified with Indrarāja who was ruling in the north in 783-84 A.D.14 The Bhagalpur inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla compares Dharmapāla with Bali and Cakrāyudha as dwarf incarnation of Viṣṇu.15 This clearly shows that Cakrāyudha owes his sovereignty to Dharmapāla who actually became the emperor of practically whole of northern India.

The extent of Dharmapāla’s sphere of influence can be inferred from the references in the Khalimpur16 and Monghyr Copper Plates,17 Gandhāra, Madra and Kīra constitutes large parts of the Panjāb and some parts of North West Frontier. The kingdom of Kīra has been placed in the neigh-
bourhood of Jallundhar. The Yadus may belong to Mathurā or Dvārakā region. Some identify them with the Yaḍavas of Simhapura in the Punjab. Matsya constituted the present territory of Alwar, Jaipur and Bharatpur in Rajasthan, Avanti is Malwa. The Bhojas can be placed in Berar and the Yavanas in the Indus Valley. From the Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla we are informed that in course of expeditions the soldiers of Dharmapāla took bath at Kedāra, at Gaṅgāsāgara and performed holy rites at Gokarna. Kedāra is Kedarnath and the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the sea is the Gaṅgāsāgara in south Bengal. According to some, Gokarna is to be located in north Kanara district, though some place it in Nepal. According to a Gujarati writer of the eleventh century, Dharmapāda was Uttarāpathusvāmi. This would suggest that there was a tradition in the eleventh century that Dharmapāla was the lord of northern India.

Thus Dharmapāla ruled over a large territory extending from the Himalayas to Central India and from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea. But all the distant parts of the country were not directly administered by Dharmapāla, the conquered territories were left in charge of local rulers and Dharmapāla following the example of the great Samudra Gupta was satisfied with the submission of the local kings. By this policy he avoided the heavy load and strain on the central administration and at the same time maintained his lordship over distant provinces and established a loose political unity over northern India. We are told that this policy of Dharmapāla of considering the defeated princes well, of honouring them after defeat did good and these princes were naturally henceforth loyal to him looking up to his leadership. As a far-sighted statesman Dharmapāla compromised with the strong local feeling in different parts of the country and did
not attempt the impossible task of establishing a complete unitary State.

Dharmapāla must have been aware of the possible attempt by his enemy, the Pratihāras to recover their lost prestige and kingdom. In view of this he was anxious to strengthen his borders and to establish some sort of understanding with the Rāśṭrakūtaśas that may explain why at an advance age he married Ranno Devī, a Rāśṭrakūta princess, the daughter of Parabala. However, the war between the Pālas and the Pratihāras could not be avoided for long. The Gurjara Pratihāra recovered from the shock that they had received and Nāgabhaṭa II proved to be a very able military leader and a sound shatesman. He appears to have made necessary preparations before challenging his powerful enemies, the Pālas and the Rāśṭrakūtaśas. Nāgabhaṭa befriended the kings of Andhra, Sindhu, Vidarbha and Kaliṅga and ultimately brought them under his influence. Thus kingdoms were always afraid of the Rāśṭrakūta push from south and therefore, were quite easily won over by Nāgabhaṭa. These States extending from Sindh to Kaliṅga formed a central belt right across the country bound in the north by the empire of the Pālas and in the south by that of the Rāśṭrakūtaśas. As a result of this arrangement Nāgabhaṭa II could consider himself fairly secured on the southern frontier and could, therefore, decide on offensive against the Pāla imperialism and its protege Cakrāyudha. Cakrāyudha the king of Kanauj and the vassal of Dharmapāla was defeated. This defeat of Cakrāyudha led to direct clash of arms between the Pāla and the Pratihāra king and we are informed that in a terrible battle Nāgabhaṭa ultimately defeated the Pāla king who must have been Dharmapāla himself. This battle might have been fought somewhere near Mudgagiri or Monghyr.
However, Nāgabhaṭa’s victory again proved elusive because soon on the heels, came the Rāṣṭrakūṭas under Govinda III. There is some ground to suggest on the authority of the Saujana Copper Plate of Amoghavarsha that both Dharmapāla and Cakrāyudha voluntarily submitted to Govinda III\(^a\) who was encouraged to attack Nāgabhaṭa II. Nāgabhaṭa II was severely defeated and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army went as far as the Himālayas. There is a lot of controversy about the approximate date of the north Indian campaign of Govinda III. Mirashi after carefully examining the problem has come to the conclusion that Govinda III’s campaign in northern India leading to the submission of Dharmapāla and defeat of Nāgabhaṭa II should be placed not later than 808 A. D.\(^a\) Govinda III also retired to the Deccan where his presence was urgently needed. Probably the only positive addition to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire was the province of Malwa. The person who gained most from the northern expedition of Govinda was Dharmapāla who appears to have taken advantage of the eclipse of Nāgabhaṭa and re-established his authority as a paramount power in northern India. The Khalimpur Copper Plate inscription dates in the 32nd year of the reign of Dharmapāla is couched in the spirit of triumphant and prosperous imperialism with Pāṭaliputra as the scene of a imperial darbar.\(^b\) The Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla\(^c\) also informs us that Dharmapāla had left to his successor a kingdom free from troubles.

Dharmapāla was a great conquerer. He established an extensive empire in the teeth of bitter opposition. He suffered defeats but was not cowed down and very cleverly organised his conquest, on a feudal-federal basis by allowing full autonomy and continuity of dynasty in the defeated territories. Dharmapāla was a real empire builder who knew when to wage war and how to consolidate his con-
quests. He was always anxious to keep within maryadā and was a safe refuge for kings who approached him for protection. Dharmapāla is the first Pāla king who assumed full imperial titles of mahārajaḥadhirāja, parmeśvara and paramabhāṭṭāraka. His father was referred to simply as mahārajaḥadhirāja only. Dharmapāla was an able administrator. He imposed just taxes which could be easily borne by the people.

He was a Buddhist and is credited with the foundation of the Vikramaśilā Mahāvihāra which should be located in Antichak village near Kahalgaon, the Bhagalpur district. He also built the Sonapura Vihāra in north Bengal. The excavations at Antichak and Paharpur in Rajshahi district appear to corroborate the establishment of the monasteries referred to above. The Nālandā University also continued to receive his patronage. A copper plate of his has been found in Nālandā. Though Dharmapāla was a Buddhist, he tolerated other religions of the land. He granted four villages for the maintenance of the temple of Nara Nārāyaṇa in Bengal. He also accepted and enforced the Hindu laws of caste and was well-versed in Hindu Śāstras. An image of four faced Mahādeva was installed in Bodh-Gayā during his reign. Dharmapāla ruled for a long time. Tāranāth gives him a period of 64 years. It would be safe to assign him a rule of about 40 years from 780 to 820 A. D.

Dharmapāla was succeeded by his son Devapāla. His reign is the high water mark of Pāla imperialism. He conquered Utkala (Orissa) and Prāgjyotisha (Kāmarūpa, Assam). In the course of the military campaign he is said to have reached the Kāmboja country. The Kāmbojas in ancient India are known to have been living in the north-west, but in this period the Kāmbojas are known in east India also, and very probably it may mean the
Tibetans. Devapāla came into conflict with Tibet, there is nothing impossible in this because Tibetan sources claim that their kings Khri-srong-lde-btsan and his son Mu-ten-btsan-po subdued India and forced Rāja Dharmapāla to submit. Devapāla also may have come to clash with them and defeated them. In the inscriptions he is claimed to have made the whole country from Himālayas to the Vindhyas and from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian sea his tributary. He also came into conflict with the Dravīḍas of south India who might be Rāṣṭrakutās or the Pāṇḍyas. The struggle with the Gurjara Pratihāras continued. Soon after the death of Nāgabhaṭa II, Rāma-bhadra a weak king came to the throne and in his time Devapāla appears to have scattered the conceit of the Gurjaras. But in later years of his reign Devapāla faced a younger and more resourceful enemy, Mihirabhooja the son and successor of Rāma-bhadra on the throne of the Gurjara Pratihāras. Before 835 A.D., Mihirabhooja was master of Kanauj, the imperial city and he proceeded to the east towards the dominion of the Pāla king Devapāla. He claims to have defeated Dharma's son Devapāla and goddess of sovereignty went over to Mihirabhooja, but the Pāla records say that "Devapāla brought low the arrogance of the lord of Gurjaras." It is difficult to be certain in view of the conflicting claims by both the rival parties, but it appears that Mihirabhooja had won some initial success which might have made him arrogant but ultimately Devapāla held his own. The fact that he issued the Monghyr Copper Plate from the Camp Mudgagiri adds weight to the view that he might have dug in himself here in view of the Pratihāra offensive.

Devapāla ruled over an extensive empire and was well assisted by his cousins Jayapāla and the family of able ministers. His inscriptions have been found in Ghosrawan,
(Patna district), Nalanda (Patna district), Monghyr (Monghyr district), Hilsa (Patna district). He was a Buddhist paramasaguata. The most celebrated event of his reign is the establishment of friendly and cultural relations with Balaputra-deva, king of Suvarṇadvīpa. The later built monastery at Nalanda and on his request Devapāla granted few villages for its maintenance. The charter making the grant has been discovered in Nalanda. Devapāla’s reign may have come to an end in c. 853 A. D.

The problem of the succession to the Pāla throne after Devapāla is fairly complicated. From the Bhagalpur Grant of Nārāyaṇapāla, it appears that Devapāla was succeeded by Vigrahapāla but in the Badal Pillar Inscription Śūrapāla is mentioned immediately before Nārāyaṇapāla and after Devapāla. According to R. D. Banerji Vigrahapāla of the Bhagalpur Grant is identical with Śūrapāla of the Badal Pillar Inscription. While most of the scholars have accepted this identification, it is not as certain as imagined. We know that Vigrahapāla I was the son of Jayapāla and nephew of Devapāla as Jayapāla was a cousin brother of Devapāla. There is no suggestion about the relationship that might have existed between Devapāla and Śūrapāla. In the Bhagalpur Inscription Śūrapāla is not mentioned. It does not mean, therefore, that he did not exist. It should be borne in mind that such royal lists are genealogical not dynastic. It is quite natural not to find the name of Śūrapāla in the genealogical table of Nārāyaṇapāla who was not directly connected with him. The Badal Pillar Inscription belonging to the time of Nārāyaṇapāla is interested in giving the genealogy of the hereditary family of ministers and mentioned those Pāla rulers who were patrons of the ministerial family. Vigrahapāla I does not appear to have employed a member of this ministerial family as his minister and so his name is omit...
in the Badal Pillar Inscription. It appears that Garga, his son Darbhapañi and the latter's son Kedāra Miśra contributed immensely to the achievements of Dharmapāla, Devapāla and Śūrapāla. But Gurava Miśra was satisfied with the fact that Nārāyaṇapāla held him in high esteem. To us it appears that Vigrahapāla I and Śūrapāla were not on happy terms and with the rise of Nārāyaṇapāla the status of the family was not as high as before, but by the 17th year of Nārāyaṇapāla's reign, the latter was reconciled to Gurava Miśra who is to be identified with Bhaṭa Gurava, who is the dātaka of the Bhagalpur grant. That there was a definite change of line in the ruling Pāla dynasty is clear from the Bhagalpur Plate. Vigrahapāla I, father of Nārāyaṇapāla was not a direct descendant of Dharmapāla and Devapāla but he descended from the collateral family of Vākpāla and Jayapāla. Thus the direct line of Dharmapāla was superseded. The successor of Devapāla according to the Bhagalpur Grant was not a son of Devapāla but a son of Jayapāla. Such a change or break in the line reasonably suggests dynastic trouble or internal crisis. There is some ground of suspicion that after the death of Devapāla the Pāla empire was temporarily divided into three independent kingdoms—Aṅga, Vaṅga and Magadha. Amoghabarsha claims to have received homage from the rulers of these territories. It may also be pointed out that Śūrapala and Vigrahapāla are apparently two distinct names and can hardly by accepted to be a title or a secondary name of the other. The exact course of events that followed the death of Devapāla is not known. But it appears that after the death of Devapāla the succession to the throne was not peaceful. In the Rāmacarita there is a reference to a king Hāravarsha also known as Yuvarāja. He is a Pāla king. Who was Hāravarsha can only be guessed. Some have identified Hāravarsha with Devapāla but he may have
been a brother or a son of Devapāla. He might have succeeded Devapāla at least over some part of the kingdom. Śūrapāla was either a son of Devapāla or of Yuvarāja Rājyapāla who was the Dūlaka of the Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla. This Yuvarāja may probably be identified with Yuvarāja Haravarsha. The Udayasundarikathā refers to the poet Abhinanda living in the court of king (Nareśvara) Yuvarāja. It may be that immediately after the death of Devapāla Yuvarāja Rājyapāla succeeded but was ousted soon after by his brother Śūrapāla. But the latter had to contend against the rising family of Vākpāla, brother of Dharmapāla. We know that in the time of Dharmapāla and Devapāla, Vākpāla and Jayapāla respectively had made considerable contributions, so this branch of the family was also rising in importance. At the same time a ministerial Brahmin family of Garga and his sons and grandsons was also coming into importance and according to the Badal Pillar Inscription actually this family claims the achievements which were also claimed or given to Vākpāla or Jayapāla. In such a situation it is possible that after the death of Devapāla the two families of Vākpāla and Garga might try to aspire for ascendancy. Vīgrahapāla appears to have occupied the throne, while Śūrapāla was assisted by Kedāra Mīśra and his son, Gurava Mishra to claim the imperial Pāla heritage. This might have led to the division of the empire, Śūrapāla appears to have ruled in Magadha while Vīgrahapāla made himself master of Aṅga. Vaṅga might have been under Hāravarsha or some Candra ruler. Vīgrahapāla could not have ruled for long and Śūrapāla's reign was also short lived. Nārāyaṇapāla who succeeded Vīgrahapāla accordingly made himself master of the entire region of Magadha. By the 17th year of his reign, he was already master of Aṅga.
NĀRĀYANAPĀLA

Vigrahapāla abdicated his throne and was succeeded by his son, Nārāyaṇapāla, in about 863 A.D. His inscriptions have been found in East Bihar, in Magadh, i.e. South Bihar and in North Bengal. Thus, almost the whole of the home provinces of the Pāla empire were brought under the unified rule of Nārāyaṇapāla. An inscription of the seventh year of his reign has been found in the Gaya temple. The purpose of the inscription is to record the erection of a monastery for Brahmenical ascetics by Bhaṇḍa Deva in the seventh year of the king Nārāyaṇapāla. Another inscription known as the Indian Museum Inscription dated in the 9th year of Nārāyaṇapāla’s reign refers to the erection of an image by a Buddhist elder Dharmamitra, an inhabitant of Andhra country. This inscription is most probably the same as was found in Bihar by Bradley.

The most important inscription of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla is the Bhāgalpur Copper Plate dated in the 17th year and issued from Mudguagiri, Monghyr. The Badal Pillar inscription refers to Nārāyaṇapāla and it shows that North Bengal was under Nārāyaṇapāla. The issuer of the inscription is Gurava Miśra who appears to be the same as Bhaṭṭa Gurava, the dūtaka of the Bhagalpur Grant. It is reasonable to presume that soon after his accession a reconciliation between him and the powerful ministerial family represented by Gurava Miśra was effected. Later Gurava Miśra was employed in service by Nārāyaṇapāla. We can, therefore, say that till the 17th year of his reign Nārāyaṇapāla ruled over Magadha, West Bengal and North Bengal. He was certainly master of Aṅga. But some time after, Nārāyaṇapāla had to temporarily lose his home dominions. We have positive evidence that during this period his authority was overthrown and the Pratihāras took possession of the Pāla Empire. Miḥirabhoja appears to
have advanced up to the western boundaries of Pāla kingdom and in these campaigns he was assisted by his feudatories. From the Kahala Plates of Soḍhadeva dated in the Vikram year 1134 or 1077 A.D., we learn that Guṇāmbhodideva, a chief of the Kalcury family received land from Bhoja and took away sovereignty from the Gauḍa king. The Guhila chief, namely, Guhila II appears to have joined Bhoja against the Pāla king Nārāyaṇapāla. Nārāyaṇapāla also suffered defeats at the hands of Kṛṣṇa II, the Rāśtrakūṭa king. His commands are said to have been obeyed by Áṅga and Magadhā besides others. The definite proof of a Gurjara Pratihāra’s success in Bihar and Bengal is furnished by inscriptions of king Mahendra Pāla found in Nālandā and Gaya, in Bihar and Paharpur in North Bengal. An inscription belonging to the time of Mahendra Pāla has been found in Itkhorī in Hazaribagh district of Bihar. In Nālandā three fine little stūpas in all probability were built in the time of Mahendra Pāla. One of the inscriptions refers to the construction of a Cāitya in the reign of Mahendra Pāla. Thus it is clear that the Gurjara Pratihāra king Mahendra Pāla was master of South Bihar including Chotanagpur and North Bengal. The Pāla dominion was limited to Western Bengal and northern part of the Gangetic delta. Mahendra Pāla was also holding his sway over North Bihar as is clear from his Dhigwa Dabauli Plate dated in Vikrama year 955 = 898—99 A. D.

However, after the death of Mahendra Pāla troubles arose in the Gurjara royal family and Mahipāla and Bhoja II came forward as rival claimants. This opportunity was taken advantage of by Nārāyaṇapāla who appears to have recovered Magadhā. An inscribed image found in Bihar is dated in the 54th year of the reign of Nārāyaṇapāla. It is quite conceivable that the Pratihāra power was not in a position to check Nārāyaṇapāla’s recoveries of his lost dominion.
Nārāyaṇapāla who liberated Magadha and North Bengal from the hands of the Pratihāras sometime between 910 and 916 A.D. died soon after in about 916-17 A.D.19

SUCCESSORS OF NĀRĀYAṆAPĀLA

Nārāyaṇapāla was succeeded by his son, Rājyapāla,20 whose inscription belonging to the 24th year of his reign has been found in a Jain temple in Nālandā.21 Four inscribed images discovered in Kurkihare bear the dates 28, 31, 32 years of the reign of Rājyapāla.22 So he must have ruled for at least 32 years and kept Magadha under his control. The most important event of his reign was that he married Bhāgya Devī, daughter of Tuṅga Deva of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family.23 Who the Tuṅga Deva was is a matter of controversy. The reign of Rājyapāla might have come to an end in about 948 A.D.

Rājyapāla was succeeded by his son, Gopāla II, born of Bhāgya Devī, daughter of Tuṅga, the moon of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family. During this period Bengal appears to have been lost to the Pālas. Some interesting light is thrown on the subject by the Dinajpur Pillar Inscription,24 It refers to the building of a Śiva temple by a king of Gauḍa of the Kāmboja family. The inscription is dated but the interpretation of the date is not clear. Paleographically the inscription belongs to about the same period as that of the Badal Pillar Inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla. So the Gauḍa king belonging to the Kāmboja family conquered Northern Bengal in the time of Gopal II. The history of the Kāmboja Pāla dynasty is further known from the Irdā Copper Plate of Nayapāla.25 This plate was obtained from a Jamindar of Irdā of the Balasore District of Orissa. The inscription was issued from Priyāṅgu the capital of the imperial ruler Nayapāla who was the younger brother of Nārāyaṇapāla and the son of Rājyapāla, a member of the Kāmboja family. It is wrong to identify this Rājyapāla of the Irdā Copper
Plate with the Pāla king Rājyapāla, son of Nārāyaṇapāla.\(^1\) It therefore appears clear that for at least two generations the Kāmboja Pālas were ruling in West Bengal, North Bengal including Burdwan and Daṇḍabhukti. East Bengal appears to have been occupied by the Candras. However, South Bihar (Magadha) continued to be under Gopāla II. An inscription on an image has been found in Nālandā belonging to the first year of the reign of mahārajādhirāja Gopāla Deva.\(^6\) In the 15th year of his reign a manuscript of *Ashtasāhāriḥprajñāpāramitā* was copied in the Vikramāśīla-deva Vihara\(^6\) situated in Bhagalpur district. Another palm-leaf manuscript of the Maitreya Vaiyākaraṇa was dated in his reign. The manuscript has a date but its reading is controversial. Some have read it as 57, some 11 and some has 17.\(^6\) In our opinion a reign of 17 years may be attributed to Gopāla II.

Gopāla II was succeeded by his son Vigrahapāla II.\(^5\) He also continued to rule over Magadha while the parts of Bengal were under the Kāmbojas. He ruled for at least 26 years as is clear from a manuscript of the Pañcarakṣā copied in the 26th year of his reign and is preserved in British Museum.\(^5\) The dated inscriptions on images having dates 3 and 19th may belong to Vigrahapāla II and not to Vigrahapāla III.\(^5\) The rule of Vigrahapāla II was over by about 990 A.D. Vigrahapāla II was succeeded by his son, Maḥṭpāla I. Under Maḥṭpāla there was a revival of the Pāla empire which had been shrinking after the death of Devapāla and had been confined to Magadha and Aṅga. Maḥṭpāla in his Bangarh inscription dated in the 9th year of his reign claims that he recovered the paternal kingdom which had been snatched by people who had no claim to it.\(^6\) Now this may refer to his victory over the Kāmboja Pālas who had conquered Northern and Western Bengal and even Northern Orissa
from the Pālas. This success of Mahipāla over the Kāmboja Pālas must have taken place before the 9th year of his reign. A Vishṇu Image Inscription dated in the 3rd year in the reign of Mahipāla has been found in Bāghāura in the Comilla district of East Bengal (Bangalādeśa). So by the 3rd year of his reign Mahipāla was master of Eastern Bengal. He must have conquered this after re-establishing his control over West Bengal. A few inscriptions belonging to the time of Mahipāla I have been found in Bihar. A Buddha image inscription is dated in the 11th year of the reign of māhārajādhirāja paramesvara paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahipāla. Another inscription of the same year was found in Nālandā. This inscription refers to the re-restoration of the temple of Nālandā which was earlier burnt down. In Nālandā was also copied in the sixth year of his reign a manuscript of the Ashtasahasrikā-prajñāparamitā. Then a bronze image inscription belonging to the 31st year of his reign has been found at Kurkihara in the Gaya district.

Mahipāla was not only master of Magadha but he also ruled over Tīrabhukti, North Bihar. Two identical image inscriptions found in the village of Imadpur in the Muzaffarpur district are dated in his 48th year. In this connection it is necessary to discuss the evidence of a manuscript of the Rāmāyaṇa. In the colophon of a manuscript of Kishkindhā Kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, there is a reference to a Maharajādhirāja Puṇyāvaloka Gauḍadhvaja Śrī Gāngeyadeva who was ruling in Tīrabhukti. Now the date Samvat 1076 has been taken by Bendall to be in the Vikrama era and he identified Gāngeyadeva with the Kalcuri king, father of Karna. If this interpretation is right the colophon proves that in 1019 A. D. the Kalcuri Gāngeyadeva was ruling over Tīrhubut and therefore Mahipāla must have recovered it from the Kalacuris. But this view is not accepted by
many writers. It has been well observed that no Kalacuri ruler is known to have assumed a title ending in ‘avaloka’. Moreover, the phrase ‘Gauḍadhvaja’ suggests the authority of the king over Gauḍa. But Gāngeyadeva does not claim anywhere else any authority on Gauḍa. Moreover, there is no other evidence of Gāngeyadeva’s authority over Tirhut even. R. P. Chanda argued that if Magadha was under the Pālas and the territory west of Magadha under the Candelas then how could the Kalacuri king extend his rule over Mithila? Dr. Majumdar suggests that the date 1076 may be in the Śaka era and so equivalent to 1154 A.D. He identified Gāngeyadeva Punyāvaloka with Gāṅgeya-
deva, son of Nānyadeva of Mithilā who came to the throne in 1097 A.D. Nānyadeva is known as the Karnāṭa Kakudabhushaṇa Dharmāvaloka, so his son Gāṅgeya-
deva may be Punyāvaloka. But the word ‘samvat’ does not by itself refer to Śaka era. In most of the Śaka dates, the word ‘Samvat’ is preceded by the word ‘Śaka’. However, Majumdar pointed out that in the colophon of the commentary of Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra Nānya claims to have broken the powers of Āṅga and Gauḍa. If this is possible then his son Gāṅgeyadeva may have assumed the title of Gauḍadhvaja. So there are two theories about the identification of Gāṅgeyadeva, who was ruling over Tirhut in samvat 1076. One view is that he is the Kalacuri king Gāṅgeyadeva who certainly ruled over Banaras and who could have invaded Gauḍa and Āṅga and occupied Tirhut for some time. The other theory is that this Gāṅgeyadeva might be the son of Nānyadeva and if so then the date is to be in Śaka and not in Vikrama era. However Mirashi has shown that in a photostat copy of the colophon under discussion he had read Garuḍadhvaja instead of Gauḍadhvaja. So there is no reason now to connect the Gāṅgeyadeva with Gauḍa. It has been stated by Mirashi that no Kalacuri king
adopted any title ending in *avaloka*. Moreover they were worshippers of Śiva and not of Vishṇu. The high imperial titles assumed by Gāṅgeyadeva Kalcuri do not occur on any inscription before 1037-38 A.D. So in 1019 A.D. Gāṅgeyadeva, the Kalcuri king might not have assumed the high imperial title. Gāṅgeyadeva of the manuscript of the Rāmāyana who is claimed to be ruler of Tirabhukti, cannot be Gāṅgeyadeva son of Nānyadeva. Nānyadeva never claimed high imperial title. He was satisfied with the title of Mahāsāmantaśāhīpati and there is no evidence that his son assumed the imperial title Mahārājādhirāja. Moreover there is no evidence to connect the Nānyadeva family with the lunar dynasty. Mirashi has suggested that this Gāṅgeyadeva, the ruler of Tirhut may have been a Rāśṭrakūṭa, as Rāśṭrakūṭas have assumed titles ending in *avaloka* and also used the Garuḍa seal for their Copper Plates. In the latter’s records the Rāśṭrakūṭas claimed descent from the moon. Gāṅgeyadeva Punyāvaloka may have belonged to the Rashtrakūta family whose inscription has been found at Bodh-Gayā. The inscription is a mere religious one and the existence of the inscription is no guarantee that the person ruled over the district of Gayā. It appears wise to postpone the decision about the identification of Gāṅgeyadeva Punyāvaloka who ruled over Tirhut and who appears to have been followed by Mahipāla as ruler of Tirhut. Towards the west Mahipāla appears to have extended his dominion as far as Kāśi. An inscription has been found at Sārnath which says that Mahipāla, the king of Gauḍa has caused Sthirapāla and his younger brother Vasanta-pāla to establish in Kāśi hundreds of precious monuments of his glory. The inscription is dated in Samvat 1083 equivalent to 1026 A.D. It is generally accepted that this proves the possession of Sārnath by Mahipāla, though it is not impossible that constructions in a religious centre like Sārnath by kings do not necessarily mean the rule of
the king over Sarnath. King of Ceylon and Java built temples in Bodh-Gaya and Nalanda but that did not mean that they ruled over these territories. However, it is quite likely that after the defeat of Pratihaśa king Rājayāpāla at the hands of Mahmud of Shajna and the confederacy led by Candella prince Vidyādhara to punish Rājayāpāla, Mahipāla I might have taken advantage of the misfortunes of the Pratihaśas and extended authority over Banaras. So Mahipāla ruled over a fairly extensive kingdom which included large parts of Bengal, whole of Bihar and possibly Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Never was the Pāla dominion so large in extent after the death of Devapāla. Mahipāla is therefore, rightly considered as the second founder of the Pāla Empire. Mahipāla towards the last years of his reign appears to have suffered defeat at the hands of Rājendra Cola whose army invaded Northern India. At that time Orissa and Daṇḍabhiukti were outside the empire of Mahipāla. However the victorious Cola army soon went back to south India leaving Mahipāla king of large part of Bengal. Mahipāla I appears to have ruled for about 52 years, according to Tāranāth. It is true that in his time Atiśa, the Chief abbot of Vikramaśīlā left for Tirhut. So Mahipāla’s reign might have come to an end in about 1040 A.D.

Mahipāla justified his long reign and restored the Pāla empire to a dignified extent. His period of rule coincided with the Turkish invasions in the north-west and Madhyadeśa. These invasions kept the rulers of northern India engaged and this might have helped Mahipāla to quietly recover and consolidate his possession. It is true that Mahipāla did not join any confederacy against the Muslim invasion of India. He did not take a larger view of the crisis. It is unfortunate that while kings like Mahipāla were not aware of the crisis posed by
Muslim invasion, a Buddhist monk Ratnākara living in Vikramaśīla monastery was very much concerned at that. "Numerous Turuskas are invading India and I am much concerned at that." However, Mahipāla and even later Pāla kings of Magadha were not concerned at the Muslim invasions. The fears of the Buddhist monk of Vikramaśīla came true when the Vikramaśīla monastery was destroyed by the Turks in the last years of the 12th or the early years of the 13th century. However, it has to be considered that Mahipāla had to utilise all his intelligence and resources in recovering his lost empire and had he tried to extend his sphere of activities and projected his plans far wider, he might not have succeeded even in recovering and consolidating his dominion, which he did. Had he plunged himself into the vortex of Northern Indian politics complicated by Mahmud of Ghazna's raids the repeated dipradations of the Pratiharā empire and the rise of new powers like the Candella, Mahipāla might have found himself unable to recover and retain his own kingdom. With the death of Mahipāla I the Pāla empire again began to decline.

Mahipāla's reign came to an end in c. 1038, and with this the empire began to disintegrate rapidly. His son Nayapāla ruled for at least fifteen years. He had to wage in constant warfare against Karna, the Kalacuri king, who had invaded the Pāla empire. Karna's wars with the rulers of Vaṅga and Gauḍa are referred to vaguely in the Kalacuri records. From Tibetan accounts we learn that Karna was at first defeated probably in Magadha or Aṅga but ultimately peace was restored with the efforts of Atiśa. While the war between the Pālas and the Kalacuris was indescribable, the Pāla king Nayapāla's hold over Magadha and Aṅga was weakening. Actually Mahipāla I appears to have been the last Pāla king to effectively hold Vaṅga, Gauḍa, Aṅga, Magadha and Tira-
bhukti. Many feudatory families were coming into prominence. Śūdraka in Gayā region, centre of Magadha, appears to have succeeded in taking advantage of the fluid political condition of the region, and by the strength of his own arms became the protector (pratipālaka) of Gayā, as is claimed in the inscription of his grandson. This must have happened in the time of Nayapāla, during his engagement in wars against the Kalacuris.

Nayapāla was succeeded by Vigrahapāla III (1054-1072 A.D.). This dismemberment of the empire continued. Karnā advanced into west Bengal and the king of Vāṅga trembled in his fear and the king of Gauḍa waited upon him. Vigrahapāla appears to have made peace by marrying the daughter of Karnā. Vāṅga had become independent. In Aṅga (east Bihar) a Rāṣṭrakūṭa family under Mathanadeva had emerged as a ruling dynasty. In Magadha the Chikora family had established his authority at least over Gayā region. Devarakshita is known as both Magadhahanātha and Pithipati. What was happening to Śūdraka and his descendants? Nothing definite can be said, but it is likely that the family had accepted the overlordship of Pālas, as the Gayā Akshayavata inscription is dated in the 5th year of the reign of Vigrahapāla III, and Śūdraka’s son Viśvarūpa (Viśvāditya) appears to have helped Vigrahapāla against his enemies which may include the Kalacuris. The Pāla kingdom also suffered an invasion by the Cālukyan prince Vikramāditya (VI). The Somavamśī king of Orissa a Mahāśivagupta Yayāti also invaded north, west and east Bengal. The Cālukya invasion directly in course of time contributed to the rise of the Karnāta dynasties—of the Senas in east Bengal and of Nānya in Mithilā.

Thus the Pāla empire fell on evil days. The fortunes of the dynasty sank still lower during the civil war that
broke out after the death of Vighrapāla III, who had three sons, Mahīpāla II, Śūrapāla II, and Rāmapāla. Mahīpāla II, ascended the throne and suspecting his brothers harbouring rebellious intentions against him put them into prison. This did not win respite for Mahīpāla, who not only lost Varendra to the rebellious Divya, the Chief of the Kaivartas, but also his life. Divya’s seizure of the Pāla throne was an outright rebellious act. There is no doubt that the success of Divya, who might have been an officer under Mahīpāla II, was mostly due to the growing weakness of the Pāla rule. Other chiefs in west and south Bengal, and also in Santhal Parganas in Bihar successfully carved out their own kingdoms which only in name could be regarded as vassal states under the Pāla king. Rāmapāla later secured the help of as many as thirteen of these.

Śūrapāla and Rāmapāla escaped from prison and left Varendra. Śūrapāla appears to have actually ascended the throne (vide Manahali Copper Plate of Madanapāla), but soon after him, Rāmapāla came to the throne. There is no evidence that Rāmapāla murdered Śūrapāla.

Rāmapāla came to the throne in about 1077 A.D. He could have claimed authority over some parts of west Bengal only, Magadha was practically out of his control. Aṅga was under the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family and in the Gayā region Narendra Yakshapāla son of Viśvarūpa appears to have ignored Pāla overlordship all together and no mention of Pāla king’s reign is mentioned in the inscription. However either the family’s power soon evaporated or it became under the kingdom of Pithī. Then from the west the Gāhaḍvālas were encroaching on what was traditionally a part of the Pāla dominion. The Gāhaḍvālas had occupied Kāśi and were threatening the western region of south Bihar. In south-east part of south Bihar, at least,
the chiefs mentioned below were ruling over regions which were traditionally under Pāla empire, and the Rāmacarita takes them to be feudatory chiefs, but in the manner in which Rāmapāla begged their help, makes it clear that they were actually independent rulers of their kingdoms. Among the thirteen chiefs mentioned in the work, the following may be placed in Bihar (a) Lakshmīsenā lord of Apara-Mandāra. Many have located this place in Bengal (Birbhum or Hooghly district), but most probably it means the regions round Deoghar (Vaidyanātha) lying on the other side of Mandāra hill (30 miles south of Bhagalpur; (b) Narasīṃhārjuna, king of Kajaṅgala-maṇḍala (Rajmahal region). (c) Śūrapāla king of Kujavāṭi, about 14 miles north of Nayadūnika in Santhal Pargana. Another ruling family in Colgong area has been recently known from a stone inscription discovered in course of excavations at Antichak; the site of the Vikramaśīla University. The inscription is unfortunately very much damaged at vital points, but we are informed of Rājādhirāja Hemmna, Kesara and Mannikēśa. This family was ruling independently and appears to have rendered help to the Gauḍa king against the king of Vaṅga. The king of Gauḍa may have been Rāmapāla or Kumārapāla and the Vaṅga king could have been Vijayasena. The outlandish names suggest that the family could be from an aboriginal tribe. The family maintained its rule for three generations, and ultimately lost to the Sena king Vallāla Sena. This shows that not only complete erosion of the Pāla authority in south Bihar, but also its political fragmentation.

Rāmapāla’s first task was to recover his paternal kingdom from the Kaivartas and for these the Pāla king who had hardly any significant territory under his direct rule, had to seek alliance and get their military support against Bhīma, the son of Divya. Rāmapāla’s maternal uncle
Mathanadeva of Aṅga rendered him singular help, and Rāmapāla moved door to door of independent chiefs of Bihar, West Bengal and East Bengal seeking military help. With their assistance he defeated Bhīma and executed him and the members of his family. Rāmapāla recovered Varendra secured the submission of the Varman king of East Bengal (who may be identified with Hari-varman) conquered Kāmarūpa and Orissa and extended his conquests up to Kaliṅga.

But Rāmapāla lost Mithilā or North Bihar to Nānya, the Karnāta chief, who claims to have broken the powers of Vaṅga and Gauḍa. The lord of Gauḍa was probably Rāmapāla. Thus Mithilā, which was certainly under Mahtpāla I till the 48th year of his reign (Imedpur Inscriptions), was how independent Rāmapāla had also to contend against the Gāhaḍavālas. Govindacandra, son of Madanapāla fought against the Gauḍas whose king was Rāmapāla. The battle was not decisive and Mathanadeva king of Aṅga and maternal uncle of Rāmapāla may have attempted to bring about reconciliation between the two the Pālas and the Gāhaḍavālas. Mathana may have engineered the marriage of Kumāradevi the princes of Piṣht and daughter of Mathana's daughter with Govindacandra, the Gāhaḍavāla prince. It was therefore no wonder that the news of the death of his staunchest supporter and wise adviser, Mathanadeva king of Aṅga made him feel so sad and forlorn that Rāmapāla put an end to his own life by drowning in the Gaṅga at Monghyr in 1130 A. D.

Rāmapāla represents the last glow of the dying lamp of the Pālas. The disintegration partly arrested by his heroic efforts and the diplomatic skill of Mathanadeva, the king of Aṅga, now took a step downward course. Rāmapāla was succeeded by his son Kumārapāla who in turn was followed by his son Gopāla III. Madanapāla son of Rāmapāla
succeeded his nephew Gopāla III in c. 1144-45 A. D. Kāmarūpa was lost and Vaidyadeva, the minister of Kumārapāla had declared himself independent ruler of Kāmarūpa after Kumārapāla’s death. East Bengal’s king Bhojavaran was now an independent king. The eastern Gaṅga king Anantavarman had carried his arms right up to the Gaṅgā and defeated the king of Mandāra. The Senas had made themselves secure in South Bengal. But for our purpose the push into Bihar by Gāhaḍvālas is more important. From the Maner Plates of Govindacandra it is clear that the Gāhaḍvālas had brought South Bihar up to Maner in the Patna district under their rule by or before 1124 A. D. and by 1146 A. D., as the date of the Lar Plates, Monghyr had fallen in the hands of Govindacandra. This happened in the early years of the reign of Madanapāla. The latter also suffered some defeat at the hands of Vijayesena, the Sena king who had made himself master of South and East Bengal. On the basis of the disputed reading in the colophon of the Rāmāyaṇa dated in Samvat 1076, Nānyadeva’s son Gaṅgadeva is credited with having defeated king of Gauḍa and exercised authority over Gauḍa or a part of it. The king of Gauḍa was certainly Madanapāla. However, Madanapāla appears to have recovered his position in South Bihar, of course temporarily, from the Gāhaḍavālas as his Jayanagar Inscription found in the Monghyr district is dated in the 14th year of his regin, i.e. 1157-58 A. D. He continued to control this area down to the 18th year of his reign dated actually on 4th May 1161 A. D. the date of the Valguḍar Inscription.

That Madanapāla maintained his hold over Anāga of which Monghyr region formed a part is clear from the Rāmācarita wherein it is stated that Candradeva, grandson of Mathanadeva held Anāga and a feudatory (Maṇḍalā-
dhipati) under Madanapāla. The last known date of Madanapāla is 4th May, 1161 A. D. who was his successor in the great Pāla dynasty? It is unknown. However we know about one Govindapāla who certainly ruled for at least 4 years over Nālandā and Gayā region. One of the Buddhist manuscripts was copied in Nālandā in the fourth year of the victorious reign of Govindapāla. Other colophons and also one inscription found at Gayā have dates in his ‘gata rājye’, ‘vinashṭa-rājye’, and the Gayā inscription dated in the 14th ‘gata-rajye’ of Govindapāla end in Samvat 1232 (vikrama) 1175 A. D. Dr. D. C. Sircar held that the reckoning in ‘gata-rajye’ began from his accession, and so he came to the throne in 1162-63 A. D. But this appears to be a forced interpretation. The natural meaning should be the 14th year of the end of his rule. Majumdar has therefore, rightly placed the accession of Govindapāla in c. 1158 A. D.

In one of the colophons Govindapāla is referred to as Gauḍēśvara. So he must have belonged to the Pāla family, and took advantage of the difficulties of Gopāla III and Madanapāla succeeded in created a niche for himself in south west Magadh and shared power with Madanapāla, who had his hands full with the Gāhaḍavālas, the Senas and even the Cālukyas.

Both Madanapāla and Govindapāla appeared to have ceased to reign in about the same time. The use of the word ‘vinashṭa rājye’ may suggest that Govindapāla was violently overthrown. The successful invaders were the Gāhaḍvālas, and the Senas. Some time earlier in the Nawada region authority was being exercised by the Māna dynasty. From the Govindpur Stone Inscription of the poet Gāṅgādhara, dated in Śaka 1059 (= 1137-38 A. D.), Rudramma was ruling and he had succeeded his father Magadhanātha Varṇamāna. Unfortunately there is no
other reference to this family of rulers, though it is possible to imagine some connection with the Māna brothers who had come much earlier to the court of king Ādisimha, the king of Magadha and were granted three villages in the Hazaribagh district (cf. Dudhpāni inscription). It appears that taking advantage of death of Rāmapāla Vṛṇoṣāna declared himself an independent ruler in this part of Magadha, and at least two generations ruled over the region. Govindapāla might have eclipsed the fortunes of this dynasty. But Govindapāla did not survive long enough to consolidate his power.

What happened to South Bihar after Govindapāla cannot be indicated precisely, but it appears that the Senas from the east and the Gāhaḍavālas from the west finished what remained of the Pāla dominion in South Bihar and Bengal. The Tarachandi Inscription found near Sahasram in the Shahabad district (now Rohtas) dated in 1169 A.D. (1225 V. S.) refers to Vijayacandra, the Gāhaḍavāla king, who granted villages to the Brāhmaṇas and Jāpilādhipati Pratāpadhavala was his mahānāyaka. The Sivhar Plate dated in 1175 A.D. shows that Jayacandra, son of Vijayacandra, controlled Patna district and granted two villages in Maner Paṭṭala to a learned Brāhmaṇa. It is difficult to hold on the basis of the Bodh Gayā inscription (dated between 1189 and 1192-3 A.D.) that Jayacandra controlled Gayā region. He might have come to Gayā on a pilgrimage.

While in the east, the Senas has conquered whole of West Bengal and penetrated into Aṅga. The Sanokhar Image Inscription dated in the 9th year of the reign of Vallālasena shows that he was master of Golgong area in Bhagalpur district before 1165 A.D. Either he or the Gāhaḍavāla king Vijayacandra had overthrown Govindapāla, the Buddhist king. This violent extermination of
the Buddhist Pāla king by the Brāhmaṇical conquerer created such an impression on the Buddhist learned men that they began to count the years from the end of Govindapāla’s reign, rather than use the vijaya-rājya years of the conquering Brahmanical kings.

Thus the long and glorious Pāla dynasty came to an end Palapāla\textsuperscript{138a} and Indradyaṃnapāla\textsuperscript{139} should find place in sober history.\textsuperscript{140}

The Gāhaḍavāla push from the west and the Senas’ penetration from the east into South Bihar was bound to bring about a clash between them and we learn from the Prākṛta-Paṅgalam that Kāśirāja (Jayacandra) fought the king of Gauḍa. Prabandhakosha also refers to such a conflict between Jayacandra and Lakshmaṇasena, son of Vallālasena.\textsuperscript{141} In the Sena inscriptions Lakshmaṇasena claims to have defeated the king of Kāśi (who must have been Jayacandra). The fact that the inscriptions of Asokacalla found at Bódh-Gayā\textsuperscript{142} are dated in atīta-rājya samvat 51 and 74 of Lakshmaṇasena samvat and the Janibigha inscription of Jayasena\textsuperscript{143} is also dated in atīta-rājya reckoning of La-sam, 83, makes it clear that Lakshmaṇasena must have conquered Magadha from the Gāhaḍavālas, and as we shall see a Sena dynasty continued to rule in Magadha long after the main Sena dynasty was overthrown by Muhammad-Ibn-Bakhtiyar in about 1200 A.D. There is an unending controversy about the interpretation of atīta-rājya and about the date of the Lakshmaṇasamvat. But on the analogy of the reckoning of the atītarājya of Govindapāla, the atīta-rājye of La-sam should be counted from the date of the end of the reign of Lakshmaṇasena. The view that it should be counted from the year 1119 with which some of dates in manuscripts of Mithila correspond, is proved wrong in view of the fact that when Dharmasvāmin, the younger Tibetan monk
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visited Bodh-Gayā in 1234-36 A.D., king Buddhhasena was ruling.148 We know from the Janibigha inscription that Jayasena, the king of Pīthi, (Magadha) with Bodh-Gayā-vajrāsana as the capital, was son of Buddhhasena.149 If the fall of Nadiya is placed in 1200 A.D., then the Janibigha inscription is to be placed in 1283 A.D. His father Buddhhasena could be ruling in 1234-36 when Dharmasvāmin visited Bodh-Gayā. When the Turks under Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khilji invaded South Bihar conquered Bihar Sharif (site of Oddantapuri mahāvihāra) and made it the centre of Muslim rule in this part of the country picked Turkish contingents guarded the passes in Rajmahal area and thus the Sena dominion in East Bihar was destroyed and contact with the centre Nadia was lost. It is possible that one of the Sena governors, may have established an independent kingdom of Pīthi in Magadha. It has been well demonstrated that the occupation of Nadiya by the Muslims did not mean the end of the Sena rule in Bengal. Lakshmīnāsena continued to rule till 1205 and was succeeded by his sons Viśvarūpasena and Keśasena who continued to fight the Muslim rulers of Lakhnauti. Lakshmīnāsena's descendants continued to rule in Bengal till 1245 A. D. or 1260 A. D.148 However the era referred to in the Gayā inscriptions of Aśokacalla and in the Janibigha inscription may be regarded as having started about 1200 A. D.148 The inscription of Aśokacalla is dated in the year 1813 of the Buddhist Nirvāṇa Era which would be equivalent to 1813—543 = 1270 A. D. Another inscription of Rājādhīrāja Aśokacalla found at Bodh-Gayā is dated in year 74 of the atiltarājya of Lakshmīnāsena which should be 1274 A. D., if the reckoning is believed to start in 1200 A. D. According to the inscription Buddhhasena was ruling at that time. Buddhhasena was ruling in Magadha with Pīṭha Gayā (or Vajrāsana) as the capital in 1234-36 when Dharmasvāmin visited Bodh-Gayā.
If Buddhhasena is supposed to be the first Sena king of Pithi as independent ruler, after Lakshmanaśena was dethroned in the battle of Nadiya, then Buddhhasena must have continued to rule from 1200 to 1270 A.D. This is not impossible, but improbable. It appears that as Śūdraka, Viśvarūpa and Yakṣhapāla established a ruling dynasty with Gayā as the capital in and after the reign of Nayapāla. Similarly after the Turkish invasions and conquests of Bihar and Bengal a Sena dynasty established its rule over Magadha with Gayā as the capital. It is to be remembered that the Turkish conquest of Bihar, even South Bihar, was not complete with the invasion of Muhammad Baktiyar Khilji. From Bihārsharif the Muslims were raiding Nālandā and also Bodh-Gayā, but the king Buddhhasena who had fled into forest on the outskirts of Bodh-Gayā on the approach of the Muslim raiders had come back.\(^{189}\) His son and successor Jayasena continued to rule over the region down to 1283 A.D. (83 year of attārājya of Lakṣmanaśena) when practically whole of South Bihar and Bengal was under Muslim administration. There is no evidence that Buddhhasena or his son Jayasena even ruled as a Vassal of the Muslim sultan. Jayasena may be regarded as the last independent king of South Bihar. It, however, could not exist longer as an independent kingdom in the blazing midday sun of the Turko-Afghan imperialism under Balban or Alaudeen Khilji.

Before we close the history of South Bihar, reference may be made to the Panchobh copper plate of Saṃgrāma-gupta.\(^{190}\) Panchobh is situated near Lahariasarai in the Darbhanga district. The inscription refers to the following line of kings:

1. Yajūśu-gupta
2. Dāmodara-gupta
3. Deva-gupta
4. Rājaditya-gupta
5. Kṛṣṇa-gupta
6. Saṁgrāma-gupta

First three are mere kings but the fourth Rājaditya-gupta is paramabhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara. Saṁgrāma-gupta, his grandson, has the seven titles. Both are Parmamāheśvara-Vṛshadvaja-Somānvayaja-Arjunavarāṇśodbhava and are lords of Jayapura (Jayapura parameśvara). On account of the identification of Jayapura with Jayanagar near Lakshmisarai in the Monghyr district, the dynasty is to be placed in South Bihar. We know nothing else about this line of kings. Their names ending in ‘Gupta’ may suggest some relationship with the later Guptas, as they claim to have become reputed as vamśa-gupta. Palaeographically the inscription is to be placed towards the end of the 12th century A.D. It is significant that besides the high imperial titles, both Rājaditya and Saṁgrāmagupta are also referred to as mahāmāndalika. So they were actually feudatories probably of the Pālas, and later Senas, and in the disturbed and confused political situation in the later half of the 12th century, could have basted of imperial status. Their ancestor Arjuna cannot be identified, though some have tried to identify him with Arjuna the ruler of Tirhut immediately after Harsha. This line of feudatory kings has to remain obscure for the present.
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CHAPTER XXXV

Political History of North Bihar
(from 550 to 1200 A.D.)

The history of the North Bihar from 550 to 1200 A.D. is not yet clearly known. Stray references are found here and there about certain names and places but no systematic attempt has yet been made to piece together all those scattered informations and give them a concrete shape. Various MSS discovered from Nepal contain indirect references to this period. The newly discovered Copper-Plate Inscription of Jivita Gupta and some other Later Gupta Inscriptions, the Dighwa-Dubauli Plate, the Imadpur Image Inscriptions, the Naulagarh Inscriptions, the Nagadah Terracotta plaque, the Bangaon Copper Plate and the Panchobh Copper Plate and a coin of Vigrahapāla III from Naulagarh are some of the important source materials brought to light so far. The Yaśastilaka of Somadeva, Rāmacarita of Sandhyakara Nandi, Mudita-Kuvalayāsā, Ballāla-Carita, Vikramakadevacarita, Saduktikarnāmṛta of Śridharadāsa, the Paṇji records, the Prakṛta-paiṅgalam, Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakshmīdhara, Lingavārtika of Jayasimha, Kāvyaprakāśa-niveka of Śridhara, Purushaparikshā of Vidyāpati, Chāndogya- parishtā of Narayana, Lingānuśāsana of Vāmana, writings of Caṇḍēśvara, Vàrṇaratnākara of Jyotirīśvara, Purijataharaṇapāṇīka of Umāpati, the diary of Mulla Taquia and other literatures preserved in the handwritten palm-leaf and paper MSS of Mithilā are some of the important literary sources. The accounts of Fa-hsien, Hsuan Tsang, I-ting, Dharmasvāmin and other foreign travellers throw some light on the history of North Bihar during the period under review. Some colophons of the MSS of Mithilā and Nepal do throw welcome light on the political history of
north Bihar. The Nepalese Inscriptions and the various
texts of the royal Vamsāvalts also help us in reconstructing
the history of this period.

Barua holds that with the dissolution of the Gupta
empire after Yaśodharman’s lightening victory, the Varman
rulers of Kāmarūpa extended their authority westward
and reached the Kośi river in the Purnea district, where
Mahābhūtavarmā made grants of land in Candrapuri
vishaya bounded by the dried Kauśiki. Some scholars
hold that the lands donated in the Nidhanpur grant lay
in Sylhet district. In this connection the most important
point to be noted is that the only Kauśiki, west of Trirotā,
is the river Kośi of north Bihar. The grant was renewed
by Bhāskaravartman from Karnasuvāra. The Mayūraśāl-
malāgrahāra containing the assignments formed out of the
silts of the Kauśikī and Gaṅgini, was comprised in the
Candrapuri vishaya. The area was bounded on the east
by the śushka Kauśikī, on the west by the Gaṅgini, on
the south-east and the north-west the śushka-Kauśikī was
represented respectively by the dambari-ccheda and a tank
of Vyavahārika Khasoka. On the south it was marked
by dambari-ccheda again and the same sign represented the
Gaṅgini on the south west. The identification of śushka-
Kauśikī with the Mara-Kusiyārā of Pañcakhaṅḍa in Sylhet
cannot be accepted.

Other identifications are also not
convincing. The mention of Jatalī on the north is impor-
tant. Jatalī means forest. Forest even today is a special-
ity of the district of Purnea, the earliest boundary line
of Kauśikī. Kauśika of the Nidhanpur Plates should be
identified with Kośī. The Vappaghosavāta grant issued
from Karnasuvāra refers to Audumbarika vishaya. Udum-
bara and dambari have the same meaning (i.e. fig tree).
Candrapuri vishaya touched the borders of the ancient
Audumbara district on three sides. According to the Bhuv-
samhita, Candrapuri lay in the east. Since there is no
mention of any bhukti in the Nidhanpur grant, the mere mention of vishaya does not admit of any verification. It would thus appear that the Varmans of Kāmarūpa extended their authority up to a part of the Purnea district in the time of Mahābhūta Varman.

Mahāsenagupta the later Gupta king of Magadhā who must have viewed with alarm the extension of Kāmarūpa’s authority in north Bihar, defeated the Varmans of Kāmarūpa on the Lauhitya, which provided the boundary between the later Guptas and Kāmarūpa, kingdoms in the north-east. According to R. D. Banerji, Magadhā, Assam, Vaṅga, Varendra and Mithilā were included in the kingdom of Mahāsenagupta. Jayanāga of the Vappaghosvāṭa grant was the king of the Gauḍa, and he appears to have annexed Udumbara vishaya (of Purnea district).

Śaśāṅka ruled over a considerable portion of north and south Bihar. Both Bāṇa and Hsuan Tsang suggest that Śaśāṅka was a powerful ruler. His kingdom included Kārṇa-suvarṇa, Magadhā and the intervening kingdom or tracts of Tirabhukti and Kāśi. The tradition about Tirhut being a part of five-divisioned Gauḍa may not be a mere fiction.

After Śaśāṅka’s death Bengal passed under Harsha who must have ruled over north Bihar (Mithilā) which was included among five Gauḍas. The turmoil following the death of Harsha might have enabled Bhāskaravarman to conquer Bengal and pitch his victorious camp at Kārṇa-suvarṇa from where he issued the Nidhanpur Copper Plates. He is referred to as the king of eastern India in the Chinese annals. His occupation of Tirhut is suggested by the fact that from here he could have actively assisted the Chinese envoy who had taken refuge in Nepal just to the north of Mithilā. Kośī formed the boundary between
Kāmarūpa and Mithilā and the land donated by the charter lay in eastern Mithilā.

The death of Harsha was followed by an upheaval of an unprecedented scale. Arjuna or Aruṇāśva was the governor of Tirhut. The circumstances following the death of Harsha, the usurpation of the throne of Kanauj by Arjuna and his subsequent defeat and capture by the Chinese ambassador helped the extension of the Tibetan influence into the Gangetic valley and north Bihar. A Chinese mission under Wang-Hiuenc-tse arrived in India immediately after the death of Harsha. According to the story preserved in the Chinese annals, Arjuna attacked the mission. Wang fled to Nepal, secured some soldiers and help from Tibet and disastrously defeated and imprisoned Arjuna and took him a captive to China. Wang also secured help from Bhāskaravarman of Assam who appears to have became subordinate to Tibet.

The sources regarding the episode are conflicting and hence in arriving at a definite conclusion we have to examine them afresh. The leader of the mission, Wang, visited India four times and has himself left an account of his travel in India. Only extracts from this account are preserved in Fa-iuen-chu-lin, compiled by Tao-chen in 668 A.D. There is no mention of his second embassy in these accounts. There is reference to his second embassy to Magadha in the History of the Tang Dynasty, of which we have two versions (897-946 and 1060 A.D.) and these have been translated by Levi. The account of Ma-twa-lin, Pien-i-Tien and that in the Che-fu-yuankoei (1013 A.D.) are based on the two later Tang histories. In the old history of the Tang dynasty it is said that "Śilāditya had just died and there was anarchy in the country. His minister Nafuti Otonashuen usurped the throne and sent the barbarian forces to drive out Hiuan-tse. The mission had
only thirty horsemen as escort. Hiuen-tse alone escaped. He fled to Tufan (Tibet) and brought 1200 picked soldiers along with 7000 Nepalese cavalry. He was accompanied by Tsiang-Chen-Jenn, second officer of the embassy. The battle that was fought lasted for three days. The town of Cha-puo-ho-lo, was captured on the third day. Arjuna fled but he re-assembled his troops and again offered battle. Arjuna was captured. Even after his arrest, his followers opposed the passage of the river Kien-to-wei and a great battle ensued. Chen-juen had 580 walled towns. Kumāra (Bhāskaravarman) also helped him with men and material. The captive Indian king remained in China till his death. Ma-twa-lin supports the version of the new history of the Tang dynasty.

All these accounts when read together indicate that the usurping minister was a local ruler of Tirhut and that all the campaigns of Wang were confined to this region. Bagchi calls Arjuna a king of Tirabhukti. The inscription, engraved on the statue of the royal prisoner, means—“Hindu king of the kingdom of Tirabhukti-Arjuna or Aruṇāśva”. The river Cha-puo is identified with the Gaṅgā and Kien-to-wei and Chen-lien with Gaṇḍakī. Waddell suggested that the capital city was of the same as that of the Vijjis. The Tibetan king, Srong-btsan-Sgampo (600-650) was an ambitious ruler and his imperialist intentions were an open secret. He married the daughters of the king of China and king Amśuvarman of Nepal. Nepal was subject to Tibet in 643 A.D. It was in the reign of Jishnugupta of Nepal that Nepal and Tibet helped the Chinese envoy against Arjuna. The anarchy and confusion created by the death of Harsha emboldened Srong to make a bid for supremacy in the valley and the plains of north Bihar. Wang is said to have fought with the barbarians and when he appealed
to Tibet for help, the Tibetan king took it as god-sent opportunity and hence without allowing any grass to grow under his feet, Srong came forward to fish in the troubled waters of north Bihar. Majumdar thinks that Srong was already in India and Wang's campaign should be regarded merely as a part of Indian campaign of the Tibetan king. The campaign was limited to a very narrow region along the foothills of the Himalayas and extending to the plains of north Bihar, of which Arjuna was formerly a governor and later an independent ruler after Harsha's demise. Majumdar further believes that the Tibetan king left no impress and returned home without any permanent gain. The only Tibetan source, La-dvago-rgyal-rabs, that gives an account of Srong's conquest makes no mention of his Indian expedition or even intervention in Indian affairs.

It is really intriguing as to why Arjuna attacked the Chinese mission. Thakur has suggested that the Brahmaṇa governor Arjuna "insulted the Chinese mission probably because of his hatred towards them." Just after the death of Harsha, the Later Guptas under Madhava Gupta asserted their independence, the Maukharis raised their heads and following their footsteps. Arjuna also did the same in his own region but unfortunately he could not succeed on account of the Tibetan invasion in the wake of Wang's mission. Madhava Gupta might have successfully resisted the usurper Arjuna, who is reported to have "forced neighbouring kings into submission". Madhava Gupta resisted the pretensions of Arjuna. It is reasonable to agree with Sinha that Arjuna might have foreseen that the successful arrival of the mission would raise the prestige of Later Gupta king of Magadha and that is why he possibly attacked it with a view to prevent it going to Magadha. His miscalculations about the mission's helplessness brought Tirhut under the heels of Tibetan imperialism. The Chinese
annals have possibly exaggerated this conquest of Tirabhukti as conquest of central India by the Tibetan army.

The Maukharis and the Later Guptas felt the need of being cautious against this new danger. The alliance between the Maukharis of Kanauj, the Later Guptas of Magadha and the Licchavis of Nepal was possibly directed against the rising power of Tibet and that prevented the expansion of the hill state into the interior of India. E.H. Parker believes that the Tibetan authority continued in Tirhut till 703 A.D., when both Nepal and Tirhut threw off the Tibetan yoke, and the king of Tibet perished during his personal conduct of the punitive expedition that he had organised against them. Levi places the event in 702 A.D.

According to Levi, with this event began a new phase in the history of Mithilā which was marked by the re-emergence of the Later Guptas of Magadha as a great power. From the Chinese and Tibetan records, it appears that Nepal and Indian provinces of Tibetan empire revolted. It is quite possible that Tirabhukti which may have formed a part of the Tibetan empire may have been annexed to the empire of Magadha. We have, however, no positive evidence to show that north Bihar formed a part of the kingdom of Mādhava Gupta. The fact that Ādityasena did not assume imperial titles till the closing years of his reign may be because of his respect for the powerful Tibetan empire. After the exit of the Tibetans the Later Guptas seem to have re-annexed the area possibly under Vishṇu Gupta or under Jīvita Gupta II. Jīvita Gupta II is the last known ruler of the Later Gupta dynasty. He seems to have been defeated by Yaśovarman of Kanauj. Tirabhukti might have formed a part of the kingdom of Magadha during the time of Jīvita Gupta II. The newly discovered copper plate throws sufficient light on the administrative system of Mithilā. It refers to Tirabhukti
and also the Vishaya. The old administrative system of the imperial Guptas in north Bihar seems to have been revived by the Later Guptas. At Katra in the Muzaffarpur district in north Bihar has been found a copper plate grant of Jiva Gupta. Palaeographically the inscription belongs to the 7th or 8th century A.D. The inscription has issued from the viceroy’s camp (Jayaskandhavāra) Tārāvāsila by Jīva Gupta son of Rāma Gupta. Both are given imperial titles such as paramamāheśvara, paramabhaṭṭāraka maharājādhirāja and paramēśvara. Jīva Gupta is called ‘laghu’, which suggests that there was another Jīva Gupta in the family. It is impossible to identify Jīva Gupta. It is possible that after Jīva Gupta II of the later Gupta dynasty was defeated and killed by Yasovarman of Kanauj, one of the princes of the family, Rāma Gupta, who may have been governor of Trabhukti i.e., Tirhut, could carve an independent kingdom. His attribute ‘laghu’ may suggest that Jīva Gupta (Jivita Gupta II) was his grandfather. It is quite possible that the family mentioned in the inscription belonged to a local ruling family of north Bihar.

Vākpatirāja’s Gaudavahā and Kalhana’s Rajatarangini throw some light on the meteoric career of Yasovarman who appeared in Kanauj in between 725 and 733 A.D. The Gaudavahā preserves an account of his digvijaya and discusses the slaying of the Gauḍa king (P. XLVIII). It refers to the defeat of the Magadhanātha (king of Magadha). The defeat of Magadhanātha must have necessarily indicated the disintegration of later Gupta’s authority (vv. 695-697). The whole of Magadha and Gauḍa fell into his hand. Gauḍa included the parts of Pundra (the modern districts of Maldah, Rajashahi and Purnea). A. Banerji suggests that the decline of the Tibetan authority probably coincided with the rise of Yasovarman and his Himalayan expedition had some-
thing to do with this event. If any credence be attached to his "subjugation of the Himalayan country", it can be said that he brought under his control all the territories between Magadha and the Himalayas. Under the circumstances, he must have also controlled Tirabhukti. The Nālandā Stone Inscription confirms his victorious campaign.36

Yaśovarman was humbled by Lalitāditya Mukta-pīḍa, who invaded eastern India and that was followed by Jayāpiḍa's. He came up to Purṇāvardhan and married Kalyānadevi, the daughter of its king name Jayanta. The identity of Jayanta is problematical.37 Jayāpiḍa helped Jayanta in bringing five Gauḍas under subjection and if that be the fact we cannot exclude north Bihar out of his range. The Ragoli Plates of Jayavardhana II refer to the conquest of Purṇa by a prince of the Sāla dynasty. Purṇa decidedly included Purnea or a major portion48 of it. H. C. Ray identifies this Sāla ruler with the Magadhanātha defeated by Yaśovarman.39 It has been questined by Sinha who holds that Magadhanātha was Jivita Gupta II.40 Sālās came into power possibly after the defeat of Yaśovarman during whose time Harshadeva, father-in-law of Jayadeva, the Nepal king, was the ruler of Gauḍa. The king of the five Gauḍas reduced by Jayāpiḍa may have belonged to the Sāla41 dynasty. From the Paśupati Temple Inscription of Jayadeva II of Nepal (748 A. D.), it appears that Harshadeva of Kāmarūpa undertook an expedition into Bengal42 and Bihar. He is said to have belonged to the royal Bhagadatta43 line. This Harshadeva may have ruled in the western portion of eastern India.44 In view of the conflicting nature of the sources it is difficult to state the nature of Kashmir's influence in north-Bihar.

According to Tāranātha the Candra dynasty ruled in in Bengal and north Bihar before the rise of the Pālas, though no other definite data about their rule is known to
us. The names of all the kings prior to Gopāla end in "candra" for example, Vṛkshacandra, Vigamacandra, Kāmacandra (who was possibly a contemporary of Harshavarudhana Siṁhacandra. Bālachandra, being driven from Bengal, presumably by the powerful king Paṇcamasimha of the Licchavi family whose kingdom extended from Tibet to Tīlinga and Banaras to the sea and who (Bālacandra") ruled in Tirhut. It is said that prince Bālacandra of Bengal, son of king Siṁhacandra of Bengal was banished by his father to Tirabhukti. He was a devout Buddhist and became a conqueror in all four quarters." Bālacandra established his rule in Tirhut and extended his authority upto Kāmarūpa." His son Vimalacandra retrieved the fortunes of his family and ruled over the kings of Bengal, Kāmarūpa, Magadha and Tirhut," He patronised the Buddhist sage Ratnakīrti and his teacher was Ācārya Amaraśuddhi. He married the sister of king Bhartṛhari of Malwa. He was succeeded by his son Govindacandra. He was ruling when the Buddhist teacher Dharmakīrti" died. He may thus be placed in the last quarter of the sixth century or the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. He renounced the secular life under the influence of Jālandharipā and Kanhapā. He was called Dinamukta.

He and his son Lalitacandra were both converted to Tāṇtrika Buddhism by Kāhanpā. Both of them attained Siddhi. Lalitacandra succeeded his father. It was in Lalitacandra’s time that there flourished eminent Buddhist sages, Śāntisoma, Śubhamitra and Śilarakshita. Though he was the last king of the dynasty he is said to have ruled for many years. The rule of the Candras was followed by a period of anarchy in Bengal, Kāmarūpa, Orissa, Varendra and Tirabhukti though it has been suggested by the Lama that Bengal ruled Tirhut and Kāmarupa.

The anarchical condition of north eastern India facilitated the rise of the Pālas. That anarchy was the
order of the day is evident from the account of Lāmā Tāranātha and the Khalimpur Copper Plate of Dharmapāla. Kielhorn while interpreting the word "Mātseyāṇyāyā" thinks that "Gopāla was made king by the people to put an end to a lawless state of things in which everyone was prey of his neighbours."  

Dharmapāla was the founder of the greatness of this line. During the period of the Pālas and the Senas, Mithilā was regarded as the fifth division of Bengal. The boundaries of Mithilā, Bengal and Kāmarūpa were not clearly defined and the country west of the Mahānandā was regarded as the country of Mithilā. The Kośī and the Mahānandā joined the river Karātoya. Gauḍa lay to the north-west of Mithilā. According to Tāranātha, Dharmapāla subjugated Kāmarūpa, Tirhut, Gauḍa and other countries. From the Svayambhu Purāṇa, we learn that he occupied the throne of Bengal and the Monghyr CP refers to his campaign at the foot of the Himālayas. It seems that he acquired supremacy over Nepal Tarai after conquering Mithilā. The withdrawal of Govind III Rāṣṭrakūṭa from North Indian politics facilitated the path of the Gurjarapratthāra Nāgabhaṭa II, who is said to have defeated Dharmapāla at the battle of Monghyr. This region included a portion of the riverine tract of Tirhut, and the Kṛmila Vishaya of Śrīnagarabhuṅki extended upto Naulagarh on the left bank of the Gaṅgā. After Nāgabhaṭa's retirement Dharmapāla retrieved his position again, as is evident from the Khalimpur record, Keśava's praśasti and the Bhagalpur grant. The Pāla conquest of Mithilā appears to be a reality if we take into consideration the facts that his army is said to have visited Kedāra and Gokarna. The latter is identified with a sacred place in Nepal on the Bagmati. The capital of the Kirātas, said to have
been defeated by Nāgabhaṭa II, was situated in the jungles of Gokarna to the north-east of Paśupati. The identifications is further strengthened by a tradition in the Śvayambhū Purāṇa that Dharmapāla occupied the throne of Nepal.

He was succeeded by Devapāla. Devapāla is said to have ruled over the whole of northern India from the Himālayas to the Vindhyaś and from the eastern to the western ocean. He must have ruled over the whole of Bihar and undivided Bengal. From north Bihar as the base he must have found it easy to subjugate Kāmarūpa.

The Bhagalpur grant of Nārayaṇapāla, which was issued when the king was staying at Mudgagiri, records the grant of a village Makuṭikā to the temple of Śiva at Kalsapota, situated in the Kāksha viśaya of Trirabhukti. The record is an indelible proof of the fact that Nārayaṇapāla held sway over Trirabhukti till the seventeenth year of his reign. He boasts of having built one thousand temples of Śiva in the said locality. In the later part of his reign Magadha, Varendrā and possibly East Bengal passed into the hands of Prathārā Mahendrapāla.

Bhoja was succeeded by Mahendrapāla, the Prathārā king, had launched his offensive against the Pālas with an intention of controlling the trade routes running down the Gaṅgā. He made attempts to push forward his frontier. Bhoja had already paved the way and the task was very easy for Mahendrapāla. It was under Mahendrapāla that the Prathārā empire reached its high watermark. His inscriptions have been found in south and north Bihar. During the period of the Prathārā domination, Pāla dominion was limited to western Bengal and the northern part of the Gangetic delta. Mahendrapāla held authority in south Bihar and north Bengal down to the end of his reign. The Dighwa-dubauli Plate of 898-99 A. D. of
Mahendrapāla concerns a village about twenty-five miles south-east of Gopalganj in the Sāran district. His hold over a portion of north Bihar is thus proved. On the basis of this solitary evidence it is not clear whether he extended his authority in the whole of "Tirhut region". During the reign of Rājayapāla the Gurjaras crossed the Śoṇa and over-ran Tirhut. H. C. Ray holds that during the reign of Rājayapāla the Gurjaras conquered the whole of Tirhut." But the Pratihāras could not consolidate their conquests in north Bihar. The Pālas recovered it. But the fall of the Pratihāras let loose the forces of disruption which proved no less disastrous. The Candellas and the Kalacuris tried to establish their political supremacy in the wake of Pratihāra withdrawal from north Bihar.

Yaśovarman and his son Dhaṅga, the Candella kings, followed a policy of crippling the resources of the east Indian rulers. In the middle of the 10th century A. D., the Pāla kingdom was passing through a period of stress and strain. The Kāmbojas deprived the Pālas of their sovereignty of Gauḍa and established their supremacy over that country. The Pāla king Gopāla II was forced to take shelter in Magadha and Mithilā."

Yaśovarman defeated the Pratihāra emperor and launched a scheme of Digvijaya. He invaded the territories of the Pālas and the Kāmbojas and is said to have conquered Gauḍa and Mithilā. Verse 23 of the Khajurāho inscription" contains the only reference to Mithilā in the Candella records. Other rulers also claim to have conquered the same" region. Yaśovarman is said to have obtained an easy victory over the Gauḍas, who proved to be no better than pleasure creeper to his sword. He was "a sword to cut down the Gauḍas as if they were the pleasure-creeper...and weakened the Maithilas." (verse 23). His Gauḍa contemporary is identified with Rājayapāla or his
son Gopāla II. The Pāla records do not refer to any encounter with the Cândellas probably because the victory lay with the other side. The records show that the digujaya attributed to Yaśovarman in the Khajuraho inscription of Dhānga (dated 954) is not an empty boast. But it did not result in the absorption of Mithilā in the Cândella empire.

The Cândella invasion was just like a wave and it subsided soon as is evident by the restoration of the Pāla power in Mithilā under Mahipāla I.

Mahipāla I revived the glory of the Pālas. The find-spots of his inscription show that he was in possession of north and south Bihar.75 He recovered his patrimony in north Bengal and extended his authority upto Banaras. His authority over north Bihar is evident from the Imadpur image inscriptions.76 He was ruling over Tirhut and Banaras in 1026 A. D.77 Certain doubts have been raised with regard to the date and authenticity of the Imadpur image inscriptions of Mahipāla I. R. C. Majumdar has read the date as 148 and he refers it to the Nepali era. Relying on Levi (Nepal-II, 188) Majumdar says, "the dedicator of the image was an inhabitant of Nepal and hence used the Newari78 era." Questioning the validity of Majumdar's findings, D. C. Sircar79 says, the figure 4 in the inscription is found in the Maithili script...the form of 4 in the Imadpur inscriptions was prevalent in Bihar in the age of the Pālas." The alleged use of Nepali era here is not easy to explain.

THE KALACURIS

The colophon of the Rāmāyaṇa MSS, discovered in Nepal reads, "Maharājādhirāja Purṇāvaloka Somavamsādībhava Gaṇḍadhara Srīmad Gaṅgeyadeva Bhūiyamāna—Tirabhuktan Kalyāṇavijayarāṣṭre Nepaladesiya Śrībhana cusalika"
Sri Anandadasya Patkavasthita (Kavyastha) pada Sri Srikurasamjna Sri Gopati Alekhitan. The MSS refers to Maharajadhiraja Punyaloka Gangeyadeva Gaudadhvaja (mentioned in a MSS exhibited at the Lahore session of the Indian History Congress) ruling in Tirabhuuki in Samvat 1376 of an unspecified era. This has given rise to a good deal of confusion among the scholars. Bendall and others took it to be equivalent to 1019 A.D. and identified this Gangeyadeva with the Kalacuri king of that name. This has been questioned by Levi and others. Mirashi does not agree with the above scholars and suggests the possibility of the Rashtarkuta domination over Tirhut. R.C. Majumdar identifies him with the Karnatka king, Gangeadeva of Mithila. This colophon supplemented by other sources and local traditions, confirms our belief that this Gangeyadeva belonged to the Karnatka dynasty of Mithilaa. It has been suggested by the upholders of the opposite view that the Kalacuri Gangeyadeva defeated Mahipala and conquered Mithila. This view runs counter to the evidence furnished by the Imadpur image inscription, dated in the year 48 which could hardly be placed before 1019 A.D. when Mithila is supposed to be under Gangeyadeva. There is no other evidence to show the authority of Gangeyadeva Kalacuri over Tirhut.

However, it appears that Mahipala did not rule over all north Bihar, or his hold over parts of north Bihar weakened during the last years of his reign. Two copper plate inscriptions have been found in the Bagaha police-station in the Champaran district of north Bihar. They have been issued by paramabhatraaka maharajadhiraaja parameSvara Suryaditya, son of Hamsaraja, and grandson of Helavaraha and who belonged to the solar race and whose ancestor was Malayaketu. It has been shown that a Malayaketu family is known from Gurmitha and Gorakhpur Plates. These Plates were issued by Paramabhatraaka
mahārajādhirāja parameśvara Jayāditya, son of Dharmāditya, who has been given the same imperial titles. It is obvious that Sūryaditya belonged to the same family. His Bagaha inscriptions are dated in 1020 and 1026 A.D. respectively. It is therefore clear that this dynasty of rulers claiming descent from Malayaketu ruled over Gorakhpur region and the adjoining areas (Champaran) of north Bihar. Mahīpāla may have ruled over Muzaffarpur region. However, there is some evidence to show that the Kalacuris made some devastating raids into the territory of Mithilā when the Pālas were also strengthening their hold on this part. Between 1041 and 1072 A.D. the Cedi-Kalacuris made a dash towards Bihar under Lakshmirākṣa. He renewed with great vigour his hostility against the Gauḍas. Kṛṇa had two Gauḍa contemporaries—Nayapāla and Vigrahapāla III. The Karaṇābela inscription assigns to Kṛṇa a victory over Gauḍa. Nayapāla is said to have defeated Kṛṇa. A treaty between the two contending forces was brought about through the mediation of Atiśa Dīpaṅkara. According to Sandhyākara Nandin, it was a Kapālasandhi (RC—I.9), on the basis of which Kṛṇa gave his daughter Yauvanāsītī in marriage to Vigrahapāla. The Bangaon GP, proves beyond any shadow of doubt that Tirabhukti was in possession of the Pālas till the 17th year of Vigrahapāla’s reign and the Naulagarh inscription proves that north Bihar remained under him till the twenty-fourth year of his reign.

On account of the frequent foreign invasions the Pāla power had been considerably weakened. While the political power of the Pālas was on the wane, Cālukya invasions under Vikramāditya took place in the reign of Vigrahapāla III. Mahāśivagupta of Orissa also invaded Bengal and the Kalacuris were already knocking at the door. The Pālas in Magadha were reduced to non-entity. Thus ousted from south Bihar and Bengal, Vigrahapāla III
tried to strengthen his position in north Bihar. The grant of village Vihanpur in the Pundravardhanabhukti in the Amgachi CP may be tentatively identified with the village Vishnupur in Purnea district. Vigrahapāla III seems to have strengthened his position in north Bihar from Purnea to Champaran, the latter was occasionally raided by the Kalacuris.

Viewed in this background, the Bangaon CP, the Naulagarh inscriptions and a silver coin of Vigrahapāla III (since lost) throw refreshing light on the history of the Pālas in north Bihar. The extant remains of a fort at Naulagarh may indicate its strategic importance; it being close to the Gangā. The Pāla remains have been discovered from the adjoining sites like Birpur, Baraipura, Jayamanglagarh and some parts of Darbhanga and Saharsa. The Naulagarh inscription refers to the 24th regnal year of Vigrahapāla III. The Bangaon CP is all the more important in this respect. It was issued from the Jayaskandhāvāra Kāñcanapurā and it records the grant of land in a locality called Vasukavartta in the Hodreya Vishaya of Tirabhukti. The donee was an inhabitant of Itthaka or Ituhoka. It refers to the seventeenth regnal year of Vigrahapāla III, son of Nayapāla. The dataka seems to have been the mantrin Prahasitarāja, described as a son of the king. The donee came to Tirabhukti from Kolānca. These two inscriptions prove that the Pālas were entrenched in the districts of north Monghyr, Saharsa, Darbhanga, Purnea, Muzaffarpur and Champaran.

The place names of the Bangaon CP can be tentatively identified. Jayaskandhāvāra Kāñcanapur is to be identified with Kandaha, a village near the findspot of the Inscription. Kandaha was a famous place till the 15th century A.D. and an inscription of the Oinvara king of Mithilā is still seen there on the temple gates (JBORS, XX.
The whole area is dotted with mounds though now thoroughly destroyed by the ravages of the Kośī. The popular tradition associates it with the headquarters of a government in the days of yore. Thus the Bangaon CP adds a new name to the list of Pāla-Jayaskandhāvāras, viz, Kāñcchanapura yet unknown from any Pāla period. This temporary capital lay in Tirabhukti. Hodreya vishaya is to be identified with modern village of Hardi, associated with famous Lorika ballad, which is as old as the 14th century A.D. if not earlier as it is mentioned by Jyotirīśvara. Hodreya was a vishaya of Tirabhukti. Village Vasukavartta was situated in the Hodreya vishaya. Vasukavartta is to be identified with village Vasudeva near Bangaon. Ittahaka is to be identified with Etaha nearby or Itahari near Ghailar in Madhipura sub-division of the district of Saharsa. The above identification is open to correction. The Naulagarh inscription refers to Kṛmila vishaya. Another inscription from Naulaghrh refers to a Vihāra, the name of which is blurred and illegible.

The Bhagalpur grant, Bangaon CP, and the Naulagarh inscription enable us to suggest that Tirabhukti was one of the important administrative centres during the period of Pāla rule. Tirabhukti was one of the provinces of the Pāla empire. In Tirabhukti lay one of the temporary capitals of the Pālas. From the Pāla records it appears that there were two important vishayas, viz, Kaksha vishaya, and Hodreya vishaya. Kṛmila vishaya of the Naulagarh inscription seems to have extended upto the region of Naulagarh in north Monghyr. The Pāla empire was divided into the bhuktis, vishayas, maṇḍalas, patakās, grāmas etc. Some portions of north Bihar seem to have been included in the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti while the rest lay in Tirabhukti. The most curious thing about the Pālas is that they do not give us any clue about the location of their capital. Monghyr, Tirabhukti and Pātaliputra are
described as temporary capitals. The Pāla inscription give us the names of the vishayás, maṇḍalas, villages in Tīrabhukti. The establishment of a vast empire brought in its train a number of feudatories who wielded sufficient powers. From the Bangaon CP. it appears that an officer of the king made the grant out of his own fief and it was simply confirmed by the king. The Pāla records refer to a number of feudal chiefs. From the Bangaon CP. it appears that there were governors, high ministers of state, military officials, record-keepers, judicial officer, collector of tolls and custom dues, custom inspector of police, controller of criminal tribes, collector of ferry dues, keeper of records. There was a special officer in-charge of land under cultivation. The empire seems to have been divided into a number of provinces and the latter were divided into vishayás, maṇḍalas, grāmas respectively. While the viceroy were appointed for the Bhukti, vishayapati was in-charge of a Vishaya; maṇḍaleśvara of maṇḍalas and grāmapati of the grāmas. Village was the lowest unit of administration. Whenever a gift of any village was made, a total description about the locality was given in the charter to avoid any further confusion and that is evident from the Bangaon CP. We learn about the Kalasapota and Makutika from the Bhagalpur grant, Vasukavarta, Ittahaka or Ituhoka from the Bangaon CP. and Kṛmila from the Naulagarh Inscription. Tīrabhukti had two vishayás—Kaksha and Hodreya, though the Kṛmila vishaya seems to have extended upto the Begusarai subdivision in the Monghyr district.

The Pāla sovereignty in north Bihar continued even after Vigrahapāla III, Mithilā remained a part of the Pāla empire till the rise of Nānyadeva. Verse 4 of the Kamauli grant affirms that Rāmapāla spread the glory by gaining the country of Janaka (EI-II, 355). Sandhya-
kara-Nandin mentions Varendri as the Janakabha of the Pālas. Janakabha of the grant should be taken to mean Varendri and not Mithilā as has been done by some. The Bangarh grant of Mahipāla also refers to the paternal kingdom of the Pālas. During the period of the Kaivarta revolt and after the loss of Varendri, the Pāla kingdom was limited to northern and central Bihar. It is not unlikely that during the period of the Kaivarta revolt, the Karnatās entrenched themselves in Tirabhukti. The 'new danger' which confronted Rāmapāla on the eve of his fight with Kaivarta Bhīma, may be actually referring to the establishment of the Karnatā power in Mithilā under Nānyadeva. Mithilā was the northern border of the Pāla kingdom. After or even during the reign of Rāmapāla Mithilā was lost to the Pālas. There is nothing to prove that Rāmapāla attempted "a partial rejuvenation." The Pāla kingdom was torn asunder by internal strife and external pressure and the Pāla rulers immediately following Rāmapāla had only a shadowy existence in a negligible part in south Bihar.

There is no substantial basis for the view held by Thakur that Paramāra Bhoja of Malwa held sway over Mithilā. "Volumes of Maithili legends" cannot be accepted as the basis of history. There is no such reference in any of the Paramāra records. From the Maner and the Lar plates and the recently discovered inscriptions in the Shahabad district, it appears that the Gādaḍavālas ruled over a major portion of south Bihar. The Prakṛta paṅgalam states that the king of Kāśī (Govindacandra) fought successfully with the kings of Gauḍa, Vaṅga, Telangā, Mahārāṣṭra, Saurāṣṭra, Champarana, Nepal, Bhoṭa, China and Lohavara (Lahore). The king of the the west against whom the Sena king Vijayasena advanced through the upper course of the Gaṅgā was in all probability
Govindacandra. Nānyadeva of Mithilā was the immediate neighbour of Govindacandra and there might have been a clash between the two. Invasion of Nepal, China and Tibet seems to be an exaggeration. Govindacandra came into conflict with Pālas, the Senas, the Gāṅgebra, the Kākāṭiyas, the Cālukyas, the Candellas, the Muslims and the Karnāṭas of Mithilā.\(^{11}\)

**THE KARṇĀṬAS OF MITHILĀ**

The association of the Karnāṭas with South India can be traced back to the Pāla inscriptions which leave no doubt that they originally belonged to the south.\(^{12}\) Like his counterpart in Bengal,\(^{13}\) Nānyadeva is called Karnāṭakalabhūshana and Karnāṭakshatriya in the Mithilā tradition. The Senas are also known as the Karnāṭakshatriya from verse IV of the Madhainagar grant and the Naihatti grant of Ballā Sena.\(^{14}\) It can be safely assumed on the basis of this grant that some Karnāṭa officials actually acquired political power and set up independent kingdoms for themselves. We know that the storming of the capital of the Paramāra king Bhoja I and the destruction of the Kalacuri king Karnā by Someśvara I (1040-1069) facilitated the path for Karnāṭa domination in the north Indian politics. The Karnāṭas of Mithilā hailed from the Deccan in the wake of Cālukya invaders, Someśvara I and Vikramādiṭya VI.\(^{15}\) Vikramādiṭya led victorious campaign against Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa, and the Cālukya’s emergence in the north Indian politics had a very significant effect on the then political condition. Vikramādiṭya VI’s son Someśvara III is described as having placed his feet upon the heads of the kings of Andhra, Draviḍa, Magadha and Nepāla.\(^{16}\) Their emergence in north Indian politics ushered in a new epoch. The destruction of the Paramāras by the Cālukyas is supported by the Basahi Plate of Govindacandra Gāhaḍavāla\(^{17}\) of Kanauj. The
dynasties of Kanauj, Mithilā and Bengal were the direct results of the Calukya invasions of north India. R. C. Majumdar has rightly observed that, "the deluge of the Kārṇāṭa invasion ushered in three new dynasties at Kanauj, Mithilā and Bengal".

The frequent mention of the Kārṇāṭas in Pāla inscriptions leaves no doubt that they were employed by the Pālas as important officials and they took advantage of the situation when the supreme authority became weak. The Kārṇāṭa invasion from the south helped in realisation of their ambition. Aca, a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI is represented to have conquered large territories for his master. The Tamil poem Kaliṅgattuparāṇi, describing the Cola conquests of north Kaliṅga and gives a long list of peoples who paid tributes to Kuloṭṭunga, the Cola king (1070-1118). This account of the poetical work is further supported by the Drākṣhārāma inscription. The Cola conquest included Vaṅgas, Vaṅgālas and Māgadhās. It was about this time that the Kārṇāṭas were also heading towards this region. The Pāla territory which included Mithilā seems to have been invaded by these two groups of southerners and Rāmapāla might have sought an alliance with the Colas for securing support against the common enemy, i.e. the Kārṇāṭas. Sandhyākara Nandin’s Rāmacarita suggests that "Varendri was successfully guarded against the Kārṇāṭas". While Aca carried arms into Bengal, the Pālas had to face two rising Kārṇāṭa chiefs, viz., Vijayasena in Bengal and Nānyadeva in Mithilā.

Another important theory put forward by a set of scholars is that the Kārṇāṭas were merely the results of the revival of the eclipsed Kārṇāṭa power in Magadha. The supporters of this theory believe that Rajendra Cola Gaṅgaikondā had a powerful imagination and grasp of the political situation of North India and he made a bid for
supremacy in that part. The Tirumalai inscription and the inscription no. 44 at Kolar give the achievements of his conquest in the following words: "attacked Vaṅgala-deśa from which Govindacandra fled and took the territory where the monsoon never ceases." He is said to have defeated Mahīpāla. Kielhorn believes that Mahīpāla referred to in the Cola inscription is the first Pāla ruler of that name. A critical study of the contemporary records shows that the Cola conquest did not affect in any way the political condition of Bengal and neighbouring countries. Aiyangar suggested that Daṇḍabhukti meant Bihar with Orissa, a view not accepted by others. There was a family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kārṇātas in the region of Daṇḍabhukti planted by either Dhruva or Govinda III; Dharmapāla of Daṇḍabhukti was probably a relative of Gauḍa king ruling over the territory of the eclipsed Kārṇātas. M. Ramakrisna Kavi believes that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were the Kārṇātas and after their decline in 970 A.D. in the south, they moved towards the north. Mr. Kavi fails to give any plausible explanation for the so-called migration of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas from south to north. If the view about the Rāṣṭrakūṭas' expansion in the north be accepted, it is quite likely that Kārṇātas moved along with the Colas and when further strengthened by the fresh Cālukya invasions, they asserted their independence in the last decade of the eleventh century of the Christian era. Nānyadeva is said to be a brother of Kṛttirāja who is known to us from the Bodha-Gayā inscription of Tuṅga Dharmāvaloka. The identification however lacks corroborative evidence and cannot be accepted as such in the present state of our knowledge.

Kshemēśvara's Gaṇḍa-kauśika says that Mahīpāla of the Pāla dynasty defeated the Kārṇāta Rājā who had invaded Bengal. The MSS is dated 1331 and refers indirectly to a contest between Mahīpāla and the Kārṇātas.
The Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa were at this period rulers of Karpāṭa but none of the contemporary inscriptions of the Cālukya sovereigns refer to any conflict with the Pālas. R.P. Chanda is of opinion that the Karpāṭas were soldiers who are known to have invaded Mahāpāla’s kingdom. H.P. Sastri believed that the people defeated by Mahāpāla might have been connected with those Karpāṭas who are believed to have established later on in Bengal and Mithilā. In the present state of our knowledge, it is very difficult to be precise with regard to the time as to when those Karpāṭas first settled in Bihar and Bengal. As has been shown above, they seem to have formed an element in the Pāla administration and Pāla grants bear testimony to the fact. The series of southern invasions of northern India may have quite possibly been responsible for the regular inflow of Karpāṭa settlers in Bihar and Bengal. The fresh wave of Karpāṭakendra Vikramādiyā VI only gave them impetus to stabilise their position as independent rulers after the local central authority had become weak and incapable of keeping in control the forces of disintegration.

The reasonable view seems to be that before the Pālas could take advantage of the difficulties of the Kalacuris, the Pālas had to face an invasion from the Cālukyas of Karpāṭa. The earliest raid of the Cālukyas must have taken place before 1053 A. D. Another important Cālukya expedition was taken towards Vāṅga and the neighbouring countries at the close of the eleventh century A. D.

Nānyadeva was a Karpāṭakṣatriya, as would appear from his epithets. The commentary on Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra reveals to us that he was called Karpāṭakulabhāṣaṇa. Jayaswal believes that his name is only a sanskritised form of Dravidian ‘Naniya’ meaning affectionate. Naniya, Nanyupa and other such names of Nānyadeva are known to us from traditions current in Mithilā and preserved by such tradi-
tional writers as Mm. P. Jha in his \textit{Mithilātattvaśivamārśha} and Rasbeharidasa in his \textit{Mithilādarpana}. The Deopara inscription unmistakably calls Vijayasena a scion of the Kārṇāṭa race and Nānyaadeva is also mentioned therein. In the last quarter of the 11th century A.D., when the southerners were disturbing the political life of North India, the Kārṇāṭas gained a permanent footing in the eastern part of north India and carved out for themselves small independent kingdoms which were destined to play very important role in the following centuries. Nānya or his ancestor seems to have asserted independence. The revolt must have coincided with the Cālukya invasion during the reign of Vikramāditya VI. Kārṇāṭas of Mithilā have been referred to in epithets like \textit{Kārṇāṭacudāmani} in the Nepal inscriptions, \textit{Kārṇāṭavamśodhava} and \textit{Kārṇāṭadhīpa} by Cāṇḍēśvara, Kanadda speaking barons from the Deccan, a southerner, in a recent Mārāṭhi work and \textit{Kārṇāṭakulalakshmi} in the Sena inscriptions.

As late as 1162 A. D. Nepal is mentioned as a vassal state of Someśvara III in the Pattadakal stone inscription. The unstable condition of Nepal and surrounding area is well attested by a number of epigraphs and \textit{Vamśavali} sources. In view of all this it is plausible to hold that “the forefathers of Nānya established themselves as feudatory chiefs in Tirhut, on the border of Nepal, as a result of the successive raid by the great Cālukya prince to the foothills of the Himālayan range,......and after the withdrawal of the strong Cālukyan arm, they rose to pre-eminence, broke off their allegiance and established themselves as rulers of Tirhut.” Nānya was first ruler of this dynasty. Levi holds that Nānyaadeva at first accepted service under some unknown king, and taking advantage of the weakness of the master, wielded sovereignty. It is a well-known fact that even the Pāla rulers had appointed sufficient number of
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Karṇāṭa officers under them. D. C. Ganguly is of opinion that Nānyadeva was an officer under the Pālas and established a kingdom in Tiṭrabhukti during the Kaivarta revolt. "A new danger" which confronted Rāmapāla on the eve of his fight with Kaivarta Bhima, mentioned in the Rāmacarita, may be referring to this incident.129 According to a tradition which is not to be rejected outright, Nānyupadeva, or more correctly Nanayapadeva founded in the year 1097 Simarouna, the ancient capital of the province of Mithilā situated in the Nepal terrain, in the ruins of which statues and idols have been found.130 During the reign of Rāmapāla they took advantage of the weakness of the Pālas and established an independent dynasty. The Karṇāṭas ruled Mithilā from 1097 to 1324-25 A. D.

NĀNYADEVA (1097-1147 A. D.)

Date of Nānyadeva:—Much ink has flown since the advent of this century over the question of the date and accession of Nānyadeva. M. Chakravarti placed Nānyadeva in the 12th century131 A. D. Kielhorn placed Nānyadeva in the Śaka era 1019 or 1097 A.D. The date of Nānyadeva is known to us from the so-called Simaraon stone pillar inscription and the exact replica of the text is preserved in the Nepal Vamsāvatī records. The so-called verse was brought to the notice of the learned public by late Pandit Chanda Jha in his edition of the text of Vidyāpatī’s Purushaparikṣā.132 It is believed that the fort at Simaraongarh was built by Nānyadeva himself. Regarding this inscription, it has been pointed out by a competent authority that in the whole domain of Bengal and Magadha antiquities there is not another record with such a date of marvellous accuracy. It states that Nānyadeva made an erection in a simhalagna (i. e., early morning) of a Saturday in a Śrāvāṇa, the titti being śukla seven and the nakshatra svātt in the year 1019 Śaka, i. e., on July 10,1097 A. D.133
Levi has read the verse with slight variations here and there.\textsuperscript{119}

Conquests of Nânyadeva (1097-1147):—At the beginning of his political career, Nânya seems to have been an ordinary feudatory chief and that is evident from his own commentary on Bharata’s \textit{Natyasastra}.\textsuperscript{111} In the available portion of the commentary Nânyadeva referred to as \textit{Mahásāmantādhipati Dharmāvaloka Śrīmān Nânya pati}. Here we have to take note of the fact that in the Andhārathaṛhi Inscription of his minister, Śrīdharaḍāsa, he is again called Śrīmān Nânya pati.\textsuperscript{119} Śrīdharaḍāsa seems to have been aware of his exact name or might have taken the same epithet from his commentary.

\textit{Mahásāmantādhipati} is indicative of the fact that he was a feudatory chief before he assumed the royal power in Mithilā. Whether he was a Śaṁanta under the Cālukya rulers or under the Pālas is very difficult to say in the present state of our knowledge. His important contemporaries were:—(i) Rāmapāla and also Madanapāla of the Pāla dynasty; (ii) Vijayasena of the Sena dynasty, (iii) Govindacandra Gāhaḍavāla of Kanauj and (iv) Rāghava\textsuperscript{123} of Kaliṅga. \textit{Magadhādipatiḥ Pithipatiḥ}\textsuperscript{13,4} is said to have fought against Nânya deva.\textsuperscript{125} Except the Pāla kingdom all the other kingdoms were newly established and contemporaneous with the Karnāṭas of Mithilā. Just a cursory glance over the map of the then north India would convince us of the fact that Nânya’s kingdom was hemmed on all sides and its existence was always at stake. Nânya’s diplomatic move was responsible for the safety of Mithilā from any foreign attack. He does not seem to have been over-ambitious and he remained satisfied with what he had. He consolidated his kingdom to the best of his ability. We do not know of any of his successful conquests except one in Nepal.
We learn from the *Prāktā-Paṅgalam* (Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta, 1902) that the Kalacuri king, Karna, after defeating the *Kāśirāja*, conquered Champaran (P. 296-Verse 4). The statement finds support in the Bheraghat inscription of Alhandevi, wherein it is said that Yaśāḥkarna, having broken the Gāḍavāla barrier at Kāśi, reached Champaran and devastated it.136 Jayaswal suggested that the event took place during the time of Nānyadeva.137 Whether Nānya was defeated or whether Champaran passed into the hands of the Cedis, we cannot definitely say. We learn from the Bheraghat inscription that though Yaśāḥkarna succeeded in devastating Champaran, he could not possibly succeed in establishing his hold over the region. The event must have taken place before 1124 A.D., the time by which the Cedis retreated from Banaras. In north Bihar, Yaśāḥkarna had led two campaigns in Champaran.138 The invasions of Champaran were raids and did not result in the permanent occupation of the territory. It seems that Nānya took a very serious view of the situation and shifted his capital from Nānapur, a village founded by him, to Simraongarh in the Champaran district. The seat of administration was shifted to this place possibly after the Cedi expedition to Champaran. The local traditions also confirm that Nānayadeva shifted from Nānapur to Simaraon.139 He fortified it in a remarkable manner.140 Simraongarh continued to be the capital of the Karnāṭas for a considerable period. It is believed that there was an inscription on the main entrance. The strategical importance of Simraongarh was doubled after the Karnāṭa victory in Nepal by Nānayadeva.

Nānya is described as having defeated the heroes of Sauvira and Mālava. He is said to have broken the name and fame of these two contemporaries. It is likely that he might have defeated the kings of Mālava and Sauvira,
not as a ruler of Tirhut, but as Vikramāditya’s feudatory in his early life. It was in course of these campaigns that he possibly had married a Gurjara lady. R. C. Majumdar has rightly pointed out that—“it is impossible to believe that as a ruler of Mithilā he could have carried his arms so far to the west”, Nānya further claims to have broken the powers of the Vāngas and the Gauḍas. At the time of the establishment of the Karnāta dynasty of Mithilā, Bengal was passing through a period of crisis and every ambitious prince was trying to fish in the troubled waters of that province. The whole of eastern India was then in a process of political disintegration. The suppression of the Kaivartas in Bengal by Rāmapāla was not attended with peace. East Bengal had come under the possession of the Varmans. The Senas had established themselves in Rādhā. Nānyadeva, after having successfully settled in Mithilā, turned his attention towards Gauḍa and Vāṅga. In Gauḍa, Nānya probably came into conflict with Kumārapāla and in Vāṅga with the Yādava ruler Harivarman. He came into conflict with Vijayasena either before or after his victory over Rāmapāla. He could not have established his kingdom in Mithilā without coming into conflict with Rāmapāla and it was as a result of this conflict that he could make Mithilā independent. The boastings of Someśvara III (1127-1138), Vijjalla (1145-1167) and his son Soma about having conquered the kings of Nepal, Āndhra, Draviḍa, Magadha and Kalinga simply indicate that they took credit of what was done by the Karnāta chiefs in these regions as they latter paid nominal homage to their distant overlords. The reasons for conflict between the Senas of Bengal and the Karnātas of Mithilā were obvious. Both of them coveted the same territory and it appears that at first the two Karnāta chiefs combined in their efforts in the beginning but fell out over the spoils.
According to R.C. Majumdar, Nānyadeva might have obtained some success at first both against the Pālas and the Senas but was ultimately defeated by Vijayasena of Vaṅga and fell on his own dominion of Mithilā. He further believes that Vijayasena brought Mithilā under his control. But such an assumption is highly improbable in view of the fact that the very exactitude of the La-Sam is doubtful. There is no positive, either direct or indirect, evidence to conclude finally about the Sena conquest of Mithilā as a reality. It is true that the Deopara inscription refers to Nānya as a defeated hero. Verses 20, 21 and 22 of the said epigraph may be interpreted to mean that Vijayasena first defeated the kings of Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa and Kalinga and then proceeded against Nānya and Vīra. Verse 21 reproduces a conversation that is imagined by the poet to have taken place among them during their imprisonment, in course of which the futility of their arms was discussed. Ballālasena's inscriptions do not refer to any of his campaigns against Mithilā. The expeditions referred to in the traditions may have been the same as was undertaken by his father. The question of Sena invasion of Mithilā is yet an unsolved enigma in the history of northeastern India. The Deopara inscription does not give us any definite information on this point except that it refers to Nānya's defeat. Vijayasena is said to have led an expedition against the west along the course of the Gāṅga, probably against Govindacandra of Kanauj. Most likely it was on this occasion that he invaded Mithilā and inflicted a defeat on Nānyadeva. H. C. Ray interpreting the relevant verses (22-24) of the Deopara Inscription suggests that Vijayasena after crossing the river came into conflict with the chiefs of Mithilā. It was possibly in course of this campaign that Bengal chief sent a naval expedition against the western region, which "may not have been entirely unconnected with the Gāhaḍavālas." The naval expedi-
tion was possibly an auxiliary to a land force. His fleet sailed westward beyond Rajmahal. Since Gaṅgā is the dividing line between north and south Bihar it is very difficult to say against whom this fleet was despatched when there were three different rulers in Bihar, viz., Govinda-candra, Madanapāla and Nānyadeva. Since the Deopara inscription is not specific about the victorious achievements of his fleet in the west, it is natural to presume that Vijayasena’s western expedition was not a complete success.

Mithilā’s tradition asserts that Ballālasena at the instance of his father invaded Mithilā and imprisoned Nānyadeva in the fort of the Gaṅdeśvara (on the borders of Supaul and Darbhanga). In recognition of his services Ballāla was adorned with the title of Niḥśaṅka Śakkara. We further learn that Gaṅgadeva, after freeing his father from the Sena detention, liberated the area and changed the name of Niḥśaṅkapura and named it Gaṅgapura Bajni (after his own name) which is yet a village in Pargana Nishankpurkurha in the district of Saharsa. In the Madhainagar grant of Lakshmānasena, Ballāla is described as "Arirāja-Niḥsaṅka-Śakkara". It was during his Mithilā expedition that he seems to have displayed his military talents. It is believed that Pargana Nisankpurkurha in the Madhipura sub-division was the Sena administrative centre. It is known from a literary source of the latter period that Ballāla invaded Mithilā during the reign of his father and that his kingdom comprised Vaṅga, Rāḏha, Vagḍi, Varendra and Mithilā. The Laghubhāra, a late work, states that Ballāla received the news of Lakshmana’s birth when he was marching against Mithilā. If there is any truth in the statement, Lakshmana was obviously born after the death Rāmapāla in 1120 A. D., when alone Ballāla could have led an expedition against Mithilā. It was on the basis of this passage in the Laghubhāra, (Chapter 2, p.
140) that Nagendranath Basu suggested that Ballāla went on the conquest of Mithilā. On the basis of the *Ballalacarita,* it has been suggested that he led an expedition against Mithilā and R. C. Majumdar believes that the Sena rule over Mithilā is indirectly supported by the obscurity in the history of Mithilā after Nānya and its association with the *La Sam* era. Here we have to bear in mind that Ballāla's inscriptions do not refer to any campaign against Mithilā. The fact of Nānya’s defeat and his consequent arrest by Vijayasena is proved by the Deopara inscription, the Mithilā tradition and the evidence of Mulla Taquia. Other evidences are of a later date and cannot be thoroughly relied upon. In the present state of our knowledge, though we cannot reject outright the fact of Nānya’s defeat and arrest, it is yet doubtful if Mithilā was at any time under the control of the Senas. Dr. D. C. Sircar observes—"It is difficult to believe that Vijayasena had any appreciable success against Nānya whose successors were ruling over Mithilā for a long time to come."

Nānyadeva was the immediate neighbour of the Gāhaḍavālas. We learn from the Kahla inscription of Soḍhadeva, dated V. S. 1135 (1079 A.D.) that as early as 1072 A.D., Soḍhadeva had declared himself independent in the Gorakhpur region and extended his territory upto Saren in north Bihar. We further learn from a Lucknow Museum plate of Kīrttipāladeva, dated V. S. 1167 (1111 A.D.) that the north-eastern portion of Gorakhpur (bordering on Motihari in north Bihar) lay outside the Gāhaḍavāla dominion till that date. The inscription refers to the grant of two villages in the *Darada-Gaṇḍaki-Deśa* by Kīrttipāla. This land possibly lay contiguous to a dart or a mountain and the Gaṇḍaki. On the north-east probably the river Burhi Gandak was the boundary of the Gāhaḍavālas and after that began the Karnāṭa territory of Mithilā. Viewed
in the light of contemporary political condition it would be more appropriate to suggest that Nānya avoided to come into death conflict with the Gāhaḍavālas and was satisfied with his own fortunes in Tirhut and he sought his compensation in the valley of Nepal.

Mithilā and Nepal have been intimately connected since time immemorial. Mithilā lay on the route to Nepal. The decline of the Pāla authority was followed by a period about which we have no definite information. We have seen that Vikramāditya VI claimed to have placed his feet upon the heads of the kings of Andhra, Draviḍa and Nepal. The Pattadakal inscription of 1162 mentions Nepal among the vassals of Cālukya emperor Somesvara III. All these are indicative of the fact that all was not well with Nepal which was passing through a very critical stage of her history. Within Nepal, there were some sort of disturbances between the Thakuris of Nayakoṭa and Pāṭana. The disturbances leading to the restoration of the Thakuris of Nayakoṭa originated in Tirhut, where the Karṇāṭas had already established their power. The absence of full royal titles in case of Harshadeva (1082-1098) is indicative of the fact that he did not assume such titles and on his death there appears to have ensued some trouble in Nepal. The later Vamsīavalis hold that Nānya Deva entered Nepal, introduced the Śaka era and established his court at Bhatagaon. From there he ruled over Pāṭana and Kathmandu. Petech, refuses to acknowledge Nānya Deva as a king of Nepal, but admits that “apparently he (Nānya) did raid Nepal after the death of Harshadeva, and this was not forgotten.” The colophon of a MSS of 1099 A. D. suggests that Rāmadeva of Dvāvalaśrota was a Mahāsāmantādhipati in Nepal, and he possibly claimed independence in the time of Harshadeva. This Rāmadeva might have acknowledged
the sway of Rāmapāla deva of the Pāla dynasty, prior to the rise of Nānyadeva, as is evident from the colophon of a MSS of *Kukjikamata* (Rāmadevasya... Parameśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka Paramasaṅgata Mahārāja sṛmadramapāladevasya). According to Petech, Rāmadeva accepted "the overlordship of Rāmapāla, perhaps as an insurance against any threat from Nānyadeva." Rāmadeva, after the fall of the Pālas, might have transferred his loyalty to Nānya as his Mahāsāmantādhipati. Rāmadeva might have been Nānya's sāmanda against Śivadeva (1098-1126).

Taking advantage of the chaotic situation in Nepal, the Karnaṭās had entered the valley during the time of Nānyadeva. Nānya captured the whole of the country, dethroned the ruling princes and established his court at Bhāṭagaon. If the Nepalese tradition is to be relied upon, Nānya captured two Nepalese princes, Jagadevakamalla of Pāṭana and Kathamandu, and Ānandamalla of Bhāṭagaon. According to Levi, the chroniclers have fallen into a blunder by introducing Malla kings into Nepal at this period. The Mallas of Nepal traced their descent to Nānyadeva. The other view is that Nānya did not destroy the local princes in the Nepal valley who continued to rule under him. Thus it seems plausible to suggest that the vacuum created in Nepal was filled in by the Karnaṭās. Nānya did not have a peaceful time in Nepal as he had to face the opposition of the Thakuri prince, Śivadeva, who had adopted a high-sounding title "Rājādhirāja Parameśvara." The circumstances through which Śivadeva came to the throne are obscure. The kingdom was in turmoil on account of internal feuds between the Thakuris of Nayākoṭa and Thakuris of Pāṭana. The revival of the Thakuris of Nayākoṭa was made possible by the invasion of Nānyadeva which put an end to the power of the Pāṭana family. Nānya's invasion of Nepal took place in 1119-20 and even after that
the local ruling princes continued to assume imperial titles inspite of their subservient position. On the evidence of the titles adopted by Śivadeva, it has been held that Nānyadeva could not certainly keep the conquered country under his control for a long time. Thakuris of Nayakoṭa under Śivadeva again came to power. Nānyadeva in the beginning espoused the cause of Śivadeva. Śivadeva was followed by Indra or Mahendra in 1128 and the latter was followed by Mānadeva in 1134. If Regmi's contention be accepted, Nānya occupied the valley in 1141 A. D. It has been suggested that the internal difficulties of Tīrhuṭ between 1118 and 1141 called for the immediate attention of Nānyadeva and hence probably a reconquest of the valley was made necessary in 1141 A. D. and since then his rule over Nepal continued unabated.

Nānyadeva ruled for about fifty years from 1097 to 1147. He was not only the founder of the Karṇāṭa dynasty but also one of its greatest kings. The Andhratharhi inscription, though undated, is the only epigraphic record of Nānyadeva in the heart of Mithilā. From that epigraph we learn that Nānya was treated by his contemporary as a Kshatriya. In the Mithilā tradition, he has been described as a Paramāra (Karṇāṭa) Kshatriya of southern origin. He is also described as the "lord", "victor" and besides "his extraordinary achievements", he is said "to have turned the world into a second Kshirasāgara" by his fame. Nānya, whose origin is yet enveloped in obscurity, succeeded in carving out an independent state practically out of dust. He not only conquered and created a state but also consolidated it and left a good heritage for his successors. Besides being a good warrior and diplomat, he patronised art, literature and culture and was himself one of the greatest scholars of the time. He wrote his famous commentary on Bharata's Nāṭyasāstra, which came
to be regarded as the most standard work on the subject. It was under the able leadership of Nānyadeva that Mithilā once again came to the forefront of Indian history both in the arena of politics and culture after a long gap.

Nānyadeva had two sons Malladeva and Gaṅgadeva. We consider Malladeva to be a forgotten king of Mithilā." On the basis of the Bheet-Bhagavanpur inscription, which reads "Om Śri Malladevaya......", it has been suggested that Bheet-Bhagavanpur was the capital of Malladeva. The Gandhvarīya Rajputas of Tirhut trace their descent from Malladeva. The ruins at Bhagavanpur, still unnoticed, are in keeping with the Kāṁśa tradition of blackstone and they belong to the 12th century A. D. Even the script of the inscription bears close resemblance to the palaeography of the same century. Vidyāpati asserts that Malladeva was a valiant warrior. He went to the king of Kanauj, Jayacandra, but due to his quarrelsome nature he could not stay there very long. He left Kanauj and went to the Cikor king. The Cikors belonged to the kingdom of Piṭhi and at one time played a very important part in the history of north-eastern India. Piṭhi was an important kingdom. The Gāhaḍavālas had friendly relations with the Cikkors of Piṭhi and the Cikor Princess Kumarādevi was the wife of Govindacandra. According to Vidyāpati, the Cikor kingdom had not the means to measure arms with so mighty a monarch as Jayacandra of Kāśi. Malladeva became the bone of contention between the Chikors and the Gāhaḍavālas. Jayacandra called Malladeva a supreme scion of the Kāṁśa race. Malladeva was known as "Pratimalla"—antagonist. Vidyāpti calls him heir-apparent, valorous hero and praises his independent attitude of mind. Since he was a man of independent nature he left his kingdom to eke out his existence elsewhere.
Tradition asserts that one of Nānyā's sons ruled in Nepal. It seems that Gaṅgadeva ruled in Mithilā while the other, who is none else than Malladeva, ruled in Nepal. Narasiṁhadeva had some differences with his kinsmen in Nepal, the upshot of which was that Mithilā and Nepal were separated. The possibility of the division of Nānyā's kingdom cannot be ruled out or rejected outright. It is likely that Gaṅgadeva ruled over a certain portion of Mithilā and from there he extended his authority up to Bengal, while Malladeva ruled over the north eastern portion of Mithilā and the Terai area of Nepal. Malladeva kept his headquarters at Bheet Bhagvanpur, where his inscription can yet be seen. He was not on good terms with his brother, Gaṅgadeva. Another proof of Malladeva's kingship is the assertion of a local tradition that one Vardhamāna Upādhyāya was patronised by Malladeva. Vardhamāna, the distinguished writer on Smṛti, flourished between 1150 and 1250 and has referred to a Kāṇṭā-la-lāna in his writings. Popular tradition is supported by certain village names in Tirhut still commemorating the name of Malladeva. Maldiha on the borders of Purana and Saharsa districts and Malhad in the Supaul subdivision are said to have been founded by Malladeva and vast ruins of these villages were washed by the Kośi in the thirties-forties of the present century. While it is very difficult to be absolutely certain about Malladeva as an independent king on the basis of a solitary epigraphic evidence, further archaeological excavations are expected to throw more welcome light on the authenticity of Malladeva as a ruler of Mithilā. From Pratāpamalla's inscription of Nepal we learn that Gaṅgadeva succeeded Nānyadeva in 1147. He was a very brave king. The Rāmacarita (iv. 27) of Sandhyākara Nandin refers to an invasion of Gauḍa by the Kāṇṭā ruler of Mithilā. Gaṅgadeva claimed some political authority in Gauḍa. He was almost certainly a
contemporary of Madanapāla and attacked his kingdom in north Bengal with some success. He has been rightly called \textit{Gauḍadheva}ja in the colophon of a much discussed \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} MSS. After the death of Madanapāla, the Pāla rulers had ceased to exercise any suzerainty in western, eastern and southern Bengal and northern Bihar. In the Sena dynasty, Ballālasenā was contemporary of Gaṅgadeva. It is believed that the Sena kingdom did not lose any of its provinces during the reign of Ballāla but as far as we know from various sources, with the possible exception of the Ballālasa\textit{carita}, that Ballālasena did not lead any independent invasion against Mithilā during his own rule. There is no positive evidence to show that Ballāla came into conflict with Gaṅgadeva. The village Gaṅgapur Rajni in the subdivision of Madhipura (Saharsa) still reminds us of the rule of Gaṅgadeva in that region.\footnote{189}

Malladeva was ruling over the Terai area and the eastern portion of Tirhut while Gaṅgadeva was ruling in Tirhut. Ānandadeva (1146-1166), Rudradeva, Mitradeva (Wright) or Amitadeva (Bendall) were the contemporary rulers of Nepal during the time of Gaṅgadeva. The history of Nepal was then in a process of political disintegration Kalacuri Bijjalla is praised for having destroyed the stability of Nepal\footnote{190}. The Manglai inscription represents Yādava Jaitūni as having defeated the leaders of the armies of Nepal. In view of these facts, and the discovery of five\footnote{191} MSS representing the restoration of the Thakuri-line, it appears that authorities of the Karnāṭas had been reduced to non-entity and that the Thakuris had asserted their independence. The \textit{division} in the Karnāṭa line in Mithilā had enabled Nepal to assert its independence in the time of Gaṅgadeva, though Malladeva could succeed in keeping his control over a portion of Nepal in the Terai area. Malladeva ruled over such territory of Nepal as lay conti-
guous to the eastern portion of Tirhut. The Mallas had also established their power before and after Nânyadeva and Levi considers the existence of such a dynasty as not wholly impossible.

The Andhrarhatrhi inscription also mentions Gaṅgadeva but there is nothing positive to throw light on his reign. Śridharadāsa seems to have continued as minister under Gaṅgadeva. Unlike his father, Gaṅgadeva’s reign was comparatively peaceful. The Senas were kept at bay on account of the advance of the Gāhaḍavālas, who were also face to face with the Muslim invaders. Thus when all the contemporary powers seem to have been faced with internal and external trouble, Mithilā remained peaceful under Gaṅgadeva, who set himself to the task of introducing certain administrative reforms in his kingdom. By introducing these reforms, he consolidated the gains of the Karnāṭa dominion. He is said to have introduced the system of Parganas or fiscal divisions for the purpose of revenue administration. For the collection of revenue, a Choudhary or Headman was appointed for each Pargana. For the settlement of all types of dispute, he created Paṅḍāyata on the basis of election. He got dug many tanks and erected a large number of temples. Three such tanks bearing his name are yet extant. According to a tradition, he built a strong fort at Andhrarhatrhi. It has been pointed out by Mulla Taquia that Gaṅgadeva shifted his capital to Darbhanga. In fact Simaraongarh continued to be the main capital but several other towns were converted into temporary capitals and Darbhanga was one of them. While Nânyadeva conquered and consolidated, it was left to Gaṅgadeva to stabilise the newly established kingdom on sound lines.

Narasiṁhadeva succeeded his father Gaṅgadeva in 1188. Various scholars have confused this Narasiṁha with
Nṛśimhadeva of Rāmadatta’s Dānapaddhati. Rāmadatta was the son of Gaṇeśvara, the author of Sugatisopāṇa. Nṛśimhadeva of Dānapaddhati should be distinguished from Harasimhadeva, the third ruler of the Karnaṭa dynasty. In the Dānapaddhati, Nṛśimha is called Śrīmall and he seems to have been a local ruler of the dynasty after the fall of Harasimhadeva. That he belonged to the Karnaṭa dynasty is evident from the epithet ‘karnaṭānayabhūshana’ ornament of the Karnaṭa family.

We get some information about Narasimhadeva from Vidyāpāti’s Purushaparīkṣhā. In tale 4, we are told that Delhi Sultan in his march against the enemy was helped by the two young princes—Narasimhadeva of the Karnaṭa race and Cacikadeva Cauhana. Grierson identified this Sultan with Mohammad bin Tughluq. Grierson admits that Narasimhadeva was the grandson of Nānya. How can a grandson of Nānyadeva be contemporaneous with Mohammed bin Tughluq? Chakravarti has also followed Grierson and later writers have simply dittoed him. The service of Narasimhadeva under Delhi may be a friendly gesture of goodwill and not a sign of surveillance. Muhammad of the Purushaparīkṣhā is to be identified with Shihabuddin Mohammad Ghori, this finds support in the Mithilā tradition that Narasimhadeva used to go to Kanauj with his uncle Malladeva. At the end of Jayacandra’s rule he went to Delhi and fought for Shihabuddin Mohammad Ghori. In this case we cannot reject Vidyāpāti’s authority outright. Here we have to take note of the fact that Vidyāpāti has given us the history of the Karnaṭas in five tales and in doing so he has kept in view the chronological order. There should be no hesitation in identifying Mohammad Ghori as the king of Hastināpura (Delhi). After defeating Prthvīrāja, Shihabuddin became the master of Delhi, which fell in 1193 A. D. Cacikadeva was a
brother of Pythviraja. Naturally he was also a contemporary of Shihabuddin and might have joined the camp after the defeat of his brother.

If Mulla Taquia is to be relied upon, Narasimha had been reduced to a subservient position under Lakshmanasena of Bengal. The position of the Karnata kingdom under Narasimha had become very insecure as it was sandwiched between the two powerful kingdoms of Oudh and Lakhnauti. He seems to have paid direct or indirect tribute to some Muslim masters but by following the policy of Vastuvaftti, he succeeded in maintaining the independence of Mithila, though its size seems to have been reduced to a great extent. Possibly a portion of Purnea went out of its orbit. His kingdom was no better than a supple cane bending under pressure and becoming straight again.

In Nepal, Narasimha had a quarrel with his kinsmen, the upshot of which was that Mithila and Nepal were separated. Between 1187 and 1227, we find the names of the following rulers of Nepal—Gunakamadeva II (1187), Lakshmikamadeva (1193), Vijayakamadeva (1196-97), Arimalladeva, founder of the Malla dynasty, Ranaasura (1221) and Abhayamalla (1223-1252). It is doubtful if these rulers accepted the suzerainty of the Karnataas of Mithila. Malla dynasty does not seem to have been very powerful by that time in Nepal. We learn from Nilgriva pillar inscription, that Dharmamalla and Rupamalla were the ancestors of the mallas of Nepal. Arimalladeva was the most important ruler of this dynasty (1201-1216) and he was a contemporary of Narasimha of Mithila. Whether the Mallas were connected with Naavyadeva or not, is a very doubtful question and hence in the present state of our knowledge, we can say that Nepal under the Mallas, specially Arimalladeva, broke connections with
Tirhut. Had that not been the case, there was no necessity of embarking on fresh conquests by the great minister of Narasimhadeva, Caṇḍeśvara. Caṇḍeśvara’s boasts about Nepal’s conquest is an ample proof of the fact that Nepal had freed herself from control of the Karnāṭas. Some areas of the Terai were possibly under the control of the descendants of Malladeva who were ruling separately from the main branch.

The later history of the Karnāṭas of Mithilā belongs to the medieval period will be discussed in Vol. II of the Comprehensive History of Bihar.
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CHAPTER XXXVI

Government and Political Institutions
(A. D. 550-1200)

I. POST-GUPTA INTERREGNUM

Since the Guptas had their capital at Pāṭaliputra, they were in a position to exercise effective administrative control over Bihar. But the powers which succeeded the Guptas in this state did not set up their administrative centre here, which naturally weakened central control in Bihar. The Maukhariis, and Harshavardhana, had their seat of power in Kanauj, which was too far to make the people of Bihar feel the weight of their administration. There is no doubt that during this period culturally Nalanda enjoyed the greatest celebrity in Bihar, but whatever political and administrative importance it had was secondary and derived from the presence of such kings as Ananantavarman, Harshavardhana, and Yaśovarman, and their numerous officials, who came there to record their respect to the famous town.

For sometime after the death of Harsha, the real capital of Bihar under the Later Guptas lay somewhere in the district of Shahabad, where most of their inscriptions have been found. In the early 8th century the victory camp of Jivita Gupta II was situated somewhere near the fort of Gomati-Koṭṭaka, which cannot be identified but may have been situated in western Bihar. Before the rise of Harshavardhana a line of the Maukhariis ruled Magadha as the nominal feudatories of the imperial Guptas. This is evident from the title sāmantacudāmanī, the head of the vassals, applied to Šārdūla, the first known ancestor of
the Maukharis. A similar title rājakasya agrānta (the head of the chiefs) was held by Yajñanavarman, the father of Śārdūla. Later Maukharī inscriptions conceal the real position of Śārdūla, who is described simply as a nṛpa or king, but even this does not seem to be any better than a feudatory title. Another feudatory title of the period was mahāsāmanta, applied to Śaśānka. Who was the overlord of Śaśānka is difficult to say. Perhaps he ruled the Rohtas area as a vassal of the Gauḍas, who had conquered Magadha.

The vestiges of the authority of the Maukharis and Śaśānka were wiped out by Harsha, but the Later Guptas may have ruled as his feudatories. They acquired independent status after his death, when some rulers of the line called themselves paramabhaṭṭaraka mahārājādhikarā jā paramēśvara.

The category of vassals who ruled in their respective territories on the fall of the Gupta empire also included some erstwhile regular officials of the Guptas. Kumārāmālīya Nandana, who was apparently a high Gupta official in Gaya, assumed the title of mahārāja and made land grants in his own rights. There may have been similar other officers, of whom we have no information.

The above instances indicate feudal disintegration following the end of the Gupta empire. Probably the reign of Harsha gave some administrative stability, but disruptive forces again raised their heads after his death. In the 8th century A.D., in the district of Hazaribagh, one of two merchants from Ayodhya was requested by the local people to become their king, and recognised as such by the Magadhan king Ādi Simha on condition that he would pay tribute (avalagna) to him. This appears to be a typical example of benefice and commendation in times of anarchy, and reminds us of the case of Gopāla, who was
raised to kingship under similar circumstances. It would therefore appear that in the pre-Pāla period a considerable portion of Bihar was parcellled out among vassals who owed allegiance to the Gauḍas, Harsha or local Magadhan kings of unknown identity. The vassals were known as sāmanta, mahāsāmanta, and probably also a nṛpa and nṛpati. The term nṛpa was coterminus with the term sāmantacūḍamani, and, as shown earlier, both were held by the Maukhari chief Śārdūla. The epithet nṛpa and nṛpati were also bestowed on the merchant Udayamāna, who was made a vassal by the Magadhādhirāja Ādi Sīhma. Another vassal who held the title of nṛpati was Śrī Māna Sīhma, but the name of his overlord is not known.

The epigraphic records of the period do not throw any light on the privileges and obligations of the sāmantas mahāsāmantas, nṛpas, etc. Probably they rendered military aid and paid court in various ways to their overlords. The description of the court of Harsha by Bāṇabhaṭṭa lends support to such a view. Bāṇa refers to three ranks of vassals: (1) the enemy vassals who were vanquished and had to perform various kinds of services in the court; (ii) the vassals who clusted in the court being overpowered by the prowess of the king; and (iii) the vassals who were attracted to the king voluntarily out of their attachment to him.

How the independent kings governed Bihar is difficult to make out. The votive seals of the Maukhari ruler Avantivarman and Harshavardhana, found in Nālandā, show that the kings presented themselves to the public as the upholders of the social order based on varṇas (fourfold class system) and āśramas (four stages of life). This was also considered to be an important function of the minor kings and vassals, who were expected to rule over the varṇas and to be well-versed in the laws of the
varṇas and āśramas. All this was in accordance with the Dharmaśāstras, which enjoined the kings to observe its laws. In one respect the Maukhari kings proved themselves to be the real followers of the Dharmaśāstras, for they uniformly used the title varman (shield) prescribed for the kshatriyas by the law-books.

The pre-Pāla kings, however, did not have great pretension to divinity, so characteristic of the Gupta emperors. Usually they are compared to one god at a time, and not to several gods, like the Gupta kings. Among the gods chosen for comparison are Maheśvara, Bhāsvān, etc.

An important duty of the kings was to take care of their subjects. This claim is made for some minor kings. It is stated that in spite of his being the leader of kings in respect of wisdom, nobility (prajñānāyava) charity and prowess the Maukhari king Yajñavarman was devoted to his subjects (prakṛtistha). Similarly nāpati Māna Simha boasts of having gladdened the heart of his subjects through the rise of his qualities (anurājita-prakṛteh). Whether the prakṛti included all the people or covered only the important elements in the kingdom is not clear. The latter hypothesis is supported by a passage of the Raghuvamśa, which considers prakṛti identical with ministers and counsellors, and by the use of the term in the election of Gopāla, who, according to Tāranātha, was elected by the nobles and elders.

The kings were probably assisted by some counsellors, some of whom were quite distinguished. Thus Yaśovarman’s minister Tikin, whose son Mālāda made gifts to a temple at Nālandā, was an officer-in-charge of the frontier and master of the north. His non-Sanskritic name suggests his foreign extraction. Under the Later Guptas the rājanātyas were preceded only by the rājaputras and followed by all
the high officials. But the exact status of the rajamātyas, who also figure in the Pāla list of officials and dignitaries, cannot be fixed. Whether they were higher in position than the amātyas of Gupta times and enjoyed the status of mantri cannot be said. According to Bāṇa the title of amātya was held by the learned, high-born, and cultured crowned heads. In this sense rajamātyas may be taken as those sub-kings who held the title of amātya.

Of the administrative units we have some indication only under the Later Guptas. Tīrabhukti of Gupta times is mentioned as an administrative unit in this period, and we have the additional information that it contained Cāmunda vishaya, which is difficult to identify. Nagarabhukti, continued to exist, and included the modern Patna Division. Perhaps it lay under the jurisdiction of rājas-thānīyoparika. The next administrative unit was vishaya, two of which, Vālavī vishaya in Shahabad and Kṛmilā vishaya in Monghyr are mentioned in the records of the period. The former is difficult to identify, but the latter corresponded to the western part of the modern Monghyr district extending over both sides of the Ganges, and had its headquarters at Valgudar near Jaynagar in south Monghyr. Thus the administrative units of Gupta times continued in the main.

The officials of Harsha working in Bihar are not mentioned in any record. But it is more than possible that the same set of officers,—known from his inscriptions, Bāṇabhatṭa, and the account of Hsuan Tsang,—worked in Bihar. Land revenue administration seems to have received particular attention, and land records were maintained by the grāmakṣapataṭika (at the village level) and the mahāgrāmakṣapataṭika (at the central level.) The work of land survey was carried on by the mahāprāmūrti. The mahūśandhivigrahadhiṅka, the mahabalaṅgāhikṛta, the senāpati, and the mahāpratihāra were mainly high military officials.
The grant of Jivita Gupta gives us some idea of the officials working in western Bihar during the first half of the eighth century A.D. They were the chief commander (mahādaṇḍanāyaka), the head of the palace-guard (mahāpratihāra), kumāramāṭya, divisional heads (rājasthāniyoparikas), the officer dealing with thieves (cauroddharianikas), the magistrate-cum-police officer (dāṇḍika), and police officer (dāṇḍapāsika). Certain minor functionaries such as herdsmen (goshṭhanakula), officials looking after low land (tulanātakas), messengers (dātās) and boundary makers (śīmākarmakara) were mainly connected with land revenue administration in the village of Vārunikā. The present grant also mentions several other officers whose names are blurred. From another record, however, we learn that the balādhikṛta or the chief commander was an important officer under the Later Guptas.

If we regard the spurious Nālandā copper-plate of Samudra Gupta as reflecting the state of affairs in the seventh-eighth century, to which it can be assigned on palaeographic grounds, it would appear that the officer-in-charge of village records (grāmākidaputralādhikṛta), the great commander of the elephant corps (mahāśilapati) and the great commander-in-chief (mahābalādhikṛta) were some other important functionaries in post-Gupta Bihar. Moreover, sometimes the same person held all the three offices together.

The mode of appointment of the officials is not known to us. Some of them may have been hereditary. It seems that officials owed their posts not so much to their ability as to the favour of the king. The officials named in the grant of Jivita Gupta are described as subsisting on the favour of the feet of the king (asmat-pāda-prāśado-pajīvinaḥ). How the officers under the Later Guptas of Magadha were paid we have no means to know, but high officers under
Harsha were paid by grants of revenues, which must have undoubtedly introduced a distinct feudal element in the Bihar polity, also, of the period. This was reinforced by the grant of villages to temples and priests made by the Maukhari kings and Later Gupta rulers of Magadha. Anantavarman granted a village to Bhavānī, and Jivita Gupta II confirmed the grant of a village, originally made by Bāladitya, and successively endorsed by two Maukhari kings, to a temple of the sun-god on the eve of setting out a military expedition. We learn that Harsha granted 100 villages to the Brāhmaṇas with 1000 halas roughly equal to 10,000 acres in Madhyadeśa. Such villages were not only exempt from taxes which meant loss of revenues to the kings concerned, and they also carried administrative rights for the grantee was empowered to realise the fines imposed on account of ten offences. Obviously the grantee maintained law and order in the village granted to him.

As regards the sources of revenue, no records indicate the share of the state during this period. The two important taxes levied from the villagers in Magadha under Jivita Gupta were udraṅga and upārikara. The first probably implied the royal share, which according to Hsuan Tsang was 1/6 of the produce, and the second was an impost on temporary peasants. Fines imposed on the persons convicted of ten offences formed another source of income to the Later Gupta kings. There were certainly other sources of revenue in the period, but they are neither mentioned in the mutilated grant of Jivita Gupta nor in any other grant of the time. As such we have no means to find out whether all the old taxes were continued or replaced by any new or supplemented by additional ones. Hsuan Tsang informs us that taxes on peasants and traders were light under Harsha. Whether the same position continued in post-Harsha times we have no idea.
As to the expenditure we have some indication of it under Harsha. One-fourth of the revenue was earmarked for scholars, one-fourth for religious teachers, one-fourth for officers, and the remaining one-fourth for the king and his palace. This clearly does not provide any room for expenditure on public works or the material welfare of those who paid taxes.

Hsuan Tsang throws light on the military organisation of Harsha. The number of his soldiers was greater than that of Candra Gupta Maurya and so a considerable part of it may have been supplied by the vassals from Bihar. The only other piece of information about the military system relates to that of Jivita Gupta II, whose army consisted of boats, elephants, cavalry and infantry, but its numerical strength is not known. Fortresses probably played an important part in the military organisation of the Later Guptas, and the victory camp of Jivita Gupta II was situated near a fortress.

Of the town administration we have no information. The village was probably managed by the Brähmanaś and the elders who were known as mahattaras. A striking development during the period was the rise of autonomous villages known as the grāma-janapadas or simply as grāmas. The seals presented on their behalf at Nālandā testify to their corporate existence. On palaeographic grounds most of them seem to be of post-Gupta times. The villages cannot be definitely identified, but most of them seem to have been situated not far from Nālandā, in Magadha. It is difficult to account for the rise of such villages in Magadha, but they do indicate administrative decentralisation for according to the Dharmasāstras the rulers were expected to respect the local laws and customs of the janapadas.

The above sketch of political structure of Bihar in post-Gupta times would show that in respect of administra-
tive divisions, officials, revenue system and village management, the Gupta system continued in its essentials. The new system was, however, marked by more feudalisation and decentralisation on account of the weakness of central authority, payment of officials by grants of revenues and emergence of grāma-janapadas.

II. ADMINISTRATION

The greater portion of Bihar, excluding the Chota-nagpur area, seems to have been directly governed by the Pālas till the middle of the 11th century. During the ninth century, however, the central administrative control was more effective, for several grants of Dharmapāla and Devapāla were issued from Monghyr (Mudgagiri), which apparently served as the capital of the Pālas under these two rulers and thus enabled them to closely supervise the administration of Bihar.

The largest administrative unit in the Pāla kingdom was the bhukti, two of which were included within the modern boundaries of Bihar. Tīrabhukti covered the major part of north Bihar and Nagarabhukti the major part of south Bihar. The north-eastern fringe of the province (parts of the district of Purnea) was probably included in the Pundravardhana-bhukti, which covered the greater part of northern Bengal, while the south-eastern fringe of the Chotanagpur plateau was probably included in the Vardhamānabhukti, which was coterminous with the modern Burdwan Division, and was sometimes known as Daṇḍa-bhukti. Besides this the Pāla empire also comprised Prāgjayotishabhukti in Assam. Thus of the six bhuktis under the Pālas, two lay within the boundaries of Bihar proper, while two or three included parts of its border districts. Although the greater part of Bihar was under the direct administration of the Pālas, parts of the districts of Chapra
and Shahabad lay in Śrāvastībhukti in the Pratihāra kingdom, at least in the 10th century.

The bhuktis were divided into vishayas, roughly corresponding to modern districts. Nagarabhukti or Śrīnagarabhukti included the vishaya of Kṛmila\textsuperscript{49}, Gaya\textsuperscript{50} and Rājagṛha.\textsuperscript{48} The latter probably occupied the area covered by the modern subdivisions of Biharsharif and Barh. The colophon of a manuscript of the Ashtasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā written in the fifteenth year of Rāmapāla mentions the vishaya of Magadha.\textsuperscript{51} It is suggested that this formed part of Magadhabhukti.\textsuperscript{52} But from the 8th century A.D. onwards epigraphic records speak only of Nagar or Śrīnagarabhukti, which obviously had taken the place of Magadhabhukti. Hence the vishaya of Magadha probably was a district of Śrīnagarabhukti and included part of the district of Shahabad. Apparently it had taken the place of the vishaya of Pāṭaliputra mentioned in the spurious Nālandā Plate of Samudra Gupta. Tīrabhukti included the vishayas of Kaksha\textsuperscript{53} and Haudreya\textsuperscript{54} which are difficult to identify. The headquarters of the district of Haudreya, however, was probably Hardi, an old village in the district of Saharsa.

The vishayas were divided into nayas or vīthis, corresponding to modern subdivisions and in some cases parganas. Thus the Gaya vishaya included the vīthis of Jambūnādi\textsuperscript{55} and Kumudasūtra.\textsuperscript{56} The Rājagṛha vishaya was divided into the nayas of Ajapura\textsuperscript{57}, identical with the village Ajaypur about 7 miles to the north-west of Rajgir, Acalā\textsuperscript{58}, and Pilipinka\textsuperscript{59} identical with the Pilichh pargana in the subdivision of Biharsharif. It would thus appear that the district of Rājagṛha was divided into both vīthis and nayas, but that of Gaya was divided into vīthis. Probably the vīthi was smaller in size than the naya. But if the naya of Pilipanka is equated with the Pilicch pargana, it would
seem that the nāya was a fiscal unit, smaller in size than
the modern subdivision.

The two vishayas of Tīrabhukti seem to have been the
smallest administrative units north of the Ganges, if we
leave aside the villages. They were not divided into viṭhis
or nāyas. This also held good of the Kṛmilā vishaya,
which covered the area on both sides of the Ganges roughly
forming the eastern part of the modern Monghyr district.
It served as the headquarters of some offices, and was hence
known as Kṛmilā adhishṭhāna.\(^{61}\)

The administrative unit known as maṇḍala was wide-
spread in Bengal, but is hardly found in Bihar under the
Pālas. The only maṇḍala mentioned is that of Gayā in an
inscription of the 11th century. The term seems to have
been used here in a general and not in any technical
administrative sense. Further, the viṭhis prevalent in
Gupta times were slowly passing out of existence and being
supplanted by the nāyas, which appear for the first time
under the Pālas and were characteristic only of Bihar.
Whether difference in the names of administrative units
meant any difference in actual administration cannot be
said.

The head of the bhukti was now probably known as
rājasthāniyoparika and not uparika as in Gupta times. The
new designation probably made the governor more exalted
and powerful. The head of the vishaya was the vishayarātī,
occupying the place next to the rājasthāniyoparika in several
Pāla grants from Bihar.\(^{61}\) But which of the officials mentioned
in the land grants managed the affairs of the nāya or
the viṭhi cannot be determined.

The list does not mention any official who can be
taken as having anything to do with town administration.
This was in great contrast to the elaborate arrangement
for the administration of towns in Maurya times, and
might suggest the comparative absence of towns in the Pāla dominions.

The village was under the jurisdiction of the grāmapati, who may have managed its affairs with the help of the Brāhmaṇas and elders called mahattaras or mahattamas. The fact that the Brāhmaṇas, Caṇḍālas, etc., were directly addressed by the king should not be taken to mean, as has been done,38 that the leaders of the local population did not enjoy any influence in local government, for the mahattaras (elders) are invariably addressed in the Pāla grants.

The officials mentioned in the Pāla grants from Bihar number about two dozen in contrast to about one and a half dozen officials mentioned in Gupta records of the province. This gives the impression that the Pāla system of administration was more comprehensive and efficient than its Gupta counterpart, and had organs of a more differentiated character. It is difficult to account for this development under the Pālas. Probably the increase in the number of various grades of officials performing different functions was possible because of the smaller size of their kingdom, which covered only Bihar, Bengal and a part of Assam. On account of the larger size of their dominions the Gupta could not afford to attend to so many functions as the Pālas did.

The order in which the officials are mentioned in land grants raises several problems. Is the list arranged in order of precedence of the officials? Does it indicate the grouping and bracketing of officials according to their respective functions? Or has the whole list been drawn up indiscriminately? The last hypothesis that officials are just lumped together, would have sounded plausible if the grants had been composed in verse, which demands such arrangements in order to meet the needs of metre, but the
grants are uniformly in prose. Nor there appears to be any deliberate attempt at grouping based on the similarity of functions, for there is hardly anything common either between the rājasthānīyoparika and the vishayapati, or between the mahādauḥsādhasādhanika and the mahākumārāmatya, although these are placed one after the other. Some scholars try to interpret the functions of these officials on the basis of the above hypothesis, which is not sound. Perhaps the basis of arrangement seems to be precedence, which takes into account not only the regular officials but also the vassals and the members of the royal family. In the list the members of the royal family and the kith and kin of the king such as rājaputras, rājarājānakas, etc., are given the first place, and are immediately followed by the amātya or rājāmatya, who was the chief counsellor of the king and the highest official in the state. Thus assuming that the names of officials were arranged in order of precedence, we can guess something about their relative status and position.

Guided by the modern differentiation of governmental functions and departments, the Pāla officials have been classified as belonging to the Revenue Department, Judicial Department, Police Department, and Military Department. But it would be wrong to think that these departments were organised separately and their functions demarcated definitely. Nevertheless, the officials give some idea of the functions performed by the Pāla government, which can be better appreciated by taking the officials separately on the basis of the earliest list of Dharmapāla found in Bihar.

Rājāmatya or sometimes simply amātya headed the list of officials. He seems to have been the chief adviser, and had the same place in the official hierarchy of the Pālas which the mantri had in the Gāhaḍavāla counterpart.
Sometimes the rājāmātya is taken as a junior minister of the king, but really he seems to have been the chief minister. In fact maunṭi is mentioned in later Pāla inscriptions but not of Bihar.

The mahākartoṣṭikāraka appears to have been in charge of some religious functions, an interpretation which cannot be pressed far. Or else he may be taken as the highest executive official, without any power of tendering advice to the king which was the function of the rājāmātya. The mahādaṇḍanāyaka has been understood as both a general or the chief judicial officer. But since mahāsenāpati, the term for the chief commander is found in later grants, it is better to take him as the highest judicial official with magisterial powers in the Pāla kingdom. But the emphasis on dvyāṇa shows that punishment was more important than arbitration or mediation.

The mahāpratihāra was obviously the head of the palace-guards, and may have commanded the body-guards of the king. The palace being something of a fortified place, the mahāpratihāra was as good as the commander of a fortress.

The dauḥsādhasadhanika or mahādauḥsādhasadhanika was a high police official dealing with the most criminal elements in the kingdom. Perhaps these turbulent people were tribals, not easily amenable to law and order and hence dauḥsāḍha, difficult to be controlled. In later times they came to be known as dusāḍhas, who are found in considerable number in modern Bihar.

The pramāṭṭ was the chief surveyor of land, which had to be measured for assessment. His position underwent some diminution for under Harsha the mahāpramāṭṭmaḥāsamanta served as the executor of land grants.

The ivaḥkhaṇga's position seems to be uncertain. Did he look after unorthodox religious sects? The kumārāmāṭṭya,
well-known in Gupta times, probably continued as a district officer under the Pālas. In later inscriptions the term *mahākumārāṃśya* is used. The term *rājasthāntyoparika* occurs as a compound in most grants combining the words *rājasthāntya* (regent or viceroy) and *uparika* (the head of the bhukti). In the beginning there seem to have been two officers, functioning separately. Subsequently these functions were combined by the same officer, who served as the deputy of the king in the bhukti, his status being higher than that of the uparika.

The *vishayapati* was the head of the *vishaya*, a post prevalent from Gupta times. From the time of Nārāyaṇapāla he seems to have lost in status, for in the list of officials his name was relegated towards the end, only two officers *grāmapati* (head of the village) and *tarika* (officer in-charge of ferries) ranking below him. It might indicate that as the representative of the central government the *vishayapati* did no longer enjoy any effective control over his district.

The *daśaparādhika* is taken as a revenue official who collected the fines imposed on persons convicted of ten offences. But really he seems to have been a kind of minor judicial magistrate who took cognisance of ten offences, and probably also realised fines imposed on their account. Thus he combined magisterial, judicial and revenue functions.

The *cauroddharaṇīka* has been taken as an officer who collected taxes from people in order to protect them against thieves. This seems to be correct so far as it goes, but this officer perhaps also punished the thieves and thus gave protection to the private property of the people.

The *daṅgīka* was probably a kind of trying magistrate, and *daṅgapatīka* a police official who confined the convicts to prison.
The śaulkika (customs officer) and the gaulmika (troop head) find place in later grants, although their offices were known in Gupta Bihar.

The kṣhetrapa also known as kṣhetrapāla literally means the protector of fields, and people might have sought his intervention and arbitration in land disputes.

The pṛāntapāla was the warden of marches, guarding the frontier. In later grants the pṛāntapāla is followed by the kottapāla, protector of the fortress, and khandarāksha, protector of old buildings. The āyuktaka and the viniyuktaka seem to have been lower executive officials. The āyuktaka is mentioned in the kāmandakāntītisāra, but does not occur in any Gupta or post-Gupta inscriptions.

The hasty-asvō-yṣṭrā-balā-vyāppṭaka was obviously the superintendent of elephants, horses and camels maintained for military purposes.

The kṣiravādaṇavāgava-mahishyaj-ūvīk-ādhyaksha has been taken to be a superintendent of such animals as elephants, mules, cattle, buffaloes, sheep and goats on the basis of such an office in the Arthasastra of Kauṭilya and is regarded as an officer in civil administration. In our opinion the officer was a glorified herdsman or chief shepherd of the kingdom. Whether he performed the same duties as the superintendent of animals in Kauṭilya is difficult to say, for there is a long gap of time between the two. Probably the officer exercised a general supervision over the pasture grounds, which were invariably attached to villages.

The meanings of gamāgāmika and abhitvaramāṇa are uncertain.

The grants of Nārāyaṇapāla mention three other officers, the mahākṣhapatalika, the chief record keeper or accountant, the mahāśāndhiṅgābhaṅika, the great minister of peace and war, and the mahāsenāpati, the chief commander.
Of these the first and last appear in the Nālandā Copper Plate of Dharmapāla,41 but not in the consolidated list of officials who are addressed in the grant. Obviously these offices existed earlier, but it was not considered necessary to invoke their authority for the successful implementation of land grants. Probably in later times royal authority became weak, and it was found necessary to inform all the officials in the kingdom.

Besides the above officers were the karaṇikas, or scribes who drafted the land grants and possibly other government records too.

Since the precise nature of the posts mentioned above is not known, we cannot make firm generalisations on the nature of administrative machinery. The list of officials give the impression that the element of force represented by the mahāpratīthāra, the mahāsenāpati, the mahādaṇḍāṇḍyaka, the daṇḍika, the daṇḍapāsika, the daśāparādhika predominated in the Pāla system. No other function seems to have received so much attention as that of dispensing punishment and commanding the soldiers. This, therefore, undermines the hypothesis that the Pāla rule was popular in character.42 If the government really enjoyed popular support, it would be difficult to account for the existence of so many officials connected with police, magisterial and military functions.

The military organisation consisted of the infantry, cavalry, elephants, chariots and boats, which are invariably mentioned in the description of a victory camp.43

Forts played an important part in the Pāla military organisation. The remains of most early mediaeval forts of south Bhagalpur, south and north Monghyr, Patna and Gayā belong to Pāla times. At least as many as ten forts of Pāla times can be identified. It seems many of these fortresses were under the command of Kottapālas;
some of them may have been commanded by vassals. The function of the *khaṇḍaraṇaksha* seems to be to look after the repairs of these old forts. Forts obviously served as the garrisons, which could be employed to maintain the authority of the government in the neighbouring areas. A part of the army was standing, but the greater number seems to have been occasionally contributed by the kinglets of the north. The standing army and the police force (*cāṭas* and *bhātas*) consisted of Laṭas, Gauḍas, Auḍras (people from Orissa), Mālavas, Khaśas, Kulikas, Karnaṭas and Hūnas. The first four are territorial names, and the last four tribal. Although the Pāla kingdom extended over the major part of Bihar, none of its people or region find place in the list. We have no indication of the numerical strength of the standing army or the mode of its remuneration. It seems that the villages were expected to supply provisions to minor policemen and retainers in course of their duty, but whether the same applied to the soldiers on march cannot be said.

The army was under the command of the *mahāsenāpati*. Some other officials mentioned above performed military functions, but their mutual relation cannot be determined. The lowest military unit was commanded by the *gaulmika*, whose garrison maintained royal power in two to five villages.

The revenue organisation seems to be another important aspect of the Pāla administration. The sources of revenue were *uparikara* (tax on temporary peasants), *deśāpa rāḍha* (daṇḍa) (fines accruing on account of ten offences), *cauroḍdharaṇa* (levy for protection against thieves), *bhaga* (probably a sixth of the produce), *bhogakara* (seasonal presents in the form of first fruits), *hiranya* (levy in cash), *śulka* (customs on the sale of commodities), and several others which are not mentioned, but covered by the term
Moreover, the king could subject the villages to forced labour whenever necessary; this can be inferred from the exemption from all kinds of oppressions (*pariketetasarva-päda*) granted to religious grantees. The terms of the land grants suggest that the king enjoyed general ownership over the pasture grounds, reservoirs of water, lowland, barren and fertile land, and various kinds of trees attached to the village. But what actual benefit was derived by the government from such ownership cannot be stated. Of the various sources of revenue the most important was the *bhäga*, which seems to have been one-sixth of the royal produce, collected by an officer called *shashthädhikśita*.

Other officials connected with the revenue administration were the *rajasthāniyoparika, vishayapati, grāmapati, daśāpura-dhika, caurodharaṇīka, śaulkika, pramātr, and kshetrapä.* Perhaps the highest revenue official was the *mahākṣapātalikä*, who first appears in the grants of Harsha and serves as writer of charters under the titles *mahākṣapātaladhi-karṣāṇādhi-kṛtasamanta-mahārāja* or simply as the *mahākṣapātalikasamanta-mahārāja.* Under the Pālas, however, this official was not given any feudal title.

How the Pāla officials were remunerated for their work is not known. The absence of coins suggest that they were not paid in cash; they were possibly paid by grants of revenues, a practice noted by Hsuan Tsang in the time of Harshavardhana.

As regards limitations on the powers of the Pāla king, clearly there was no constitutional machinery. Nevertheless, the Pāla kings, like good Hindu rulers, thought themselves to be under the obligation to maintain the varṇa system outlined in the Dharmaśāstras. In cases of doubt these laws were probably interpreted by the Brāhmaṇas, who could thus impose their views on the kings. Besides, hereditary Brāhmaṇa ministers (not belonging to Bihar), who owed
power to their learning and wealth, surely may have influenced the policy of the Pāla kings, although the extent of such influence is exaggerated by them in their inscriptions."

How far the two dozen grades of officials, high and low, modified and influenced the decisions of the king cannot be said. A comparison between the Gupta and Pāla land charters shows that in the bestowal of grants the officials enjoyed some weight with the Pāla king. In Gupta grants the assent of the official was not sought. On the other hand the early Pāla kings ask their officials to give their assent to the gifts of villages and observe the terms of the endowments (anumodya pālanīyam). Later Pāla grants further strengthen the element of assent by using the term anumantvoyam in addition to anumodya used earlier. Does this indicate the growing dependence of the later Pāla kings on their officials? Under the Pratihāras we have an instance of the grant falling into desuetude on account of the incapacity of the local official. Such cases may have occurred under the Pālas. At any rate once appointed the royal agents were considered powerful enough to undo the policy of the kings. Whether Pāla officials derived their importance from the tradition set by the election of Gopāla cannot be said. It is stated that the first Pāla king was elected by the prakṛtis, which is difficult to interpret. Some take it in the sense of the seven constituent elements of the state mentioned by Kauṭilya; others take it in the sense of general subjects, and others in the sense of nobles. The last hypothesis is supported by the sixteenth century Tibetan historian Tāranātha, who records the tradition that Gopāla was elected by elders and nobles. In a general way, however, this lends indirect support to the view that Gopāla was elected by important elements, possibly nobles who may have been
absorbed as high officials. As the price for their support at least formally, their assent to the religious land grants was asked by the Pāla kings. But it would be wrong to think that there was any well-established constitutional machinery, which restrained royal power.

An important check on royal power was provided by the emergence of feudal elements, of which there is some indication the Pāla Polity.

III. POST-PĀLA ADMINISTRATION

The Pāla pattern of administration continued till about the end of the 12th century over the southern districts of Bihar, to which the Pālas were confined on account of the Sena pressure on the east and Gāhaḍavāla pressure on the west. Part of Patna and probably the whole of Shahabad districts passed into the hand of the Gāhaḍavālas, who controlled the former directly, and the latter through their feudatories. For sometime they also controlled the area around Monghyr, from where they issued a land charter.

The area under the direct administration of the Gāhaḍavālas was divided into paṭṭalas, one of which, Maniyara had its headquarters at modern Maner in the Dinapur subdivision of Patna, and probably occupied the the same area as the Maner pargana in Mughal and British times.

We have some idea of the taxes the people of this fiscal unit had to pay to the Gāhaḍavāla kings. This included the royal share of the produce (bhāga), occasional presents (bhogakara), some tax on merchants (pravānīkara) and taxes for warding off the Turkish invaders (turushkadaṇḍa). People had also to pay taxes on fishing (matsyakara) and on the exploitation of iron and salt deposits (loha-lavanakara).
What was the machinery for assessment and collection of taxes is difficult to say. Probably the bhāṇḍāgarīka (treasurer) and akṣhapāṭalika (accountants) were in charge of revenue administration of the kingdom, and their assistants may have managed it in the patti.

Their land grants show that the Gāhaḍavālas did not have as many officials as the Pālas had. While coercive elements enjoyed importance in the Pāla system of administration, priestly elements did so in the Gāhaḍavāla system. Thus the posts of the mantrin (office held by the Brāhmaṇa family of Praharāja Sarmā for several generations), the purohita (chief priest), the bhishag (physician), and the naimittika (astrologer) indicate that the priestly class supplied some high officials to the Gāhaḍavālas. Again, there was no provision for the administration of towns under the Pālas, but the Gāhaḍavālas provided for officers, who looked after pattiyaś or towns (generally situated on the bank of the rivers). The Gāhaḍavāla control over Maner might imply their rule over the town of Patna, which is derived from the term pattaṇa, and not from Paṭaliputra as commonly understood.

In the Gāhaḍavāla polity kings, queens and princes ranked higher than regular officials, but the number of such vassals in Bihar is not known. Their only known vassal in this State was Pratāpadhavala, the lord (adhipati) of Jāpilā, who revoked the grant of two villages procured by a Brāhmaṇa by bribing a slave of king Vijayacandra. It seems that this feudal vassal also enjoyed the right of making grants of villages, held by him under royal authority. But we have no clear case of subinfeudation. At any rate, the Maner grant made to Brāhmaṇas was a clear example of making over fiscal and administrative rights to them.

The system of administration in North Bihar during the 12th century seems to have been somewhat different
from that of South Bihar. We have no idea of the admini-
strative organisation of the Karnatâs, who began their
rule in 1097. But it could not have been much different
from that of the Senas who were ruling over northern
and eastern Bengal in the same century. Nânyadeva, the
founder of the dynasty, was a mahânâmantâdhîhipati, head
of the vassals, under the Câlukyas who raided Mithilâ.
Even when he set up an independent dynasty, he
retained his old title. He further represented himself as an
upholder of the existing social order by describing himself
as dharmâvalôka and dharmâdhârâbhûpati;83 Saângrâma
Gupta, who had his capital at Jayapura, somewhere
in Mithilâ,84 was probably a vassal (mahâmânândalika) of
the Karnâtas. He maintained an independent administra-
tive machinery, consisting of about two dozen officials,
many of them with flamboyant designations beginning with
mahâ.85 These officials were the chief adviser (pâtra),86 the
commander of military arrays (mahâvyâhâpati), the chief
executive officer (mahâdhihârîka), the keeper of royal seal
(mahâmudrâdhîkârî), the head of the elders or nobles in the
kingdom (mahâmahâttakâ), the commander of the elephant
corps (mahâpilupati), the chief officer dealing with criminals
(mahâsaûhânika), the chief accountant (mahâkshâpatálîka),
the head of the palace guards (mahâpratîhâra), the chief
justice (mahâdharmaëhîkâranîka), the chief scribe (mahâkarañâ-
dhîyaksâ), the intelligence officer (vûrîti), the law adviser
(writer of grants) (naîbandhâkâ), mahâkaûuka, the mahauhîka,
the tûsanîka, the chief judicial magistrate (mahâdaûânîyâka),
the chief endowment officer (mahâdânîka),87 the superinten-
dent of the local councils of five (the mahâpûneâkulîka), the
supervisor of religious gifts made by merchants (mahâresh-
thîdânîka), the supervisor of the gifts of cultivated land
(bhûlidânîka), the keeper of mountain passes (ghaûtapâla), the
protector of old buildings and forts (khaûtapâla), the captain
of the infantry (naraûpati), the captain of the local garrisons
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(gulmapati), the head of the navy (naubalanyāpta), the superintendent of cattle, buffaloes, etc., (gau-mahisha-vidavādhyaksha), other officials who are covered by the terms ādin and anyūnapī rajapādopajīvināḥ.

Since the names of some officials are obscure it is possible neither to indicate their functions nor to ascertain the precise character of government under Saṅgrāma Gupta, during the 12th or 13th century. But certain features appear to be obvious. The designations of the officers are too pretentious, apparently meant to satisfy their sense of prestige and vanity in a feudal atmosphere rather than to indicate their real power. We are not quite sure whether all these officials existed in the kingdom of a vassal (mahāmāndalīka). But if they were there, it would appear that the process of granting immunities had gone too far, for at least three officers—the mahādānīka, the mahāśreshṭhādīnīka and the bhālidānīka were concerned with endowments, the nature of which could not be different from the grants of villages which carried economic and administrative independence. This would point to the growing importance of landed feudal elements in day-to-day administration, which was reinforced by the presence of princes (rājaputra) and the head of the feudal vassals (mahāsāmantarāṇyaka). On the other hand the offices of the mahāpañcakulīka and mahāśreshṭhādīnīka might suggest the association of urban and mercantile interests with administration. Moreover, the office of the mahākarṇādhyaksha might reflect the emergence of the scribes as an important factor in administration. Strikingly enough all these officials such as the mahākarṇādhyaksha, the mahādānīka, the mahāpañcakulīka, the mahāśreshṭhādīnīka, and the bhālidānīka as well as the vassal mahāsāmantarāṇyaka, are not found under the Pālas or Senas. Some of Saṅgrāma Gupta's functionaries, the dharmādhikaraṇī, the mahāmahattaka and the
prati-bala kasaṃpūdhyaśka are mentioned in the Varga-ratnākara of Jyotirīśvara Ṭhākura (1324), which indicates that Sāṃgrāma Gupta flourished either in the late 12th or the early 13th century.

Although the officials and vassals were supposed to subsist on the favour of the feet of the king, their opinion counted for more in making religious grants than that of the Pāla officials. The Pāla land charters begin by informing the functionaries of the grants by using the phrase viditanastu and then seek their assent, but Sāṃgrāma Gupta’s charter begins by seeking the consent of his officers by means of the phrase matamastu. This probably betrays the increasing dependence of the post Pāla rulers on their subordinates.

The sources of revenue under Sāṃgrāma Gupta were not very different from those under the Pālas. The king enjoyed the usual agrarian rights over trees, reservoirs of water, and all varieties of land, together with the ownership of salt and iron mines on the use of which people had to pay taxes. What distinguished the present system of taxation was the imposition of various kinds of forcible labour (sāmanta-pāda = uparikara), which is not to be found in the Pāla system. But once transferred to grantees, religious or secular, all these revenue rights were bound to add to their administrative and economic power.
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CHAPTER XXXVII

Social and Economic Conditions
(A.D. 550-1200)

(I) SOCIETY

We do not notice any striking changes in the social life of Bihar in post-Gupta times. Broadly speaking the four-fold division of society based on varṇas continued. Although we do not come across Brāhmaṇa rulers, the Brāhmaṇas continued to occupy the highest position in society. Only they could receive religious grants for officiating at various sacrifices, which naturally added to their social and economic power. Besides performing religious functions they imparted education for which they were granted agrahāras. Land grants mention Brāhmaṇas of various gotras such as Kāśyapa,1 Gārgya, Śāṇḍilya, Aupamanyava,2 Śāvarṣya,3 etc. Brāhmaṇas of some of these gotras are still found in the localities in which grants were made. Thus Maithila and Bhumihar Brāhmaṇas of Śāṇḍilya gotra are found in the Saharsa district where a grant was made in Bangaon to a Brāhmaṇa of this gotra. Similarly Bhumihar Brāhmaṇas of Śāvarṣa gotra are found in the Chapra district, where in Dighwa-Dubauli a grant was made to a Brāhmaṇa of this gotra in the 10th century A.D. This may imply that the Brāhmaṇas of Śāṇḍilya gotra have been living in Saharsa since the 11th century A.D., and those of Śāvarṣya gotra living in Chapra since the 10th century A.D., but it is difficult to say that the present Brāhmaṇas are the descendants of the old ones. In the case of the Gāhaḍavāla grant made to a Brāhmaṇa family in Maner some Brāhmaṇas having Kāśyapa gotra and three pravaras
mentioned in the grant still live in Maner. Others called Maneria Brāhmaṇa with the same gotra and pravaras are found in the district of Arrah. According to their traditions they originally lived in Maner from where they were driven out by the Muslims in the beginning of the thirteenth century.

In several cases the pravaras of the Brāhmaṇas are mentioned. Thus the Brāhmaṇas of the Śāṇḍilya gotra had Śāṇḍilya, Asita and Devala as their pravaras; those of Kāśyapa had Kāśyapa, Avatsara and Naidhruva. The pravaras of Sāvarṇya and Anupamanyava gotras are not mentioned. We can only note that many Bihari Brāhmaṇas had three pravaras and not five as in the case of some of their counterparts in modern times.

What gotra and pravara meant to Brāhmaṇas in early mediæval Bihar, we have no means to find out. Possibly their gotra indicated the name of the sage from whom they were descended and the pravaras the original teachers of their clan or the spiritual gurus who had instructed their forefathers. At any rate it is clear that gotra and pravara, by which Brāhmaṇas are identified and distinguished in the present-day Bihar, had become sufficiently important from post-Gupta times onwards.

The original home, now commonly known as mūla, is mentioned in several cases, but cannot be identified. One of the place Kolaṇca is mentioned as the original habitation of a Brāhmaṇa of Śāṇḍilya gotra in Tīrabhūkti under Vigrahapāla in the 11th century and also of a Brāhmaṇa donee of the same gotra under Sāhgrāma Gupta in the 12th-13th century. The term Kolaṇca viniggtaya (hailing from Kolaṇca) is applied to many Brāhmaṇa grantees in north-eastern India. The place is possibly identical with Korānca near Banaras, from where many Brāhmaṇa families of modern Bihar claim to have come
Some Brāhmaṇas were proved of their original home or village, and made a specific mention of it whenever there was an occasion for it. Thus the Brāhmaṇa writer of an eulogy in the Śītalā Temple of Yakshapāla describes himself āgīrūma-kulodbhavah.⁸

Most Brāhmaṇa grantees specialised in different branches of Vedic study. The Vedic schools to which they belonged are mentioned as Vājasaneyin,⁹ Chāndogya,¹⁰ Āśvalāyana,¹¹ Yajurveda,¹² Kauthuma-Chāndogya.¹³

Although the Brāhmaṇas formed the most cultured section of society, they did not always maintain a high standard of character and integrity. Some of them were too greedy of land grants. We know of two forged grants, apparently made by the Brāhmaṇa beneficiaries, palaeographically ascribed to the 7th-8th century A. D., but manufactured in the name of Samudra Gupta. Much later in the 13th century A. D. some Brāhmaṇas are condemned as cheats (lampatāḥ) by Pratāpadhavala of Jāpirā, for they enjoyed land on the strength of forged grants which had to be revoked.

The titles of the Brāhmaṇas, as known from the records of this period, have survived down to our times. These titles are bhāṭṭa (pre-fixed),¹⁴ miśra (suffixxed),¹⁵ sārman¹⁶ (suffixxed), svāmin (suffixxed).¹⁷ Since the first was prefixed it might indicate political or administrative status, but the second is a familiar title in modern times among the Maithila, Bhumihar, and Śākadvip Brāhmaṇas. Of the remaining two svāmin has died out, and sārman has been recently revived by the Bhumihars and members of some other castes who want to rise in scale in Hindu hierarchy.

Information about the Kshatriyas of the period is meagre. It seems that the ruling chiefs and kings were considered to be Kshatriyas, according to the dictum ksha-trīyo rājā jāyate, i.e. anybody who is a king is a kshatriya.
We have no indication of neo-Kshatriyas or Rajputs in Bihar during this period, although the Pratihāras and their feudatories in Northern India mostly belonged to this caste. The Pratihāras and Gahaḍavālas ruled over portions of Bihar, but it is not known whether some of their families settled down in Bihar. On the other hand although we have no indication of the Candella rule in Bihar the Candella Rajputs of Gidhaur seem to have settled down during this period. Their original home lay in Madhya Pradesh, where they seem to have been improvised into Rajputs from being aboriginal Gonds. There is some indication of such a process in Palamau during this period. The Khayaravāla rulers of Jāpala, called jāpiladhipati, were obviously the chiefs of the aboriginal Kharwars who are found in good numbers even today. The term khayaravāla was the sophisticated sanskritised version of Kharvar, and the fact that they issued land grants in Sanskrit to the Brāhmaṇas in the beginning of the 13th century shows that they were adopted as Kshatriyas much earlier.

As in the rest of early medieval India in Bihar also the ruling chiefs tried to invent respectable genealogy for themselves by tracing their descent from the lunar or solar race. Thus the Pālas rose from humble origins, but in their later inscriptions trace their origin from the Sun. It seems that once certain clans or castes rose to power it was not difficult for the Brāhmaṇas to invent suitable genealogies for them. In their turn these rulers became great champions of the Brāhmaṇical order based on four varṇas. The term upholder of the varṇa system (varaṇa-vyavasthāpana pranaśita) is applied to Later Gupta, Vardhana and Pāla kings. None of these were originally Kshatriyas, but came to be reorganised as such at a later stage.
Some ruling families such as those of the Vardhanas started as Vaiśyas, which may be taken as an example of some Vaiśyas raised to the rank of Kshatriyas, but we have no adequate knowledge about ordinary Vaiśyas. We know of two merchants from Ayodhya who came to the Hazaribagh area sometime in the 7th-8th century A.D. and were recognised as rulers by the local people who commended themselves to the rule of these merchant brothers. Obviously they must have been men of substantial means and status. Merchants are also mentioned in the votive records set up in honour of various Buddhist deities. Sometimes their wives are also named. Some merchants were quite respectable and known as vanijākula. Apparently these merchants belonged to the Vaiśya varṇa, and it seems that during our period trade was considered to be the chief function of the Vaiśyas. But on account of scarcity of coins and consequent retrogression in trade, traders could not be expected to occupy any leading position in society.

Śūdras as such nowhere figure in the inscriptions of the period. But several artisans (silpīns), particularly those who acted as engravers of the copper-plates, are mentioned. We could take them either as Vaiśyas or Śūdras. It is evident that these artisans were literate otherwise they would not have been engaged in carving out land grants. An important section of the Śūdras and possibly Vaiśyas seems to have been the Śaunḍika (vintners) who are mentioned in several votive records of Pāla times. The modern Suris, who function as oilmen and retail merchants in rural areas along with the Telis, seem to be the representatives of the early medieval Śaunḍika caste.

According to Hsuan Tsang, Śūdras in Madhyaadeśa were agriculturists, and this may have also been true of the overwhelming majority of them living in Bihar.
The available sources do not throw any light on the disabilities of the Śūdras during this period in Bihar, but the Caṇḍālas, who are repeatedly mentioned as inhabiting villages in Pāla grants, were subjected to ignominies. Hsuan Tsang informs us that they were considered to be untouchables and had to live outside the village. But the fact that they are frequently informed of the land grants by the Pāla rulers shows that numerically they constituted a sizable section of the village population. This also held good of the aboriginal tribes Mečas and Āndhras who are mentioned in the land grants along with the Caṇḍālas.

The grants mention karanikas, a class of scribes who are now represented by their descendants Karaṇa Kāyasthas in North Bihar. They seem to have been allied to their compatriots in North Bengal, where lived the karaṇa kāyastha Sandhyākara Nandin, the author of the Rāmacarita. Karnakas were also employed for drafting inscriptions by the Gāhādavāla rulers, and one of these, karaṇika Ṭhakkura Viśvarūpa, is mentioned in their Maner-grant. Some Karaṇa kāyasthas acted as ministers, and the case of Śridharadāsa, a minister of Vigrahapāla, may be cited.

Another caste that practised writing as a profession seems to have been that of Vaidyas (physicians), who appear in Bihar for the first time under the Pālas. Inscriptions at Gayā mention three Vaidyas acting as composers of pralastis (eulogies). One of them is a veterinary surgeon (vājī-vaidya) and the other two ordinary Vaidyas. Thus the Vaidyas of the Gayā area seem to have been a highly educated section of the community.

The early medieval society of Bihar furnishes instances of social mobility and integration. It has been shown how peoples of humbler origins were raised to the status of Kshatriyas once they had captured political power. We
may add that villages granted to the Brāhmaṇas on the fringe of the Chotanagpur plateau—such as in south Monghyr—may have helped the spread of the Brāhmaṇical way of life among the tribal people. In the developed areas the Meḍas, Andhras and Caṇḍālas, who were originally tribal elements, were admitted to the Brāhmaṇical social order as junior partners occupying the lowest ranks in society. The fact that several tribal goddesses were given respectable place in the Hindu pantheon suggests the incorporation of the aborigines in the Hindu system on a large scale. Unfortunately direct records of this fascinating process are not available.

A major factor which worked for the social integration and wide intercourse not only between different sections of Bihar, but also between Bihar and other parts of the country was the visit of princes, nobles, officials and ordinary folk to the religious towns of Nālandā and Gayā. Numerous seals of post-Gupta time found at Nālandā and inscriptions found at Gayā bear witness to this process of mutual intercourse. In some cases pilgrims and devotees came from the farthest corner of the country; the example of a devotee from Nagarahāra is wellknown. Whether the restrictions on interdining could be observed in these places of pilgrimage is doubtful. In any case we have no instances of inter-marriage.

Another factor that brought the peoples of distant regions was service in the Pāla army. From the 8th century onwards the Pāla records invariably mention the Oḍras, Hūṇas, Khasas, Kulikas, Kāṛṇātas, Mālavas and Lāṭas who served the Pālas as retainers and soldiers. They may have been absorbed locally and may have introduced some of their manners and customs. Perhaps so many peoples of different regions are not mentioned in the records of other contemporary ruling dynasties.
In pre-Pāla times women were evidently important in public affairs, for the names of the queens are mentioned in the genealogical tables of the Later Guptas, Maukharis, Vardhanas, and also of the Pratihāras in their only copperplate grant found in Dīghwa-Dubaulī in Chapra. They are, however, not mentioned in Pāla genealogies, which suggests that women in ruling families suffered in position under them. This might suggest that while some matrilineal traces persisted among the pre-Pāla dynasties, the Pālas were completely a patrilineal people among whom name of the queens was not mentioned. In contemporary times the position was quite different in Orissa, where women played an important part in administration probably because of the tribal background. In Bihar, however, many votive records donated by women, mostly from the merchant class, belong to Pāla times, which shows that Vaiśya women did not lose in importance.

We have no means to find out the forms of marriage and various practices and rituals connected with it.

Some women of higher varnas seem to have been highly educated. In Mithilā, Bhārati, the wife of Māndana Mīśra gave defeat in philosophical disputation to no less a scholar than the famous Śaṅkarācārya of South India. But we do not hear of any women teachers in the universities of Nālandā or Vikramaśilā.

Some of the aboriginal goddesses were made members of the Brāhmanical pantheon, which might imply some infiltration of the matrilineal practices in Hindu society. Women could be freely initiated in the Tantric rituals which were not considered to be the monopoly of any caste or class. But the introduction of erotic element in these practices degraded the position of women. Some of the curious practices such as the worship of the female organ
which continued in Mithilā till recent times seem to have originated in this period.

(II). PRE-PĀLA ECONOMY

For lack of sources, epigraphic and particularly literary, our knowledge of economic life of Bihar in post-Gupta times has to be vague and fragmentary. We have some information about the land system but less than nothing about trade and industry.

A striking feature of land system was the existence of agrahāras, which were granted by the king for religious and educational purposes. It is claimed that the Later Gupta king Dāmodara Gupta, who flourished in the sixth century A. D., created one hundred agrahāras.¹⁹ In the first half of the following century the monastery of Nālandā was maintained out of the revenues of about one hundred villages²⁰; in the second half this number seems to have risen to two hundred.²¹ We have also an instance of a prosperous village being given to goddess Bhāvānī²² and of another village being granted to some priests,²³ but in Bihar the lion’s share of gift villages during this period was held by the Buddhist monasteries.

Monasteries lived on revenues realised from the tenants, but they also got a portion of land in the gift villages cultivated by others. I-ṣing indicates the nature of tenure on which the cultivators were assigned land. According to him, the Saṅgha provided the bulls and fields, and generally received one-sixth of the produce.²⁴ It implies that seeds, manure and other equipment for agriculture were provided by the tenants, who could retain 5/6 of the produce. Here the tenants of the monasteries appear in a favourable light in contrast to these under the king who was entitled to 1/6 of the produce and yet not under the obligation of supplying bulls to the peasants. However, under the monastery the
tenants probably were no better than semi-serfs, on the other hand under the king they enjoyed occupancy rights. But we are not quite sure whether I-tsing represents the correct state of affairs or idealises the land system under the monasteries.

Some idea of the village economy in Bihar during the period can be had from the two spurious Copper Plates of Samudra Gupta, which are assigned to the 7-8th century. According to them, an important obligation imposed on the donee (agrahārika) was not to introduce any tax-paying peasants and artisans from another village into his gift village. On account of various exemptions from royal exactions granted to the inhabitants of gift villages it was natural that the peasants of the neighbouring villages would be tempted to migrate to the agraḥāras. But if such a practice was allowed, it would not only deprive the state of revenues but would also disrupt the self-sufficient economy of the village in which they lived. Hence the restriction served to maintain the self-sufficient economy of the village.

An important activity that may have contributed to the progress of agriculture was the digging of tanks by some Later Gupta rulers. The lady Koṇadevī of that dynasty constructed several tanks, some in the Mandar Hill area, apparently out of religious considerations, but it may have been of some help in irrigating the neighbouring lands. She also set up a monastery, but we have no indication of other economic activities undertaken by the rulers during this period.

The old crafts possibly continued during the period. Building activities provided employment to a considerable number of artisans, as can be inferred from continuous building work (of bricks) at Nālandā during the period. The other two important crafts were seal-making and
working in copper. Numerous votive seals of kings and officials discovered at Nalanda show that the craft was practised by skilled artisans of the town. The same seems to be true of working in copper, which can be inferred from the copper-plates of the period. Images of the period show that image-making was another craft in pre-Pala Bihar.

Of trade and industry our sources give no indication during this period. No coins have been discovered; this shows that there was not much use of money.

The most important town of the period was Nalanda which is described as an opulent and prosperous city in an inscription of the period. Its main source of income was the offerings made by the devout votaries who visited it from different parts of the country.

(III) ECONOMIC LIFE UNDER THE PALAS

The Pala copper-plate inscriptions throw some light on the village economy of Bihar. The village consisted of various kinds of land, low (garta), barren (ushara), and land under occasional flood (tala). Curiously enough there is no mention of irrigated land, which suggests that there was not much of artificial irrigation in the province. Agriculture naturally depended on rains.

Cattle-rearing was an important source of livelihood, for the pasture land meant for cattle (gocara) is mentioned in several grants. It seems that the king also possessed considerable animal wealth, and an officer looked after cows, buffaloes, goats, sheep, etc. Either these were received as tributes or maintained by the Pala king. In any case it is clear that cattle constituted one of the important resources of the villagers.

Other resources of the village included reservoirs of water, and various kinds of trees such as mango, mahua, 24-II
which were certainly of considerable economic value. The Candella land grants mention some cash crops, but not the Pāla grants.

We further find that the limits of the villages granted are not specified, although they are granted together with their boundaries (spastmā)." Probably the idea is that the grantee would extend the limits of the village by bringing the pasture ground or the shrub (ṭṛṇa) area under cultivation.

In this period also many villages were granted according to the tenure of bringing virgin land under cultivation (bhūmicchidranīya), which was prevalent from Gupta times onwards. But the use of the term seems to be a solecism, for the village was already inhabited by the Brāhmaṇas, Elders, Caṇḍālas, etc., the transfer of the village could, however, enable the priestly grantees to extend cultivation in the neighbouring areas and thus expand the boundaries of the village.

We have five copper-plate grants of the Pālas in Bihar embracing ten villages granted by the kings to priests and temples. In one case Devapāla granted four villages to the Nālandā Vihāra at the request of king Bālapurtradeva of Suvarṇadvīpa. If the monastery continued to hold the villages from the 7th century, it would appear that its landed property increased in the 8th century.

Besides whole villages, their parts were also granted to temples and priests. This can be inferred from the fact that of the four villages granted to the Nālandā monastery by Devapāla the portions allotted to Devas and Brāhmaṇas were exempted.

Thus villages and their portions held by priests, temples and monasteries, and exempt from taxes, formed an important category. But majority of villages, seem to have been in temporal hands,
The material condition of the peasants is difficult to describe. We have no indication of the amount of burden imposed on them by way of bhāga, bhaga, kara and hiranya, or of the exactions made by the regular and irregular troops in the course of their march through the village. It seems that the peasants in temporal villages were subjected to forced labour of various kinds (sarpaṭīḍa), exemption from which was granted to villages made over to priests and temples. This practically reduced them to the position of semi-serfs. In the villages given to grantees sometimes they practised sub-feudation. A Brāhmaṇa officer Gaṅṭūṣā, described as a servant of the king granted land, with the permission of Vīgrahapāla II (1055-70), out of his own possession (hala) in Tīrabhukti. Such a practice shows that the grantees enjoyed rights of ownership over the villages and their peasants. We could not say whether the peasants were better off under the grantees. It is true that the state gave up its claims to several taxes and judicial fines, but these were apparently resigned in favour of the grantees, who being men on the spot, may have come down heavily upon the peasants. On the other hand in the absence of strong coercive power some grantees may have found it difficult to realise taxes from the villages under them.

We have no means to find out the state of crafts in Pāla times. The bronze images of Nālandā, and particularly Kurkihar, suggest that between 9th and 11th centuries A. D. the Pāla rule in south Bihar was distinguished by a considerable amount of bronze working of high quality. Buddhist images of bronze, made in large numbers, provided employment to numerous smiths. Probably the main reason for a leap in bronze-working during the period was the wider use of iron, which facilitated the cutting, etc., of bronze images. Utensils also may
have been made in large numbers, but they have not been recovered in any quantity. The existence of a large number of Pāla sculptures, mainly religious in character shows the existence of a flourishing stone carving craft.

Bihar carried on some internal trade in Pāla times, but there is no idea of its volume or the commodities involved in it. As customs officer, the saulkika levied duties from trader. The tarika or tarapatika may have something to do with trade by way of regulating ferry and river transport. Perhaps coins were also used in trade, for it is stated that a tank was constructed at Gayā for one thousand drammas. But except one silver coin of Vīrāhāpāla II and a gold coin attributed to Devapāla no coins have come to light so far. This would suggest lesser use of money, and hence mainly trade by barter. It is significant that drammas belong to the reign of Dharmapāla, an early Pāla king. Neither in epigraphs nor in literary sources later kings are associated with the use of coins.

There is no indication of towns specialising in trade and commerce in Pāla times. Nālandā, Bodh-Gayā, Kurkihar and Uddandapuri (in Bihar sharif town) were monastery or religious towns. Mudgagiri (Monghyr), was an important military camp or occasional capital, but there is nothing to show that any of these towns was important on account of crafts and commerce. Towns seem to have been mainly religious or military establishments or both.

The material remains of the Pāla period are impressive; Patna, Gaya, Monghyr and south Bhagalpur are practically littered with them. In fact no other period of pre-Muslim history of Bihar has left so much of material survivals in the form of fortresses, monasteries, images, etc., as Pāla period. At least ten fortresses, now known as gāḍhas, belong to the Pāla period. But few sites have been excavated, and they surely hold prospects of welcome light on
economic life when this is done. Mean-while we could only say that the Pāla period witnessed a remarkable building activity in Bihar. Whether this is an indication of their higher material standard cannot be said unless we know more.
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CHAPTER XXXVIII

Education, Literature and Science
(from 550 to 1200 A.D.)

It has been reviewed earlier that the Buddhist system of education was one of the most important systems prevalent in this state. Royal patronage helped some of the existing monasteries of this state to rise into big residential monastic colleges as Universities like Nālandā, Vikramaśilā and Oddaṇṭapuri. Due to their being the most developed and widely known centres for Buddhist learning, they attracted Buddhist scholars not only from different parts of India but also from far off countries in Asia.

NĀLANDĀ

When Hsuan Tsang came to India in the first half of the seventh century A. D., Nālandā had grown to a full-fledged residential university. "The king of the country remitted the revenues of about 100 villages for the endowments of the convent." In I-tsing's time "the lands in its possession" bestowed upon the monastery by kings of many generations 'contained more than 200 villages.' Besides these literary evidences, we have epigraphical references about gifts made to the Nālandā monastery. For example, an inscription states that a minister of king Yaśovarmadeva, made various gifts to the monks of Nālandā, provided for their daily food, and purchased the Vihāra and its accessories by giving their price, and redonated them. Next followed the benefactions of the Pāla kings. There is inscription which refers to the construction of a monastery at Nālandā by Bālaputradeva, king of Suvarṇa-dvīpa (Sumātrā), and the grant by king Devapāladeva of five villages for the maintenance of this monastery at his
request conveyed to the Pāla king by his ambassador named Balavarman.\textsuperscript{4} Out of the income of these estates the University provided for all its alumni free of cost their four requisites, viz., clothes, food, bedding and medicine. The number of the resident-scholars in Hsuan Tsang’s time "always reached the number of 10,000", including the priests belonging to the convent or strangers residing therein.\textsuperscript{5} During the time of I-tsing,\textsuperscript{8} the number of the residents appears to have been reduced though 'exceeded 3000.'

The University area was marked off by a lofty enclosing wall with one gate. The gate opened into the great college from which were separated eight other halls, standing in the middle of the Saṃghārāma.\textsuperscript{7} The Saṃghārāmas were three to four storeys high, and their lofty height and grandeur are repeatedly mentioned by Hsuan Tsang.\textsuperscript{9} These observations of Hsuan Tsang are corroborated by the Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśovarman of the 8th century A. D.\textsuperscript{6} It mentions "She (Nālandā) had a row of Vihāras, the line of whose tops touched the sky,.....Nālandā (was full of the) heaps of the rays of the Caityas shining and bright like white clouds...."

Regarding the Nālandā monastery I-tsing\textsuperscript{10} (who came here more than forty years after the return of Hsuan Tsang) also writes, "There are eight halls and three hundred apartments in this monastery'. The archaeological excavations so far have laid bare about eleven monasteries at Nālandā. The monastery-site no. 1 seems to be the oldest. These monasteries at Nālandā give us a good idea of the rooms in which the bhikshus stayed. The monasteries form a rectangle and contain many small cells which vary slightly in size but average some ten feet square. Some of these are single-seated and some double-seated with one or two benches of stone provided for sleeping. Each room also shows a niche to hold a lamp and another to hold
books. Ovens of large sizes have also been unearthed, showing the common kitchen and the mess of the monks in the monastery.\textsuperscript{11} All these go to show that there was an elaborate arrangement of boarding and lodging for the students of the monasteries.

About the teaching and scholarship of the Nālandā University, Hsuan Tsang writes,\textsuperscript{13} "In the establishment were some thousands of Brethren, all men of great ability and learning, several hundreds being highly esteemed and famous; the Brethren were strict in observing the precepts and regulations of their Order; they were looked upon as models all over India; learning and discussing they found the day too short; day and night they admonished each other, juniors and seniors mutually helping to perfection. If among them were any who did not talk of the mysteries of the Tripitaka, such persons, being ashamed, lived aloof. Hence foreign students came to the establishment to put an end to their doubts and then became celebrated, and those who stole the name (of Nālandā Brother) were all treated with respect wherever they went."\textsuperscript{13} There was a great rush for admission to the University.\textsuperscript{14} According to a Tibetan account,\textsuperscript{14} Nālandā was maintaining a splendid library to meet the needs of the hundreds of teachers and thousands of students who were engaged in the study of different sciences. The library quarter was known as Dharmagañja, "Mart of Religion." It was located in three splendid buildings appropriately called Ratnasāgara, Ratnodadhi and Ratna-ranījaka respectively. In Ratnodadhi, which was nine-storeyed, there were the sacred scripts called Prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra and Tāntrik works such as Samāja-guhyā, etc.

The University was a corporate institution and had its own seal or monogram. The upper field of the seal is
taken by the wheel of the law flanked by a deer. This was the device of the deer park where the Buddha first set the Dharmacakra or the wheel of the law in motion. They would vouch for the genuineness of the documents and might have also been affixed to the certificates 'Praśamsā' or 'Pramāṇa-patras', which the various educational establishments at Nālandā gave to the scholars, to distinguish them from frauds of which Hsuan Tsang has spoken in his accounts. Besides the Mahāvihāra, other vihāras of Nālandā had also seals of different types with legends such as Sandhekuṭe-Vāsika-Bhikshu Samgha.

VIKRAMĀŚILĀ

Like Nālandā, the University of Vikramāśilā was also the result of royal benefactions. We know nothing about its origin either from the accounts of Hsuan Tsang or from I-tsing. This shows that Vikramāśilā came into existence after them. We owe its history to Tāranātha's well-known work which states that king Dharmapāla founded Śrī Vikramāśilā Vihāra on a suitable side of a hillock on the bank of the Gangā in Magadha. He endowed Vikramāśilā with rich grants, fixing regular allowances for the maintenance of priests and students. The University building was surrounded by walls. There was a central hall, called the House of Science. It had six gates which opened on its six colleges, each having one hundred and eight professors. There was also a large open space in between the six colleges which could hold an assembly of 8,000 persons. There was a Dharmāśāla at the gate outside the wall of the University, where strangers arriving late after the closing of the gate were sheltered.

The gates of the University were guarded by the most erudite of its scholars called dvāra-pāṇḍitas, who had specialised in particular subjects. Students desirous of entering
the University had to appear before the duṣṭa-pāṇḍita who used to test the merits and intelligence of each student. According to Tāranātha, Prajnāpāramitā was in charge of the southern gate, Ratnākaraśānti of the eastern, Vāgīsvarakīrti of the second central gates were in charge of Ratnavajra and Jñānaśrīmitra respectively, during the reign of Caṇaka or Nāyāpāla. The object of such hard tests was evidently to discourage promiscuous admission of students into the colleges of this University. Besides these duṣṭa-pāṇḍitas, we have references to many other distinguished scholars of Vikramaśila. It is interesting to note that like the present day convocations, we find degrees and titles being given to the Vikramaśila students by the reigning kings. Tibetan authorities inform us that Jetūri and Ratnavajra had received degrees at the hands of king Mahīpāla and Caṇaka (Nāyāpāla) respectively. Dīpankaraśrījñāna was closely associated with this University before his departure to Tibet. As a student he had received instructions from Jetūri, as scholar of the Vikramaśila University.

ODDAṬAPURĪ

Oddaṭapuri was another Buddhist educational institution in Magadha famous for its Tāntric study. It was founded by Gopāla, the first ruler of the Pāla dynasty, in the 8th century A.D. The site of the monastery has been generally identified with the modern town of Biharshariff, the head quarters of the Bihar sub-division of the Patna district (Now of the Nalanda district). The Oddaṭapuri Vihāra had the distinction of the association of Mahārakshita, and Śīlarakshita from whom Dīpankaraśrījñāna had received sacred vows. Dīpankaraśrījñāna also on his return from Suvarṇadvīpa and Ceylon was appointed the high priest of the Oddaṭapuri Vihāra besides that of the Vikramaśila Vihāra.
TILĀDHAKA

Tilāḍha or Tilāḍhaka was another famous monastery in Magadha, which is referred to by both Hsuan Tsang and I- tsing. Hsuan Tsang tells us a good deal about the splendour of the Tilāḍhaka monastery. He writes, “This establishment, erected by the last descendant of king Bimbisāra, had four courts with three-storeyed halls, lofty terraces and a succession of open passages. It was the rendezvous of eminent scholars who flocked to it from all regions. The Brethren in it, all Mahāyānists, were above 1,000 in number”. This shows that the monastery was in a flourishing condition. We further learn from Hsuan Tsang that this monastery was under the control of a renowned priest named Prajñābhadra. I- tsing mentions another scholar named Jñānacandra who lived in that monastery during his visit. According to I- tsing it was two yojanas distant from Nālandā, and it has been identified with the modern village, Tillara, or Telhare west of Nālandā, near Ekangarsarai on Futwah-Islampur Light Railway.

PHULLAHARI

There was another monastery at Phullahari and its hermitage is frequently referred to as a place where several famous Buddhist Ācāryas lived, and Sanskrit texts were translated into Tibetan in collaboration with Tibetan scholars. It was situated in Magadha. Majumdar thinks that it was somewhere near Monghyr, but the Biography of the Buddhist Tibetan scholar Dharmasvāmin shows that it was in the forest north of Nālandā.  The Blue Annals also places it in the vicinity of Nālandā.

The foregoing accounts show that the Buddhistic system of education was predominant in Bihar during the period under review and there were many famous monastic
educational centres, some of which had developed into international centres of learning.

In the early period the Buddhist monasteries denied admission to the following classes of people. One affected with the five diseases, viz., leprosy, boils, dry leprosy, consumption and fits; one who was in the royal service; a proclaimed robber; or one who had broken out of jail; one who had been punished with scourging or branding; a debtor; a slave; anybody under fifteen years of age; an eunuch; and one deformed in person or any of whose limbs was cut off. Those who were exempted had to pass through the ceremonies of Pabbajjā and Upasampadā.

In course of time when the Buddhist monasteries began to admit advanced students who did not desire to be ordained as monks, the system of admission was modified. Thus, at Nālandā and Vikramaśilā monasteries the students were admitted by the daṇḍa-paṇḍitas or gatekeepers (one at Nālandā and six at Vikramaśilā). Hsuan Tsang has described how a student desiring admission had to undergo hard tests including taking part in discussions. The tests were so severe that only two or three candidates out of ten eventually succeeded in getting admission into the University. But even though the standard of admission was so high there was still a great rush for admission to these Universities. The severity of the examination was necessary to maintain the high standard of learning for which the Universities were so famous.

The Chinese travellers, while describing the general condition of India, furnish us with some idea of the curricula of studies in vogue in the monastic institutions. Hsuan Tsang says that children began by learning the alphabet and the Siddhirastu, a primer of twelve chapters. At the age of seven they began to study the following five vidyās:—(i) Šabda-vidyā (Grammar), (ii) Šilpasthāna-vidyā
(Arts and Crafts), (iii) Cikitsā-vidyā (Medicine), (iv) Hetuvidyā (Logic), (v) Ādhyātma-vidyā (Philosophy). I-tsing\textsuperscript{40} gives more details. According to him the name for the general secular literature in India was Vyākaraṇa of which there were about five works, similar to the classics of the Divine Land (China), namely.

(1) The Siddha—composition for beginners known as Siddhirastu, signifying 'Be there success for so named is the first section of this small book of learning'.

(2) The Sūtra—the Sūtra is the foundation of all grammatical science. It contains 1,000 ślokas and is the work of Pāṇini. Children began to learn the Sūtra when they were eight years old and could repeat it in eight months' time.

(3) The book on Dhātu—It consisted of 1,000 ślokas and treated particularly grammatical rules.

(4) The book on the three Khilas—Khila means 'waste land', and is so called because this part of grammar may be likened to the way in which a farmer prepares his field for corn.

(5) The Vṛtti-sūtra (Kāśikāvṛtti)—This is a commentary on the foregoing sūtras (i.e., Pāṇini's sūtra). It cites the text of the sūtra, and explains minutely its manifold meaning, consisting altogether of 18000 ślokas. The boys began to study this commentary at the age of fifteen, and finished it in five years.

Thus it seems to have been a long course of grammatical study of Sanskrit language. The boys began to learn it from the age of six till they were twenty, which was a preliminary to the study of higher subjects. This system of education continued for a long time. In course of time, when the Buddhist monasteries became centres of higher knowledge and specialisation it is found that the subjects of teaching became diversified gradually.
At the University of Nalanda, we find that the courses of study covered a wide range. Almost all knowledge both Brahmanical and Buddhist, sacred and secular, philosophy and logic were taught there. For instance as stated in ‘Life,’ the students at Nalanda “study the Great Vehicle, and also the works belonging to the eighteen sects, and not only so, but even ordinary works, such as the Vedas and other books, the Hetuvidya, Sabdavidya, the Cikitsavidya, the works on magic or Atharvavidya, the Sāmkhya, and besides these, they thoroughly investigated the ‘Miscellaneous’ works.” Hsuan Tsang himself became a student of Nalanda for the study of the Yogaśāstra, in which Ślabhadra the Head of the Nalanda Mahāvihāra, was the highest living authority. His study of the Yogaśāstra was followed by the study of other subjects like Nyāya, Hetuvidya, Sabdavidya, and the like, as also of the books of the Brahmana with the wide area of knowledge covered by them including philological, legal, philosophical, astronomical subjects, and the Sanskrit Grammar of Pāṇini. The Vedas were taught at Nalanda as specialised subjects. It was also a great centre of Tantric studies. It appears from the records of Hsuan Tsang’s biographer that there was an astronomical observatory at Nalanda and that astronomy formed a part of the students’ curricula.

The courses of study were perhaps less comprehensive at Vikramaśilā than at Nalanda. The most important branch of learning taught here was the Tantra. Next to the Tantra were Grammar, Metaphysics and Logic. Unfortunately there is no information about the duration or gradation of the course at Vikramaśila, but it is quite likely that it was more systematically organised here than at any other centre of ancient Indian education. For, unlike any other monastic college, we find diplomas and titles being given to the Vikramaśilā students at the end of their course
by the reigning king of the country. On the walls of the University were painted images of Pāṇḍitas eminent for their learning and character.

The Buddha had framed a set of rules for observance by a Buddhist monk or a novice which constituted the basis of a monk's life in the monasteries, and were in the main observed also in the great educational institutions in the Pāla period. There were elaborate rules for begging, eating and clothing for the bhikshus. In addition to the rules for the regulation of daily lives there were elaborate rules for the maintenance discipline which the novices had to observe. The novice had to live a life of strict discipline under a teacher. He had to keep the ten precepts, viz., abstinence from destroying life, stealing, impurity, lying, intoxicating liquor, eating at forbidden times, dancing, singing, use of garlands and scents, high beds and accepting gold and silver.

He was expelled from the fraternity, if he violated any of the first five precepts or if spoke against the Buddha, the Dharma and the Samgha or if he held false doctrines or had sexual intercourse with Bhikshunis. In five other cases he was liable to be punished. The punishment could be inflicted by any bhikshu, with the consent of the Upajjhāya.

A high standard of discipline was maintained in the residential University of Nālandā. Hsuan Tsang has recorded that "during the seven centuries of its history", there did not occur a single case of "a guilty rebellion" against the institution. This was mainly due to the fact that even important matters like the residential arrangements of the University were left to be administered by its students who decided the annual assignment of rooms to boarders. Discipline was left to the students, as their own concern. They were to decide the trial and punishment of offences against the fraternity, and also the expulsion of
recalcitrants. According to I-tsing, the rules and regulations governing life in the monasteries were more strict at Nalanda than elsewhere.

Ancient Indian educational institutions have been renowned for the close student-teacher relationship and monasteries are no exception to it. Mahavagga mentions that the novice was to live for the first ten years in absolute dependence upon his Upajjha. The Vinaya text gives in detail the relation between Upajjha (teacher) and the Siddhivivara (the taught). According to it, the teacher was to consider his pupil as a son while the pupil was to consider his teacher as a father. Suttanipata states that, "one should serve one's preceptor just as the Devas serve Indra." This shows that there was spiritual and personal relationship. A student helped his teacher by doing a variety of manual work. The pupil was not to accept presents or wait on any one else or go out, without the permission of the preceptor. If the preceptor was sick, he was to wait upon him and nurse him diligently. The preceptor too had corresponding duties. He had to observe a strict conduct towards his pupils and afford spiritual help to them by teaching, by putting questions to them, by exhortation and by instruction. The preceptor should serve the pupils during the period of the latter's illness.

In this way we find that the relation between the teacher and the student in the monastery was filial in character; they were united together with mutual reverence, confidence and affection. The teacher was to teach the student the rules of etiquette and discipline, to draw his particular attention to the vow of chastity, poverty and abstinence from pleasure and to help him in his intellectual and spiritual progress by suitable discourses and lessons in the mornings and afternoons.
He was also to help him in getting food and robes and even to nurse him if he was sick. This relationship was inaugurated by religious ceremonies called Pabbajjā and Upasampadā. The pupil became a member of the monastery and was treated by the teacher in every way as his son. The constant and intimate association between the teacher and the taught was a very vital factor in the educational process of the monastery. The pupil was thus able to imbibe the inward method of the teacher. The duty of the pupil in doing the personal work of the teacher had its own educative value. This had the effect of training the pupil in self-help and the dignity of labour and service to his fellow students were inculcated in him. The outdoor life and robust physical exercise which their duties involved were fruitful in every way.

We get a fairly good idea of the administration of the Nālandā and the Vikramaśilā Universities from the accounts of foreign travellers and Tibetan manuscripts. The whole establishment used to be in charge of a famous abbot (bhikshu). He was usually elected by the members of the Saṅgha. Character, scholarship and seniority were the factors usually taken into consideration. Sometimes, the Head of the institution was nominated by the king of the country. In the ninth century A.D., a monk scholar from Jalalabad, (Nagarahāra) who was on a pilgrimage to Bihar, was appointed Principal of the University of Nālandā by king Devapāla.8 This also shows that there existed international cultural co-operation.

We get from Tāranātha,8 a detailed account of the management of the Vikramaśilā University. The Head of the University used to be assisted by two councils, one academic and the other administrative. The academic council consisting of eminent teachers used to regulate admission, determine courses and assign work to different
teachers. It is further stated that this council of Vikramasālī also administered the affairs of Nālandā. If we accept his statement, it must be admitted that a spirit of co-operation prevailed between these sister Universities. Both were directly under king Dharmapāla who might have asked the academic council of the new University to watch over the older University. Sometimes we find men like Dīpankaraśrī jñāna and Abhyākara Gupta working in both the Universities. We, however, have no definite information whether the affairs of the Nālandā University were later on conducted under the direction of the pagītas of Vikramasālī. The administrative council was in charge of the general administration. Construction and repairs of buildings, distribution of food, clothes and medicine, allotment of rooms in hostels and assignments of monastic work fell within its purview.

We have already seen that the Buddhist Universities of Bihar had attained great reputation because of the high standard of teaching and the unimpeachable discipline and organisation prevalent there. These Universities not only imparted education in different subjects and stimulated discussion and research, but also took active part in the spread of Buddhism and Buddhist philosophical schools in the country. These Buddhist Universities (located in Bihar) had in fact became the cultural centres of India due to their high standard of learning. These institutions represented the country as a whole because they had students and teachers from all over the country. For example, at Nālandā University Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu were from Peshawar,61 Dīnāga hailed from the south62 while the scholars, Guṇamati and Sthiramati, from Valabhi,63 Dharmapāla also hailed from the south, and was a native of Kāñcipuram.64 Also majority of the scholars of Vikramasālī were from different parts of India. For example,
Jetâri was a native of Varendra. Ratnavajra was from Kashmir, Vâgîśvara hailed from Banaras, and thus most of these scholars who were natives of different and distant parts of India flocked to the Nâlandâ and the Vikramaśilâ Universities to complete their studies and become teachers. They built up the reputation of these places as seats of learning. There were no provincial restrictions.

Their fame of learning also attracted a large number of foreign scholars, who came here in search of learning. This movement began with Fa-Hsien who came here in the company of scholars like Hwuy-king, Tao-Ching, Hwuy-Ying, and Hwuy-Wei in the beginning of the fifth century A. D., continued under the stimulating success attending the missions of Hsuan Tsang and I-tsing. We have references to an early Chinese mission in Magadha on whose request Paramârtha was sent to China by the king of Magadha, where the former undertook the translation into Chinese of the manuscripts which he had brought with him. We learn from I-tsing that, between Hsuan Tsang and his own visit in the interval of about forty years, as many as fifty-six foreign scholars visited India from China and Korea, most of whom came to Nâlandâ for study. They came through the northern route (by land) as well as the southern route (by sea). I-tsing himself came to India by the southern sea route. He stayed at Nâlandâ for some time.

We know of one early traveller from Tibet who came to India and studied at Nâlandâ. He was Thonmi. It is said that Hsuan Tsang came to Nâlandâ just at the time when Thonmi was staying there. Thonmi after thoroughly studying the Indian alphabet and Sanskrit language returned to Tibet and created the thirty letters of Tibetan alphabet on the basis of the Indian alphabet. We have on record another Tibetan monk Nag-tsho who was
deputed to Vikramaśilā by his king for the purpose of inducing its great scholar, Atiśa, to go to Tibet and organise Buddhist preachings in that country. After his arrival at the monastery in the night, he heard prayers in Tibetan and he was taken by a Tibetan monk to the Tibetan House meant for the residence of the students from that country. There he met a senior Tibetan monk, Gyat-son. This shows that Vikramaśilā was a place where a large number of Tibetan monks were studying and for whom separate residential arrangements had been made.

The work of the Buddhist Universities was not confined to the teaching of students (both from the country and outside) who were within its precincts. They sent out scholars and preachers to other countries like Tibet, China and Ceylon. These scholars propagated Buddhism, established monasteries, spread the knowledge of Sanskrit language and translated Sanskrit books into the local languages. Thus these scholars were the active agents in the spread of Indian religion and culture in the far off countries, triumphing over the hazards of difficult climates and paths. Work in this direction had already been initiated by scholars like Kumārajīva and Guṇavarman even before Nālandā started developing into a University. Later on a large number of scholars from Nālandā as well as from Vikramaśilā went to foreign countries to preach the message of Lord Buddha. It was they who contributed largely to the building up of the Greater India beyond the Indian sub-continent. The Tibetan Tripitaka mentions the contributions made by the works and scholars of Nālandā in building up the culture and civilisation of the country.

Among the scholars who went to Tibet from Nālandā were Śāntarakshita and Padmasambhava. They are regarded as the pioneers in the propagation of Buddhism
in Tibet. Works of scholars such as Āryadeva, Śīlabhadra, Dharmapāla, Candragomin, Sthiramati, are found in Tibetan manuscripts. The most distinguished scholar of the Vikramāsilā University, who went to Tibet on the invitation of the king of Tibet was Atiśa, Dīpankaraśrījñāna.

Scholars from Bihar also visited Central Asia and China. They were Dharmakshema, Paramārtha, Prabhākara-mitra, Subhākara Singh, Vajrabodhi, Dharmacandra, Dharmadeva and Budhakīrti. Thus it is clear that the Buddhist Universities (of Bihar) were not only the centres of education, but they were also important centres for the propagation of Indian culture and art in other countries.

(II) LITERATURE

There was a pronounced development in the field of literature during the period under review. The Buddhist Universities at Nalanda and Vikramāsilā of this state were the main centres for the progress of this cause. Sanskrit was adopted by the Buddhists as the medium of their literature. But it has been found that the common people used popular dialects, as we find the Siddhas who flourished during this period preaching in Apabhramśa or simply Bhāṣā, born of the Sanskrit-Pāli-Prākṛta hybrid composition.

Of the great panditas of Nalanda, the name of Dharmapāla is famous. We have somewhat definite information about his date. He was a native of south India and belonged to a minister's family. He left his home in search of truth and at last came to Nalanda, and got himself ordained to the Buddhist monastery and acquired great distinction and subsequently he became the Head of the University. He must have retired from Nalanda before 635 A.D. because when Hsuan Tsang visited it, he found that Śīlabhadra had succeeded him. He might have been
dead or retired by then. He is said to be a contemporary of the great Bhartṛhari and wrote the śloka portion of the Vedāṅṛtti in collaboration with him.¹⁷ He wrote treatise on Etymology, Logic and Metaphysics of Buddhism.¹⁸ The following other books,¹⁹ Álambana-pratyayā-dhyāna-śastra-vyākhyā, Vidyāmātra-siddhi-śastra-vyākhyā, Śata-śastra-vaiipulya-vyākhyā, Valitattva samgraha—are also ascribed to him.

Śīlabhadra, who succeeded Dharmapāla as the pañḍita of the University, was equally famous among the Nālandā pañḍitas. Like his predecessor Śīlabhadra too, was from outside Bihar and was perhaps from Samataṭa,²⁰ and a Brāhmaṇa by caste. At Nālandā he was initiated into the principles of Buddhism by Dharmapāla. In his youth he is said to have defeated in śastra-rtha a heretic of south India, who had dared to raise his head against Dharmapāla. As a reward for this most wonderful victory, the king (of Magadha) granted him the revenues of a village in spite of the persisting refusal of Śīlabhadra. But Śīlabhadra, a true Bhikshu, instead of keeping the revenues for his own personal use, built a vast and magnificent monastery.²¹ He was a great logician and master of Śastra, but unfortunately only one of his works is available, namely, Ārya-Buddhabhūmi-vyākhyāna, which is preserved in Tibet.²² As to his date, we are informed that when Hsuan Tsang came to Nālandā, he was the abbot of the monastery and had become pretty old at that time. Thus he may have flourished in the later part of the sixth and the first half of the seventh century A. D.

The name of Dharmakīrti²³ is famous in the realm of Buddhist philosophy. He was the son of a Brāhmaṇa from south India. From his very childhood, he had acquired great skill in the fine arts, Vedas and Vedāṅgas including grammar and in all the theories of the Tīrthas.
In course of time he joined Buddhist Saṅgha as a consequence of which he was later on made an outcast. Thereupon, he came to Nālandā. Here he attained great learning in the three Piṭakas and knew in all about 500 sūtras and dharaniṣ by heart. He is the author of numerous works on Logic and Yogācāra philosophy, such as Pramāṇavārttikā-kārikā, a commentary on the book Pramāṇa-samuccaya of Diṇnāga. He wrote a sub-commentary on the Pramāṇa-vārttikā-kārikā called Pramāṇa-vārttikā-vṛtti. Pramāṇa-viniścaya quoted by Mādhyavācārya is another work on logic by him. Besides these books, the following are also attributed to him: Nyāya-bindu, Hetu-bindu-vivaraṇa, Tarkanyāya or Vādanyāya, Santānāntara-siddhi, Sambandha-parikṣhā and Sambandha-parikṣhā-vṛtti, a commentary on the above by himself. He flourished in the middle of the seventh century A. D.

Tāranātha mentions the names of some other writers like Devendra-bodhi, Śākyabodhi, Vinitadeva, etc. who also contributed to Buddhist philosophy of Yogācāra. Their details are obscure. They might be attributed to the Nālandā University, where in the company of renowned scholars of the University they must have aspired to contribute to Buddhist literature. According to Vidyābhūṣaṇa all these writers flourished in between 650 to 700 A. D.

On Dharmakirti’s advice Devendra-bodhi wrote a commentary known as Pramāṇa-vārttikā-panjikā on Dharmakirti’s Pramāṇa-vārttikā. Śākyabodhi is stated to have been a pupil of Devendra-bodhi and Pramāṇa-vārttikā-tīkā is attributed to him. Vinitadeva is said to be the author of the following books on logic: Nyāyabindu-tīkā, Hetubindu-tīkā, Vādanyāya-vyākhya, Sambandha-parikṣhā-tīkā, Ālambana-parikṣhā-tīkā and Santānāntara-siddhi-tīkā.

Candra-gomin, another Buddhist monk and a native of Varendra, wrote commentary on Pāṇini’s Grammar
known as Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. According to Tāranātha he composed a large number of hymns and learned works. He composed some Tāntric Vajrayāna-sādhanā and some Sanskrit stotras on Tārā and Mañjuśrī. Of his poetical works we have only the Śiṣya-lekha-dharma-kāvyā. Nyāya-siddhyāloka is also attributed to him. His drama Lokananda has come down to us only in the Tibetan version. He lived in 700 A.D.

After Candragomin, Śāntideva is regarded as the most prominent writer of Nālandā. He has been identified as Bhusukapā of Nālandā. He flourished in the first half of the eighth century A.D. He is said to have composed three works namely Sūtra-samuccaya, Śikṣāsamuccaya and Bodhi-caryāvatāra. He is regarded as a writer of Mahāyāna philosophy and wrote a book on Buddhist Tāntrikism known as Śrī-Guhyā-samājaya-mahā-yoga-tantrāvalīvidhi. Besides the Sanskrit works on philosophy and Tāntrikism, he wrote a book, in early vernacular, known as Sahajagiti which is available in Tanjor. There is another book assigned to him and it is a commentary on Cākraśaṁvaratantra.

After Śāntideva the name of Śāntarakṣita is mentioned with high regard in the realm of Buddhist literature. Of his life we know very little. While he was a pāṇḍita in Nālandā he wrote a large volume of philosophical works known as Tattvasaṁgraha in which, from the standpoint of the Svatantriya Yogācāra school, he has criticised numerous other philosophical systems of his day, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. The Mādhyamakā-laṅkāra-kārikā, with the author's own commentary, is a shorter work of Śāntarakṣita. The other book Vādanāyāvṛtti-vipaścitārtha, an elaborate commentary on the Vādanāyāya of Dharmakīrti is also assigned to him. His age is assigned to the early eighth century A.D. and he hailed from Bihar.
Śāntarakshita’s pupil, Kamalaśīla, was a professor of Tantra at the Nālandā University, and has also contributed to the Buddhist literature. Books that are assigned to him are Nyāyabiddha-pūrva-paksha-samkṣipta, a summary of criticism on the Nyāyabindu of Dharmakīrti, and Tattva-saṁgrahapañjikā, a commentary on the Tattva-saṁgraha of Śāntarakṣita. Being a disciple and contemporary of Śāntarakṣita, Kamalaśīla must have lived between 720 and 780 A. D.

Besides the above mentioned scholars of Nālandā we know about others from the Vikramaśīla University; Jñānapāda, Vairocana, Jetāri, Ratnavajra, Ratnākarasānti and Dīpankaraśrījñāna are some of the most important among them for their contribution to Buddhist literature in the ninth to the twelfth century A. D.

Works of Jñānapāda are preserved in Tibet. Vairocana wrote several works in Sanskrit, such as Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā, Ratna-vāda-cakra etc. The works that are attributed to Jetāri are Hetu-tattva-upadeśa, Dharmādharmi-viniścaya and Bālavatara-tarka.

Ratnavajra had received the royal diploma at the Vikramaśīla University by the end of the tenth century A. D. Later on he was appointed there as a Gate-keeper (dvāra-pandita) of the University. He wrote a book on Buddhist philosophy known as Yukti-prayoga. While in Tibet, he is said to have translated into Tibetan a large number of Buddhist works of which a few are Mahāyāna-Sādhanas like Śrī-heruka-sādhana-nāma, Śrī-akshobhyavajrasādhana and other Tāntrika works.

Ratnākarasānti another Gate-keeper of the Vikramaśīla University was an author on Chanda (Prosody), called Chandaratnākara. About nine works of his on Buddhist philosophy are available in Tanjor, of which Vijñaptimātrai-siddhi and Antarvyāpti are the most important.
He also wrote a few poems in early vernacular, one of which is 'Sukha-duḥkha-dvaya-parityāgadṛṣṭi'.

Dīpaṅkaraśrīnjāna was a prolific writer. About 200 original works as well as translations have been attributed to him. They are mostly Vajrayānist works known as Sādhanā, but Sūtra works are also listed in the Bstan-hyur under his name. He composed the Abhisamaya of the Guhyasamāja in which Jig-rten baṅ-phyug (Lokeśvara) was the chief deity of the Maṇḍala of Guhyasamāja according to the system of Jñānapada. He translated many works with the assistance of Nag-tsho such as the Mahāyāna-Saṅgraha-bhāshya. He further composed the large and short Mādhyaṃkika-upadeśa and the Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa-nāma-Mādhyamakā-upadeśa. The Mahāyāna Uttara-tantra, composed by Asaṅga was translated by him.

Jñāna śrīmitra was another scholar of Vikramaśila. He was also a Gate-keeper of the Vikramaśilā University. He wrote books on Buddhist logic known as Kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva-siddhi, Tarka-bhāṣā and Praṃaṇa-viniscaya-ṭīkā, Abhayakaragupta was also a scholar of the Vikramaśilā University. In the reign of Rāmapāla he composed his great work ‘Munimatālaṅkāra’. He also composed the Vajrāvali, Vajrāvalināma-maṇḍalasādhana.

The discovery of some of the manuscripts of the Baudhāyaṇa-O-Dohā throws unexpected light on the state of Buddhist vernacular literature in eastern provinces of Bihar and Bengal. According to Sastri, these Dohās consist of three kinds of works—Cāryacāryaviniścaya, Dohā-kosha and Dakārṇava. As regards the language of these Dohās or songs, Bendall once stated that ‘they are in Apabhraṃśa language, but later on he revised his opinion and called it Buddha-Prākṛta Bhāṣā. This latter opinion could not satisfy him and he again changed his view and pointed out that the ‘Dohās are in Śuddha-Prākṛta’. In
spite of the revised version of Bendall about the language of the Dohākosha, Sastri is not inclined to accept his opinion and has pointed out that the language of these Dohākoshas is early Bengali-vernacular. He has stressed that most of the writers of these Dohākoshas were from Bengal. But Misra has tried to show the resemblance between the language of Dohākosha and old Maithili literature on the basis of palaeography, grammar and vocabulary. In his book 'Purātattvanibandhāvali', Sankritiyayana has claimed that most of the Siddhas (the writers of the Dohākoshas) were from Bihar and have written their songs in early Magadhi Hindi. In another book 'Hindi Kāvyādhāra', Sankritiyayana has tried to establish that these poems have nearest approach to early Hindi vernacular language. Jayaswal has admitted this fact that Cāryāgītas are old Maithili specimen or Magahi Hindi. It seems, in the beginning, the language of the people of eastern provinces (Bihar and Bengal) was the same. But in course of time distinct regional popular dialects developed. Such local languages were mostly used by common and low class people who had very little literary attainments. They were, therefore, not pure languages of the different localities and it is futile to regard them as particularly Magahi, Bengali or Maithili. Specimens of Maithili literature from 900-1200 A.D., are not many. The most extensive material which can be referred to as literature during 900-1200 A.D. is, however, found in the Bāuddha-Gāṇa-O-Dohā. As regards the subject-matter of the Bāuddha-Gāṇa-O-Dohās, Majumdar writes, "The subject-matter of these old Bengali Cāryā-padas is highly mystical, centering round the esoteric doctrines and erotic and Yogic theories and practices of the Sahājiya school of Buddhism."

Hindu philosophy also flourished in this period. Ācārya Māṇḍana Miśra was a great Mīmāṁsaka. He
hailed from Bihar and was the disciple of Kumārila.\textsuperscript{135} His time may fall in 800 A.D.\textsuperscript{136} His most important work is 'Brahma-Siddhi,' which is in both verse and prose. Many important works refer to Brahma-siddhi as written by Maṇḍana Miśra and it was commented on by many writers in later years. Among them Vācaspati Miśra’s Tattva-samīkṣhā\textsuperscript{137} is an important one. Maṇḍana Miśra’s other works are Bhāvanā-viveka, Vidhi-viveka, Vibhrama-viveka and Sphoṭa-siddhi. The Vidhi-viveka was commented upon by Vācaspati Miśra in his Nyāya-kanikā, and the Sphoṭa-siddhi was commented upon by the son of Bhavadāsa (who had also written a commentary called Tattva-vibhāvanā on Vācaspati Miśra’s Tattva-bindu.\textsuperscript{138})

Vācaspati Miśra lived in Mithilā\textsuperscript{139} in about the middle of the ninth century A.D. He is famous as a great commentator of his period. He is the celebrated author of a commentary called Bhāmati on Śaṅkara’s Bhāshya.\textsuperscript{140} He is also said to have written Tattva-samīkṣhā, a commentary on Maṇḍana’s Brahma-siddhi.\textsuperscript{141} He also commented on the Sāṃkhya-kārikā, Vidhīviveka, Nyāya-vārttikā and was the author of a number of other works.\textsuperscript{142} In his Nyāya-sūcinibandha, he gives his date as 898, which in all probability has to be understood as of the Vikrama Samvat and consequently he may be placed in 841 A.D.\textsuperscript{143} Bhāmati was his last great work, for in the colophon he mentions that he had already written his Nyāya-kanikā, Tattva-samīkṣhā, Tattva-bindu and other works, on Nyāya, Sāṃkhya and Yoga.\textsuperscript{144} Thus Vācaspati Miśra contributed to almost all the main branches of Hindu Philosophy.

Scientific literature of the period is not known at present. Science and technology appear to have been neglected.
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CHAPTER XXXIX
Religion and Philosophy
(350-1200 A. D.)

SECTION A
PAURĀNIC RELIGION—VAISHNAVISM, ŚAIVISM ETC.

The discovery of a considerable number of images, votive inscriptions and copper-plates testify to the fervent religiosity of the people of Bihar in the post-Gupta period. In their urge for spiritual life they followed and at the same time accelerated the growth of cults prevailing in the Gupta age. During the period under review the addition of deities in the Buddhist, Vaishnava, Śaiva and Śākta pantheons went on with greater momentum. In this process of transformation many of the older divinities were relegated, some were given greater prominence and some new deities were added to the pantheon of the Buddhist and Paurānic religion in Bihar.

The attempts to combine new and old ideas in the sphere of religious thought enabled the people of Bihar to visualise the Rgvedic saying that the one eternal principle is called by various names by the sages (ekam sat vipra bahudhā vadanti). It is because of the adherence to the spirit of reconciliation and rapprochement that syncretistic icons emerge. A Gupta sculpture from Bihar, now preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, shows Buddha and Sūrya standing on the right and left sides respectively to the central figure of a four-armed Hari-Hara. Such attempts at syncretism continued throughout the early medieval period. A Kurkihar image of the tenth century A. D., preserved in the Patna Museum, shows a standing Buddha image in
varada-mudrā and to his right and left respectively are a two-armed but three-headed Brahmā and a two-armed Indra. A medieval Hari-Hara sculpture, now preserved in the Indian Museum, is a specimen indicating reconciliation between Vaishnavism and Saivism in Bihar. Modern ekāntins may be surprised to find the incision of a Śiva-liṅga on the top and the figure of a lion at either end of the stone slab bearing an inscription which records a transaction relating to the Gadādhara (Vishṇu) temple at Gayā in V. S. 1232/1175 A. D. and 14th Year (gata-rājya) of Govinda-pāla. This epigraph also begins with an invocation to Vāsudeva. Further, an inscription on the present image of Gadādhara begins with an invocation to Mārttanḍa or Sun. R. D. Banerji believes that it was composed in the reign of Vigrāhapāla III. Sculptures too show the spirit of rapprochement prevailing amongst the votaries of Hindu deities. The Caturmukha-Mahādeva erected in the 26th Year of Dharmapāla at Gayā, shows the figures of Śūrya, Śiva and Vishṇu. J. N. Banerjea describes a Pañcāyatana Śiva-liṅga, found in Bihar, as showing four cult deities, Gauḍapati, Vishṇu, Pārvatī and Śūrya on the four sides of the central Śaiva emblem. Thus during the period the recommendation of the Smṛtis and Nibandhas on the panaśyayatana-pūjā, indicating worship of the five principal cult deities, was accepted by the people of Bihar.

The tolerant attitude towards different sects was shared by the Pāla kings, who ruled over Bihar and Bengal. Their personal religion did not stand in the way of their charities and donations. Nārāyaṇapāla, a devout Buddhist, built thousand temples for Śiva-bhaṭṭaraka and granted the Makutikā village in the Kaksha-vishaya in Tirhut for the divine Śiva and his Pāṣupata worshippers. Similarly, Vigrāhapāla III ratified the donation of land to a Brāhmaṇa in
Vasukāvarta in the Hodreya-viśhaya in Tirhut, after worshipping, the Buddha and a ceremonial bath on the Vishvavat-saṁkrānti day.\(^8\)

**Vedic Culture**

The widespread influence of the Paurānic religion did not however signify discontinuance of the Vedas, mainly because the study of the Vedic texts and some Vedic sacrifices have always formed part of the orthodox Brahmanical religion. Hence during the period under survey, inscriptions refers to Brāhmaṇas, settled in Bihar as versed in the Vedas, Vedāṅgas and engaged in the performance of the Vedic sacrifices. The Nandapur copper-plate of 488 A. D. records the gift of four kulyavāpas of land by Chattramaha, a Visha-yapati, to a Brāhmaṇa of Khatapuraṇa in the Nanda-viṣṭha for enabling the latter to perform the paṇca-mahā-yajñas or the five daily sacrificial rites.\(^9\) While this Brahmin of Monghyr, belonging to a little earlier period, was versed in the Chāndogya-śākhā of the Śāmaṛveda, the recipient of a grant by Ghaṇṭiṣa during the reign of Vigrahapāla III was also a student of the Chāndogya-śākhā.\(^10\) The ancestors of this donee as well as the one, who received a village from Saṅgrāma Gupta, who ruled in north Bihar probably in the twelfth century, hailed from Kolāña, which has been usually located in ancient Śrāvasti or the district round Set Mahet. But the latter donee (of the Panchobh GP.) was versed in the Yajurveda.\(^11\) The donee of the Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla adhered to the Āśvalāyana school, which belongs to the Ṛgveda. The donee of the Amauna plate of Mahārāja Nandana dated 551-552 A. D., was a student of the Vājasaneyt-śākha.\(^12\) The Nidhanpur Copper plate of Bhāskaravarman relate that the donee Brāhmaṇas of Mithilā belonged to Vedic śākhas like Vājasaneyt, Čārakya and Taittirīya of the Yajurveda, Chāndogya of the Śāmaṛveda and Vahvṛṛṛ of the Ṛgveda. A tall claim of the knowledge
of the Vedic studies is made in the Govindapur stone-inscription of Saka 1059/1137-38 A.D. We are told that Manoratha, Daśaratha and their four sons were not only fond of the Vedas but also acquainted with Śikṣā, Jyotisha, Nirukta, Vedic grammar etc. It is difficult to say, however, how far this eulogy of the academic achievements is hyperbolic in character. A sceptic may also suggest that like the modern holders of the surnames as Dwivedi, Trivedi and Chaturvedi, the medieval scholars claiming descent from particular schools of the Vedic lores, were practically innocent of all knowledge of the Vedas.

Along with the study of the Vedas, sacrifices continued to be performed by the kings. Yakshapāla, a local ruler of Gayā in the eleventh century, claims to have revived the sacrifices, which satisfied the Sacrificial Fire. But it is doubtful whether horses were sacrificed in course of performance of some of those Vedic rites. The only reference to the horse sacrifice (aśvamedha) in our period is in the Vaidyanātha temple-inscription at Deoghar. Probably, the influence of Vaishnavism deterred some ruling kings and feudatories of south Bihar like Śūdraka and his descendants from sacrificing animals. Of course, the people were reminded that by observing rituals and performing meritorious deeds, one would get the reward of celebrations of horse-sacrifice. Verse 5 of the Gayā inscription mentioning Govindapāla, dated V. S. 1232/1175 A. D. states that those who "would maintain the dharma (i. e. Vidyādharā's pious deed) every year would acquire the merit of performance of the Aśvamedha sacrifice."

**Purānic religion and mythology**

In Chapter XXIX of this Volume the introduction of the Paurānic religion and mythology in Bihar has been discussed. The impress of personalities and deities of the Epics and the Purāṇas was too deep to be obliterated even
in course of successive ages. The greatness of the Buddhist Pāla kings and their queens has been emphasised in the official records by comparing their qualities with Purānic characters. The Nālandā Plate of Devapāla describes Gopāla as a second Prthu and Sagara, Devapāla as having opened that road of liberality which was first made by Bali in the Kṛta age and by Karna in the Dwāpara. The Bhagalpur Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla compares Dharmapāla with Rāma and Vākpāla with that of Saumitri. The official estimate of the rule of Nārāyaṇapāla in the record mentioned above, runs thus: "The deeds of this king, which deserve to be recorded in the Purāṇas and which are full of the caturvarga, captivate the heart. By fine sentences, which won the hearts of good men, he confirmed (the tradition of) Śālivāhana and by his liberality he made the story of the Aṇga king (Karṇa) credible."

A survey of the deities in the early medieval inscriptions indicates the differences between the Vedic and Purānic gods and goddesses. After the Purāṇas, the epigraphs describe Indra as being defeated by Bali, the king of the Daityas, as having Paulomi a model of fidelity as his wife, and as having Vishnu as his younger brother. Not only the avatāras of Vishnu, but also the consorts of Vishnu like Lakshmi, Vasudhārā and Kirtti are mentioned. The Khalimpur Copper Plate of Dharmapāla refers to Hutabhuja and Svāhā, Dhānapati and his consort Bhadrā, and Brahmā being born from the lotus which sprang from the navel of Vishnu. Besides these deities, there are also frequent allusions to the Purānic and epic heroes in the epigraphs. The achievements of Rāma who bridged the sea at Rāmesvara and defeated Rāvana have been recounted in the Monghyr and Nālandā Plates of Devapāla. The heroic exploit of Hanumat, son of the Wind God, who took a big leap from the mountain Kośavardhana,
is mentioned in the Aphsad inscription of Adityasena. The Panchabh Copper Plate of Saṅgrāma Gupta describes the relation between Dāmodara Gupta and his son Deva Gupta by referring to Śāvarṇi, born of the Sun, the Moon of the Sea, Pradyumna of Madhusūdana, Guha of Śiva, Rāma of Daśaratha and Jayanta of Indra. Among the Purānic myths mention may be made of the milk-ocean (kshtra-sāgara or dugdhāṅkvedhi) not only in the Andhara-Tharhi inscription of Śrīdhara, a Hindu, but also in verse 2 of the Bhagalpur Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla, and the Bangaon plate of Vigrahapāla III, both of whom were Buddhists. Partially broken square pillars from Candimau and Rajaona portray the release of Gaṅgā from the coils of the matted hair of Śiva and the Kirāṭārjuna story of the fight between Arjuna and Śiva in the guise of a hunter (kirāta) and the grant of the Pāṣupatastra to the former (Arjuna) by Śiva. All these references go to prove that the intelligensia of early medieval Bihar were familiar with the Paurāṇika stories and their knowledge of the Purāṇas must have percolated to the lower strata of the society.

Paurāṇika religion not only refashioned the Vedic deities but introduced new gods and goddesses, fasts, festivals and sacred days. In the absence of any contemporary nībandha, written in Bihar during the period under survey, it is difficult to present a concrete record of fasts and festivals. Of course, in the chapters relating to Gayā, Mandāra, findspots of Śālagrāma on the banks of the Gaṅgā river, Vaidyanātha etc. in the Kālaviveka of Jitumāvahana, Kṛtyakalpataru-Tirthavivecanakāṇḍam of Lakshmīdhara and the Dānasāgara of Vallālasena, one can get a fairly relevant idea of the fasts and festivals in Bihar. Inscriptions of our period help to determine the sacred days. Gifts were made on the following days: first (bright
half), third and the Vishuvat-samkranti day in the month of Caitra, third day (bright half) or the Akshaya-tritya, full moon day of the month of Vaisakha, second day of the bright half, eleventh day of the dark half of the month of Jaiṣṭhya, second day of the bright half of Āśaḍha, fifth day of the dark fortnight of Bhādra and full moon day of the month of Kṛttika. Early medieval digests and inscriptions indicate all these days as auspicious. The importance of the Akshaya-tritya as an auspicious date was recognised not only by Govindacandra Gāhaḍāvāla, but also by an earlier Gāhaḍāvāla king named Candradeva, a feudatory Cālukya ruler Lūnapāsaka, and Hindu digest-makers like Lākṣmīdhara, Jīmūtavāhana, and Cāndēśvara as well as the Jain scholar Hemacandra. The twelfth day of the bright half of Caitra was famous for the worship of Kāma or God of Love and also sacred to Hari according to nibandhakāras mentioned above. The Kṛttika-pūrṇimā, known in early and late medieval India as the day of Kaumudī-mahotsava is the day on which the modern Sonepur fair in Bihar commences.

**Vaishnavism**

Vaishnavite images and temples and occasional and specific references to Viṣṇu and his incarnations testify to the spread of Vaishnavism in Bihar. As in the Gupta period, so during the period under survey, Vaishnavism continued to flourish even in those areas which were the strongholds of Buddhism. Bronze images of Śaṅkarśana-Balarāma of the time of Devapāla have been discovered from Nālandā. Spooner discovered a Hindu temple, having sculptural representations of Rāma, Lākṣmī etc. behind the seventh and eighth Buddhist monasteries. Archaeologists are not sure either about the date of or the principal deity of this temple. But this much is certain that it was erected not earlier than the sixth and not later
than the ninth century A.D. Again, close to Antichak, which is regarded now as the site of the Vikramaśilā University, the rock-cut sculptures on the Patährghata hill in Bhagalpur, one can notice the figures of Viṣṇu and his other forms as Vāmana, Nṛṣimha and Kṛṣṇa. These carvings have been assigned to the sixth century A.D. From Kurkihar, which was another notable Buddhist area, three inscribed metallic images of Balarāma and Viṣṇu, one of Balarāma being dated in the 9th year of Devapāla and the other two of Viṣṇu belonging to the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. have been unearthed. The Gayā-Shahabad region appears to have been an important centre of Viṣṇavism in Bihar. Slightly earlier to our period, Anantavarman, a feudatory Maukharī chief, installed an image of Kṛṣṇa in the Pravaragiri cave near Gaya. In the third quarter of the seventh century, Ādityasena caused the construction of a big temple of Viṣṇu and that King’s mother Mahādevī Śrīmatī set up a matha or religious college which resembled “a house in the world of gods, (and) has been given by herself in person to religious people.” Recently at Apfsad has been discovered Ramayanic stucco panels on the plinth of the brick temple built probably by Ādityasena. Further, the principal deity at Gayā has been Gadadhara or Viṣṇu in the past and early medieval ages.

Viṣṇu is known by various names. Lakṣmīdhara in his Krtyakalpataru-Tirthavivecanakāndam states that the presiding deity at Gaya is Nārāyaṇa, (who has Śrīraṅga and gada in his hands) Gadadhara or Gopati or Janārdana. The identity of Viṣṇu and Murāri is clearly stated also in verse 7 of the Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple-inscription at Gayā. Moreover, as early as the date of the Apfsad Inscription of Ādityasena, the people of Bihar believed in the identity of Viṣṇu and Mādhava, son of Vasudeva.
Such identities show that the Purānic characteristics of Vaishnāvism, as the syncretism of the concepts of Vedic sun-god Viṣṇu, cosmic god Nārāyaṇa and the cult of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, were accepted in Bihar even earlier to the period under review. A group of these images belonging to 2nd or 3rd century A.D. and representing Kṛṣṇa, Balarāma and Ekanamsā has been found in Bihar.

J. N. Banerjea has rightly observed that Bhāgavatism as well as the Pañcarātra doctrine continued to prevail in the post Gupta period. The fusion of these two doctrines were so complete in Bihar that worshippers of Nārāyaṇa or Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa were known as Vaishnava. Two devotees, who set up the image of Nārāyaṇa at Kṛmilā (identified by D. C. Sircar with Valgudar) in the 18th year of King Madanapāla of Śaka 1083/1161 A. D., described themselves as “pamā-vaishnava-yoh”, that is, devout worshippers of Viṣṇu.

Bhāgavatism or the tenets of the Bhagavad-gītā emphasizing on the one-souled devotion to Vāsudeva, which prevailed in the Gupta period, continued in the post-Gupta times. A stone-inscription of the time of the regnal year 7 of Nārāyaṇapāla affixed in the wall of the Mahādeva shrine in the Viṣṇupāda temple at Gaṅgā, begins with salutations to Murāri “who is master of the world, whose image is pleasant looking and who killed the enemy of the world.” He is also described in subsequent lines of this inscription as of spotless guṇas (amala-guṇāyaṇa) and a terror to those who are proud. Another inscription, dated in the 15th year of Nayapāla in the Narasiṃha temple in the Viṣṇupāda compound also records that all difficulties were removed at the mere sight of Purushottama. Thus the Bhagavad-gītā dictum that Krṣṇa helps those who surrender themselves to him in distress, is echoed in these inscriptions. As an expression of deep devotion to Viṣṇu like those of
the Gupta period, below a footprint, discovered at Jethur in the Bhagalpur district, are inscribed the words *Garâya-Nârâyâna* dated 996 A. D. 51

The influence of Pâncarâta doctrine in Bihar can be illustrated by the references to Śrî-Lakshmi and the vyuhavâda. According to the *Nârâyânt-stuti* of the *Devî-mâhâtmya* of the *Mârkaṇḍeya Purâna*, the primeval energy (âdyâ-âsakti) is Nârâyâna-Lakshmi as well as Gaurî-Ambikâ. Many inscriptions describe Lakshmi as enclosed with Vishnû-Vâsudeva. The first verse of the Govindapur stone-inscription dated 1137-38 A. D., graphically relates that "May Viśvambhara, (the supporter of the universe) bestow (on us) his compassion—who, embracing his beloved and thrilled with delight by the close contact of his breast with her bosom, is sleeping on the lord of serpents, on one side bent low by the weight of the god's lofty body, while on the other he remains upright under the very light burden of the goddess of fortune!" 52 Similar descriptions of Śrî or Lakshmi as lying on the breast of Vishnû are referred to in the Apsfad inscription, Kṛshnadvârikâ temple-inscription etc. 53 It should, however, be noted that though Lakshmi had never a cult of her own like that of Vishnû, Šiva and Śakti, yet she was worshipped separately. Some images and representations of Gaja-Lakshmi of our period are available. 54

Avatâravâda is one of the meeting points of Bhâgavatism and Pâncarâtra doctrines. On the one hand, avatâra-vâda is linked up with vyuhavâda of the Pâncarâtrins, on the other hand, the doctrine of incarnations of Vishnû is one of the salient features of the transformation of Bhâgavatism into Vaishnâivism. In Bihar the stereotyped number of ten avatâras were popular during the period. Up till now neither images nor inscriptions of Bihar acquaint us with all the twenty-four vyahas (caturvimśatimûrtis) of the Pâncarâtra theology and twenty-two incarnations mentioned in the Śrîmad-bhâgavata
(I. 3.6-22). Out of the twenty-two names mentioned in the Śrīmad-bhāgavata (I. 3.6-22) one does not find Nārada, Nara, Kapila, Dattātreya, Yajñā, Rśabha, Pṛthu, Dhanvantari, Mohini and Vedavyāsa in Bihar. Images of Dattātreya, Māndhātā, Vedavyāsa, mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa (47.46), which must have been current in the Gupta and post-Gupta ages in Bihar, are not found in this State. Even the representations of the ten incarnations are not always identical. The Konch temple (17 miles north-west of Gayā) ascribed to the eighth century A. D., has a panel in which Cunningham did not find the figure of the Buddha among the dasāvatāras. Along with an image of Trivikrama Vishṇu, found at Silour in Saran, ascribed to the twelfth century A. D., the avatāras shown are Trivikrama, Buddha, Vāruṇa, Kalki, Varāha, Nara-simha, Kūrma, Matsya, Parasurāma and Rāma. Amongst the individual representations of the avatāras the images of Varāha, Trivikrama and Balarāma are numerous. Three inscribed images of Balarāma alone have been discovered from Nālandā and Kurkihar. The Kurkihar image of four-handed Balarāma is significant because he is not endowed with śaṅkha and cakra in his hands. The Agni Purāṇa (ch. 49) considers these two attributes as essential for a four-handed Balarāma.

A singular feature of Vaishṇavism in Bihar is the absence of both Rāma and Kṛṣṇa-Rādhā cults during the period under survey. Unlike in Bengal, there is no mention of Gopis in the inscriptions of Bihar. While the exploits of Kṛṣṇa at Vṛndāvana are unknown to inscriptions, the identity and lineage of Kṛṣṇa are mentioned in epigraphs. The name of Kṛṣṇa appears as early as the Barabar Hill Cave inscription of Anantavarman. The Aḥsād and Panchabh inscriptions tell us that Mādhava was born of Vasudeva and Pradyumna was
born of Madhusūdana respectively. E. Hultszch's reading of the "black deeds of Kṛṣṇa" in verse fifteen of the Bhagalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla is rather doubtful. In view of the absence of any contemporary reference to Rādhā or the Gopīs, it is difficult to agree with D. R. Patil that the scene depicting Kṛṣṇa amidst Gopas and Gopīs and cows at Patharghata hill (Colgong) belongs to the sixth century A. D. Further, though the god Gopinātha is described as the Lord of Kaṃdammati in a Gayā inscription of the time of Kākātiyā Pratāparudra I, edited by D. C. Sircar, Kaṃdammati was certainly beyond the jurisdiction of Bihar. However, though there is no abundant evidence to prove the existence of the Rādhā cult in Bihar during the period under survey, it seems that Kṛṣṇa cult was prevalent in Bihar. The Rādhā cult is testified to by the Belava grant and the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva in Bengal. Moreover, acceptance of a view that the depiction of the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa as a sudden creative impulse without any moorings in popular local songs in the writings of Vidyāpati in the fourteenth century does not seem logical. Howsoever we have yet to await a definite proof of the Rādhā cult, which by the end of the twelfth century had become an accepted phenomenon in some parts of northern India.

Śaivism

The popularity of Śaivism can be measured by a considerable number of images and temples and many references in inscriptions. Some kings of both north and south Bihar were Śaivites. The Asirghat copper seal inscription of Śarva-varman Maukhari describes him as Parama-Māheśvara. Devagupta and Vīṣṇugupta, the son and grandson of Ādityasena, and Indradhavala of the Khayaravāla dynasty, who ruled at least over the Shahabad district, were Śaivites. Again some rulers of north Bihar,
whose titles end with Gupta, like Rāma-gupta and Śiva-gupta, assigned by D. C. Sircar to the first half of the eighth century A. D., and Rājāditya and Saṅgrāma-gupta, whose Panchobh copper-plates have been assigned by R. D. Banerji to the second half of the twelfth century A. D. were devotees of Māheśvara. Śaivite temples were raised in both the parts of Bihar during the regime of the Pālas, Nārāyaṇapāla himself made donations to Śiva and the congregation of the Pāṣupata teachers at Kalaśapota in Tirhut in his 17th regnal year. Viśvarūpa, a feudatory chief, set up a liṅga called Vaṭeśa at Akshayaśāta in Gayā and another called Prapitā-maheśvara close by, in the 5th regnal year of Vigrahapāla III. Yakshapāla, a son of Viśvarūpa, also set up some phallic emblems and images of Śiva. Some other Śaivite temples like those of Siddheśvara on the Barabar Hill, Koṇcheśvara Mahādeva in Konch (Gayā), Śambhu temple in Monghyr belong to the period.

Śaivite images tend to show that the people of Bihar worshipped usually the phallus (liṅgam) and the saumya form of Śiva. Some of the sculptures indicating the benign aspect, are the marriage of Śiva and Pārvati, usually described as kalyāṇasundara or vaivahika-mārti, found in Gayā, the Umā-Maheśvara found in Monghyr proper, Biharsarif, Vishṇupur (Gayā), Seraikela. Kurkihar, Harihara motifs, the descent of the Ganges on the head of Śiva (Gaṅgādhara-mārti) and the grant of Pāṣupata weapon to Arjuna by Śiva, originally found in Chandimau and Rajaona and now preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The terrific forms (ugra) like the Kālārī or Kāmāntaka-mārti or those illustrating sectarian rancour like the Ekāpāda-Trīmārti were not fashioned in Bihar.

As no book on Śaivism is known to have been written in Bihar during the period under survey, it is not possible
to give a clear idea of its tenets and philosophy. Of course, the worship of Śaivite icons show that the people of Bihar were definitely Pāśupatas and Śaivas. The Bhagalpur Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla makes specific reference to the Pāśupata-dēvarṣyas. The benedictory verse of the Akhayavata inscription and verse 5 of the Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple-inscription indirectly allude to the affiliation of the people of Gaya to the Pāśupata sect. The former inscription begins with the words Namah Śivāya, which is the holy pāneākshara-mantra of the Śaivas and Pāśupatas. The first line of this inscription also conveys that is the grace of Śiva, who is jñāna-jyotih, which causes the cessation of heaps of miseries. Such a belief reminds one of the statement of the author of the Pāśupata-sūtras, an old text on Pāśupata doctrines, that “due to the grace of god, one, who is under no illusion, attains to the end of misery.” The above-mentioned author also refers to the eight kinds of supernatural powers acquired by a successful Pāśupata yogin. The Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple-inscription describes Dvijarājasēkhara or Śiva as samantato bhūri-vibhūti-bhūshanah. Even if we take vibhūti here to mean ashes, and not the supernatural powers, we can find an allusion to one of the practice of the Pāśupatas besmearing the various parts of the body with ashes. Philosophers Vācaspatī and Udayana were devout Śaivas.

A few other peculiarities of Śaivites may now be noted. The Chandil stone-inscription of the eighth or ninth century A.D. records the desire of communion with the god Śiva by one Dāmappa. Neither the Śaivites of the Kashmir variety, nor the Pāśupatas desire such a goal. The ultimate aim of a believer in the Pratyabhijñā system is the identification of the soul with the Ultimate Reality. Further, the incorporation of the name of Śūkṣmaśiva, the composer or engraver of the Aphaśad inscription of
Adityasena," raises the question of the existence of Mattamayūras in Bihar. Most of the names of the Mattamayūra Śaiva ascetics end either in śambhu or śiva. They believed in the tranquil aspects of Śiva and hence belonged to the moderate Śaiva school.

Śāktism

Śāktism has been one of the principal cults in Bihar through the ages. D. C. Sircar believes that the yonikuṇḍa at Udyatparvata in the Tīrthayātṛā section in Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata (III. 84) was probably located in the Gayā region. The Kubjikā Tantra, which was composed at least earlier than the eleventh century, mentions Vāgmatī and Vaidyanātha as two of the Siddhapīṭhas. Late medieval works refer to Rājagrha, Mithilā and Tirhut as Śākta- pīṭhas.2

Two inscriptions refer to the worship of the Devī and Caṇḍikā by the kings, Anantavarman Maukhari and Indradhavala of Japila and Shahabad.27 But the discovery of a few references to Śāktism as the personal religion of some royal families only, does not necessarily signify that Śāktism was on the decline in Bihar. Rather, the association of Tantricism with Vajrayāna Buddhism and Brahmanical Hinduism, contributed to the increase of popularity of Śāktism.

Śakti continued to be worshipped under various names like Durgā, Pārvati, Mahishāsuramarddīni, Jagaddhātri, etc. Lakshmīdhara quotes the Matsya Purāṇa, which states that Maṅgalā is worshipped at Gayā, just as Viśālakṣhi and Lalitā in Banaras and Prayāga respectively.24 A tenth century mutilated image of Pārvati, discovered at Gaṅgāpur (Patna), preserved now in the Patna Museum, shows her seated and endowed with sword and shield in upper right and left hands, trīśūla in the
main left hand.* The differences in the iconography of Pārvati or Durgā may be illustrated by two images. The one at Monghyr shows her having six hands, seated on lion, holding shield and triśāla in her right hand and cakra and khaḍga with her left hand.** A bronze figure of Pārvati at Nālandā shows her with three eyes, four hands holding three of them, a rosary, a hooked staff and a water-vessel, riding on a lion and a creeping iguana near her right leg. J. N. Banerjea also finds heaped naivedya (offering) pots on four corners of the pedestal, the sun and the moon on either side of the elaborately designed śīrāsakra.*** An inscription of Nāyaka Pratāpadhavala, dated V.S. 1214/1158 A.D. refers to the consecration of the image of Jagaddhātri.**** References to uru-nilā-padmā is found in verse 4 of the Kṛṣṇa-nāḍvārīka temple inscription of the time of Nayapāla at Gaya. A. K. Maitreya identifies her with Mahānīla Sarasvatī and P. C. Bagchi takes her to be a “definite Tāntṛk divinity”.** There is no positive evidence to show that she was a Buddhist Tāntric deity.

As compared to the Gupta age the number of images of the Mother Goddess seems to have increased during the period under review. The Patna Museum has images of as many as six Mothers (Mātrkās), namely, Vaishnavī, Māheśvarī, Indrāṇī, Brāhmī, Kaumārī and Vārāhī, from Seraikela in Singhbhum district.†† Each of them, excepting Vārāhī, has a child on her left thigh. Thus out of the list of Sapta Mātrkās, in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (88.14-20) only the image of Nārasimhī was not found in Seraikela. As there is no rigid uniformity in the number of the divine mothers, a bronze composition of the time of Mahipāla I, discovered at Imadpur and now preserved in the King Edward VII gallery of the British Museum, shows three goddesses, namely Kaumārī, Brahmāṇī and Vaishnavī seated between Vīrabhadra and Gaṇeṣa.†‡ To
this composition only Kaumārī places her hand on the back of a child.

There are certain indications of the increasing popularity of the concept of the Mother Goddess. The Durgā-stotra of the Mahābhārata or the Durgā-saptaiśā of the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa clearly state the role of the Mothers. They rose to fame due to the assistance they rendered to Durgā, Caṇḍikā or Ambikā in her struggle against the demons. But during the period under review they possibly became cult objects. Not only separate reliefs of the Mārkās, but also new names of the Mother Goddess are heard of for the first time in Bihar. The Jaynagar image-inscription of the 35th Yr. of Pālapāla, the Pāla King, records the dedication of the image of Bhaṭṭārikā Purūsvarī or Puṇyeśvarī (c. 1165 A.D.). Another inscribed image of Puṇḍeśvarī, installed during the reign of Naya-pāla (c. 1038-1055 A.D.) was discovered from Rajaona. Commenting on the discovery of such images of the Devī with child in many places in south Bihar, it has been rightly observed: "she must have enjoyed great popularity amongst the people of the region in the early medieval period." It is not surprising if images of the same goddess were installed under different local names. Such a new name of the Devī may have been Gausevā, or Gausavā, whose inscribed image discovered at Valgudar, near Luckeesarai, was set up in the eighth or ninth century A.D.

Regarding the Imadpur bronze relief showing Balarāma, Ekānāmśā and Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva of the time of Mahāpāla I, it may be stated categorically that the concept of Ekānāmśā evolved earlier than the time of Varāhamihira, who gives the earliest account of her iconography in the Bhāṣṭākhyātā. J. N. Banerjea, while pointing out the placing of a mirror in the hand of Ekānāmśā of the relief under discussion, states that "the mirror also is one of the
characteristic attributes of Durgā-Parvatī who is no other than Ekānaṁśā in one of her aspects.99

Saura cult

We learn from Varāhamihira that the worship of Sūrya of different heights is beneficial, for one would be endowed with wealth, peace and abundance.98 Whether the people of Bihar were motivated by these promises is not known. But there is no doubt that the considerable number of people of Bihar were worshippers of Sūrya, the Dvādaśādityas and Navagrahas. That there were devotees of Sūrya in south Bihar, particularly in the Gayā region is evident, because even the Gadādhara image-inscription of the reign of Vigrahapāla III begins with the invocation to Mārttaṇḍa. The inscription of Yakshapāla, commencing with adoration to Sūrya, invokes the blessings of Sūrya in the following words: "May the Sun protect you! —he who illuminates the lotus which is the universe, filled with a mass of honey the objects of sense, having for bees the multitude of living beings, (and) charming with its leaves—the eight regions."99 This inscription also records the building of a temple for Maunāditya, Vijayāditya, which are obviously the names of the Sun-god. The Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvitagupta II refers to the solar-worship in the Shahabad region. Jīvitagupta II continued to approve of the grant of a village either Vārunikā or Kiśoravātaka to the Sun under the title of Varuṇavāsin.100 Another inscription, discovered at Sanokhar, near Kahalgaon or Colgong (Bhagalpur), records the making of a copper-cover (tāmra-kholi) for the god Damacāditadeva, which according to the editor of the inscription is the name of the Sun-god, in Yr. 9 of Ballālasena in c. 1166 A. D.101

Inscriptions and images discovered in Bihar tend to show that during the period under review the alien features of the worship of Sun merged in the indigenous school of
Sauras. The main characteristics of the Sun icons as laid down in the Bhûtasamhitâ and Vishnuudharmottara—that he should be dressed up in the fashion of a Northerner, his body being covered from feet up to the breast and something like a waist-girdle (jâviyânga)—are found in Benisagar and Kurkihar reliefs of Sûrya standing in the company of Aruṇa, Daṇḍa and Pingala. The foreign influence on the Sun cult is evident not only from the statement of Varâhamihira that the image of the sun should be installed by the Magas, but also the stories given in the Bhavishya, Sâmba, Varâha and Agni Purânas tell us of though not directly, the importation of the Magas, the special worshippers of the sun by Sâmba from Sakadvipa. The Govindpur (Gayâ) inscription also records that the Magas were brought by Sâmba to India and became known as Maga Brâhmaṇas. It also states that the body of Sûrya as ‘written by lathe’ (bhramilikhita-tanor-bhâsvatah, Verse 2). Here we find an allusion to the Purânic story of the paring the upper part of the body of Sûrya by his father-in-law, Viśvakarmâ, for the sake of the latter’s daughter Saṃjñâ. However, neither the Maga Brâhmaṇas nor the Bhojakas, who were probably in charge of the administration of the Sun temple referred to in the Deo-Baranark inscription had a distinct school of philosophy of their own. Rather, Gaṅgâdhara, a Maga Brahmin mentioned in the Govindpur inscription, took pride in the fact that he, his brothers, father and uncle, had knowledge of the Vedas, Vedângas, Nirukta grammar etc., and he himself had special knowledge of the Upanishadas and composed the Advaitâdâta.

Minor cults

A number of other gods and goddesses like Gañêśa, Kârttikeya, Brahmâ, Sarasvatî, Agni, Varuṇa, Gaṅgâ, were worshipped. In spite of their images, it is doubtful whether even Brahmâ, Gañêśa and Kârttikeya had exclu-
sive worshippers in Bihar during the period under review. Their blessings are not invoked in any contemporary inscription. Brahmā's stay at Gayā has been referred to in the Krśṇadvārikā and Narasimha temple-inscriptions and the Gadādhara inscription. Brahmā, who was a sectarian deity at Gayā in pre-Gupta times, occupied a subsidiary position in the post-Gupta period.

The worship of the Nāgas, however, does not appear to have declined as compared to the earlier times. Large number of sculptural representations of Nāga have been discovered in the Rajgir area. A beautiful Nāga relief from Ghorakatora, Rajgir, shows that it was set up by Madrārudra who belonged to the Mūla-sarvāstivāda school of the Buddhists. Thus the relief proves that the worship of the Nāgas in Rajgir, which is referred to in verses 21-22 of the Sabhāparvan of the Mahābhārata was confined not to the Hindus alone, but also accepted even by the followers of the Hinayāna Buddhists of south Bihar.

Conclusion

A survey of the religion of the people of Bihar during the period shows that they were more in favour of the benign aspects of the cult deities. In Śaivism, but for the solitary reference to the Tāṇḍava dance of Śiva in the benedictory verse of the Sone East Bank Copper Plate of Indradeva and Udayarāja, dated 1197 A.D., images of Śiva in Bihar usually depict the anugraha and saumya (grace and benign) types. Though the Varāha and Narasimha images illustrate the terrific (ugra) form of Vishṇu, yet it was in Bihar that we find the setting up of the Kevala Narasimha image, which is rare in other regions of India. This image of Kevala-Narasimha was discovered at Kheri, a village about 20 miles from Bhagalpur, depicts the grace of Vishṇu. So also in the Śakti cult we find a considerable number of Mother Goddess icons. Probably a liberal outlook was
also responsible for the absence of sectarian narrowness amongst the Hindus. Whereas the Buddhists of Bihar gave vent to the feelings of sectarian rancour by making such images as to show the trampling of Hindu deities by the Buddhist ones, the Hindus, on the contrary, were trying to absorb Buddhism within their fold. The worship of a subsidiary deity as the principal one in the Mundeśvarī and Deo-Markanda temples in Shahabad, may possibly be interpreted as displaying sectarian rivalry amongst a section of the Hindus. But that rivalry was never marked by communal riots or religious wars. In Purānic ideology an ekāntin can live in peace and harmony with votaries of other deities. The people of early mediaeval Bihar were born and nurtured in Purānic religion and hence there was least fanatical religious outlook.

SECTION B

BUDDHIST RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY (550-1200 A.D.)

1. Historical Review

Hsuan Tsang’s account of the sites in north Bihar gives us the impression that the fate of the Buddhist religion in these regions was rather dismal. In Fei-she-li (Vaiśali) excepting three or four, rest of the hundreds of Buddhist establishments were “dilapidated and deserted and the Brethren were very few.” About 5 li to the north west of the “palace city” of Vaiśālī there lived a few professed Buddhists of the Sāṁmittya school in a monastery. In Fu-li-chih (Vrjj) country as compared to the few Buddhists and ten monasteries, there were “tens of Deva temples and the non-Buddhists were numerous.” In Chan-p’o (Campā, Bhagalpur) also most of the monasteries were in ruins. As compared to the desolate condition of Buddhist monasteries is north Bihar and Bhagalpur, Hsuan Tsang was glad to find much reverence for Buddhism and more than fifty monasteries in Magadhā.
More than 200 li to the south-west of Patna he found a monastery with a tope, which "had manifestations of divine light and other miracles and people from far and near came to it and offered up prayers." But of all monastic institutions the greatest sanctuary of learning was at Nalanda, about which he has left a glowing account.

Buddhism prospered more in the succeeding centuries after the departure of Hsuan Tsang. In addition to the universities at Nalanda and Gaya, several other vihāras were set up during the Pāla period. The monasteries of Oddantapurī (Biharsharif) and Vikramaśilā were established during the reigns of Gopāla and Dharmapāla. We shall not be far from truth if we say that the teachers of Nalanda and Vikramaśilā universities set the pattern of Buddhist religion and philosophy during our period. The Pālas are also credited with having started two other vihāras—one at Phullahari near Monghyr and another at Naulāgarh, 16 miles from Begusarai (Monghyr). Apart from these monastic institutions or universities, we have other evidences to show the comparatively better status of Buddhism in north Bihar. An inscribed image of the Buddha, assigned to the 8th or 9th century A.D. has been found at Kolhua, near Vaiśāli. Images of the Buddha and Lokeśvara have been unearthed in Naulāgarh and Birpur, near Begusarai. While there was thus a revival in north Bihar, fresh recruits seem to have been brought within the fold of Buddhism in and around Chandil in Singhbhum district.

At the time of the visit of Hsuan Tsang and I-tsing Hīnayāna, already weakened due to the rise of various sub-sects like the Sthavira-vādins, Śaṃmitīyas, Sarvāstivādins, had been losing its ground in eastern India. Mahāyāna, the newer form of Buddhism with its altruistic principles, had larger number of adherents. Yet the balance had not been wholly in favour of Mahāyāna in Bihar in the
seventh century. Hsuan Tsang’s account shows that while most of the ecclesiastics in Magadha professed Mahāyāna, the Buddhists of Monghyr-Bhagalpur areas were mostly Hinayānists. I-tsing mentions that the four schools, Mahāsaṅgiti, Sthaviravādin, Sarvāstivādin, Sāṃmittyas flourished in Magadha. Hsuan Tsang found disciples of the Sarvāstivādin school in the Pigeon Monastery and in I-lan-na-po-fa-to region. There were nearly 1000 ecclesiastics, all of the Sthavira school, in the Mahābodhi Saṅghārāma in Gayā. Long after the departure of Hsuan Tsang an inscription, probably of the 9th century A. D., mentions the name of Mañjuśrīvarman, adhering to the Sarvāstivādin school.

The relation between the two principal forms of Buddhism was not happy during our period. Mahāyānists considered themselves superior to the Hinayānists. Śāntideva claims that a Bodhisattva could uproot the sins more quickly than a Śrāvaka. He also considers that one of the eight root sins was the preaching of ideals that lead to the Hinayāna. About four centuries later, Advaya-vajra also affirms that Śrāvakayāna and Pratyekayāna are lower steps in the ladder leading to the higher one which is Mahāyāna. Such statements of course, should not lead us to the conclusion that Hinayānists were disparaged. Śāntideva himself asks that one should be equally respectful towards Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. Such an attitude could not have been possible unless there was some adaptation of the disciplinary rules of the Hinayānists by the Mahāyānists. At least during the time of Hsuan Tsang there was a common code of ecclesiastical rules, which made it possible for both the Hinayānists and Mahāyānists to reside in the same monasteries. Hsuan Tsang’s life by Hwui Li records that the priests and students of the Nālandā University “study the Great
Vehicle, and also (the works belonging to) the eighteen sects". At the Mahābodhi Saṅghārāma there were nearly 1000 ecclesiastics who were "all Mahāyānists of the Sthavira school and all perfect in Vinaya observances".

At a later period we find Saindhava śrāvakas living in the monasteries at Oddantapuri and Vikramaśilā. If Tāranātha is to be believed king Mahāpāla (?) caused the building of an annexure called the Uruvasavihāra in Oddantapuri. They were adherents of the older Buddhism. They decried Mahāyāna and Tantrayāna. In the time of Dharmapāla they destroyed the metal image of the Vajrayāna deity Heruka and burnt the treatises on Mantra.

II. Mahāyāna Sects and Schools

Mahāyāna passed through several stages of transformation, which process had already begun much before 550 A. D. Advayavajra of eastern India gives a clear account of different schools within the fold of Mahāyāna. The two primary divisions of Mahāyāna are Pāramitānaya and Mantranaya. The Pāramitānaya is explained by Sauṭrāntika, Yogācāra and Mādhyaṃika schools. The Mantranaya is explained only by Yogācāra and Mādhyaṃika. The two sub-schools of Yogācāra are Sākāra and Nīrākāra. Mādhyaṃika had also been divided into two groups: Māyopamādvayāvāda and Sarvadharmāpratishthāna-vāda. This classification of different sects and schools of Mahāyāna, however, does not take cognizance of the esoteric schools. Those followers of Mahāyāna who accepted the principle of Tantras, were known as belonging to the cult of Vajrayāna, Sahajayāna and Kālacakrayāna. These three Yānas may commonly be called Tantrayāna. When did the Tantrayana arise within the fold of Mahāyāna cannot be determined. Probably Vajrayāna was an earlier phase than the other two Yānas. In the former there was greater emphasis on ceremonials and mantra, mudrā and
manḍala. But the Sahajiyā Buddhists repudiated mantra manḍala and other external means of the Vajrayāna. In spite of these differences all the above-mentioned three Yānas believed in mysticism, body as the abode of truth and the efficacy of blessings of the Guru in practical aspects of their sadhanas. The common aim of the adherents of various sub-sects and schools of Mahāyāna was to have a Bodhicitta which being free from all impurities would alleviate the distress of beings. To them Bodhisattvas, and not the Buddha, can render service to all sentient beings.

It is difficult to state which of the numerous vihāras adhered to which of the sub-sects and schools of Buddhism. None of the numerous seals issued by the Saṅghas in and around Nālandā indicate to which particular school of philosophy they were attached. The books written by a particular scholar do not help us in determining his affiliation to any particular sub-sect of Mahāyāna. Śāntideva’s works show his acquaintance with Mahāyāna and its developed forms as well as the Hinayāna. Though the Śikṣā-samuccaya and Bodhicaryāvatāra were undoubtedly Mahāyāna works, yet there is undeserved praise of the dhārayās in the former work. Dipākara-Srijñāna wrote books on both the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna systems. Abhayākara Gupta also composed works explaining the views of the Vajrayāna and Kālacakrayāna sub-sects. Further, some of the scholars of our period passed on from one school to another. Jñānaśrīmitra, a central pillar of the Vikramaśila-vihāra, was originally an adherent of the Saindhava-śrāvaka school and later on became a Tantrayānist.

(III). Glimpses of the Mahāyāna and Tāntrika Buddhism in Inscriptions

One can get an idea of Mahāyānism and not the peculiarities of distinctive schools of Mahāyāna, in the
inscriptions of the Pāla and Sena periods. Sometimes we have occasional glimpses of the doctrines of the Hinayāna as well as Tantrayāna. The Buddhist creed formula, containing the words—Ye dharmā hetu-prabhava hetuṁ teshāṁ tathāgato hyavadat, teshāṁ ca yo nirodha evaṁ vādit Mahāśramanaḥ—is frequently engraved on different inscriptions and images in Bihar. This concept of Buddhist Dharma shows the influence of the Vaibhāṣhika system. The doctrine of Pratītyasamutpāda incised on three inscriptions from Uren in the Monghyr district, paleographically assigned between 9th and 12th century A.D., can be found mentioned in earlier Hinayāna texts like the Śālistamba Sātra and the Majjhima Nikāya.

A number of inscriptions acquaint us clearly with some Mahāyāna doctrines. The concept of the Buddha as a god who possessed not only the Ten Powers—‘rakṣhantu va daśabulāṇi diśo’ in Khālimpur Pl. verse 1 (vide Gauḍālekhamaṇa by A. K. Maitreya, p. 11) but also show an abiding and unceasing interest in and compassion for the welfare of human beings (karuṇā), is stated in inscriptions like the Khālimpur Plate of Dharmapāla, Monghyr and Nālandā Plate of Devapāla and Bhagalpur Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla. That a Bodhisattva could become a Buddha, another Mahāyāna idea, is recognised in the Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla. Here we are told that Devapāla, unsullied in thought, steadfast in the performance of blameless actions, inherited “the kingdom of his father free from troubles as a Bodhisattva attains the status of a Buddha.” The concern of all Mahāyānists for the happiness and welfare of all beings is indicated in the wish of Bālāditya, who repaired the burnt monastery of Nālandā in the eleventh year of Mañipāla I and in other inscriptions of Bihar.

Some ideas of the Mādhyamikas and the presence of the Tāntrika Buddhists can be traced in a number of
inscriptions. The Nālandā Copper Plate of Devalāpa records that the illustrious King Bālaputra Deva of Suvarṇadvipa caused the erection of a monastery in Nālandā and made endowments "for the blessed Lord Buddha, the abode of all the leading virtues like the Prajñāpāramitā... of the assembly of the venerable bhikṣhus of the four quarters (comprising) the Bodhisattvas, well-versed in the Tantras". The concept of Prajñāpāramitā is the central creed of the Mādhyamikas. The old spiritual discipline of śīla (virtue), samādhi (contemplation), prajñā (wisdom) was elaborated into the sixfold path (namely, dāna, śīla, kshānti, virya, dhyāna and prajñā) of the Pāramitās by the Mādhyamikas. Hari-bhadra, the spiritual teacher of Dharmapāla, quotes the significance of Prajñāpāramitā as laid down by Diinnāga thus: "Prajñāpāramitā is non-dual knowledge and that is the Tathāgata. The treatise and the spiritual discipline, as leading to this end receive the same appellation." Similar is the view of Śāntideva, who quotes the Mahātī Prajñāpāramitā. In short, one is fit to receive the Prajñāpāramitā when the observations of all other virtues or knowledge have purified the mind. As a non-dual knowledge it is equated with the Tathāgata by the Mādhyamikas.

Two main concepts of Tāntrika Buddhism, male and female principles and the position of the Gurus can be detected in the copper-plates of the Pāla period. Maitrī has been described in the Bhagalpur Copper Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla as the wife of Daśabala-Lokanātha. The Ghosrawan inscription states that Viradeva, who 'governed' Nālandā in the time of Devapāla, built two caityas on Indraśaila (hill) for the welfare of his Gurus. The twelfth century Kāndī (8½ miles from Sikandra P. S., Monghyr) inscription also states that the Buddhist image was given away as gift (devadharmā) for the attainment of the results of the highest knowledge (anuttarajñāna) for all sentient beings beginning
with the teachers (chāy-o-pādhyāya acāry-o-pādhyāya) and parents of Rāṇaka Samudrāditya.  

IV. Vajrayāna Images and Tāntrikism

Images, inscribed or stylistically assigned to the Pāla period, illustrate the innumerable manifestations of the Vajrayāna concept of Śūnya and the male and female principles of the Vajrayāna—Tāntrika form of Buddhism. As contrasted to the days of Hsuan Tsang, I-tsing and Śāntideva, the number of gods and goddesses of the Vajrayāna pantheon went on increasing to a very large extent after about 800 A. D. Śāntideva mentions three Tathāgatas (namely, Akshobhya, Amitābha and Śūnābhikṣṇa) and only one Bodhisattva (Gaganagaṇja) in the Śāksṭa-samuccaya and Mahājñuḥṣastra, one of the many forms of Bodhisattva Mahājñuḥṣa in the Bodhicaryāvatāra.  

Prior to our period the Mahāyāna Buddhists had conceived of five Dhyāni Buddhas (Amitābha, Akshobhya, Vairocana, Amoghasiddhi and Ratnasambhava). During the period of our survey the pantheon increased. From about the seventh century A. D. Tārā was made a companion of Avalokiteśvara, the personification of love and compassion. Consequently “it did not take long to reach the Tāntrik conception that Tārā as such was Buddha’s sākta”.  

Not to Avalokiteśvara alone but also to each and sometimes collectively to the Dhyāni Buddhas were affiliated the divine Śaktis and Bodhisattvas. Emanatory forms went on multiplying and Avalokiteśvara had as many as 108 forms, including Śaṭākshari, Lokēśvara, Śūnābhikṣṇa, Khasarpaṇa, Lokaṃtha, whose images have been found in this State. The concept of Vajradhara or Ādi Buddha, which originated at the Nālandā monastery in the tenth century resulted not only in the addition of another Vajrayāna-Tāntrika deity but also led to discussions amongst the then Buddhists about his specific
form. Some considered him as one amongst the five Dhyāṇi Buddhas, some as Vajrasattva and some as Samantabhadra or Vajrapāṇi Bodhisattvas.¹⁴³

A few remarks on the nature of Vajrayāna Tāntrika images are necessary. Some of them betray the aversion of the Buddhists towards the followers of the Brahmanical faith. An image of Aparājitā, preserved in the Patna Museum tramples Gaṇeśa with her left foot and her right hand displays the attitude of dealing a slap.¹⁴⁶ A fragmentary Nālandā image of this goddess shows a rod held by Indra on her right side.¹⁴⁵ The Patna Museum image of Trailokyavijaya has four faces, skulls as garland and he is trampling Mahēśvara and Pārvatī.¹⁴⁶ The Sādhanaamālā mention Prasanna-Tārā, Vajravālānalārka, Vidyujjvalākarāli, Hariharihari-vāhanodbhava Lokeśvara and Ucchushma Jambhala as inemical to the Brāhmaṇical deities. The sādhana of the last one—Ucchushma Jambhala—deserves particular mention because his dhyāna has been composed by Abhayākaragupta.¹⁴⁶ He describes him as “standing in the Pratyālīḍha attitude, tramples with his right leg upon the legs of the sleeping Dhanada (=Kubera) of yellow complexion with his mouth vomiting jewels, while the left leg rests upon the head”.¹⁴⁶ It may be recalled here that the lotus-feet of the Buddha is described in the Nālandā stone-inscription of the reign of Yaśovarman-deva as having been rubbed “by the gods, including Indra, with the fishes (engraved) in the diadems on their heads.¹⁴⁶³

Iconographic traits of some deities like Saptaśatika Hayagrīva, Heruka Yamāri and Jambhala show affinity with or borrowing of ideas from the icons of Brāhmaṇical gods. In Hindu iconography Vishṇu in the form of a horse-headed man killed the demon Hayagrīva. In the Buddhist image of Saptaśatika Hayagrīva, found at Kurkihar and now preserved in the Patna Museum,¹⁴¹ one sees snakes
enwining his hands and hair similar to that of a horse. The stone-image of Yamārī, discovered in Nālandā,142 tallies with the iconography of Śiva, while punishing Kāla or Yama for attempting to take the life of the Śaiva sage Mārkaṇḍeya. Numerous images of Jambhala, found in Bihar, show unmistakable affinity with Kuvera-Vaiśravana. A Jambhala figure in the Patna Museum has a pot-belly, squat dwarfish feature, holding money-bag in his left hand, a citron in his right hand and upturned jar shown below the leg hanging down the seat.183

Varieties of figures of Tārā found in Bihar illustrate the principles behind the Mahāyāna-Tantrayāna iconography. It is a common name applied to a number of goddesses. Broadly speaking, there are two types of Tārās. While the ordinary Tārās originate from the ten syllables of Tārā-mantra (Om Tāre tuttāre ture svāha) and carrying the blue lotus in the left hand and showing the varada mudrā in the right, the extraordinary ones do not necessarily originate from the above mentioned Tārā-mantra. There is no single colour for all these varieties of Tārā. Amongst the seven ordinary ones, Khadiravāṇi, Vaśyatārā, Ārya-tārā, Mahattari-Tārā and Varada-Tārā have green colour and the two other Ashtamahābhaya-Tārā and Mṛtyuvāñcana-Tārā have white colour. Amongst the extraordinary Tārās those having green colour are Durgottārīṇī, Dhanada, Jāṅguli and Pārṇaśavarti, white coloured are Caturbhuja-Sitatārā, Saṃbhujā-Suklatārā, Viśvamātā, Kurukullā and Jāṅguli, yellow ones are Vajra-Jāṅguli, Pārṇaśavarti, Bhṛkuṭi, and Prasanna, blue ones are Ekaṭā, Mahācīna and red coloured is Kurukullā. Of these different forms possibly the most popular in Bihar was Khadiravāṇi-Tārā and the most interesting are Vajra-Tārā and Mahācīna-Tārā. Vajra-Tārā’s ten companion goddesses (namely Pushpa-, Dhūpa-, Dipa-, Gandha-Tārās, Vajrāṅkuśī, Vajra-
pāṭi, Vajrasphoṭi, Vajraghaṇṭā Uṣṇīśhavijayā and Sumbha vide Sādhanamāla, vol. I., Text pp. 179-180, 184-185, 197-198) and attendant divinities correspond to the ten-syllabled mantra of Tārā and the materials used in the ritual worship. A metal image of this deity found at Chandipur (Bhagalpur) is enclosed within an eight petalled lotus flower along with figures of eight attendants.¹⁶⁸ Mahācīna-Tārā is believed to have been introduced from China.¹⁶⁹ A Buddhist inscription from Bodh-Gayā during the reign of Jayacandra records the invocation of Ekajaṭā and installation of three Tārās including that of Ugra-Tārā by Śrīmitra at Jayapura.¹⁷⁰ Thus the varied images of Tārā illustrate the principles and methods by which the Vajrayāna pantheon became rich and extensive. One single deity may have innumerable forms according to the number of hands, the number of faces and legs, āśanas and the weapons. The colour of each one of them differs according to the worship of each in different maṇḍalas.¹⁷¹

While making a survey of the Vajrayāna deities, a word of caution is necessary. The Vajrayānists believed that each manifestation of the Śūnya took the form of a divinity in accordance with the Bijamantra (germ-syllable) uttered by the worshipper.¹⁷² Dr. B. Bhattacharya pointed out that the Vajrayānists never worshipped any image or god.¹⁷³ He amplifies his statement thus: "it is the bhūvanā (desire) of the worshipper, which is of the nature of a psychic force, that reacts on the infinite Energy giving rise to different manifestations according to the nature of the reaction. The nature of this reaction is of illimitable variety and thus the resultant deity also appears in an infinite variety of forms."¹⁷⁴ The non-real existence of a Vajrayāna deity in Bihar can be proved by the reference to one Trailokyavijayā in a Chāndil stone-inscription of the 8th or 9th century A.D. Dr. D. G. Sircar suggests that 28—11
there is no such goddess either in the Hindu or Buddhist pantheon, yet she "was probably conceived by the Buddhists as the sakti of the god Trailokyavijaya." The Jaynagar image-inscription of Year 85 of Palapāla mentions bhāttārikā Pūrneśvari (or Puṇyeśvari) and her image is seen carrying a child on her left lap. I have not been able to trace the dhyāna-mantra of either of these two goddesses in the Buddhist literature.

Mantras and dhūraṇjts were invented by the Gurus for the benefit of those votaries who could not worship their gods in accordance with the prescribed sādhana (procedure) or read the vast Mahāyāna Sūtras. Such devotees were told of the efficacies of mantras. An illustration of the types of the benefits and rewards a devotee would earn by the utterance of the mantra and worship of Vajra-Tārā is given here. Ācārya Ratnākarasānti, a famous scholar in charge of the eastern gate of the Vikramasīla University, narrates that at the mere recital of the name of Vajra-Tārā, tigers, thieves, crocodiles, lions, snakes, elephants, buffaloes, bears bulls etc. will fly away or may even be killed. If one hundred and eight blue lotuses were offered into the fire with her mantra (Oṁ Tāre tūttāre ture svāhā) any woman can be subordinated. If a feather of a crow over which the mantra has been recited 32 times and could be smuggled in the house of one's enemy, that enemy would die within a week. Further, on recitation of her mantra, a reciter could get himself married to any girl of his choice, get varied types of favour from the king, secure emancipation etc. These ideas have striking similarity with the ubhicāra process of Hindu Tantras, the root of which can be traced to the Ātharvasveda.

Modern man may be sceptical about the magical potency of the mantras. But Tāranātha tells us that some of the teachers like Buddhaśrī, Bhavabhadra, Lilāvajra and
Kamalarakshita of the Vikramaśilā University were not only authors of Tantra works but also had obtained siddhis, informs us that due to their drawing of Yamāri-maṇḍala or performance of Yamāri-sādhana, Līlāvajra and Kamalarakshita could repel and cause the death of the ‘Turushkas’ who had invaded Magadha. Śākyasri, who lived towards the close of the twelfth century had enough of magical powers to bring a mad elephant or a vicious buffalo under his control.

V. Tāntrikism and Mādhyamika-Yogācāra systems

Tāntrika Buddhism is based on twin beliefs—Mantras and drawing of diagrams in the form of circles and triangles, and union of the male and female principles for the highest state of Buddhahood. The symbolism that the knower becomes one with knowledge just as a man and woman become one in the embrace of love, has been subject to much criticism by modern scholars. One may not agree with Anagarika Govinda for stating that the Tāntrika Buddhists did not seek union with a woman physically but union of our male and female nature in process of meditation. But none can brush aside his argument and proof that the principles of Yoga were taught by Tilopa through the symbolism of union of man and woman. The Six Doctrines of Tilopa, who flourished in the eleventh century, runs thus: “The vital force of the Five Aggregates (= 5 Skandhas) in its real nature, pertaineth to the masculine aspect of the Buddha-principle manifesting through the left psychic nerve (= idā-nāḍī). The vital force of the Five Elements (= dhātu), in its real nature, pertaineth to the to feminine aspect of the Buddha-principle manifesting through the right psychic nerve (= pāngalā-nāḍī). As the vital force with these two aspects of it in union, descendeth into the median nerve (= sūshumna) gradually there cometh the realisation...” and one attains the boom of the Mahāmudrā.
The Budhist-Tantrika principle of Yoga may also be interpreted on the basis of the views of the Yogacara school. Winternitz gives the following translation of verse 46 of the *Sutralamkara* of Asanga: "In the turning aside of sexual union supreme greatness is obtained, (namely) in the enjoyment (or pleasure ground) of Buddha-happiness and in looking without impure thoughts at a wife." Dr. P. C. Bagchi rightly says that the meaning of the term *paravrtti* given by Winternitz "does not appear to be so plain." In the words of Bagchi, *paravrtti of maithuna does not mean 'turning aside' or 'abnegation of the sexual act,' but enjoyment of bliss similar to that arising from that act. "The word *vrtti has the implication of a forward circular motion whereas *avrtti means a complete revolution; the prefix *para means 'back, in an inverted order.' This really amounts to a mental revolution." Sthiramati, commenting on verse 29 of the *Vijnaptimatrata-tasiddhi Trimisika* of Vasubandhu says that "that which is its *paravrtti is produced when there is no more impregnation either of troubles or of duality and on account of their stoppage there is pliability. This *paravrtti is attained through the elimination of two kinds of troubles—Klesavara and Jneyavarana." There is neither reference to the sexual act nor its abnegation in the interpretation offered by Sthiramati.

Tantrika-Buddhism though resembling outwardly with the Hindu Tantras has little similarity. Whereas in Saktism the world is created by the union of Siva and Sakti, the aim of a Yogin of the Yogacara school, as we have seen above, is to turn back the *citta* to its original state of all-pervading *karanacitta*.* In Buddhism the central idea is *prajna* (wisdom) and not *sakti. To the Buddhists *sakti is maya and it is *prajna which liberates one from the *sakti* or the power that creates illusion. Again whereas in Saktism
the female principle is active, "the world creating
eroticism", in Tāntrika-Buddhism it is the male principle,
upāya and karuṇā which is active and positive. The negative
or unqualified aspect of reality is praṇaū or śronya.

All shades of Tantrayāna as well as the Mādhyaṃka
and Yogācāra schools shared in the common belief in the
extreme universal altruism, which distinguished Mahāyāna
from Hinayāna. Moreover, like the Vajrayāñists, the
Mādhyaṃkas also believed in some magic and miracles.
In a work of Śāntideva who belonged to the Mādhyaṃka
school, one reads that a Mahāyāna monk had to believe in
magic circles and charms for protecting oneself from disces-
ses, pestilence and thieves. But a study of the disciplinary
rules in the books by the above-mentioned author, Śānti-
deva, show how stern and strenuous was the life of a
Mahāyāna monk as distinguished from that of a Vajrayāñist
Tāntrika. A Mahāyānist was asked to meditate and
eschew all loka-dharmas like gain, fame, desire for food and
clothing, control the mind and cultivate the pāramitās.
He was asked to shun princes and kings, nuns of giggling
and chattering ways, lay sisters and barren women, monks
of evil conduct and such as approve of the Jainas, and not
to enter the room of the womankind alone. Even a wife
was to be considered as an evil, for "a wife must be regarded
as an obstacle to virtue, to meditation and to wisdom. And
yet three more she is like a thief, a murderer or a guardian
of hell." Again, the Vajrayāna view of Śunya is some-
thing different from those of the Mādhyaṃkas and the
Viśnūnavādins. According to Vajrayāna, Śunya includes
three elements, namely Śunya (Reality), Viśnūna (conscious-
ness) and Mahāsukha (great bliss). Śunya in Mādhyaṃka
and Yogācāra-Viśnūnavāda systems is avaya or devoid of
of duality. To the Viśnūnavādins Nirvāṇa is Viśnūna and
Śunya. The concept of Śunya has been dealt in details in
the section on philosophy.
VI. Kālacakrayāna

As both the Vajrayāna and Kālacakrayāna radiated from the Tantrayāna, there is good deal of similarity in the religion and mysticism of these two systems. One of the great teachers of the Kālacakrayāna was Abhayākara Gupta of the Vikramāśilā University. There is no essential difference on the interpretation of the nature of the Bodhicitta. Kālacakra is not different from the Śūnyatā and Kāruṇā. Kālacakra is as much the absolutely unified principle of Prajñā and Upaśya as the commingling of Śūnyatā and Kāruṇā in Vajrayāna-Tantrikism. Kālacakra is the Ādi Buddha. Just as the Ādi Buddha of the Tāntrika-Buddhists is the symbol of the universality and timelessness so also Kālacakra is beyond past, present and future. Both Tāntrika-Buddhists and followers of the Kālacakrayāna believe in the efficacy of mantras, mandalas, offerings and sacrifices. Again in both of these we have the concepts of Trikāla and Trikāya.

L. A. Waddell held that the Kalacakra was “unworthy of being considered a philosophy” But Dr. P. C. Bagchi rightly points out that though the Kālacakra sect gave more emphasis on sādhana than on philosophy, yet it must be admitted that they followed the Mādhyamika school of philosophy to a large extent. Nagarjuna holds that as Śūnyatā cannot be tarnished by prapañca or māya (Śūnyatā is prapañcain aprapañcitam) so it is beyond origin and destruction. Similarly there is no origin and decay of Kālacakra. Like the Mādhyamikas, the followers of the Kālacakrayāna also believe that there are many Sāṃbhoga and Nirmāṇakāyas of Bodhicitta but there is only one Dharmakāya.

Despite the similarity with the Mādhyamika philosophers and Tāntrika-Buddhists, the Kālacakra sectarians differed from both. First, Kālacakra is unified with Bhagavatī Prajñā in her sākara and nirākara aspects. Bhagavatī
Prajñā is here šakti and not māyā or illusion, as held by the Tāntrika-Buddhists. Kālacakra is Karuṇā and Prajñā is the creative force. Secondly, Abhayākara Gupta’s Kālačakra-krauṣṭāra introduces astronomy and astrology along with the practices of Yoga. He holds that it is not possible to avoid the influence of constellations. So one should regulate his life according to the time factor, the mūhūrta, thithi, the movement of stars and planets. It is by the control of the vital winds in our body that we can keep ourselves free from the influence of the whirl of Time.

VII. Sahajayāna

Another school which received strong impetus from the Buddhists of Bihar was Sahajayāna. It is another aspect of Buddhist mysticism, which had affinity with and dissimilarity of ideas with Vajrayāna-Tāntrika Buddhism. How many of the authors of the three Dohā-kōsas and the fifty Cāryā-padās belonged to or were connected with Bihar is uncertain. All scholars are however almost unanimous that at least Sarahapāda, Tilopā (Tilo-pā, Tillo-pāda, Tillopā, Tailopa, Telopa, Tailika-pāda) and Nāro-pā, (Nādopā, Nāda, Nāda-pāda, Nāro, Narota-pā) lived in Bihar.13

Sahajayāna was the last phase of Vajrayāna. In both of these two branches of Tantrayāna, we find the importance of Guru, the addition of one more kāya to the existing three kāyas, propounded by the earlier Mahāyāna thinkers, the cultivation of the bodhicitta, which brings about the highest bliss. In all the three schools of esoteric Buddhism, it is through the yogic process that the objective world disappears and the YOGIN finds himself established in the vacuity. The Sahajiyā Buddhists took the help of poetic images to explain the yogic process and their mystic doctrines. In Cāryā song No. 38 composed by Saraha, the images for the kāya, the purified mind and the Guru are the boat, the oar and the sails respectively. As the boat has to proceed against the
current, advice was given that the boat should always be kept near the kula. Finally the boat reaches the sky (gagana). The imagery implies the following yogic principle: "While this introversion or internal revolution takes place the bodhicitta in its upward march follows three principal channels, called the nāḍīs. Connexion with the external world still continues and is not completely severed. This connexion totally ceases at a stage where the three meet together to form a single channel only. This is implied by saying that the boat should steer clear of the two paths on the right and left which are full of dangers." The same principles are involved in Carya-padas Nos. 32 and 39 of Sarahapāda. The great destination called the gagana (vacuity), nairātā, mahāsukhacakradvIPA (island of the great bliss situated in the ocean of vacuity) by the Sahajiyā Buddhists is the same as Śūnyatā of the Vajrayāna. When one attains a perfectly calm mind and an imperishable body there happens the diffusion of the soul. At such a stage Tilopa tells us that "I am the world, I am the Buddha, I am Nirñjana and I am Amanasikāra (That which does not stick to the mind)."

There are however some differences between Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna on the one hand and Sahajayāna on the other. Neither ceremonials nor the mystic value of mantra, manḍala and mudrā in the Vajrayāna had any place in the Sahajayāna. The Mahāyāna approach of realisation of the supreme bliss through high thinking and deep learning was not approved of by the Sahajiyās. Sahajayāna emphasizes the intuitive approach to Reality. Sarahapāda has made sarcastic reflections on the practices of Brāhmaṇas, Jains, ascetics etc. in his Doha-kośa. To him asceticism, reading of scriptures, uttering of mantras and worship of rituals were all useless. So he states—

Moksha ki labh hai jhāna pabītol
Tillo-pāda observes that Paramārtha is to be realised by intuition and not by intellect. In short, though the Buddhist Tantra works like the Hevajra and Heruka Tantras, reveal the existence of the nāgīs within the body, the Sahajiyās must be given the credit of explaining the mechanism of Ḫathayoga through analogies. The following analogies can be found in the works attributed to Saraha:

(a) "There where the mind and the wind do not move about, there where the ravi and šāsin do not enter, repose your citta there.......".197

(b) "When the candra and sūrya are rubbed and mixed up together, merit and demerit immediately disappear".198

(c) "Mix up the two, candra and sūrya by rubbing them".198

(d) "There is no nādu, no bindu, no sun and no moon, the citta-rāja is free by his own nature".198

(e) "The right and left are the pitfalls".197

The terms sūrya and candra or ravi and šāsin or nāda and bindu, or the right and left are really the symbols of day and night, conscious and unconscious, the inspiration and expiration of the vital wind. These categories of terms give us the notions of the external or objective world. A Yogin who extirpates such perceptions of the objective world can proceed towards the Sahaja. "This is why it has been said on so many occasions that 'the sun' and 'the moon' should be killed".199 The recognition of Ḫathayoga by the Sahajiyā Buddhists show that man is a microcosm and whatever exists in the outer universe exists in him. Their sādhana involved the practice of a yoga by which one could have an imperishable body and thereby bring about the transubstantiation of the body.
VIII. Kaula School

The fusion of the process of hāṭhayoga and Śāktism led to the rise of the Kaula school. Dr. Bagchi has pointed out that though many of its leading ideas were derived from the Buddhist mystic schools yet it identified itself with Brahmanical Śāktism. It is difficult to ascertain the positive contributions of Bihar to the thought of this school, which had deviated far from Buddhism when it accepted the Varnāśrama.

IX. Philosophy

The wide distribution of Vajrayāna images and Bihar as the habitat of some mystics belonging to the Sahajayāna does not mean that the scholars of this region were satisfied with the current metaphysical speculations. We should not be led to think that the philosophy of Buddhism was obscured by the symbolism of union of man and woman or analogy of the sun and moon, Jīnapura as the city of highest bliss suggested by the above-mentioned schools. There is hardly any truth in the statement of MM. H. P. Shastri when he says that during the Pāla period "the words Śūnyavāda and Vijñānavāda—the war cry of the sects—seem to have died out from this time (i.e. the time of Haribhadra, during the reign of Dharmapālā) and another word came into currency without the sectarian sting. This is Advayavāda or monism." Rather the fact appears to be that during the period under review, a large number of books were written on the Mādhyamika and Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda schools of thought which philosophically explained Mahāyāna Buddhism. So substantial was the contribution of Dharmakīrti to logic that even the orthodox Brāhmaṇa logicians accepted the importance of induction (nyāpāti) and the major premise. One can discern the influence of Dharmakīrti through Prabhakara on Navyanyāya, which was systematised at the end of our period.
Hsuan Tsang and I-tsing tell us that the students of the Nālandā University used to study *hetuvidyā* (logic), *adhyatmavidyā* (philosophy) and the works of all the eighteen rival schools of Buddhism. From the eighth century onwards broadly speaking the two principal schools of philosophy within the fold of Mahāyānism in Bihar were Mādhyamika and Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda systems. To the former system, propounded by Nāgārjuna (c. 150 A.D.) belonged Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka, Candrakīrti and Sāntideva. The notable philosophers of the Yogācāra school founded by Maitreyanātha, Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu (3rd-4th century A.D.) were Sthiramati, Dharmapāla of Nālandā, Candragomin, Dharmakīrti, Dharmottara, Prajñākara, Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti of the Vikramashīla University. Both of these schools had their sub-schools. While Buddhapālita holds that the *prasāṅga* (*reductio ad absurdum*) method as applied by Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, was the correct approach to philosophy, the Svātantra school initiated by Bhāvaviveka believed that Mādhyamikas should not only disprove the arguments of opponents but also adduce syllogisms and arrive at a new thesis. Candrakīrti pointed out the inaccurate statements of Bhāvaviveka and reaffirmed the Prāsaṅgika school of Buddhapālita. Sāntideva also followed the Prāsaṅgika method, Sāntarakshita belonged to the Svātantrika school. He and Kamalaśīla reinterpreted the Mādhyamika system. These two brought a syncretism of Yogācāra and Mādhyamika, because they accepted the ultimate reality of the Mādhyamikas and empirical reality of the Sautrāntika-Vijñānavādins. So deep was the influence of Sāntarakshita that Khai-dub, whose Tibetan work has been quoted by Dr. Obermiller, observes: “The Mādhyamika-āloka and the Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla, as well as the texts of Vimuktasena, Haribhadra, Buddhajñānapada, Abhayākaragupta etc. agree with Sāntarakshita in the main standpoint (which is
that of the Yogācāra-mādhyamikasvātantrika whereas Bhāvaviveka and Jñānagarbha express the point of view of the Sautrāntika-mādhyamika-Svātāntrikas. On the Yogācāra side we find that Dharmakīrti restated the views of Diānāga.

All systems of Indian philosophy enquire into the nature of life and believe that the world is full of suffering. Yet there is a remedy for all perennial evils. The Buddha held that sufferings were due to avidyā and kāma. The philosophers of our period also held that avidyā (nescience) hides the real from us and causes bondage. But there is no unanimity of views about its nature. While certain schools of the monistic Vedāntist argued that avidyā is neither absolutely real nor absolutely unreal, and a fictitious category, the Buddhists view it as a positive entity. The Yogācāra-Vijnānavādins hold that bāhya or vishayadrṣṭi (objectification) is avidyā, and it is due to avidyā that the object appears as an entity existing independently of consciousness. The Mādhyamikas hold that any drṣṭi or conceptualisation is avidyā. Prajñākaramati commenting on Śāntideva’s Bodhicaryāvatāra observes: “Reason (buddhi) is not grounded in the real; it is a subjective play of the imagination (vikalpasvabhāva); and all vikalpa is avidyā—as it apprehends the non-entity (avastugrāhītvā). Thus it is said: Vikalpa is, by its nature, of the stuff of avidyā”.

Mādhyamikas hold that avidyā is itself unreal. But Vijnānavādins take it to be real, because bondage is caused by nescience and other imperfections.

Avidyā is due to the notions of atman, which causes the two kinds of veils or positive hindrances (āvarana). The first one is of nescience and passion (klesāvarana), which obstructs the realisation of purity and truth. The other veil covers the ontological reality (jñeyāvarana). Vijnānavādins call these two types of veils as daushṭhulya.
On the denial of ātman Śāntarakśhita tells us that "when one has perceived the fact of there being no soul...no defect can obtain a footing in him; because it is its contradictory. Just as when a bright lamp is there, there can be no darkness." The negation of self (anātmanavāda) means denial of ātman. The five factors that enter into individuality and all elements are ephemeral or anitya. The Hinayānists believed in the dharmaśūnyatā, that is, the dharma or things around us, internal or external, do not have an independent nature or ātman of their own. The Mahāyānists in general argued that not only elements but also the self were unreal and non-existing. Sutta, jīva, purusha or pudgala have no independent nature of their own. Thus the pudgalaśūnyatā and dharmaśūnyatā of the Mādhyamikas and pudgala-nairātmya and dharma-nairātmya of the Viṣṇunāvādins are non-substantial.

Due to avidyā one does not understand the fluxional nature of all entities—an entity endures for a moment yielding place to another entity which has emerged. The Sautrāntikas hold that by inference one knows the external world, which has its reality. Both Yogācāra and Mādhyamikas reject the Sautrāntika view and prove that the external world is non-existing. Both these schools of philosophy base their argument of unreality of phenomenon on nihsvabhāvavāda. Nāgārjuna and his followers point out that phenomena are unreal because they are dependent and mutual dependence is unreal. The Yogācārins hold that the external world is a mere ideation or extension of the cittamātra or viṣṇu-namātra. Each individual creates a world mentally, which does not exist in reality. The Yogācārins explain this by stating that the world is no more than a sky-flower or a dream. In a dream there is no object whatever one sees. Yet this school admits that none can deny the mental creations, vikalpa, or parikalpita or bhṛnti. The samsāra is not as absurd and non-existent as a barren
woman's son and it has that much of reality as long as a rope is mistaken for a snake. Thus though ultimately misapprehension would be discovered as unreal, yet misapprehension or wrong ideation is as existent (sat) as the truth. The Mādhyamikas do not believe that bhṛānti can be sat. To them Reality is only sat.

The Buddha pointed out that all sufferings have causes. Buddhist philosophers later on elaborated the law of causation and called the theory as Pratītyasamutpāda. The Sautrāntikas developed the whole Buddhist philosophy on this law. They also postulated four different causal factors329a for the understanding of the theory of perception. Sāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla also argue that just as the succession of seed and sprout is determined by the law of causation, so also memory, bondage, emancipation and the rest can be explained in terms of causality. Kamalaśīla while commenting on Sāntarakṣita's texts on the relation between action and reaction,330 has criticised the views of Vaibhāshikas and Kumārila, who maintained that cause and effect are synchronous.331 Both Sāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla argue that simultaneity between cause and effect is clearly incongruous.332 Two later writers of the Yogācārā-Vijñānavādā school, Jñānaśrimitra and Ratnakīrti observe that a subsequent cognition emerges with the impression of a previous cognition and "so the concomitance of the two factors of causality-in-presence is easily apprehended in the form 'one thing happening another happens'.333 The Mādhyamikas also point out that whatever originates is dependent on others. Everything is relative. While enunciating the law of causation they criticised the Ābhidharmika system which believed in the reality of separate elements. Nāgārjuna argues that "If you take entities to exist by themselves (svabhāvata), you take them as unconditioned, uncaused".334 His commentator Candrakīrti also observes that "It is thus you, who uphold the doctrine of rigid nature of
entities (sasvabhāvatā) that contradicts the Pratītya-Samutpāda. And in consequence thereof the entire Buddhist philosophy is vitiated.31 Thus the Mādhyamikas interpret Pratītyasamutpāda as not the temporary sequence of momentary entities but their mutual dependence and thereby link it up with their proposition of unreality of things.32 Śaṅḍideva, however, by quoting the chain of causation in the Saṅistamba Sūtra shows affinity with the older proposition of the twelve links of Moral Causation.33 It needs be mentioned here that Nāgārjuna and his Mādhyamika followers too reveal the hollowness of the law of causation as a metaphysical reality and this influenced the theories of Śaṅkara and later dialecticians.

Nirvāṇa can bring cessation of nescience and it is panacea to all ills and sufferings of sentient beings. Śaṅkarācārya, Kamalaśīla and other Buddhist philosophers have repeatedly said that so long as the I-notion remain one cannot attain Nirvāṇa.34 The Buddha persistently refused to explain the metaphysical implication of Nirvāṇa. Dr. Satkari Mookerjee rightly remarks that the implication "has however, become a fruitful source of polemics among his followers and modern scholars too"35 Candrakīrti, while commenting on the first verse of chapter XXV of the Mādhyamika-Kārikas tells us that philosophers believed in two types of Nirvāṇa: (1) Nirvāṇa with some residual substratum (sopadhiśesha) is attained when one can abandon the varied types of klesas (defilement) beginning with nescience, though there still remains the five aggregates (pañcopādānakandhāḥ). (2) Nirvāṇa without any residuum (nirupadhiśesa) is attained when there is cessation even of those aggregates (skandhas) which constitute empirical or conscious existence. Nāgārjuna and his followers point out that there are contradictions in that theory of Nirvāṇa which explains it as extinction of all elements of conscious existence. The Mādhyamikas argue that Nirvāṇa is neither
to be identified with consciousness or bliss nor bhāva (being) and ābhāva (non-being). Nirvāṇa to them is metaphysically indeterminate. Candrakīrti says that Nirvāṇa is "what is not abandoned nor acquired, what is not annihilation nor eternality, what is not destroyed nor created." Sthiramati believes that on the attainment of Nirvāṇa, consciousness is completely void, being devoid of the subject-object relation (grāhya-grāhaka-bhāva-rahita).

The Mahāyānists, including Vijnānavādins and Mādhyamikas hold that Nirvāṇa is Truth and Absolute. To the former Vijnānavādins Śūnyā is the highest truth and devoid of all characteristics (lakṣaṇa). It is tathāta or dharmaṭa, that is denoted as vijñaptimātrata, which is non-mental state (citta). Candrakīrti of the Mādhyamika school explains Śūnyata as the highest truth (paramārtha) in the form of questions and answers. He begins by stating that we see a thing not in its innate (sva-rūpa) but in its imposed (āropita) form. In reality its form is dharmaṭa. He explains dharmaṭa as own being (sva-bhāva). Own being means Nature (prakṛti) and Nature is called voidness (Śūnyatā). He further states "what does voidness mean? The state of own being (naiṣvabhāva). What are we to understand by it? That which is 'suchness' (tathāta). What is 'suchness'? Being of such nature (tathābhāva) that is, the state of not liable to change (avaikārita), the state of permanent existence (sadbhavasthārayita). So Śūnyatā is not nihilism or positivism. Thus to Mādhyamika and Vijnānavāda the Absolute is both transcendent and immanent. Absolutism in the philosophy of these schools is advaya or non-dualism, rejection of duality as illusion. But advaya has been interpreted by each of these schools differently. The advaya knowledge of the Mādhyamikas is free from the duality of the extremes (dṛśṭīś) of 'is' and 'not is'. To the Vijnānavādins advaya is devoid of the duality of subject and object. Both of these schools take the help of dialectics to prove their theses.
Inspite of the agreement in the form of Absolutism, the two metaphysical schools differ in their manner of approach to it. They do not view illusion from the same angle and do not agree about what is negated. We can have some idea of their standpoints when we take note of the Mādhyamika criticism of Vijnānavāda and vice-versa. It seems that criticism of Vijnānavāda began not with Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva but with Candrakīrti and Śāntideva, who flourished in the period under survey. Vijnānavādins explain atayavijnāna as the consciousness which accepts the phenomenal existence of the world with its distinctions of subject and object. Consciousness is self-luminous. Pure consciousness can get rid of the notion of duality and thus can absolve itself of impurities. Dharmakīrti takes the word 'citta' for consciousness, including all cognitions, thoughts and ideas and caittta for feelings, which are classed apart from cognitions on the ground that feelings do not contain an external, objective reference like the latter, but are conversant with internal mental states and are purely inward in reference. Candrakīrti argues that if consciousness can exist by itself without the object, as Vijnānavādins maintain, it must be noted that without the object the knowing consciousness cannot function. He also says that as the citta is empty it cannot cognize itself. To quote his own words, "Even the sharpest sword cannot cut itself; the finger-tips cannot be touched by the same finger-tips. Citta does not know itself." The criticisms of Śāntideva are also similar. The Vijnānavādins criticise the Mādhyamikas by arguing that when the Mādhyamikas say that Śūnyatā is negation of all, nothing itself becomes the criterion of truth. Further, if nothing is reality how are we to explain the process of the universe? Sthiramati puts the Vijnānavāda proposition thus: "Constructive ideation (abhūtoparikulpaḥ) is real. In it duality does not (absolutely) exist. Non-substanti-
ality (Śūnyatā) however, exists in it. In this (Non-substantiality) too, that (Constructive Ideation) is found.”

Thus in the ultimate analysis of the Absolute we pass on to a realm which can be described not by the process of logic and reasoning but by the empirical mode of intuition. In spite of high standard of academic discussions on metaphysics it has to be admitted that the Mahāyāna-Vajrayāna philosophers of our period did not forget that a Bodhisattva should be in the service of a humanity. The Vajrayāna and Yogācāra schools knew the imperfections and impurities in human life. But it was possible for a Bodhisattva to remove the impurities and purify the chain of consciousness. The emancipated Bodhisattva, endowed with the highest knowledge, exists for the welfare of humanity. The supplication of a Bodhisattva has been beautifully expressed by Śāntideva: “May I be a lamp to those who want it, a bed for those who require it, a servant of all. May I have the power to dispose myself in various ways so that all living beings in space may live upon me until they are liberated”.

SECTION C

JAIN RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY (550-1200 A.D.)

In the age of commentary and Bhāshya the Jain religion could neither get state protection nor could it produce any great and influential ascetic in Bihar. During the period if could flourish and spread in the Deccan, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Kerala, Andhra etc. Consequently great scholars, teachers, thinkers and authors appeared in only those regions. Nevertheless the heart of every Jain throbbed with an attraction towards the age-old sacred land of his religion—Bihar. Therefore not only the intellectual teachers and authors but even the laymen maintained an incessant chain of religious visits to sacred places in Bihar like Rājagṛha,
Campā, Vaiśālī, Sammeda Śīkhara and Gayā. Intellectual mendicants stayed for years in these places of Bihar to improve their knowledge and purify their character. The sages accomplished their last penances in this land.

Archaeological remains and epigraphical findings of the period give us an idea of the state of Jainism in Bihar during the period in question. In the Jain temple of Baragaon (Nālandā), there is to be found an epigraph of the time of Rājayapāla of the Pāla dynasty (first half of the 10th century). It is mentioned there that a trader named Śri Vaidyanātha, son of Manoratha came there in course of his religious journey. The images of Ādinātha with headlocks found in some of the Jain temples of Gayā and Campā give an impression of the development of Jainism in Bihar in the 6th and 7th century A.D. A study of these reveals that their form is based on the description found in the Padma Purāṇa (676 A.D.) of Ravisena-cačhya. The other possibility is that Ravisena-cačhya gave those descriptions only after a perusal of these images.

Another archaeological evidence happens to be a metal image of Ādinatha Tirthaṅkara found at Chausa in Shahabad district. Due to its form, hair-style and beauty of the halo it has been ascertained to belong to the 8th-9th century A.D. Some other images from Chausa also seem to be of the 7th and the 8th century A.D.

There is a big stone well in dilapidated condition on the summit of Kolutha hill in the Gaya district. There is a pond within the walls. A lot of facts has come to light regarding Jainism in Medieval Bihar from the archaeological findings unearthed after the excavation of this pond. On the north of the pond after a little ascent there is a temple of Pārśvanātha and a terrace. A little further there lies a mound the upper part of which is levelled land, with a big hole in the middle called the Yajñākunda. The
inscriptions found on its four sides have not as yet been fully deciphered but a word "Jaunasa" is worth consideration. This word may lead to the assumption that this place was the courtyard of Jinasena, the author of the Padma Purāṇa (9th century A. D.).

Some scholars are of the view that Patna is the tīrtha of Jinasena, the author of the Padma Purāṇa, but so far no strong evidence has been put in support of this theory. Despite of there being a difference of opinion regarding his birth place there are strong evidences to prove that he lived in Bhadrilpura (Bhaundil), Pātaliputra and Campā.

During the commentary age Jain travellers and Jain teachers built many Jain temples and installed Jain images in Manbhum and Singhbhum too. We may exclude detailed consideration of Manbhum antiquities as it is now a part of West Bengal.

The Saraka (Śrāvaka) caste of Singhbhum were originally followers of Jainism. In the medieval ages a number of Jain temples were constructed in this district. Even now Jain archaeological remains are found at many places of this district. Upto the 8th and the 9th century A. D. Jainism was still holding its place and its follower had a strong footing in this district. It began to face its downfall from the 11th century. Due to political changes Jain temples were destroyed, followers of Jainism were persecuted which resulted in their scattering away. Even the pilgrimage or Jain travellers were stopped and the districts of Singhbhum and Manbhum were detached from the rest of the Jain world. Those who stayed here were also scattered and became known as the Sarakas.

In the district of Bhagalapur many evidences have been found to prove the flourishing condition of Jainism
in the medieval period. In Sultanaganj there are remains of a mosque on the bank of the Ganges just facing the temple of Ajgabinath. Here there was a Jain temple in the medieval period which was afterwards transformed into a mosque. Even today here are to be found many Jain images engraved on stone slabs. There are paintings of the 7th and the 8th centuries on the Patharaghati hill which is also called the eighty four munis. The caves here were the abodes of the Jain ascetics in the 6th and 7th centuries. Maṇḍāragiri, a small hillock situated at 31 miles from Bhagalapura is mentioned as the place of salvation of the Tirthaṅkara Vasupuja in the Uttarapurāṇa. There are two Jain temples on the hill which have been repaired from time to time. The seven feet wide wall of the bigger temple indicates it to be of the 5th century A.D. In this temple there are black footprints of Vasupuja Svāmi. Its art and stone prove it to be of the 8th or 9th century. In the smaller temple there are three footprints, all of the medieval period.

Being the place of penance of Gautama Gaṇadhara, Gunama in the district of Nawada is also sacred to the Jains. There is an image of Vasupuja in the Digambara Jain temple here, which was installed on Saturday the 4th day of Vaiśākha Śukla 1268 Vikram era (1211 A.D.) by Amaradi the wife of Data Prasad Singh Bhawasingha of Sarangapura. There is another image of Kunthunātha of 1268 Vikram era on the altar. The altar is new but many images installed on it are old, which were installed by the Jain travellers of medieval period in different years. The images of Vasupuja and Mahāvīra in the Jalamanḍira here bear Śvetāmbara emblems. 24 footprints indicating the 24 Tirthaṅkaras also bear Śvetāmbara emblems. The footprints are not very old but other accessories of the temple seem to be medieval.
Sufficient information is gathered regarding the history of the commentary age from the archaeological remains found at Rājagṛha. In course of the clearing of the old well near Maniyar Math an image of Pārśvanātha with seven-hooded disc has been obtained. This image is very old, artistically unique and after studying the inscription on this stone image, Shri Kashi Prasad Jayaswal has expressed that it belongs to the 1st century A.D. and there are references to Samrāṭ Sreṇika and Vipulācala in it.

M. A. Stein writes, "The upper portion of the Jain temples at Vaibhāragiri is old but the terraces on which they have been built are of recent construction."

R. D. Banerji tells us that Jain stūpas were existing on the Vaibhāragiri upto the 7th century A.D. and there are also several Jain images of the Gupta age.

Of the three temples at Vipulācala, the middle one of Candraprabhu has an image of the Gupta age. The image of Mahāvīra in Khadgāsana (the standing pose), on the Udayagiri hill undoubtedly belongs to the 5th century A.D. Some images on the Svarṇagiri and Vaibhāragiri too belong to the 7th and the 8th centuries. Some broken images are also to be found on the hills of Rājagṛha which can be dated between the 6th and the 7th centuries. Thus the archaeology of Rājagṛha indicates its importance in the history of medieval Jainism. Images and temples were installed at Rājagṛha during the medieval age. Pilgrims from the north, the west and the south came here and purified their souls by meditation.

In this age followers of Jainism lived in the Patna district. From the Sīhāvarāvalīcarita it is learnt that king Udāyi had built this town. Its ancient name was Kusumapura which was changed to Pāṭaliputra after the reign of Ajātaśatru. The first Council of the Jain literary
academy met in this town during the reign of Navam Nanda. Kamaladaha Kshetra (the salvation place of Sudarśana Svāmi) was installed after the 8th century A.D. The story of Sudarśana also achieved importance from the 7th century. Thus Pātaliputra got its acceptance as a Jain place of pilgrimage in the 7th century. Even afterwards discussions on Jainism and its philosophy were held here in the medieval period.

The archaeology of the Shahabad district also throws some light on the history of Jainism. The inscriptions on some of the images of village Masarh in this district inform us that some Jains of Rathora dynasty came here in course of a pilgrimage and they installed the images of Ādinātha Neminātha and Pārśvanātha. These installations were performed during the reign of Rajanātha Deva of Masarh (Mahāsara) by Guru Kamalakīrti of Kashtha Saṅgha. However the inscriptions belong to the time later than our period. But there are many folk stories concerning the antiquity of this place. Due to being on the way of the travellers in medieval period Shahabad was also a centre of attraction for the followers of Jainism.

Descriptions of Bihar in detail are found in all the Jain literature of age. Even if the writers were born outside Bihar their love for the sacred land of Bihar could not lessen. So in order to get a comprehensive knowledge of the history of this age it is necessary to consider the evidences found in the Jain literature however the picture we get is mainly of the much earlier period when Magadha was centre of Jainism and Rājagrha was its capital.

The position of Jain religion is also known from the medieval Jain literature. Though most of the Jain teachers were born outside Bihar they had been keeping intellectual and spiritual contact with Bihar. Here we get an idea of the rise of Jainism as mentioned in Vasudevahindi,
a work of this age. Describing the grandeur of Magadha Janapada Saṅghadāsa muni (6th century A.D.) writes that this region abounded in shady trees enrich with flowers and fruits. The ponds and tanks were adorned with lotus and lily. Travellers had to face no difficulty in this Janapada due to its plenty. Rājagṛha was adorned with moats and walls. The city had big and spacious highways. The market place and the mansions despised even the heaven with their grandeur. The Śramaṇas and the Brahmans lived here with harmony and cordiality. The citizens were full of compassion, benevolence and good character. All the subjects lived in peace and happiness due to plenty of chariots, horses, elephants, riches and foodgrains. There was a temple named Guṇaśilālaya where the religious teachers stayed. Obviously this is an echo of much ancient time.

We may also refer to the 'Paumacariyam' a Prākrta work by Vimala Suri (6th century). A comparision of quotations from Paumacariyam with those of Vasudeva Hindi indicates that the position of Jainism in Bihar was quite satisfactory.

Dr. Moticand writes—"The Jain preachers visited Bihar in the 6th century A.D. not only to preach their religion but also to make a full survey of the places they went, which was called the perusal of the Janapada. The ascetics felt a sense of purity by seeing the Janapada. They acquired knowledge of several languages during their travels and got opportunity to know the Janapada well. This knowledge benefited even their disciples. In course of their journey the Jain saints used to go to the places of birth, initiation and enlightenment of the Tīrthaṅkaras.

It is clear that the travelling Jain ascetics went to every nook and corner of Bihar. Descriptions of their travels are to be found in the literature of the 6th century. The commentaries and the Cūrṇis have been
written in the Gupta age and afterwards. These works give information regarding Caityas of Amalakappa and Dwipa-lasa of Vanyagrāma. These Caityas were Vyantarāyatana i.e. the images of the Vyantaras were installed in them. Even the Jain Śrāvakas worshipped in these temples in order to acquire worldly accomplishments. Bhadrā, the wife of Dhanya Śārthavāha (Caravan chief) worshipped in these Yaksha temples situated on the outskirts of Rāja-grha city with food, drink etc. on the eighth, fourteenth and the fifteenth days of the lunar month. It fulfilled the desire of Bhadrā and she got a son whom she named Devadinna.

Pūrvabhadra Caitya has been mentioned to be ancient, grand and famous. It had altars, sacred umbrellas, flags and fur brooms. It was smeared with cow-dung. It was adorned with sandalwood, pitchers, gate decorations, and garlands, and was perfumed with sandal powders. It was the shelter of the dancers, invocators, wrestlers, boxers, clowns, astrologers and picture displayers. Sacrifices and offerings were performed here. Jain ascetics stayed in such Caityas.

The above description of the Yaksha temples reveals that apart from worship of the Tīrthaṅkaras, the followers of Jainism worshipped even the Yakshas for worldly acquirements. Apart from the ascetics even the Jain householders lived in large numbers in Bihar. Among the festivals we have references to Indramaha, Skandamaha, Yakshamaha and Bhūtama along with the Ātahnika. Light is thrown on the tradition of this age by these ceremonies and festivals.

A lot of information is gathered on the history of Bihar from the Padmacarita by Ācārya Ravishena of 7th century. It is learnt that during the reign of Harshavardhana, Jain religion was in flourishing condition in Vaiśali,
Magadha, Monghyr, Bhagalapur etc. Temples of Tirthankaras were being built and the teachers were always moving in these sacred places propagating their religion. Ācārya Jinasena of the 8th century has described the flourishing condition of Magadha, Aṅga and Tirahut in course of stating the principles of Jainism. Ācārya Haribhadra of the same century has also referred to Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra, Kollaka Sanniveśa, Campā, Mithilā and Kshiti Pratīṣṭhita in his work "Samarāicha Kaha". In the description of these towns it is proved that in that age the traders, bankers and other rich personalities of Bihar were constructing Jain temples. The amount spent in the worship of temples was supposed to be well utilised. The whole of Bihar was decorated with big and grand temples. From Brhatkathākosa by Harishenācārya of 10th century it is learnt that in Rājagṛha there had already started a contention between the Jains and the Buddhists. From the legend of Jinadatta and Mitraśrī it is indicated that Jainism was followed mostly by the people of the middle class. caravan men, architects, potters and gentries were mostly worshippers of Jainism and they organised different festivals for the growth of their religion. In spite of that Jainism was on the whole in decline due to spread of Buddhism in Magadha. In a legend it has been told that Padmaśrī, the daughter of Rāhabhdatta, a teacher of Rājagṛha was married to a follower of Buddhism named Buddhasāṅghā. He impersonated himself as a Jain only to marry her. After sometime quarrel developed between the two due to difference in faith. His father blamed Padmaśrī in many ways so much so that he accused her of committing murder. Padmaśrī had strong faith in Jainism and with the power of her meditation she shook off the allegations and spread the influence of Jainism.

The above legend proves that the influence of the followers of Jainism was decaying. Of course the religious
places were well managed by the Jains but their number was decreasing in Magadha. Jainism had been already ousted from Mithilā and Vaiśālī. After the 12th century descriptions of Mithilā and Vaiśālī to be found in Jain literature are rare. Mithilā and Campā have been referred to even in the literature of 13th and 14th centuries but nothing has been said about Vaiśālī. References to Magadha and Rājagṛha are found in the later literature also. This helps the presumption that though there were not many followers of Jainism in these places, pilgrims from outside still came here. Hence Rājagṛha maintained its importance for Jainism. Poet Arhaddāsa (last part of 12th and beginning of 13th century) has written in praise of Rājagṛha in his poetic work Muniṣubrata Kāvya.339

From literary and archaeological evidences it is learnt clearly that after the 12th century followers of Jainism were being ousted from different cities and villages of Bihar. In Vividha Tīrthakalpa (about 1st quarter of 13th century) Rajagrha, Mithilā, Campāpura and Pāṭaliputra have been specially accepted as places of Jain pilgrimage. Jinaprabha Suri, the author of this work has given a realistic picture of contemporary Mithilā.

SECTION D

PŪRVA MĪMĀṁSĀ AND VEDĀNTA

The Age of Logical Disputations

For one thousand years from 600 B. C. to 400 A. D., the Jains and the Buddhists were fully occupied in questions of metaphysics and religion though we have occasional references to Logic in their works of that period. At about 400 A. D. there began an epoch when they seriously took up the problems of Logic, and all the text-books on the Jain and Buddhist systems of Logic date at or after that
time. The real founders of the medieval Logic, however, were the Buddhists.346

In course of time, the exponents of Brähmanism and Buddhism wrote numerous books refuting the views of their opponents. These thinkers were accustomed often to meet together and defeat their rivals in actual debates for, the result of these wordy wranglings frequently proved very important in determining the prestige of a school of thought. Moreover, this debating spirit was largely responsible for the extensive tours for disputation undertaken by great masters all over the country for the sole purpose of defeating the teachers of the opposite school and of securing adherents to their own. In this popular intellectual game of debating skill all the resources of the art of controversy found full play for silencing the opponent before the final philosophical answer was given.

Thus, it was in the wake of this new trend of debating and speculative currents and cross-currents in the world of intellect that the systematization of Nyāya in the Sūtra form was completed by Gautama or Akshapāda during this period of philosophical turmoil and unrest. Infact the sixteen categories elaborated by Gautama in his Nyāya-sūtra349 clearly suggest that there was a definite motive, a mercenary zeal, not detached scholarly view, behind presenting all these systematizations and enumerations. The entire system seems to be borne out of the sole purpose of meeting the opponents in controversies to refute the rivals' arguments, assert one's own view-point through logical dissertations and finally to guard one's own views against the wrong reasonings of the rivals. The earliest beginnings of Nyāya are, therefore, to be traced in the disputations and debates among scholars trying to find out the right meanings of the Vedic texts for use in sacrifices, and also in these disputations that occurred between the adherents of different
schools of thought aiming at defeating and discomfituring one another. Such disputations took place in the age of the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads, and the art of disputation was regarded even then as a subject of study.

Thus, the Nyāyasūtra of Gautama forms a land-mark in the history of Indian logic. Vātsyāyana wrote a commentary on this great work in about 320 A.D., known as Vātsyāyanabhāṣya. Uddyotakara, the great logician wrote a Vārttika on Vātsyāyanabhāṣya in about 645 A.D., with a view to establishing the Nyāya views and refuting the criticism of the great Buddhist logician, Diśnāga contained in the latter’s celebrated work Pramāṇasaṃuccaya (c. 500 A. D.). It was in fact Diśnāga’s vigorous criticism of Hindu Nyāya in general and of Vātsyāyanabhāṣya in particular that aroused Uddyotkara to write this famous Vārttika. Had there been any Maithila or other outstanding Hindu logician in this intervening period, Uddyotkara would not have, just in the very beginning verse of his Nyāya-vārttika, made this sweeping statement: “This treatise is being written by me for the purpose of removing the blemish of error cast by inferior logicians (namely Diśnāga and others) upon those doctrines which the chief of sages, Akshapāda (or Gautama) propounded for peace and welfare of the world.”176 Moreover, the Buddhist and Jain method of treating logic separately from metaphysics, as an independent study, was not accepted by the Hindus till we come to the time of the great Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya of Mithilā with whom the new school of Nyāya philosophy, known as Naṣya-Nyāya, started about 1200 A. D. discussed elsewhere in detail.

The most important logician to dominate the scene after Diśnāga and before the rise of the great Śaṅkara, Kumārila and Maṇḍana Miśra was Dharmakīrti (c. 635 A. D. or the 7th cent.), the famous author of Nyāya-bhīdu,
a Sautrāntika logical and epistemological work dealing with the Sautrāntika doctrine of Buddhism or the Sautrāntika theory of Inference. He has been referred to by great logicians like Vācaspati Miśra I, Jayanta, Śrīharsha, Śālikanātha Miśra, Pārthasārathi Miśra and several other later logicians.

Dharmakīrtī was the celebrated author of many original works and commentaries. Of these the most important is his Pramāṇavārttika, a commentary on Diinnāga’s Pramāṇaśamuccaya in which he has sharply criticised the views of Uddyotakara. In his writing of this Vārttika he seems very much influenced by Uddyotakara as his very first verse is quite in tune with the beginning verse in Uddyotakara’s Vārttika. Moreover, it reads like a counter-reply to Uddyotakara who has criticised Diinnāga as an inferior logician. Dharmakīrtī boldly asserts: “Ordinary person of weak intelligence not only shows his indifference to the good work (of Diinnāga) but is malicious, envious, and jealous towards it. Therefore it was not of great use. Thinking it so with my aptitude developed with the long and continuous study of the good work, I undertake the present one.” But, notwithstanding, his vigorous defence of Buddhism, euridite learning and vast scholarship, it seems, he did not receive as much recognition as was his due. From a verse attributed to him in Śrīdhara Dāsa’s Sadukti-Karṇāmyta it is clear that he felt ignored by his contemporaries for in the last verse of his Pramāṇaviniścaya he mournfully remarks: “My view whose path has not been reached by the capacity of mighty intelligent brains, whose correct sense has not been grasped even with great efforts, and which has not found in this world an appreciator befitting it, will like water (which is absorbed and lost) in the ocean attain old age and will perish in his own person.”
From the above it is clear that Dharmakirti was not at all happy over the existing state of affairs. The revival of the orthodox Hindu ideals under the dynamic leadership of Uddhotakara, Kumārila and others and the encouragement and support that it slowly received from the people in general may have been largely responsible for the gradual withering away of Buddhistic influences and ideals which led Dharmakirti to give vent to such disappointing utterances and expressions in seer mental agony. Thus, the most talented propagandist could not change the run of history and Buddhism in India was doomed.\textsuperscript{31}

The land of Mithilā proved the most fertile for the two systems of philosophy—Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā—to thrive on. From Gautama to Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya is a fascinating story of the tremendous growth and development of these systems of philosophy which germinated and blossomed forth into an ever-expanding quest for knowledge, truth and ultimate reality touching all problems of human mind. Besides Nyāya, the philosophy of Mīmāṃsā found its three great exponents in Kumārila, Prabhākara and Murāri, culminating in three different schools. Once again, in the early medieval age, the obligation to protect orthodox culture from the sudden onslaught of all heterodox schools of thought pushed Mithilā—the ancient land of Janaka, Yājñavalkya and Gautama—to the fore to take up the cudgels for the defence of the cause of her ancient faith which in its turn saw the birth of some of the unrivalled Naiyāyikas and Mīmāṃsakas in the country between 750 and 1250 A.D. in the person of Kumārila, Mandana, Vācaspati, Udayana and a host of others.

The rise of Kumārila and Śaṅkara: the Bhūtā mata

The age of Kumārila and Śaṅkarācārya was the age of great religious ferment and Brāhmaṇic revival. They were
avowed opponents of Buddhism and literally dealt it a crushing blow. Śaṅkara’s commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* is the root from which sprang forth a host of commentaries and studies on Vedāntism of great originality, vigour and philosophic insight.

Kumārila was the vigorous exponent of the Brāhmaṇical orthodoxy which assumes the authoritativeness of the Vedas and the supremacy of the priest. He commented on the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtra* of Jaimini (*Jaimintyāsūtra*) and the *Śahara-bhāṣya*, a commentary on the *Jaimintyāsūtra*. His work is in three parts. He is variously known as Kumārila Bhaṭṭa or Kumārila Svāmin (or Miśra) Tūṭāta Bhaṭṭa. He is one of the brightest gems of Indian Philosophy, and flourished in the 7th century A.D. and was contemporary of Dharmakīrti and a senior contemporary of the great Śaṅkara.

There is a controversy among scholars regarding his birth place. According to some, he was an inhabitant of south India, according to others of north India. There are, however, reasons to believe that he was a Brāhmaṇa of north Bihar or Mithilā. He had also been to south India, Ānandagiri in his *Śaṅkara digvijaya* also attests that he came from the north. He uses the term *Udakadeśa* (the land of water) for the north which, though quite vague, probably refers to Tairabhukti or Tirabhukti (i. e., deśa situated on the bank of the rivers)—an ancient name for Mithilā which in later times became the enlightened home of hundreds of mīmāṃsakas and naiyāyikas and which was very close to the home of Buddhism. Ānandagiri also refers to Maṇḍana Miśra as being the *bhagintpāti* (sister’s husband) of Kumārila. This is a further confirmation of his nativity as Maṇḍana was undisputedly a celebrated thinker of Mithilā and this marriage could have been possible only if Kumārila belonged to Mithilā. Tradition widely current in Mithilā says that Kumārila belonged to the village of
Bhaṭṭapura or Bhaṭṭpurā (in the district of Darbhangā) which later came to be renowned as the seat of Bhāṭṭa school of Mīmāṃsā.

It was in the age of Kumārila that Buddhism had spread its influence far and wide. The University of Nālandā was then at the height of its glory and there was a large number of Buddhist thinkers in the country who were vehemently attacking Hindu religion and philosophy. But, inspite of this wide influence, corruption had already set in the Buddhist Order. Dharmakīrti tried his best to arrest this dangerous process of deterioration and disintegration in the great Order, but he met with utter failure. Kumārila rose equal to the occasion, challenged Dharmakīrti. He has criticised the Buddhists in his masterly works such as Ślokavārttika and Tantravārttika.

The Śaṅkaradīg Vijaya and the Tibetan works give us many interesting stories regarding his controversies with Dharmakīrti. It is said that he was formerly a Buddhist and having learnt all the secrets of Buddhism, later switched on to Hinduism and gave crushing defeat to Buddhists on all fronts in open debates and challenges. His knowledge of Buddhist philosophy was much more profound and accurate than that of the great Śaṅkara, and this decidedly gives him a unique place in the history of Indian thought.

The Ślokavārttika, the Tantravārttika and the Ṭuptikā are the three well-known parts of his commentary on the Śabarabhashya, noted above. Besides these, he is also the author of Bhaṭṭṭikā and Madhyamaṭṭkā. He has referred to the former in his Ślokavārttika. The Ślokavārttika is a versified commentry on the first Pāda (also know as Tarkapāda) of the first chapter of the Śabarabhashya. It deals with the problems of philosophy from the stand-point of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā and sharply refutes the Buddhist stand,
and gives his own views on the conception of moksha, the nature of the Ātman, Kāla and the existence of a subtler body, Ātivāhikaśāstra. The Tantravārttika is a prose commentary on the Śabarabhāṣya from ādhyāya I. Pāda II to the end of the ādhyāya III. A unique work, it reflects his erudite scholarship and thorough mastery over other schools of thought as well. From a study of this work it is clear that Kumārila believes in the creation and dissolution of the Universe.388 "Mīmāṃsā", according to him, "is based upon the Vedas, upon ordinary experiences and also upon direct Perception and Inference based upon these, and it has been reared up by an unbroken line of scientific teachers".389 Like the Veda, ākāśa, dik, kāla, ātman and paramānā are all eternal. He differs from Śabara on the manifestation of sound390 and remarks that the great master has omitted the interpretation of six of the more important sūtras.391 Tūptika, the third in the series, is very brief and not so important as the other two. Various commentaries have been written on these works including those by Umbeka Bhaṭṭa (Tātparyāttika), Sucarita Miśra (Kāśika) and Pārthasārathi Miśra (Nyāyaratnakara) all on the Ślokavārttika; Someśvara Bhaṭṭa (Nyāyasudhā), Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa (Bhāvārtha), Gopāla Bhaṭṭa (Mitaksara), Pārthasārathi Mishra (probably Mīmāṃsānyāyaratnakara) and a host of others (all on the Tantravārttika) and Pārthasārathi Miśra (Tantraratna) and others on the Tūptika.

Kumārila's writings are brilliant and his criticisms of opponent's views quite convincing. His originality of thought and interpretation is writ large on all the pages of his Vārttikas. Moreover, he has suggested new lines to explain the knotty philosophical problems, and that way his contributions are unique and second to none. His deep scholarship and profound influence can well be judged from the fact that he came to be celebrated as the
founder of a new school of thought in Mīmāṃsā, popularly known as the Bhāṭṭa māta or School.\textsuperscript{313}

\textit{Maṇḍana Misra}

Maṇḍana is undisputedly a celebrated name both in the field of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta. Mādhavācārya in his \textit{Śaṅkaradīgovijaya} says that Maṇḍana was defeated by Śaṅkara in debate and was consequently converted to Vedānticism and was re-named Suresvarācārya, the famous author of the \textit{Vārttikas}. Maṇḍana thereafter received Śaṅkara's permission to write a \textit{Vārttika} on the \textit{Bhāṣṭya} which he could not do owing the intrigues of Śaṅkara's other pupils. He, however, wrote a treatise, \textit{Naishkarmyasiddhi} andtocd the line of the great master in expounding the orthodox faith and denouncing the Buddhists.\textsuperscript{314} This identity is, however, controversial and Dr. Jha,\textsuperscript{315} S. Kuppuswami Sastri,\textsuperscript{316} P. V. Kane\textsuperscript{317} and others do not believe in this Maṇḍana-Suresvara equation\textsuperscript{318} and place him between 615 and 695 A.D. or 690 and 710 A.D. Any way, he flourished sometime in the 7th century\textsuperscript{319} and was a senior contemporary of Śaṅkara. According to a tradition current in Mithilā he was a Maithila Brāhmaṇa and lived in the village of Māhishmati (modern Mehisi) in the district of Saharsa. He was fairly old at the time of his disputaion with Śaṅkara who was then in the prime of his youth. From the \textit{Śaṅkaradīgovijaya} we further learn that he was husband of Kumārila's sister. According to some, he was also a disciple of Kumārila.\textsuperscript{320} In other words, Kumārila, Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara were contemporaries.

Maṇḍana was the earliest expositor of the Bhāṭṭa system and wrote commentary on Kumārila's \textit{Tantravārttika}. His other important works on Mīmāṃsā are—\textit{Vidhiviveka}\textsuperscript{321} which deals with the import of \textit{vidhi-liṅga} and refutes the stand-point of both Bhāṭṭa and Guru (This is regarded as an important work so much to that it has been
honoured by an extensive commentary Nyāyakenātka by name by the great Vācaspati Miśra, Bhāvanāvitėka commented upon by Umbeka77; Vibhramāvitėka78 which discusses four types of Khyātis; Mīmāṃsānakratānti79, a versified summary of Mīmāṃsāsūtra written with a view to recapitulating all the topics of the adhkaraṇas of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā and Sphoṭasiddhi, a work written to defend the theory of sphota against varṇavādins wherein he has criticised the views of his own Guru—Kumārila. In his Vibhramāvitėka he has briefly but critically reviewed four chief theories of bhrama (khyātivada)—(i) atmakhyāti, (ii) asatkhyāti, (iii) akhyāti and (iv) anyathākhyāti. He has tried to maintain the Bhāṭṭa theory of viparitakhyāti which is practically the same as the Nyāya theory of anyathākhyāti with slight variations. In this Maṇḍana incidentally prepares the way for the advaita theory of anirvācyakhyāti. Moreover, he has thoroughly refuted through an elaborate course of reasoning the akhyāti theory of the Prabhākaras.79

Maṇḍana, the Vedāntin, is no less great than Maṇḍana the celebrated Mīmāṃsaka. He is universally recognised as a very great authority on the advaita school of Vedānta and wielded tremendous influence on his contemporaries and also on the later advaitins. That Śaṅkara had to walk all the way from South to Mithilā to win him over to his side to establish his own view-point, indeed, speaks of his great popularity and influence as a scholar and thinker. His Brahmasiddhi (a text-book on pre-Śaṅkara Vedānta) forms a land-mark in the history of Vedāntic study, on which the great Vācaspati wrote the commentary, known as Brahmatattva-samākṣa. The Brahmasiddhi consists of four chapters—(i) Brahmakāṇḍa, (ii) Tarka-kāṇḍa, (iii) Niyoga-kāṇḍa and (iv) Siddhikāṇḍa in the form of verses (Kārikā) and long annotations (rtti). Of these the Brahmakāṇḍa is most remarkable as in it he explains the most important Vedāntic
concepts including the nature of Brahman. In the Tarka-
kāṇḍa he argues that "difference" can not be perceived
through perception and as such Upanishadic texts cannot
and should not be interpreted on dualistic lines, for
perception reveals difference. In the Niyoga-kāṇḍa he
strongly refutes the Mīmāṁsā regarding interpretation of
Upanishadic texts according to Mīmāṁsā principle of inter-
pretation, and in the Siddhi-kāṇḍa he explains that "Upani-
shad texts show that the manifold world of appearance
does not exist at all and that its apparent existence is
due to the avidyā of jīva." His other works on Vedānta are
Naisha-Karmya-siddhi referred to above and his most
important works are his two Vārttikas on the Śāṅkara-
bhāṣya on the Bṛhad-āryayaka and Taṁtirīya Upanishads.
Dasgupta ascribes these two Vārttikas to Suresvara who,
according to popular tradition, was no other than Maṇḍana
discussed above, Prabhākara Miśra: the Guru-mata.

Propounder of a new School of Mīmāṁsā, the Prabhā-
kara School (also popularly known as the Guru mata),
Prabhākara Miśra was one of the most intelligent and
independent interpreters of the Šabarabhāṣya. He is tradi-
tionally said to have been a class-mate of Maṇḍana Miśra
and a great disciple of a great teacher—Kumārila and is
respectfully called Guru by the Mīmāṁsakas. The story
goes that he was a pupil of Kumārila who was so much
pleased with a novel interpretation given by Prabhākara,
the disciple, that he nicknamed the latter as Guru and
he is generally spoken of by this title in latter Sanskrit
philosophical literature on Mīmāṁsā.

There is, however, a great controversy regarding
the relative chronological position of the two great thinkers.
Dr. Jha believes that he was senior to Kumārila and the
two were contemporaries. This view is based mainly on
the style of his commentary Bṛhatt on Šabarabhāṣya which
resembles that of Śabara in its "natural grace, simplicity and directness," amongst others. Some scholars, however, take him to be a junior contemporary of Kumārila. Jha places him between 600 and 650 A.D. while others assign him the period between 610 and 690 A.D. Notwithstanding this controversy regarding their chronological position, there is no doubt that they were contemporaries. Later researches have convincingly shown that Prabhākara, Kumārila and Maṇḍana were not far removed in time and that all of them flourished during the sixth-seventh centuries A.D. These two writers became the celebrated founders of the two Schools of Mīmāṁsā, to which a third was later added in the person of Murāri Miśra II. Consequently, in Mīmāṁsā literature, the view of Prabhākara is generally referred to as Guru-mata, that of Kumārila as Bhāṭṭa-mata and that of Murāri as Miśra-mata. And, all the later commentators belonged to either of these three different schools.

Like his great contemporary, Prabhākara also wrote a very faithful commentary on the Śabarabhāṣya known as Bhāṭṭi or Nibandhana which forms the basic text for the Prabhākara School. He wrote another commentary on the Bhāṣya called Vivarāṇa or Laghū. The former consists of 12,000 ślokas whereas the latter contains 6,000 ślokas. These works have been commented upon by Śālikanātha Miśra, known as Rjuvimata (on Vivarāṇa) and Dipāśikā (on Nibandhana or Bhāṭṭi). Unfortunately the complete version of the Bhāṭṭi has not yet come to light and is found up to the middle of the adhyāyas VI only, though later researches have brought to light some portions of the seventh and the eighth adhyāyas also. Prabhākara believes in the determinate knowledge. Sādṛṣya (resemblance), according to him, is a distinct category. Inference and analogy are distinct means of
cognition, and negation is not a distinct Pramanā. He believes in the theory of Satkārya for only the Laukikas or Tārkikas believe in the distinctive nature of cause and effect. Cognition is self-valid and does not require another means of cognition to support its validity. Motion is an object of inference. Here he differs from the Vaiśeshika according to whom it is recognizable through direct perception. And, Akṣi is a category that depends on the usage of an old man through the methods of Agreement and Difference.

Vācaspati Miśra

The great Vācaspati Miśra’s name is to conjure with in the field of Indian philosophy. He wrote the Nyāyavārtikatātparyatikā, a sub-commentary on Nyāyavārttika of Uddyotakara, elaborated its conceptions and defended them against heterodox and Buddhist criticisms. He is said to have belonged to village Thāḍhi in the district of Darbhanga. We stand on a firm ground as regards his date and time. In his Nyāya-suci-nibandha he has given the date as 898 (vasa-ahka-vasu-vatsare) which in the samvat era corresponds to A.D. 841 or 842. In other words, he flourished in the ninth century.

A master of all the six systems of philosophy, Vācaspati was popularly known as Shad-darśanavallabha or Sarvanātantrasvatantra and Dwādaśa-darśana-tīkākāra in the world of intellect. His marvellous exposition of Udyotkara’s Nyāyavārttika with a view to making clear the right meanings of the latter which was “sinking in the mud as it were through numerous other bad writings” (dustarakunibandha-pahkamagnānāṁ) earned him the celebrated title of Tātparyācārya meaning “the great exppositor”. In this work he has militantly defended Uddyotakara against the charges of the Buddhist philosopher Diināga and has sharply attacked his views with all the armoury of his debating skill
and logical prowess. His celebrated commentary, Bhāmaṭī (named after his wife who was childless) on Śaṅkarabhāṣya or Brahmaṣūtras occupies a unique place in the whole gallery of Vedāntic works, in which he has referred to the Buddhist doctrine of prātyyā-samutpāda.

He has also quoted from Dimnāga in his Tātparyāṭṭkā and strongly refuted his views on the contact of sense-organ. His another commentary Śaṅkhyatattvakaumudī on Īśvara-kṛṣṇa's Śaṅkhya-kārikā is unanimously regarded as an authorative work in the field of Śaṅkhya literature. He is further credited with having written commentaries on Maṇḍana Miśra’s Vidhi-viveka and Brahmāsadākhi, known as Nyāya-kāṇḍikā and Tattva-samiksha, Tattva-vindu and other works on Nyāya, Śaṅkhya and Yoga.

The unique popularity and influence of Vācaspati can well be judged from the fact that he was recognised as an unquestioned authority on Vedānta in northern India. As a matter of fact, the Sanskrit scholars of northern India in general and those of Mithilā in particular, were strongly averse to recognising the authority of Śaṅkara, a south Indian scholar, for a long time. They changed their attitude only when the great thinker, Vācaspati Miśra (I) of Mithilā wrote his celebrated commentary, Bhāmaṭī on Śaṅkara’s Śaṅtrakabhāṣya or Śaṅkara bhāṣya which received unanimous ovation by scholars all over the country. It is no exaggeration to say, had there been no Vācaspati, there would have been no Śaṅkara as we know him today.

All honour and credit, therefore, to Vācaspati, the grand old Nyāyaśākta of Mithilā for discomfiting the Buddhists and putting an end to their supremacy and influences in northern India by rehabilitating the orthodox Vedāntic faith. It is therefore no wonder to see that a host of Maithila scholars—Udayana and others—following in his footsteps, re-asserted themselves in vigorously denouncing
the Buddhists with the result that Buddhism lost all its force and vigour in the following centuries.

At the end of his Bhāmatī commentary Vācaspati says that he wrote this work when the great king Nṛga was reigning.35 This king has not yet been historically traced and mystery still surrounds his personality. Dr. Jha thinks that the word Nṛga stands for naravāhana, i.e., one who travels in a basket tied to the shoulders of a man. The kings of the Himalayan valley (i.e. Nepal) used this unusual conveyance (as do even now the people of the Tarāi region) because of the hilly tracts, and were known as such. It is, therefore, probable that the term Nṛga signifies some Nepalese king who might have ruled over eastern Mithilā when Vācaspati flourished.357

But, the history of Mithilā during the period under review does not at all support this contention. From literary and epigraphic records it is clear that Mithilā during this period was under the possession of the Pālā rular, Devapāla (810-849 A. D.) Devapāla was a great patron of learning and art, like the great legendary king Nṛga about whom we have unfortunately no epigraphic record and we cannot say when and where he lived. The Vedāntakalpataru, a commentary on Bhāmatī says that Vācaspati compares the then ruling king to the great Nṛga and calls the former the other Nṛga.358 In epigraphic records too, such comparisons are to be found.359 Vācaspati's Nṛga, therefore, refers to Devapāla whose liberal patronage he must have received.

Vācaspati's Vedāntic works are Bhāmatī and Tattvasaṃvitkṣā, and a still unpublished commentary on Maṇḍana Miśra's Brahmāsiddhi. But Bhāmatī is undoubtedly a very great work and constitutes one of the pillars of Vedāntic studies. "As to the method of Vācaspati's commentary, he always tries to explain the text as faithfully as he can,
keeping himself in the background and directing his great knowledge of the subject to the elucidation of the problems which directly arise from the texts and to explaining the allusions and contexts of thoughts, objections and ideas of other schools of thought referred to in the text.  

Truth and reality are defined by Vācaspati as immediate self-revelation (śva prakāśata) never to be contradicted (abādhita). Accordingly he rejects the definition of reality as the participation of the class-concept of being, as the Naiyāyikas hold, capacity of doing work (arthakriyā-kārita), as the Buddhists hold. He speaks of avidyā being twofold. All appearances accordingly originate from Brahman in association with or with the accessory cause (saṅkāra kārana) of the two avidyās (avidyā-dvītayasacīvāsa).

Vācaspati's well known work on Mīmāṃsā is his commentary on the Vīdhiviveka, called Nyāyakāṇḍa. S. C. Vidyabhushana wrongly took it to be a work on Nyāya. In it he has discussed many important philosophical topics, such as the asatkāryavāda, the Khyātis, Validity of dream-cognition, Tamas as a substance, and several Buddhist topics. In the Tatvavindu, which is his independent work, he has mainly discussed the processes of the sābdabodha according to various schools, and has closely followed the viewpoint of the Bhāṭṭa School, and here too, he is as authoritative as elsewhere.

Thus, in the shining galaxy of the great Advaita thinkers, Vācaspati has a unique place. His profound and deep impression on the later epoch in the evolution of advaitic thought has unanimously earned for him the respectful title of Ācārya by the advaitic philosophers of the later times. An undisputed originator of a separate school of thought, Ṣtvaśrita-avidyā-paksha and also of the famous school of Dyshīt-śrṣṭi-rāda, his greatness as a versatile thinker and scholar exceeds the domain of Advaita
Vedânta thought. His unrivalled genius invades almost all the trodden or untrodden fields of Indian philosophy heterodox as well as orthodox, materialistic as well as unmaterialistic. Judged from this view-point, it can safely be remarked that he has no parallel in Indian philosophy. Be it the school of the atomist Naiyâyika or ritualistic Mîmâṁsaka, the mystic Yogin or the subtle Sâmkhya, Vâcaspati shines and shines the brightest. An intense desire to face the fundamental truth of one's being, the profound philosophical genius and the never-missing discerning attitude borne of an irresistible aptitude for reality are some of the outstanding characteristics that distinctly place Vâcaspati above all other philosophers. Every system of Indian philosophy, thus, owes a deep debt to Vâcaspati without whom it is poor and loses most of its interest.

Pârthasârathi Miśra

After Kumârila and Prabhâkara, Pârthasârathi Miśra is another celebrated name in the field of Mîmâṁsâ literature, who was as faithfully devoted to Kumârila as Śâlika-nâtha was a faithful interpreter of the views of the Prabhâkara. He was well versed in both the schools, was an inhabitant of Mithilâ and learnt the Śâstra from his father Yajñâtman who was a great scholar of his time. He probably flourished sometime in the 10th cent. A. D. Unlike the running commentaries of Śabara, Prabhâkara and Kumârila on the Jaiminiya-sûtras, the commentary of Pârthasârathi, known as Śastradîpika, runs only on the main sûtra of each and every section (adîkaraṇa) and by way of reference gives the substance of other sûtras also. Viewed in this context, the Śastradîpika may be regarded as the earliest commentary of its type. It very faithfully elucidates the views of Kumârila on Mîmâṁsâ and is unquestionably the most important work which attracted a large number
of celebrated scholars to write commentaries on it. A comprehensive study on the School of Kumārila it frequently criticises the views of Prabhākara and refers to Maṇḍana, Nyāyaratnamālā and Tantraratnam (the letter two being important works of Pārthasārathi on Mīmāṃsā), Śāṅkarabhāṣya on the Brahma-sūtra and the Bhāgavadrāmāyaṇa. His another famous work is his celebrated commentary on the Ślokavārttika, called Nyāyaratnākara, a very popular name among the mīmāṃsakas. It is one of the best commentaries in which he has frequently referred to his own works, Nyāyaratnamālā and Śastraṭīpikā, Kumārila’s Bhūttikā, Bhavadāsa and Bhartṛmitra. He can thus easily be ranked with the great mīmāṃsakas of all ages.

Udayanācārya

Udayanācārya or Udayana was yet another great thinker who was a militant champion of the Brāhmaṇic faith, and bitterly criticised and mercilessly attacked the Buddhists on all fronts. He is one of the most shining stars on the firmament of Nyāya philosophy. He was born in village Kariyan which is situated about 12 miles southeast of Darbhanga. In his Lakṣaṇavāli he has given his date as 906 Śaka samvat which corresponds to A.D. 984.

He was the celebrated author of several works some of which rank the highest in the field of Nyāya literature. He wrote a sub-commentary on Vācaspati's Tatparyāṭkā, called Tatparyāṭkā-pariśuddhi. He was also the author of Nyāya-Kusumāṇjali, a classical work in which he has tried to prove the existence of God whom the Buddhists Čārvākas Jains, Sāmkhyas and Mīmāṃsakas openly denied and criticised in their arguments. This work ought to be read with its commentary, Prakāśa by Vardhamāna (13th cent. A.D.) and its sub-commentary, Makaranda by Rucidatta (towards the end of the 13th century), both Maithila
thinkers. But, his uncompromising stand against, and pernicious attack on the Buddhists, find full play in his Ātmatattva-aviveka, also known as Bauddhādhikkāra or Bauddhādhikara, a polemical work against the Buddhists in which he has tried to establish the Nyāya doctrine of soul (Ātman) by refuting the Anātmavāda (no-soul theory) of the Buddhists. Besides he was the author of Kirāṇāvali, Lakṣaṇāvali and Nyāya-pariśīṣṭa and Bodha-siddhi. Udayana treated Nyāya from the stand-point of Vaiśeshika and should, therefore, be considered as the direct predecessor of the school of Navya-Nyāya.

A zealous exponent of theism, Udayana was first and last a Naiyāyika, and not a Vedāntin which is supported by a critical study of his works. He believed in the existence of the Ātman which differs from the body, mind and other elements—a view fundamentally opposed to the monism of Vedānta.

Śrīdharo of Bhūrīśreshṭhi, Bengal, wrote in śaka 913, a sub-commentary on the Bhāṣya of Praśastapāda, known as Nyāya-kandaḷi in which he has acknowledged only six categories. The Maithila or Gauriṇya school, however, gave little or no recognition to this work. On the other hand, his contemporary, Udayana’s Kirāṇāvali, another sub-commentary on the same Bhāṣya though incomplete powerfully influenced the later Navya-Nyāya schools. In this commentary he also speaks of only six categories. In his Lakṣaṇāvali (on definitions), however, he divides categories under two heads—the bhāva with the six categories and the abhāva (the seventh) which is in complete agreement with Śivāditya’s classification.

Besides the famous Ātmatattva-aviveka or the Bauddhādhikkāra, his Nyāya-kusumāñjali (a handful of Nyāya flowers) in stavakas or bunches, consists of 71 Kārikās verses on the existence of God, with a commentary of his own, the
Kusumānjali prakāraṇa in which he relentlessly attacks the views of Saugatas, Digambaras Cārvākas, Mīmāṃsakas and Sāṁkhyaśas. The seventeenth verse of the fifth bunch is symbolic of his noble ideas which are unique:

"Iron-souled are they in whose hearts thou canst find no place, though thus washed by the repeated inundations of ethics and Vedic texts; yet still in time, Oh Merciful One, Thou in Thy goodness canst save even those who oppose our proposition, and make them undoubting in their conviction of Thy existence."

We have a very interesting anecdote concerning the life of this great thinker. It is said, he strove hard to prove the existence of God, but God in his turn did not prove to be equally kind to him. Hard pressed and mentally distressed one day this greatest supporter of God challenged him in the following words:

"Aiśvaryamadamatto'si mānavajñāya vartase
Punarbaudhē Samāyate madadhitā tava sthitih"

(O God, you have become intoxicated with power and so you disregard me! But remember that Your existence will depend upon me when You will be assailed by the Buddhists)."

It is, however, interesting to note that this long story of polemics between the Buddhist logicians and the Hindu Naiyāyikas and the subsequent attacks and counter-attacks were ultimately responsible for the tremendous growth and development of Indian logic and Vedānta philosophy which attained its highest stature and glory by the end of the 10th century A. D.

_Murāri Miśra: the Miśra-mata_

After Pārthasārathī Miśra and before the rise of Murāri Miśra (ii), the propounder of _Miśra-mata_ in
Mimamsa, the scene was dominated by a many great mimamsakas including Bhavanatha Miśra, the author of Niyaviveka regarded as a masterpiece by scholars (sometime in the 10th century just after Parthasarathi Miśra); Gurmatacarya Candra, author of Nyayaratnakara, a commentary on the Jaimityasutras and Amritabindu, an independent treatise (before 1100 A.D.) and Paritosh Miśra, author of the commentary known of Ajita or TantratiKanbhandhana on the Tantravartika (12th century).

Murari Miśra, the propounder of the third school in Mimamsa, appears to have struck out a fresh path in relation to certain important topics which has led to the famous saying among the scholars: Murares teṣyāḥ panthāḥ (the third path or school of Murari), the first and second apparently being Prabhakara and Kumārila. His views are quite distinct and convincing, e.g., his independent view on the theory of the validity of knowledge (pramāṇavāda). Mimamsakas in general support the theory of the Self-validity of knowledge (svatah pramāṇavāda) and the Naiyāyikas support the paratah pramāṇavāda. While Prabhakara supports the former, Kumārila's views are somewhat different from him. Murāri (who also happened to be a great Naiyāyika) differs from both these and suggests an entirely new line which is slightly influenced by the Nyāya system. As regards his work, only two small but very important fragments of his commentary on the Jaimityasutra known as Tripādintita-yanam and Ekadasādyādhikaranaṃ were discovered recently, otherwise much is not known except through references in other works. Pakshadhara Miśra in his Aloka has briefly but neatly brought out the distinction among the three schools of Mimamsa in regard to the validity of cognitions. Murari flourished sometime between the 11th and 12th centuries A.D. Vardhamana, son of Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya has referred to him in several of his works.
After him, a long line of scholars in Mithilā and Bihar kept up this glorious tradition of Mīmāṃsā for centuries. It is said that even in the 15th century, during the reign of queen Viśvāsa Devi, there was a vast gathering of scholars in Mithilā in which some fourteen hundred mīmāṃsakas alone were invited to her court on the eve of a sacrificial ceremony⁴¹⁰ a unique gathering indeed.

Gāṅgēśa Upādhyāya: The Navya-Nyāya School

Besides Mīmāṃsā, a new school of Nyāya philosophy, known as Navya-Nyāya (neo-logic) was started in Bihar during the period under review, the credit for which goes to Gāṅgēśa Upādhyāya (1200 A.D.)⁴¹⁰ of Mithilā. It was a distinct and marvellous contribution to the Indian system of thought which dominated the philosophical scene for centuries. Mithilā during this period was a celebrated seat of learning and scholars from different parts of the country came to receive the highest training in logic and other branches of learning in the universally reputed University of Mithilā. Gāṅgēśa, the founder of this new school, belonged to Mangaraunt, a village (near Madhubani) in the district of Darbhanga. It is said, he had established his reputed academy at the village Kariyan,³₂⁰ the birth-place of the great Udayana who was also one of his predecessors in the field.

Navya-Nyāya or the new School of Logic is based on an amalgam of old Nyāya and Vaiśeshika. The standard works on both these systems were constantly used and referred to by the later writers. The first real commentator was Vācaspati Miśra on the sūtras and their vārttika which we have noted in the preceding pages. Udayana was a direct predecessor of this Maithila School. Besides, Śrīharsha’s Khandana-khaṇḍa-khaḍya (The sweets of refutation) had a hand in moulding the views of the Navya-Nyāya Schools. Then came Gāṅgēśa, the founder, who
wrote his masterly work, *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* (The Thought jewel of fruits) in which he has criticised Śrīharsha’s views. The *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* constitutes a land-mark in the history of Indian thought. Gaṅgeśa accepts many tenets of the Vaiśeṣika School, and in this respect his work differs from the oldest Nyāya. But the more significant change is in the direction of Gaṅgeśa’s artillery. The old Nyāya had directed its argument against Buddhism. Gaṅgeśa, living in an age when Buddhism had almost disappeared in India, directs his attack more against the Mīmāṃsā, the Vaiṣṇava and other living schools of philosophy. But above all, the newness of Gaṅgeśa’s method is a newness of style and of organization. He is far more precise, more careful to define his terms, than were his predecessors. These virtues of his work are responsible for the fact that perhaps half of Nyāya-Nyāya literature is based either directly on the *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* or on a commentary on the *Tattva-cintāmaṇi*.²²¹

Gaṅgeśa accepts only the four *pramāṇas* (Gautama’s fourfold classification of proofs) admitted by the Nyāya, viz. (i) *pratyakṣa* (perception), (ii) *anumāṇa* (inference with a special sub-section on Īśvar-ānumāṇa or the inference about God), (iii) *upamāṇa* or comparision and (iv) *śabda* or affirmation, and not on any of the topics of Nyāya metaphysics. These sections are further sub-divided in to *vādas* or discussions; *pratyakṣa* having twelve, *anumāṇa* seventeen, *śabda* sixteen and *upamāṇa* none.

The whole field of Nyāya has been reviewed by Gaṅgeśa who defends it against the attacks of other systems. He has criticised their views with novel and original remarks. The Sāṃkhya and Vaiśeṣika are criticised least, but he has ruthlessly and unsparingly slashed the Mīmāṃsakas, especially the Bhāṭṭas and the Prabhākaras. While quoting the views and opinions of
the previous thinkers he has referred to a select few, e.g. Jayanta, Maṇḍana, Vācaspati, Śivāditya Miśra, Udayana etc.

One thing, however, deserves special mention in connection with his Tattva-cintāmaṇi. Of all the pramāṇaṇas, his discussions on anumāna (inference) attracted widest attention in Navadvīpa (Bengal) and other parts of the country. Large numbers of commentaries and commentaries of commentaries were written on the anumāna portion of his work. The nature of Vyāpti (the relation of universal concomitance between the middle and major terms, otherwise known as the problem of Induction in Logic), the basis of all inference, was subjected to the most critical examination. One of the knottiest problems, Gaṅgeśa discussed it threadbare in the minutest detail. In addition to this, many independent treatises on sabda and anumāna also came to be written by the scholars of Bengal which became subsequently the home of Nyāya studies for some centuries, well known as the Gauḍīya School or the Nadiā School founded by the celebrated Raghunātha Śiromaṇi (1500 A. D.) a disciple of the great Pakshadharā Miśra of Mithilā. The commentaries of Raghunātha, Mathurā nātha (1580 A.D.), Gandādhara Bhaṭṭacārya and others were widely read and commented upon in Bengal. Thus, in course of a few centuries, commentaries, sub-commentaries and glosses by successive generations of scholars gave birth to a vast literature round the original work. Judged by this standard, it can hardly be gainsaid that the popularity of the Tattva-Cintāmaṇi has been unique and unequalled.

Gaṅgeśa also wrote to other small works, called the Lakṣaṇa-mаṇjаrІ in which he covered part of the ground covered by the Tattva-cintāmaṇi and the Lakṣaṇa-tattvaṃ.  

Vardhamāna Upādhyāya:

Vardhamāna, the son the illustrious Gaṅgeśa, is the author of some of the famous Vaiśeṣhika commentaries.
He is perhaps the oldest commentator on Udayana’s works and on Śrīharsha’s Vedāntic work. His commentaries on Nyāya include the Nyāyanibandha-prakāśa (a commentary on Udayana’s Nyāyavārttika-tattvāpraparipuśuddhi), the Nyāyaprashīsha-prakāśa (a commentary on Udayana’s Nyāyaprashīsha). Besides, he wrote Kīrāṇavali-prakāśa (a commentary on Udayana’s work in two sections Dravya and Guṇa), the Nyāyakusumāṇjalī-prakāśa (a commentary on Udayana’s famous polemical work), the Nyāyatīvati-prakāśa (a commentary on Valla’s work quoted in Jayadeva’s or Pakshadharā’s Āloka) on Vaiśeshika and the Khāṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādy-prakāśa (a commentary on Śrīharsha’s famous work) on Vedānta. In other words Vardhamāna was the celebrated author of prakāśas.

He flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century and was an illustrious pupil of his illustrious father-preceptor. Mādhavācārya (Vidyāraṇya of Vijayanagara) in his Sarvadarśanasamgraha respectfully refers to him and this no doubt speaks of his great influence and importance. His commentaries greatly facilitated the study of Nyāya and Vaiśeshika and helped establish the Nyāya-Nyāya School of his father on a solid basis. It is true, the Nyāya-naiyāyikas have continued to improve their techniques almost down to present times, but the boundaries of their subject matter were set by the Tattvacintāmani and also by the Vaiśeshika commentaries of Vardhamāna.

This glorious tradition of Nyāya-Nyāya was brilliantly kept up till the seventeenth century by a galaxy of illustrious thinkers and scholars like Jayadeva (alias Pakshadharā) Miśra, Vāsudeva Miśra, Rucidatta Miśra, Bhagiratha Ṭhakkura, Mahēśa Ṭhakkura, Śāmkara Miśra, Vācaspati Miśra II (the abhinava Vācaspati), Misaru Miśra III, Durgādatta Miśra, Devanātha Ṭhakkura, Madhusūdana Ṭhakkura and others in the following centuries.
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CHAPTER XL

Fine Arts and Architecture
(750 A. D. to 1200 A. D.)

(I) SCULPTURE

Bihar, under the Pālas of Bengal, set a new stage in the cultural history of India. Not only that Bihar’s contributions, during their long yet eventful reign of over three centuries and a half, beginning from about the middle of the 8th century A. D., to the cause of the artistic development of the country were great, but also that it developed a new local school, impregnated with distinct characteristic features. Arts and architecture, which had recorded considerable progress under the imperial Guptas, continued flourishing unabated till the end of the 12th century A. D. In spite of political vicissitudes, the period witnessed the development of great Buddhist monasteries at Nālandā, Odantapuri (modern Biharsharif) and Vikramaśīlā (in the Bhagalpur district) under the patronage of the Pāla rulers. These Buddhist monasteries, themselves centres of higher learning, “cultivated with success the arts required for the decoration of the sacred buildings.” It was mainly because idolatry had formed an integral part of the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna Buddhism. As a result a new and prolific school of stone sculpture, bronze casting and manuscript painting came into being in Bihar with Nālandā, Bodh-Gayā, Kurkihāra etc. as its chief centres. The school, having flourished in Magadha, situated in the eastern part of the country, during the medieval period under the patronage of the Pāla rulers, came to be variously designated as the Pāla or the Magadha or the Medieval Eastern Indian School, the latter being more
popular and appropriate. It is very likely that the two famous artists, Dhimān and his son Vitpāla, of whom the 17th century Tibetan historian Tāranātha records in glowing terms as having founded a school of sculpture, bronze casting and painting in eastern country, flourished in the wealthy monastic establishment of Nālandā. They belonged to the 9th cen. A. D., when the Pāla rulers, Dharmapāla, and his son Devapāla ruled in Magadha. The discovery of a metal smelting furnace, with metal pieces and slag in it, in the Temple Site No. 13, proves beyond doubt that metal objects were cast at Nālandā.

The stone sculptures of the Pāla period in Bihār, as in Bengal, are generally carved out of black basalt or kasuṭi-patthar, either coarse or fine grained, quarried from the hills of Rajmahal (in the district of Santhal Pargana) and Kharagpur (in the district of Monghyr). A large quantity of slate stone was probably quarried in the Pāla period from Sītā-Kohbar in the Monghyr district for the purpose of preparing images. The metal images are all cast in brass or in octo-alloy (ashta-dhatu), at times enamelled with a thin layer of kaolin or clay, green or brown, patina-like in its effect. As a rule, the stone sculpture of the period are all stelae carved in high relief. Bronze statuettes have also been found similarly treated. There are, however, certain exceptions where images have been found modelled fully in the round. Evidences are not lacking which suggest that tendencies were at work to free the reliefs from the stela background as time advanced during these centuries. Single metallic pieces worked practically in the round remain joined with the back-slabs simply by means of struts, and so also the slabs of the stone stelae have been cut along the edges of the central figures, giving an impression of images in the round. But in spite of the growing urge to free the images from their back-ground, they continue
suffering from two dimensional restriction, producing the
effect of flatness and compression. Emancipation is, how-
ever, achieved towards the end of the 12th cen. A.D. when
a few specimens, worked fully in the round exhibit three
dimensional effect.

Human figures in the forms of gods and goddesses form
the pivot of the Pāla sculptures which have both ‘spiritual
and mundane suggestiveness.’ In this connection, reference
may be made to two very significant factors which had
important bearings on the preparations of the images in
the period. As the sculptures were mainly produced in
the establishments which were devoted to the cause of the
Buddhist culture and as most of the Pāla rulers, under
whose patronage these establishments flourished, were
devout Buddhists, the majority of the sculptures in
Bihar, as also in the neighbouring regions, is Buddhist. But Brahmanism was still a living faith followed by the
people in general, and its votaries as well contributed their
share to the production of art. Hence, as remarked by
Kramrisch, ‘the images of the 9th century are mainly
Buddhistic, but there are also Brahmanic images; in the 10th
century Brahmanic sculptures begin to increase in number,
in the 12th century, Višṇu images are so abundant that
they scarcely can be counted, but the images of the various
goddesses are equally widely spread, whereas Śivaite and
Jain images are less frequently met with.’ This was also
the period when Buddhism was strongly imbued with the
ideas of Tāntrikism. It had its due effect on the art of the
period, consequent upon which images of a large number
of Buddhist goddesses exhibiting different mudrās and āsanas
in various forms were evolved, both in the benign and
terrific aspects. These figures were made exceedingly
beautiful and delightfully charming, almost to the point of
sensuousness. It was true of the male divinities as well,
whose features showed the same fully fleshy and graceful roundness as those of the female body. If heavy round breasts and bulging hips over-emphasise the femininity of the female figures, full of sensuous suggestiveness, broad shoulders gradually attenuating to a narrow lion-waist (sīnha-kāṭī) accentuate the masculinity of male figures as well, equally suggestive of sensuousness in their fleshy plasticity or in their poses and attitudes. It is not unlikely that this sensuous suggestiveness of a really spiritual mood was due at the bottom to an inner experience of erotic nature derived from sexual Yoga or Tantrik inspiration. The Tantrik ideas including the Śakti worship greatly influenced the Brahmanical faith, and the Hindu divinities represented in art hardly display any difference from the Buddhist ones, excepting in their attributes and vehicles. The idea that Purusha and Prākṛti or Brahma and Śakti are two principles inseparable from one another and that their union is the secret of all creations, has very characteristically been expressed through the images of Umā-Maheśvara. This may also explain the reason why even the images of the male gods including the Bodhisattvas demonstrate feminine beauty in their fully fleshy body and charming face.

As already said, practically all the sculptures are stelae carved in relief. As early as the 8th cen A.D., a stela comes to assume its full shape with its upper end either somewhat pointed or rounded. In this period, the figure of the main deity, carved in high relief, occupies the middle portion of the entire composition. The central figure, however, continues to form the integral part of the back-slab in specimens of the 9th and 10th cen. A.D., but with the advance of time, it becomes almost independent of the back-slab. Attendant figures or accompanying figures placed on separate miniature lotus
pedestals in lower grades of reliefs are also shown on the either side of the main figure. Below the central figure is the lotus throne placed on the pedestal which shows on its face or sides vahanas of the deities or vegetal and ornamental decorations or simply worshippers with their hands folded in a\textit{njali mudr\=as}. Above him is the aura (\textit{prabh\=ava\textit{li}}), particularly in the earlier sculptures, where the back of the stela suggests nothing but the surrounding halo with border of flames. In later examples, mainly of the 11th and 12th cen. A.D., the back of the throne is richly decorated with leogryph motives on either side of the posts of the throne, \textit{Ha\textit{n}a\textit{s}a} motives above the throne lintel, \textit{makara} devices, and, in later specimens, Kirttimukhas, playing the most prominent part. Above to the right and left, Gandharvas are shown flying in the midst of clouds in care-free and playful manner. The linear scheme is thus well determined, and whatever freedom there is, can only be found within the rigid outline.\textsuperscript{11}

Indian art, like other aspects of Indian history including the political, had practically for a whole millennium, from the 3rd cen. B. C. to the 7th cen. A. D., admitted of a common denominator in the stages of its development; but from the 8th cen. A. D. onwards, different regions of the country seem to have become boundary conscious and, as such, started developing their own regional characters. The same has also been true of the P\=ala art in Bihar, when regional characters gradually asserted, gaining strength and power in due course. But the fact cannot be lost sight of that the art of the P\=ala period represented in the main a direct successor of the eastern version of the Gupta classical art, and, it was, therefore, but natural that it continued and perpetuated the classical tradition, which was more pronounced in the earlier productions, but
gradually thinned away in due course. Moreover, the tide and tradition persisted for a longer period in Bihar proper than in Bengal. Thus, the sculptures of the 8th cen. A.D., which stylistically belong to the last phase of the Gupta art, show tender modelling of heavy bodily forms. Not only that, even the facial and physiognomical type is a Gupta survival. In the 9th cen. A.D., the tradition of the later eastern Gupta version is continued, but at the same time, the sculptures reveal contented sensuousness. Very few specimens, however, display an exalted state of mind, although mild calmness on the face is reflected through half-closed eyes cast downward. But the figures of the 10th cen. A.D. show massive form of the body, shaped with a disciplined vigour, spread out on to the surface. Almost all the specimens have been moulded into high relief with rounded limbs. In spite of the high standard of the art, the figures retain the sensuous charm. The sculptures belonging to the end of the 10th century and the beginning of the 11th century A.D. are characterised by gracefulness and elegant mannerism. During this period, the figures assume slim and trim bodily form, with fully rounded limbs and heavily laden eyes. They also become stereotyped. The features of the preceding century are, however, retained in the 12th cen A.D., though the modelling becomes a bit more petrified. Modelled double curved eye-brows and heavy dull faces lose their significance, and they have simply decorative purpose. They also display the stiffening of the facial and physiognomical features. Even the volume becomes petrified and gradually loses plasticity. During this period ornaments become gradually lavish and sumptuous and accessories exaggerated to the utmost, without having any organic connection with the main figures of the stelae.\textsuperscript{13}

Now, the Caturmukhi Linga of Śiva installed at Bodh-Gayā in the 26th regnal year of Dharmapāla\textsuperscript{4} is undoub-
tedly, from artistic point of view, crude in workmanship. But it did not take the artists of the Pāla period long to improve upon themselves, and the images of the time of Devapāla, son and successor of Dharmapāla, exhibit creditable progress in the art of image making. Figures of gods and goddesses carved in the period are not dull and static, rather they have almost invariably been shown engaged in some sort of activities, rendering mobility to them. Even individual figures of gods and goddesses are not devoid of actions, for they have been shown performing them by means of their various hand poses (*hasta mudrās*). Numerous images of the Buddha, found from different places in Bihar, besides representing the main figure, also depict principal events and miracles connected with the Master’s life, which included his birth, his enlightenment, deliverance of his first sermon and his death, and so also his descent from heaven at Saṅkiśā, the taming of the mad elephant at Rājagrha, the miracle at Śrāvasti and the gift of honey offered by the monkeys at Vaiśāli. A very interesting sculpture from Bodh-Gayā represents the Buddha seated in the *parṣva-kūśana* with his both hands placed on the lap and holding a bowl. A monkey carved on the pedestal is also seen holding another bowl, obviously the bowl of honey for offering to the Buddha, the story regarding which has been narrated in a very moving way in the *Kuraṅga Jātaka*. The gift of honey to the Buddha at Vaiśāli by the monkey has so artistically been displayed that it renders a dramatic touch to the whole scene. A very large image of the Buddha, with a quite big and decorated halo behind it, hailing from Jagdishpur near Nālandā, shows the Lord seated in meditation on the *vajrāsana*, while Mara, the Buddhist incarnation of evils, with his retinue of wicked demons and charming damsels, is trying to disturb him though in vain. At last being unsuccessful, he returns disappointed with his head hanging low. Important events connected with the life
of the Buddha have been grouped round on the prabhāvali. A highly impressive and beautiful image of the Buddha from Lakhisarai in the Monghyr district shows the Lord standing with his right hand raised in the abhaya-mudrā. Brahmā and Indra attending upon him are standing on either side, the latter with a parasol over his head. The sculpture also depicts the descent of the Buddha from the Tusite heaven at Saṅktisā. It is well known that Buddha had left his palace at Kapilavastu, giving up the princely life of comfort and luxury, in search of supreme knowledge and salvation. The images, therefore, usually depict him as a Buddhist monk without any ornament over his person or head full of hair. As against this, the Bodhisattva images have been lavished with numerous varieties of ornaments over the person and elaborate crown over the head. These features substantially differentiate between the Buddha and the Bodhisattva images. But towards the last centuries of the Pāla regime the practice of decorating the images of the divinities became so popular that even the mendicant Buddha was not spared from this extreme urge of decorating the images, and consequently the Buddha was provided with an elaborate crown over his head. For instance, the image of the Buddha from Muzaffarpur bears a very beautiful crown over the head, besides putting on an ekāvalī over the chest, muktāhāra, wristlets and armlets. Another crowned figure of the Buddha from Bihar, presently housed in the Indian Museum at Calcutta depicts the lord in the vaiparyakāsana on a double petalled lotus in the earth-touching attitude. The figure built energetically and massively, reveals the soft texture of the skin. Two lion figures on the either side of the pedestal with their tails raised and two human figures in its centre with their hands raised up in the act of supporting the throne above, afford mobility to the piece. So also the highly attractive images of the Buddha, recently acquired from the excavations at
Antichak in the Bhagalpur district and presently housed in the Museum of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Archaeology, Patna University, shows the god wearing an elaborate crown over his head. He is seated in the bhūmisparsa-mudrā on a double patalled full-bloomed lotus, with the figures of two lions with raised paws and devotees, a male and a female, with palms folded in the aṅjali-mudrā carved on the pedestal. Besides the crown, the god also puts on a beautiful necklace hanging over his chest, and he has slim body, suggestive of the figure to be of the 11th cen. A. D. Miniature figures representing the nativity of the Buddha, the deliverance of his first sermon, his mahāparinirvāṇa, Buddha standing and exhibiting the abhaya pose, Buddha seated with a begging bowl, Maitreya and Avalokiteśvara have been grouped around the central figure on the back slab. A magnificent and impressive image of the Buddha from Vishnupur, Gaya, also represents the god seated in the bhūmisparsa-mudrā with locks of his hair beautifully arranged over his head in a coil (jaṭā) and mole-mark (ūrṇā) in between the eyebrows. His eyes are half-closed, and while his uttarīya is hanging down from his left shoulder, one end of the drapery is passing over the chest. The halo behind the head of the main figure is sumptuously decorated.

Besides the Buddha images, a number of images of Bodhisattvas and Tārās has come from different parts in Bihar. Of these, mention may be made of a highly charming image of Avalokiteśvara shown seated in the varada pose. Ornaments like the necklace (ekāvali), armlets and wristlets tastefully decorate the person of the divinity, who has his face illumined with peace. A large sized image of Avalokiteśvara from Vishnupur, Gaya, shown seated in the lalitāsana, displaying the abhaya pose, has the body slightly inclined to one side, imparting mobility to
it." Vishṇupur has also bequeathed to us a very interesting image of Maitreya, the future Buddha. With three bends (trabhanga) in his body, the deity seated in the sukhāsana pose, exhibits abhaya-mudrā by his right hand. He has a fully fleshy body with well rounded limbs.

Of the Tārā images, the one found from Nālandā deserves special mention. Although only its upper half is preserved, and that too with the arms mutilated, it represents a typical highly evolved specimen of the Pāla art. Beautiful and oval face, attractive arrangement of the coiffure, numerous ornaments on the person and full and heavy breasts with calm and serene appearance have all been very artistically displayed. The goddess has a lotus in her hand and a band supports her heaving breasts. The image also bears traces of shining polish upon it.

Not only the Buddhist, but as already mentioned, the Brahmanical images as well were produced in large number by the artists of Bihar during the Pāla period. As already noted in the time of Dharmapāla itself, a Caturmukha Liṅga of Śiva was set up at Bodh-Gaya. The Brahmanical images, however, do not record any basic distinction from the Buddhist ones in their artistic execution. Besides shedding light on the prevalence of Hinduism in different forms and worship of various gods and goddesses by the followers of different sects, the Brahmanical sculptures, like the Buddhist ones, also record the high water-mark of the art that was achieved with success by the artists of Bihar during the Pāla period. Images of Vishṇu, Śiva, Sūrya, Umā-Maheśvara, Saptamātrkās, Gaṅgā, Sarasvatī and of minor divinities have been obtained from various places in Bihar.

A remarkable image from Gaya, depicts Śiva’s marriage with Pārvatī with great success. Both Śiva and
Pārvatī are shown standing side by side, the latter standing to the left of the former. The goddess holds a mirror in one of her hands, while her other hand is placed in that of her lord. In three of his hands, Śiva holds trident, kettle-drum and human-skull, while with the remaining right hand he takes hold of the goddess' left hand. Śiva's locks of hair have been arranged in a jata, while Pārvatī, in the fullness of her youth, is befittingly bejewelled. Śiva and Pārvatī both have their eyes cast downwards, with their faces reflecting the natural shyness of a groom and bride. In between the two, the four-faced Brahmā, acting as an officiating priest, is found seated on the ground, and performing the ceremony, while to celebrate the happy occasion of the celestial union, the Gaṇas of Śiva are seen engaged in dance and music. A beautiful image of Umā-Maheśvara, hailing from Bihārsharif, represents the four-armed Śiva seated in lalitāsana with the goddess Pārvatī on his left thigh. With one of his hands, the god is touching the chin of the goddess, and with the other, he is embracing her, while with the third, he is touching her breasts. A remarkable piece of sculpture represents goddess Pārvatī seated in lalitāsana with her son Kārttikeya seated on her left thigh. The four armed goddess holds a dagger and a noose in two of her hands, exhibits varada pose by the third, and supports her son affectionately by the fourth (i.e. the remaining left hand). This endows the goddess with the quality of motherhood. She has a number of ornaments on her person, and her vehicle is lion. The child, Kārttikeya, seated on the lap of the goddess has both his legs hanging.

A beautiful image of Śūrya from Monghyr represents the god standing and holding full bloomed lotus flowers in his upraised hands. He is putting on a crown over his head, an udarabandha and high-boots upto his knees. To his
left stand Piṅgala with an ink-pot in his left hand in the
gesture of writing accounts of good and evil deeds of human
beings, and to his right stands Daṇḍa, with the staff in his
hand to award punishment to the wrong doers. Another
image, more elaborately carved, also shows Śūrya with
lotus flowers in his hands. A kirita over his head, armour
on his chest, waist-band round the waist and long boots on
his feet, Śūrya is represented as a Northerner completely in
the udāyavesha. His two consorts, Ushā and Pratyushā, are
to his either side in the alidha and the pratyalidha attitudes
with bows and arrows in their hands in order to dispel the
demon of darkness. Further beyond are the figures of the
two attendants, Daṇḍa and Piṅgala, with a staff and an
ink-pot in their hands respectively. In between the two
knees of the god is a female figure raising her right hand in
the abhaya mudrā and wearing a mukuta over her head.
Identified as Nikshubhā, the third wife of Śūrya, she is
also regarded as the Earth Goddess. Still below her is the
charioteer, the legless Aruna, and on the pedestal are carved
the seven horses and a wheel of the chariot. The dramatic
effect produced by the sculpture is highly appreciable.

So also highly attractive is the figure of a dancing
Ganeśa of the Pāla period. Possessed of six arms, his head
is turned towards the right, while his trunk towards the
left as one of his left hands holds the sweet-ball. In two of
his right hands, he holds the battle-axe and noose, while
with the third he feels the stomach full of sweets. To his
left are two female figures dancing, with one of their hands
on their breasts. Ganeśa is also dancing pleasantly, and
his big belly and highly ornate crown are worthy of note.
His favourite rat is shown carved on the pedestal. The
whole sculpture, endowed with the quality of dynamism,
presents a happy and auspicious atmosphere.

The large sized image of Vishnu (Govinda) from
Kishunganj (Purnea) has an elaborate back-slab, on which
the ten incarnations of the god have been carved around. On his either side are his two consorts, Lakshmī with a lotus and Sarasvatī with a Vīṇā. The image belongs to the 12th cen A. D., i.e. to a period when much stress was laid on the excessive ornamentation of the figures.

Besides stone sculptures, the artists of the period also produced numerous metallic pieces in Bihar. A large number of images, votive stupas and utensils has been discovered at Kurkihār and Nālandā, which have been made out of brass or octo-alloy. The Dutch scholar, Kempers, tried to prove that the metallic images from Nālandā all belong to the Pāla period. The metallic speciments from Kurkihār, on the basis of the inscriptions which they bear, can be dated from the time of Devapāla to that of Mahipāla, i.e. between the 9th and the 11th cen A. D. Some bronze pieces have also been obtained from Chausa (near Buxar in the Shahabad district) and Chandankiyyar (in the Manbhum district), but no precise dates have yet been suggested for them. These metallic images are extremely beautiful and highly attractive, revealing the soft texture of the skin, rigid adherence to canonical injunctions, precise forms of ornaments and crown or jata over the head. It may, however, be noted that the metallic images also share the traits of stone sculptures. But the material on which the artists worked being different, they record some differences as well in their technique and modelling, characterised by better accomplishment, remarkable dignity and warmth of expression. Bronze being handier and more pliable a medium and also susceptible to more minute executions and precise definition, it allowed fuller play to the genius of the Bihar artists during the Pāla period. As such, most of the specimens are examples of highly developed art. Some of the Pāla images, in their sublime expressions on
their faces, manner of arranging the drapery, curly hair on the head, roundish face and modelling of the physiognomy are reminiscent of the Gupta masterpieces; but at the same time, single or double petalled lotus seats, ornamented halo, figures of lions, Kinnaras, flying Gandharvas and Kirttimukhas are typical Pala features. The pedestals or thrones of the images are likewise elaborately decorated with elephant and lion (gajaśārdula) and other motifs, supported by two lions, suggestive of sthūlasana and also imparting mobility to the images.

Most of the bronzes from Nālandā and Kurkihār represent Buddhist gods and goddesses; but specimens are not wanting which depict Brahmanical images like those of Vishnu, Śūrya, Balarāma, Gaṅgā and Sarasvatī which have also been recovered from these places. Of the Buddhist images, mention may be made of the Buddha figures. Buddha is usually shown either standing on the pedestal and exhibiting the abhaya pose or seated on it and displaying the bhūmisparśa and the dharmaekacakra-parāvartana mudrās, suggestive of the attainment to enlightenment and the deliverance of the first sermon respectively. Crowned images of the Buddha have been obtained both from Nālandā and Kurkihār. A figure of the Buddha from Nālandā represented as standing and showing the abhaya pose, may be counted amongst the finest specimens of bronze statuettes, on account of its simplicity, convincing modelling and inner poise. Amongst the Bodhisattvas, Avalokiteśvara was very popular and hence has been more frequently represented in varieties of forms. Some of his images show as many as four and six arms. A two armed Avalokiteśvara image from Nālandā seated on an elaborate throne and another four armed image of this very god from Kurkihār are but creditable specimens of bronze casting, the former for its superb finish.
and charming smile and the latter for its sensuous modelling and contemplative serenity. An image of Tārā from Kurkihār deserves special notice. The goddess shown seated in lalitāsana, with the left leg tucked up on the seat and the right one hanging down, holds a lotus (upāla) by its stalk in her left hand, while she displays the varada pose by the right. She has full and round breasts, with a fine chain (kāra) pendant between them. A lotus garland also hangs round her neck. Though she has no mukūṣa (crown) over her head, locks of her hair are so nicely arranged in a chignon as to give an appearance of a mukūṣa itself. Each of her arms has seven bracelets, besides armlets on them. Round earrings hang from her ears. The drapery on the lower part of the right leg has been treated as curling up in folds suggestive of outstretched wings of a goose. The round cast of her face, well-formed nose and the extremely sensitive handling of the flesh on her body visible through the folds of the transparent drapery have very artistically and naturalistically been treated. It is distinguished by graceful poise, delicate modelling, sensuous warmth and subtle emotional appeal reminiscent of the stucco Nāgini figures from Rāja(g)raha and the bronze Buddha from Sultanganj, both immortal specimens of the eastern version of the Gupta tradition.

Of the Brāhmaṇical images, the two four armed bronze images of Balarāma, both belonging to the reign of Devapāla, come from Kurkihār in the Gaya district and Nālandā in the Patna district. In each case, the two back hands of the deity hold ploughshare and club; in the former, one of the right hands is broken and the other probably shows a sweet-meet and a wine cup. The Kurkihār image is an elaborate piece of bronze casting; the ornaments on the body, the vanamāla, the seven snake
hoods, the leogryph, the Vidyādharas over the parabolic sūtra, the peacocks on the top of the torana, with their tails ending in scroll foliage, the two standing female attendants, one holding a cup of wine and the other a wine jug in their respective left hands, their right ones being in the jñānamūrdhā all these are displayed in the composition, the whole being placed on an elaborate pedestal. Kramrisch remarks about this piece that 'the figure is heavy with power, which is communicated to the eye of the devotee as it accompanies in simultaneous concentration of the image of the god.'

The stone sculptures and the bronze statuettes of the period were thus made exceedingly beautiful and charming, having been characterised by high technical skill. But the artists suffered from one major handicap; they were not free to shape their images as they willed. Features and attributes of gods and goddesses had already been canonised in works like the Sadhanamāla and Vishnu-dharmottarapurāṇa and the artists had to conform their images to the iconographic prescriptions embodied in the canonical texts. Moreover, the images having been required for installation in shrines and worship by the devotees, would have served no useful purpose had they been prepared otherwise. The individual donors, on whose behalf these images were dedicated, were simply interested in the religious merit which they expected to earn by their dedication. These images, having been required to be installed in the dim darkness of the shrines or temples, had their front portions which faced the worshippers carved with consummate skill, their rear portions being relatively neglected. But still within the rigid and limited framework of textual prescriptions the artists worked wonders and achieved marvel. Gifted with a high degree of plastic facility, they showed profound sense of form, and moulded
their images with ease reproducing even the most complicated movements of the body without much difficulty. Their works though lacked the warmth and naturalness of the Gupta classical art, yet the deficiency, to a greater extent was compensated by the show of pomp and grandeur, carried on to considerable extent, particularly in the productions of the Sena period. Even stone sculptures, lavished exuberantly with ornamentation, were cut with metallic precision. As already noticed, the sculptures due to Tantrik influence reflected feminine features and sweet charm even in the modelling of the male divinities. That images with such characteristics originated in Magadha is evident from the remarks of Alice Getty: 'The school of Magadha which developed the Indian elements invented new forms. To it are due those well-known figures with long thin legs, salient hips, flexible as reeds—those figures overloaded with jewels, gesticulating extravagantly upon bosky backgrounds of stylized plants, that one sees on so many Buddhist buildings in India, Java and Cambodia.' Despite certain deficiencies with which the Pāla art suffered, the very fact that it did not only flourish and hold the ground well for over three centuries and a half in Bihar and Bengal, but also left an indelible imprint on the art of Nepal, Tibet and S. E. Asia bespeaks highly of those artists who produced such creditable works of art.

The religious atmosphere prevailing in the country since very early time, but more particularly in the medieval period, was that of toleration and rapprochement. It was long before different cults were evolved that the beautiful sentiment embodied in the famous couplet of the Dirghatmas hymn was expressed, emphasising the existence of one eternal principle being called in various other ways (ekam sat vīrā naḥudhā vadanti). The evolution of the pāncāyatana pañjā and the construction of the pāncāyatana type of temples
are but illustrative of the liberal bent of mind of the Hindus. The Indian museum at Calcutta is in possession of a very interesting piece of sculpture from Bihar which shows a Śiva Līṅga in the centre with the figures of the four cult deities (Gaṇapati, Viṣṇu, Pārvatī and Śūrya) superimposed on four of its faces.19 Again, another Śiva Līṅga from Bodh-Gayā, bearing an inscription of the 26th regnal year of the reign of Dharmapāla, shows Viṣṇu and Bhairava represented on three of its sides, the fourth side being utilised for the inscription carved upon it.20 Images of Harihara and Ardhanārīśvara,21 which represent the fusion of more than one deities, characteristically demonstrate the syncretic tendency operating amongst the followers of the rival sects. But such a tendency at work is visible not only within the fold of Brahmanism. The spirit of religious toleration and rapprochement did not leave untouched even the non-Brahmanical cults. In this connection, reference may be made to the Harihara image from Bihar in the Indian Museum, Calcutta,22 in which Śūrya and Buddha are shown standing on either side of the central figure.

But the images of several of the Buddhist deities like Aparājitā, Pārṇaśabari, Trailokya-vijaya, Vighnāntaka, etc. tell a different tale. Whereas Aparājitā,23 Pārṇaśabari24 and Vighnāntaka have been represented as pressing down under their feet the Hindu god of wisdom Gāṇeśa, Trailokya-vijaya25 has been depicted as trampling upon the prostrate figures of Śiva and Pārvatī. The images of these Buddhist deities shown as humiliating the Brahmanical deities do not apparently fit in a period of religious toleration and cult amalgam. It has also to be borne in mind that the images of such Buddhist gods and goddesses have mostly been found in Bihar in the Nālandā and Bodh-Gayā regions. In this connection, it may be mentioned
that ‘some Śaivas, Vaishnavaś and Kāpilas who did not like that Dhīḍhakara should preach Buddhism in Tibet, ‘are said to have’, engaged some robbers to take away his life as soon as he passed the border of India.” Dharmasvāmin, the Tibetan scholar, who visited Bihar in the first half of the 13th cen. A.D., records that the Buddhists had put an image of Śiva at Vajrāsana (Bodhi-Gaya) in front of the Buddha’s image in order to protect it from the wrath of the non-Buddhists. This would indicate that the Brahmanical opposition to the Buddhism was a factor to be reckoned with by the Buddhists. Evidence of a somewhat different nature is furnished by a Tibetan text, the Pag-sum-jon-zang, of course of a much later time, which, while describing the destruction of the magnificent Nālandā library, refers to a more severe act of hostility. ‘After the Turushka raiders had made incursions in Nālandā,’ it states, ‘the temples and the caityas there were repaired by a sage, Muditabhadra. Soon after this, Kukkuṭadiddha, minister of the king of Magadha, erected a temple at Nālandā, and while a religious sermon was being delivered there, two very indignant Tirathika (Brahmanical) mendicants appeared. Some naughty young novice monks in disdain threw washing water on them. This made them very angry. After propitiating the sun for twelve years, they performed a yajña, fire sacrifice, and threw living embers and ashes from the sacrificial pit into the Buddhist temples. This produced a great conflagration which consumed Rato-dadhi.” The reaction of the Hindus against the Buddhist fanaticism is also reflected from the stone slab found at Konch in the Gaya district which, while representing all the incarnations of Vishnu has excluded the figure of the Buddha, regarded as the ninth incarnation.” It is, therefore, more than likely that some such incidents could have provoked some reactions of the Buddhists in Bihar to give vent to their feelings through the images of some
of their gods and goddesses shown as humiliating the Hindu divinities.

(II) PAINTING

Gone were though the days of the wall-paintings of Ajanta, the Pāla artists themselves developed a vigorous and distinctive school of manuscript painting in Bihar which perpetuated the classical tradition of the Gupta period with a sensuous bias of the art of Eastern India. The two palm leaf manuscripts of the Ashtasahasrika-prajñā-paramitā and the Pañcarakṣāhā in the Cambridge University Library containing no less than a hundred miniatures are the largest surviving documents of Indian paintings of the Pāla period. All these illustrations, besides depicting scenes from the life of Lord Buddha, also represent various Buddhist gods and goddesses of the developed Mahāyāna pantheon. Executed in red, blue, white and black primary colours and in green, violet, light pink and grey secondary colours or mixed colours, on a fine variety of palm-leaf, usually 22½ inches × 24 inches in size, within square panels of the height of the page, these paintings reveal marked Tantrik influence, though not to any exaggerated extent. Bearing close affinity with the paintings of Nepal on the one hand and Burma on the other, the paintings of this school are characterised by 'delicate, somewhat tormented outlines, with an expression at once nervous and sensual.' The figures have almost invariably sharp nose and doubly curved eyes and eye brows. They, however, differ from the Gujarati paintings in as much as the large part of the further cheek is always seen in the three quarter profile and the nose never projects beyond its outline, though in some cases the further eye is noticeably bulging. There is thus hardly any doubt that the paintings represent in the main the works of highly accomplished craftsmen, marked with considerable facility of execution and conspi-
cuous display of delicacy and charm. He can thus legiti-
mately be said that these paintings can be ranked amongst
the best artistic achievements of the world.44

(III) ARCHITECTURE

Actual remains of architecture, belonging to the Pāla
period, are though not many in Bihar, yet literature, history
and epigraphs of the contemporary period bristle with
references to the existence of numerous Buddhist monas-
teries and stupas and Brahmanical temples. The Khalimpur
grant of Dharmapāla refers to the glories of Pātaliputra
during the Pāla period.48 Mudgagiri (Monghyr), which
served as a victorious camp of army (skandhāvara) in the
times of Devapāla48 and Nārāyaṇapāla, was later on made
the capital of the Pāla kingdom. Excavations at Naulagarh
and Jayamangalgarh48 in the Begusarai sub-division of the
Monghyr district have laid bare the remains of the Pāla
architecture. Explorations and excavations, if properly
carried on in the regions Lakhisarai, Kiul, Jamui and
Dighwara, may yield remains of architecture of the period.48
That the monastic establishments of Nālandā, Odantapuri
(Biharsharif) and Vikramaśīlā (in the Bhagalpur district)
greatly flourished in the Pāla period cannot be doubted.
Of these, Nālandā, established in the time of Kumāra
Gupta I, continued receiving the patronage of the Pāla
kings, when several of the monasteries and temples were
rebuilt and embellished.49 The brick-built monastic estab-
lishment of Nālandā, which affords the best material for
the study of the architecture during the Pāla period,
was laid on a sound planning, including within its scheme
a symmetrical row of monasteries on the east facing
another row of temples on the west with sufficient space
in between them. Practically all the monasteries are much
akin in their lay-out and general appearance. These
monasteries, which were college-cum-dormitories, were
imposing rectangular structures, characterised by their striking simplicity and uniformity of plan and design and by an impressive symmetry of alignment. On plan, a monastery consisted of a spacious open courtyard, enclosed by a covered verandah, further surrounded on all sides by small cells meant for the residence of the monks or students. Entered from the west through an imposing door-way, it contained a chapel in the centre of the eastern row of the cells facing the entrance. A raised pulpit in front of the chapel provided space for delivering lectures and discourses to the students. To judge from the remains of the staircase, every monastery seems to have been built in two or more storeys. Practically every monastery had its own source of water and sets of ovens in the courtyard. The monastery in the Site No. I seems to be the most important and perhaps the principal one of the monasteries at Nālandā. Having undergone nine phases of rebuilding, it was originally constructed in the 6th-7th cen. A.D., with its process of rebuilding having continued till the days of Nālandā's decline. The monastery is particularly associated with the name of king Devapāla, the third king of the Pāla lineage, whose Copper Plate inscription was found in a corner of the entrance.11 As stated in the inscription, the portion of the monastery with the cells near the entrance on the western and along the southern and eastern sides, is believed to have been constructed by the Pāla king on behalf of king Bālaputradeva of Suvarṇadvipa, grandson of a king of Javabhūmi. Occupying an area of 205 ft. × 168 ft., it was surrounded by a very thick wall (6.5 to 7.5 ft. in thickness), with its entrance facing the west. All along the interior of this wall were arranged the series of cells, each about 10 ft. square, for accommodating the monks or students. The cells were fronted by wide common verandahs facing to an open quadrangular court. The main chapel, in the middle of
the eastern row of cells, contained a colossal seated image of the Buddha, and in its front was the pulpit for delivering lectures and sermons. The entrance to it lay through a spacious and imposing portico on the west. From the existence of the staircase leading to the roof, the monastery can be inferred to have been built at least in two storeys, if not more. The walls of the buildings were faced with a fine masonry of reddish bricks of superior texture and rubbed so smooth that their joints were hardly noticeable. The brick masonry appears to have been covered with a coat of lime plaster, which may in turn have been colour washed, if not painted, on certain select spots. The monastery in the Monastery Site No. 10 had, however, its doorways to the cells differently constructed. Instead of wooden scantlings as lintels over the doors, true arches were introduced over some of the cells made of carved bricks set in mud mortar. The interesting feature of the monastery in the Monastery Site No. 11 is that stone pillars, instead of usual wooden ones, were used in the verandah. One of the largest of its kinds, the monastery in the Monastery Site No. 9 had a double-lined octagonal well and three sets of double ovens in the courtyard. The courtyard was paved with bricks. It had also a broad staircase, 7 ft. 10 ins. wide, with a sky-light, which had wooden planks for its treads and nosings. The monastery in the Monastery Site No. 6 was also double-storeyed, and its verandah pillars on the upper storey were possibly of wood, since fragmentary charcoal stumps of actual columns have been found in situ along the verandah parapet, particularly along the north side of the monastery. The temples were solid rectangular two-tiered structures, the sanctum being centrally built on the upper tier, approached by a magnificent flight of steps. The facades of both the tiers were lime plastered and embellished with elegant pilasters and projecting niches containing Buddhist
images. Every tier had a circumambulation path, the ground tier being surrounded by numerous votive stūpas. The highest temple, Temple Site No. 3, was more than a hundred feet in height, and consisted of seven successive accumulations of which the two upper most belonged to the 12th cen. A.D.

Antichak near Colgong in the Bhagalpur district represents the site of the renowned Vikramāśīla monastery which was founded by king Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty. Excavations carried on during the last few seasons at this place laid bare the remains of a Buddhist temple, originally consisting of ante chambers and decorated with carved bricks and stone and clay figure sculptures representing Buddha and Bodhisattvas and executed with paintings, traces of which can still be seen. Monasteries which once stood round the temple were laid on usual planning, which included within their scheme large number of cells meant for housing the monks and the students. Excavations at Sultanganj (in the Bhagalpur district) and Biharsharif (the site of the Odantapuri monastery in the Patna district) may also bring to light the remains of the Pāla architecture. The large sized Stūpa erected at Giriyak on the celebrated Grdhra dvāra peak and built entirely of bricks is assigned to the Pāla period. The Tārā Devī temple within the compound of the Bodh-Gayā temple, with its Śikhara resembling with that of the Mahābodhi temple, may also be dated in the Pāla period.

Like the Buddhist monastic establishments, the Brahmanical temples of the period as well are found mostly in ruins, and only a few of them exist in somewhat reasonable state of preservation. There is an interesting rock- out temple at Colgong (in the Bhagalpur district) which can be assigned to the 9th cen. A.D. Hewn out of a single granite boulder, it consists of a small shrine chamber
preceeded by a shallow porch, measuring only 12 ft. by 11 ft. by 20 ft. externally. It has a gable vaulted roof, imitating horse-shoe vaulted roof of the western Indian Buddhist Caitya halls and resembling the roof of the Telika-Mandir within the fort at Gwalior. Gaya has also yielded a number of examples of architecture of the Pāla period. Inscriptions of the period inform that the temples of Gadādhara and Janārdana were constructed in the time of Nayapāla, while the temples of Vatēśvara and Pitāmaheśvara were built during the reign period of Vighraha-pāla III in the 11th cen. A. D. Again, a Brahmin named Yakshapāla, son of Viśvāditya, is known to have erected temples of gods like Śiva and Sūrya. The ardhamanḍapa standing in front of the present Vishnupāda temple also belongs to the Pāla period. A few temples built in the Orissan style exist in the border districts of Ranchi and Manbhum. Of these, the Mahādeva temple at Khekpāta in the Ranchi district, standing on a rock, is entirely built of stones dressed into regular courses.
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CHAPTER XLII

Archaeological Excavation and Sites
(320-1200 A.D.)

RAJGIR

Rajgir is famous in ancient literature as Rājagrha (the royal abode). Once it was the capital of ancient Magadha. It is situated about 95 km. to the south-east of Patna. A detailed account of its ancient monuments are left by the Chinese pilgrims like Fa-hsien and Hsuan-Tsang who visited this place in the 5th and 7th century A.D. respectively. As the explorations and excavations of this important site have as yet been very imperfect, it is not easy to assess its archaeological wealth hidden in its ruins. A few trial excavations have been conducted by the Archaeological Survey of India and most of its ruins have been shown to be pre-Gupta except one i.e. Maniarmatha, which is a cylindrical brick structure surrounded by a stone compound wall. Its excavation was first undertaken by Cunningham. The excavation has established that the structure underwent many additions and alterations and was enlarged several times in the late Gupta period. At the stage nitches were provided on its outer face and Brahmanical images modelled in stucco were installed in them. Surrounding this hollow edifice were many low brick platforms, one of which yielded a stone sculpture with Nāga figures inscribed with the name Maṇināga, a serpent deity whose shrine is mentioned in the Mahābhārata. Of equal importance was the find of a large group of multi-spouted jars, the spouts having the form of serpent-hoods.
VAISALI

The next important site is Vaisali (at present known as Basarh) which is situated about 38 km. west to Muzaffarpur town. It has an immense wealth of tradition and historical legends. It is the birth place of Lord Mahavira and was the capital of the Licchavi republic from early times. It was here, that the second Buddhist Council was held about a hundred years after the Buddha’s death. A number of ruined stupas in and around this site have been located. Recently a flat low Stupa was excavated by Altekar who identified it with one of the original relic-Stupa of the Buddha built by the Licchavis in the 5th century B.C. In the centre of the village Basarh, there is an old mound (measuring 1770 x 800 ft.) locally known as ‘Raja Basarh Ka Garh.’ Partial excavations were conducted here in 1903-04 and again in 1913-14 by Bloch and Spooner of the Archaeological Survey of India respectively and they have concluded that the occupation of the mound extended from the Gupta to the Mauryan period. The excavations have yielded a large number of sealings (both inscribed and symbolic) of the Gupta period. A few of the inscribed sealings refer to the name of the city of Vaisali. The identity of the place with ancient Vaisali is now beyond dispute. Subsequently the site was again excavated by the Jayaswal Research Institute. The excavations have established that last phase of the site flourished in 300-600 A.D. and the mound was deserted after the late Gupta period i.e. in the 6th century A.D. Terracotta figurines and sealings with the legends in Brāhmi script datable between 4th and 6th century A.D. have been found in the last phase of this mound. The potteries from this period mainly comprises red ware and a few sherds decorated with ‘Srīvatsa’ symbol. Similar decorated sherds come from other excavated sites of the same period.
PāṭALIPUTRA

Pāṭaliputra or Patna is one of the important cities of ancient India. This city, however, enjoyed the prestige of being the capital of big empires for a longer period than most other cities of ancient India. The city suffered a setback in the reign of the Śuṅga as during this period occurred the Bactrian Greek invasions. It continued to be the capital of the Gupta kings but that was short-lived, as is revealed by the accounts of Fa-hsien and Hsuan-Tsang, who visited this city in the 5th and 7th century A.D. respectively. In the description of Fa-hsien we get only a reminiscence of its lost glories, for there were only the ruins of walls and buildings. Hsuan-Tsang’s account also is in the same melancholy strain. When he visited the place, the city was deserted, only the foundation walls surviving. This has been confirmed by the excavations conducted at Kumhrar under the auspicious of the K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute. The excavations have proved that the area was deserted from about 600 A. D. During the Gupta period, Pāṭaliputra had a number of rich philanthropists, some of whom used to maintain hospitals where food and medicines were distributed free to poor and the needy. The discovery in course of the excavations, of the monastery-cum-sanitorium at Kumhrar, belonging to this period corroborates the above facts. Fa-hsien has referred to in his itinerary about two monasteries at Pāṭaliputra at c. 410 A.D., one was a Mahāyāna and the other was a Hinayāna. This has further been confirmed by the recent archaeological excavations carried out at Kumhrar. The niches in the Gupta monasteries were decorated with beautiful terracotta images of the seated Buddha, flying gandharvas, mithuna figures etc. which have been revealed by excavations.
The sewerage scheme in Patna necessitated deep digging and these have resulted from time to time in the discovery of a good number of terracotta figurines and other antiquities of great importance. Many of them on stylistic ground are ascribed to the Gupta period. No antiquity of late Gupta period has so far been found anywhere in Patna. However, we do get a few Pāla sculptures hither and thither in the vicinity of Patna and this indicate its importance in the Pāla period. We learnt that in the reign of Dharmapāla, Pāṭaliputra again rose to prominence for some time.

NĀLANDĀ

The most important site from the archaeological point of view in Bihar is the famous University of Nālandā, which rose in prominence in the Gupta period and was on the peak of its glory in the early Pāla period. Tradition associates Nālandā with the Buddha and Mahāvīra. Here on the Caitya of Sāriputra, Aśoka erected a temple. After the death of the Buddha, nothing was known about Nālandā down to the 7th century A.D. Hsuan-Tsang has given an elaborate account of this place and his accounts have been supplemented by the excavations carried out there by Cunningham in 1861. His excavation was a limited one. A thorough excavation of this site was undertaken only in the year 1915, when the whole site was first measured. The area of the site as mentioned in the report of the survey is about 1600 ft. north-east and about 800 ft. east-west. After excavation, when the whole area was exposed, it has been found that the establishment comprising a long range of monasteries on the eastern side, and a corresponding range of stūpas and temples on the western side. The southern side is bounded by a few more monasteries. Between the ranges of stūpas and monasteries to west east runs the central approach avenue from the north."
The main temple of the establishment and other three small ones also stand in row south to north. There are open spaces between them. The square main temple at the southern end of the row, is surrounded by several votive stūpas and shows several stages of successive additions. This fact is further established from the accounts of Hsuan-Tsang, who has stated that after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha a former king of this country, named Śakrāditya built this Saṅghārāma. His son Buddhaguptarāja not only continued but added to it, while his son Tathāgataguptarāja followed in the footsteps of his father and grand-father. His successor Bālādityarāja added to the establishment and then Vajra continued the pious work. Then a king of Central India emulated the example of those pious kings, who not only added a new Saṅghārāma but built around these edifices a high wall with one gate. Then followed a long succession of kings who continued the work of building resulting in the establishment of the huge monastic site.

It appears from the excavations that during the fifth re-building in about the 6th century A.D. corner towers and niches with stucco figures were added to adorn the enlarged structure. The other three temples likewise show two stages of construction and are surrounded by votive stūpas. The object of worship in each case were colossal stucco images of the Buddha. So to the east of the rows of temples lie eight monasteries in a row, while two others form an oblique corner in the south-east.

Thus on the whole, we see that the monasteries take the form of a quadrangle enclosing cloistered cells inside. Within the quadrangle or in the cell facing the entrance is usually a shrine for worship. A square temple to the east of the monasteries is decorated along its base with
panels of sculptures, Brahmanical, Buddhist and other motifs.\textsuperscript{17} 

From the excavation, the earliest limit of the establishment has been determined as 450 A. D.\textsuperscript{18} which agrees also with the account of Hsuan-Tsang as stated above. It is in this period that Nālandā got the royal patronage or recognition. Its progress continued up to the time of Devapāla at least.\textsuperscript{19} Rise of the royal University of Vikramaśilā may have decreased its importance. The death blow to this establishment was certainly the invasion of Bakhtiar Khilji towards the end of the 12th century A. D.

**ANTICHAK**

Antichak is another Pāla site. This has been identified with ancient Vikramaśilā University site. This place is situated close to the bank of the river Gaṅgā and is about 13 km. north to Colgong Rly. Station in the district of Bhagalpur. The department of Ancient Indian History and Archaeology, Patna University started archaeological operations on the site with a view to settle the long controversy regarding the identification of the site with ancient University of Vikramaśilā. However, on the basis of the discovery of massive brick stūpā with two terraces where walls were decorated with terracotta plaques, and of large number of Buddhist images in stone stucco, bronzes and terracotta datable in the Pāla period on the basis of paleography and stile, it can be asserted that this was a large Buddhist temple associated with a large Buddhist establishment and Tibetan sources speak of no other similar large establishment than Vikramaśilā in the region. Further excavations by the Archaeological Survey of India under the author have revealed a number of Buddhist monastic cells, boundary walls and gateways. The conclusion is irresistible that this is the site of the ancient Vikramaśilā University. A stone inscription has been found which refers to construction of
two caityas and also introduces three generations of kings not known from any other sources. On Paleographical grounds the inscription is to be dated in late 12th century A.D.

A good description of the University is left to us by the Tibetan emissary Nag-Toho. He gives us an interesting picture of the general design and form of the building. He has stated that the University had six Colleges and had a central hall called the Hall of Science whose six gates were open to the six Colleges.³⁹ Like Nālandā, this University was surrounded by a wall. In its front wall, on the right of the principal entrance, was painted the likeness of Nāgarjuna, one of the heads of the Nālandā University, and on the left the portrait of Atiśa himself, who figured prominently at Vikramaśilā.³¹ The above inscription about the University by a contemporary Tibetan monk points out that the painting was very popular in the Institution. The fact is corroborated by the recent archaeological excavations which have exposed a lotus shaped brick pedestal with mud plaster in one of the chambers attached with the stūpa. The pedestal was decorated with a floral design in red and black pigment over a white background and showed a large seated clay image of which only leg portions were available.³² There is a reference regarding the existence of an inn, at the gate outside the wall, where strangers arriving late after the closing of the gate were sheltered.³³

BODH-GAYĀ

Bodh-Gayā is another important site from the archaeological point of view. It is situated on the western bank of the river Phalgu, and about 11 km. to the south of the town of Gaya. Here stands the famous temple of Bodh-Gayā. The temple is in the midst of an extensive mass of ruins which has not yet been excavated. But it is speculated that the site must have been very old and
would have continued in importance during the Gupta and the Pāla periods. While Hsuan-Tsang visited this place in the 7th century A.D. the temple with all its surrounding walls was seen by him. There are references of its destruction by king Śaśānka and its immediate repair by the king Pūrṇavarman. Hsuan-Tsang further states that the courtyard had gates on the south but not on the west. There were monasteries in front of the north gate. But when Dharmasvāmin visited Bodh-Gayā, he found its establishment deserted. He has also referred to the ruins of the stone gate in front of the Bodh-Gayā temple. In his time the extensive courtyard had gates on the east, north and west but not on the south. The monasteries in the days of Dharmasvāmin were twelve in number and had only sixty monks. They were small structures and their accommodations varied from six to fifteen each, whereas in the days of Hsuan Tsang, there were in existence the extensive Mahābodhi Saṅghārāma accommodating 1000 ecclesiastic of the Mahāyāna Sthavira school. The Mahābodhi temple suffered a lot due to the acts of Śaśānka.

**BELWA**

Belwa is a village in the district of Saran. It is another important archaeological site where archaeological excavation was conducted by Pandey in 1919. This place is situated about 8 km. to north-west of Gopalganj town. Near the village is a mound locally known as Bhairo-kāsthāna. It has yielded, besides antiquities of the Gupta and Śuṅga periods, ruins of a large temple, with smaller shrines attached to it, and enclosed by a compound wall. On the evidence of sculptures and other datable antiquities found here, the temple has been assigned to late medieval period, but underneath it, was discovered a much earlier temple which cannot be later than the 6th century A.D. The later temple consists of two shrines placed side by side,
one dedicated to Vishṇu and the other to Śiva. The antiquities found here include three bronze images, two of them representing Śiva, one being four-faced and the third, perhaps the Buddha under the sacred tree, and a stone image of Vishṇu. This earlier temple according to Pandey, was destroyed by the Chinese General Wang-Huen-Tse, who ravaged the country in 647 A. D.⁹¹

NANDANGARH

Nandangarh brick stūpa in Motihari district is dated in the Gupta period. Apart from the archaeological sites and excavations as stated above, there are references of many more archaeological sites where excavations have been carried on. Since they have not yielded the antiquities of the periods under review, such sites are superficial to discuss here. For example, Sonpur in the district of Gaya has yielded latest antiquities of the Śunga period when the site was practically abandoned. Similar are cases of Buxar in the district of Shahabad, Chirand in Saran, Balirajgarh and Karian in Darbhanga.

Many other Gupta and Pāla sites have been explored in this State, but since the excavations have not been undertaken, it is difficult to explain their archaeological importance. In this categories come the name of the village Dron, Manjhi, Sarankhas, Lakhminiagarh, Mahendar etc. in the district of Saran. Here on exploration, a good number of Gupta and Pāla sculptures have been found. Similarly in the district of Champaran references can be made to the sites like Chankigarh, Kesaria, Lauria Nandangarh, Bediban, Sitakunda etc. At Bediban and Sitakunda, there are remnants of old forts. The latter fort has large round bastions at the four corners. The fortification walls are quite intact. A good number of Pāla sculptures have been found here.⁹²
In the district of Muzaffarpur, besides the famous Vaisālī mound, there are references of a few more mounds such as Katragarh also known as Chamundagarh, Jauridih, Chechar, Ghoshwardih etc. The Katragarh has its brick rampart wall and on the four corners of the mound bastions are still visible. Moat was provided to this mound and its depression is still there. Though its earliest date may go back to the Maurya period, but it is definite that the site flourished in the days of the Guptas and the Pālas. Two bronze images and a few Pāla sculptures have been reported from here. A copper plate of one Rāma Gupta has also been discovered from this mound. At Jauridih, two bronze images of the reign of Mahipāla have been reported.33

The district of Darbhanga is no less important from the archaeological point of view. Places like Bhita Bhagwanpur, Bahera, Bhagirathapur, Uttara, Rarh-Balatpur, Mangalgarh, Uchchaitha, Jagat, Tarapatty, Raja Sheo Singh ka Garh, deserve our attention for archaeological excavations.

In the district of Saharsa, a quite good number of archaeological sites have been reported and they mostly belong to the Pāla period as Pāla antiquities have been reported from there from time to time. At Srinagar, there is an old fort which is not much disturbed and a good number of Pāla sculptures and images have been reported from there.34 Mahesi is also important for its Pāla sculptures, and the famous Tārā temple is located here. Garhodih, Dewandih, Kopagarh, Bhurwadih, Ghaush Khan Ki Garh etc. are the important sites in this district.35

In the district of Purnea, references can be made to the sites like Sikligarh, Jalalgarh etc. Similarly in the district of Monghyr, references can be made to the Pāla sites like Naulagarh, Jaimangalarh, Rajauna, Chauki,
Valgudar, Ratogarh, Kawaya, Kajari etc. A good number of Pāla sculptures and inscriptions have been reported from these areas. The village Rajauna was visited by Hsuan-Tsong, who has mentioned Lo-in-ni-lo as the name of the village.38

In the district of Bhagalpur, references can be made to the sites like Patharghata which is situated on the bank of the river Gāṅgā. There is a big rocky hill on which there are numerous sculptures in relief and few caves. The sculptures represent a few ‘Avatāras’ of Vishṇu, wrestling scenes witnessed by the king and the queen.37 They belong to the Pāla period. Near this site there is the village Antichak, the site of the renowned Vikramaśīla University. Not far away from this village there is another village known as Khirighat situated on a big mound.

The next important site in this district is the Karnagārha identified with the ancient Campā by Oldham.38 The adjoining village near this mound is even to-day known as Campānagar. It is practically one square mile in area surrounded by deep moat. At present the whole area is occupied by a police training centre. Antiquities from the time of the Mauryas up to the time of the Pāla have been reported from this place. Excavations conducted by the Patna University have yielded antiquities of the Gupta to the Mauryas or Pre-Maurya period.

Yet another important site in this district is SultanGANJ. Many important discoveries have been reported from here, out of which the famous bronze statue of the Buddha belonging to the Gupta period is well known to the archaeological world. In the heart of this town there is also an old mound which is also known as Karnagārha. From the outer appearance, the mound seems to be contemporary to the Karnagārha of Bhagalpur. Here from SultanGANJ, a few gold ornaments belonging to the Gupta period
have been discovered in course of digging a well in the year 1957. From here at a distance of a mile, there is an old temple on a rocky hill just on the bank of the river Gangā. The temple is known as Ajagaivinath temple. A good number of bold Gupta sculptures in high relief have been engraved over the large boulders of the hills. These sculptures represent Hindu as well as Buddhist deities. Such reliefs are also depicted over the Murli hill which is near to the above temple. The age and style of the relief suggest that they belong to the Gupta period.\textsuperscript{39}

Informations of equally important sites from the district of Patna, Gaya and Shahabad are there. But no proper explorations and excavations have been taken at those places, and so nothing can be said about their ancient past. A mention can be made of these sites and they are as follows:—Aphsad, Amauna, Barabar and Nagarjuna hills, Barnark, Chandiman, Ghosrava, Kurkihar, Konch, Mangaraon, Mundeshwari temple, Rohitagiri, Shahpur, Silsila, Bihar, Gaya, Maner, Sadisopur, Aiyara, Telara, Silao etc. At Aphsad on the plinth of the ruined Vishnu temple have been found eight panels depicting Ramayanic scenes in a continuous story form and these stylistically are to be placed in the 7th century A. D.

Of all the places referred to above in the Patna Division, Bihar or the modern Biharshariff has been identified as the ancient site of Oddantapur University about which there are lots of references in ancient literature. In the heart of town, there are remnants of an old fort covering some 312 acres of land. Over this mound a number of buildings have been constructed. The present Nalanda College stands on the mound. Unfortunately the site has not been excavated as yet, however, antiquities of the Pāla period come out frequently in course of constructions of buildings over the mound.
Archaeological sources point out that the site was already famous during the reign of the king Skanda Gupta (or Puru Gupta) of the Imperial Gupta dynasty, otherwise he could not have erected the inscribed pillar here. It was here the first ruler of the Pāla dynasty Gopāla I founded the Oddantapur monastery which subsequently became the stronghold of the Vajrayānists who held the day in the declining period of Buddhism in India. Its reputation attracted the adventurer Muhammad, son of Bakhtiyar Khilji who ravaged the monastery and later on set it on fire. He constructed a fortress on the ruins of the monastery and since then the site is known as 'Bihar Kila'.

No proper excavations and explorations have been undertaken in the Chotanagpur Division and as such archaeological sites of the period under review are practically absent. Recently there are some reported sites which have yielded the antiquities of the Pāla period. They are Benisagar in the Singhbhum district and Tulbul, Karma, Itkhorī etc in the district of Hazaribagh, but nothing has been reported from the district of Ranchi, Daltonganj, Dhanbad etc. It is not the fact that these districts are barren so far ancient sites are concerned but the lack of proper exploration in the interior of these districts is the main cause for the discrepancy.

**Epigraphy**

A fairly good number of Gupta as well as Pāla inscriptions have been found throughout the State and their numbers are increasing every year. The numerous old sites awaiting excavations always hold out a great promise. Inscriptions are both royal and private.

As elsewhere, here also, the inscriptions are found engraved on all sorts of objects such as stone, metal and
clay. The former includes rock-surface, wall of natural and artificial caves, pavements, pillars, slabs, statues etc. The Mandar Hill inscription\(^{11}\) of Ādityasena in the district of Bhagalpur, the Kalua Hill inscription of Vishnū Gupta,\(^{11}\) the Kauleshwari Hill inscription of Vishnū Gupta,\(^{11}\) and Dudhapani inscription of Udayamāna\(^{12}\) in the district of Hazaribagh, the Nagarjuni\(^{13}\) and the Barabar Hills Cave inscriptions\(^{14}\) of Anantvarman of the Maukhari dynasty in the district of Gaya, the Tarachandi Rock inscription of Pratāpadhavala\(^{15}\) and the Silsila Rock inscription\(^{16}\) of Vimurti in the district of Shahabad are the examples of rock and hill cave inscriptions of this period from Bihar.

So far as the stone-pillar inscriptions are concerned, we have the examples of Bihar Pillar inscription of Skanda Gupta\(^{17}\) or Puru Gupta in the district of Patna, Deobarnark Pillar inscription of Jīvitagupta\(^{18}\) in the district of Shahabad, the Nālandā Pillar inscription of a ruined temple,\(^{19}\) of the reign of Rājyapāla in the district of Patna. Instances of inscriptions of stone-slabs and images from Bihar are numerous. The Nālandā Stone inscriptions of the reign of Yaśovarmadeva\(^{20}\) and Mahīpāla, Bodh Gaya inscriptions of Mahānāman,\(^{21}\) inscriptions of Dharmapāla,\(^{22}\) Gopāla II,\(^{23}\) Mahīpāla I,\(^{24}\) Apsahd stone inscription of Ādityasana,\(^{25}\) Mangaraon Stone inscription of Vishnū Gupta,\(^{26}\) Govinda- pur inscription of the poet Gaṅgādhara,\(^{27}\) Ghosrawa inscription of Devapāla,\(^{28}\) Gaya stone inscription of Govindapāla\(^{29}\) etc. are some of the examples of inscriptions on stone slabs discovered in Bihar. Recently from Antichaka a stone inscription mentioning names of king’s like Sahura, Hemmana and Mannikeśa has been found. It is to be placed in the 2nd half of the 12th cent A.D. For inscriptions on the pedestal of the images, stone and bronze, the examples are so numerous that it is difficult to mention them here individually. The districts of Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Shahabad,
Patna and Gaya are places where a good number of inscribed stone images have been found. Some of the images are Hindu and some of them are Buddhist deities. The inscriptions often record the installation of the images by the donees. Their dates vary between 7th century A. D. to 12th century A. D. In the Gupta period such examples are very rare.

Copper plates inscriptions are known for this period. Spurious Nálândā Copper Plate inscription of Samudra Gupta, the spurious Gaya Copper Plate inscription of the same ruler, the Nandapur Copper Plate inscription, the Nálândā Copper Plate of Dharmapāla, Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla, Nálândā Copper Plate of Devapāla, Bhagalpur Copper Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla, Bangaon Copper Plate of Vígrahapāla III, Amauna Copper Plate of Mahārāja Nandana, Bagaha Copper Plate inscription, Digwa-Dibauli Copper Plate inscription and Don Copper Plate inscription from the district of Saran, Kataragārh Copper Plate inscription of Rāma Gupta from the district of Muzaffarpur and Maner Copper Plate inscription of Govindacandra and Panchdeh Copper Plate of Sahagrama Gupta are some of the important Copper Plate inscriptions in Bihar. In some cases, the plates are inscribed on both the sides. For example, the Khalimpur Copper Plate of Dharmapāla and the Bangaon plate of Vígrahapāla III are inscribed on both the sides. The sizes of the plates vary and there is hardly any uniformity found in them.

Besides stones and metals, clay was also used as a material for inscription during this period. Burnt bricks, plaque, and sealings are some of the instances, on which we generally get inscriptions. An inscribed brick from Nálândā is an unique example of its kind. The brick is assigned to the 6th century A. D. since it is dated in the
year 197 of the Gupta era. The text of the inscription is Nidānasūtra.

We have an example of an inscribed terracotta plaque* from the district of Monghyr. The plaque is semi-circular in shape and has a flat obverse and raised reverse. It is dated in the 67th year of unspecified era and records the offerings of lotus flowers to a deity of a temple. The era is assigned to the Lakshmanasena era and as such its date may be assigned to the last quarter of the 12th century A.D.

As regards clay seals and sealing we have a large and highly interesting collection of them from the excavations at Basarh, Kumhrar and Nālandā. The bulk of the collection consists of sealings of officials, guilds, corporations, temples, private individuals and religious. Though the inscription on the inscription on the sealings are smaller one, but they are important from the historical point of view. The Basarh seal provide us with ample information regarding the administration as well as the economic organisation of this State. A unique seal from Kumrahār† has revealed the existence of monastery-cum-hospital at Pāṭaliputra. Seals of Saśāńka‡, Sarvavarmanam and Harshavardhana§ are no less important in the history of Bihar. The Rohatagārah seal of Saśāńka calls him as Mahāśāmanta. The Nālandā seals of Bhāskaravaraman and Harsha disclose the genealogy of these two rulers.

The brief survey of the above-stated inscriptions of Bihar shows that different eras were used here simultaneously. Some of the inscriptions are dated in the Vikrama era, and some are in Śaka, Gupta, Harsha, and Lakshmanasena eras. Sometimes, the ruling kings have used their regnal years in their inscriptions. For example, Rohatagarh inscription of the Nāyaka-Pratāpadhavala* is dated in the Vikrama era, similarly the Tarachandi rock ins-
cription, Gaya inscription of the time of Govindapāla are dated in the Vikrama era. Govindapur inscription is dated in the Śaka era. The Mundeshwari temple inscription of Udayamāna, the Amauna Copper Plate inscription and the Bodh-Gayā inscription of Mahānāman are dated in the Gupta era. The Shahpur image inscription of the time of Ādityasena is dated in the Harsha era. The Gupta and the Pāla rulers have generally used their regnal years in their inscriptions. Some of the inscriptions are not at all dated, such as Dudhapani, Nālandā inscription of Yāsovarmadeva, Bodh Gaya stone inscription of Mahānāman, Bihar stone pillar inscription, Apsad stone inscription of Ādityasena, Mandar hill rock inscription of Ādityasena, Deo-Barnark inscription of Jīvita Gupta, Barabar, Nagarjuni hill cave inscriptions of Anantavarman.

The purposes of inscriptions so far discovered in Bihar are three folds;—Donative, Commemorative and Eulogistic relating to various grants; either they are Hindu, Buddhist or Jain. As regards emblems on the inscriptions, we find on some of the Pāla inscriptions, the Sarnath device, the Dharmacakra and the two antelopes on the soldered seals, and in the beginning the word 'Om' is written in most of the inscriptions, in some cases 'Namāḥ' is there. On certain inscriptions both the words 'Om' and 'Namāḥ' are written. In some other cases the word 'Siddham' is written. On the top of the Nālandā and Gayā spurious Copper Plates of Samudra Gupta, we find the device of 'Garuḍa' represented as a bird. The inscription starts with 'Om' Svasti.' The imprecatory and benedictory verses, warning the future kings against depriving the donee of the grant and extolling the benefits of making a grant, are of a stereotyped nature right from the Gupta to the end of the Pāla period.
Nowhere else has the epigraphy served history so well as it has done here. Many important informations regarding the history of this State have been gathered from them.

As to the language of the inscriptions of this period is concerned, they are written in pure Sanskrit. Some of the inscriptions are composed entirely in verse and some in prose and verse mixed. The alphabets used in the Gupta inscriptions are generally called Gupta Brāhmí scripts. The script appears for the first time in the edicts of Aśoka in its perfect form and in its general appearances it is straight and angular, though a few letters are found in round shape. The height of the letters is usually equal and the lines often run parallel and very seldom there is any digression. The lines go from left to right.

From the study of the early Gupta inscriptions it has been found that the early Aśokan Brāhmí was transformed. Like Aśokan it could not remain straight nor angular as Gupta Brāhmí scripts. Hoernle’s researches have shown a variation in the Gupta scripts of north India and as such he has found some differences in eastern and western inscriptions of this period. The difference between the eastern and western varieties of the so-called Gupta alphabets appear in the signs of La, Sa and Ha. The inscriptions of the period from the 4th to the 6th century A. D. found in this State can be grouped under the eastern variety which have the following peculiarities:—letters like A, Ā, Ga, Da, Ta, Bha, and Sa are found elongated in the lower parts in the early stone inscriptions, whereas on the Copper Plates they are often shortened.

About the beginning of the 6th century A. D. we find in the north Indian inscriptions both eastern and western varieties. Their chief characteristic is that the letters slope from the right to the left, and show acute
angles at the lower or at the right ends, as well as that the tops of the vertical or slanting lines invariably have small wedges, and their ends either show the same arrangements or protubearences on the right. The peculiarities are observable in a large number of inscriptions of the next four centuries and they are classed as 'acute-angled alphabets'. Formerly the term 'nail-headed' was frequently applied to them. Of late this has been given up and no new name has been proposed. Fleet calls it 'Siddhamārķa'. On certain inscriptions, we find box-headed and semi-circular-headed alphabets.

During the period from 8th to 10th century A. D., the development of the acute-angled or 'Siddhamārķa' alphabets progressed more and more in the direction of its successor, the Nāgari alphabets. Towards the end of the 11th century A. D., the Nāgari inscriptions of eastern India show such distinct traces of changes leading upto the modern Bengali script and these changes became so numerous in the 12th century A. D. that it is possible to class their alphabets as proto-Bengali or proto-Maithili. The Tibetan pilgrim Dharmasvāmin, who visited India in the 1st half of the 13th century A. D. has referred to prevailing script of India which was called 'Vāivarta' script (Vārtula).

In Gupta period, Medial vowels display no peculiarities. Ā is usually denoted by a line standing to right and attached to the letter at the top. Medial I is denoted by a short curve to left and ì by a similar curve to right. The form of medial U is a mere elongation of the vertical portion of the letter. Medial E is denoted by a slanting line to left at the head of the letter, and additional similar line slanting to right denotes medial O. Medial N is denoted by a short slanting stroke to the left of the letter. But in the Pāla period very little changes have been found in the
signs of medial. The only thing is that they become a little decorative with the progress in the art of writings.

**NUMISMATICS**

With a view to progress in economic condition of the country on a sound footing and in the interest of trade and commerce, the Gupta rulers issued gold coinage.

It appears from the literary and archaeological sources that the Guptas ruled over Bihar for a pretty long time and had issued a large number of gold coins, but unfortunately very few of them have been discovered here. So far about twenty-two gold coins, fourteen from Hajipur hoard⁹⁸ in the district of Muzaffarpur, four from Banke⁹⁹, one from Sultanganjⁱ⁰⁰ in the district of Bhagalpur, one from Bodh-Gayaⁱ⁰¹ and two from Nalandaⁱ⁰² have been reported. No coinage of the later Gupta rulers either in gold, silver or copper have been discovered from anywhere in this State.

Out of the above twenty-two coins so far discovered from Bihar, there is only one coin of Candra Gupta I, which has been found in the Hajipur hoard. Candra Gupta I was the real founder of the Gupta dynasty. He had issued only one type of gold coin which is known as the King-and-Queen type. The obverse shows the king and the queen facing each other, the former offering to the latter a present at which she is looking with great interest. The object offered has been differently represented on different coins. Sometimes it is a ring or a sindūradāni. In some cases, the object looks like a bangle. The name of the king is written perpendicularly partly under his left arm and partly outside staff of the standard held in that hand. The name of the queen Kumāradevi is written behind her standing figure.
The reverse shows a goddess seated on loin. The feet of the goddess are usually hanging down. The legend gives the name of the Licchavi clan as 'Licchavayaḥ.'

There is a long controversy amongst the numismatists regarding the issuer of this coin. Early numismatists have attributed this type of coins to Candra Gupta I, but Allan¹⁰³ is of opinion that those coins were commemorative medals issued by Samudra Gupta in commemoration of his father and his own Licchavi descent. Allan's arguments were critically analysed and examined by Altekar¹⁰⁸ and his conclusion was that the coins in question were issued by Candra Gupta I and were not commemorative medals issued by his son Samudra Gupta.

The early two Gupta rulers viz., Śri Gupta and Ghaṭotkaca, the grandfather and father of Candra Gupta I were rulers of no great importance and hence probably they did not issue any coinage of their own. But Candra Gupta I's son and successor, Samudra Gupta issued different types of gold coins and so far his six types¹⁰⁴ have been found in different parts of India. But Bihar yielded only six gold coins of Samudra Gupta and they belong to the following varieties:—

(I) Standard type—Three coins, two from Hajipur hoard and one from Sultanganj. This is the most popular type of Samudra Gupta. In this type, we have on the obverse the king standing to left, holding a standard in the left hand and offering oblation by the right. There is a Garuḍa-standard in his front. The legend is Samudra written vertically beneath the king's left arm. The circular legend is 'Samara-sata-vitata-vijayorjita-ripurajito divam jayati' (the invincible king who had won victories on hundred battle-fields and conquered the enemies, wins the heaven). On the reverse we have a goddess seated on a throne, holding cornucopiae in left and noose in the right
hand. Her feet rest on a circular mat. Back of the throne is visible in most cases. The legend is ‘Parākramaḥ,’ border of dots all round.

(II) Archer type—Two coins, one from Hajipur hoard and one from Bodh-Gaya. On the obverse of such coins, we find the king shown as holding a bow by the left hand and an arrow by the right. Garuḍa standard with fillet on left in front of the king. Legend ‘Samudra’ under the king’s left arm. The circular legend is ‘Apratīratha vijītya kṣhitim sucritair (or avaniso) divaṃ jayati’ (Having conquered the earth, the invincible one wins heaven by meritorious deeds). On the reverse, we get a goddess (Lakṣmi?) seated as on the standard type, holding cornucopiae in left and noose in right hand. Symbol is only on left. The legend is ‘Apratīrathaḥ’.

(III) Battle-axe type—One coin from Hajipurh oard. On the obverse of this type, we have the king standing with battle-axe in his left hand. There is a dwarf in his front looking up to him, and a crescent-topped banner between them. The circular legend is ‘Kṛtānta-parāśur-jayatyajitarājajetājitah’ (wielding the battle-axe of Kṛtānta, the unconquered conquerer of (till then) unconquered kings, is victorious). On the reverse, we find the goddess Lakṣmi seated on stool holding noose in right hand and a cornucopia or lotus bud in left. Her legs rest on a lotus. Symbol is on left; sometimes on right also. The legend is ‘Kṛtānta-parāśuḥ’.

Samudra Gupta’s son and successor, Candira Gupta II had issued fairly a large number of gold coins of several new types. Altogether eight main types of his gold coins have so far been discovered in India, but in Bihar only three types of his coins are known out of eleven coins so far discovered here. They are:
Archer type:—Three coins from Hajipur hoard. On the obverse of this type, we find the king standing to left with Garudadhvaja in his front, usually holding a bow in the left hand and an arrow in the right. Garuda standard decorated with fillets in his front. Candra, written vertically, usually under the left arm. The circular legend is ‘Deva-Sritmaharajadhiraja-Srit-Candraguptah’. On the reverse there is the goddess seated on throne and her legs rest on a circular mat on lotus. In her left hand, the goddess holds a cornucopiae in some cases and a lotus in others. The legend is ‘Srivikramah’. Symbol generally on left; in rare cases on right.

Chattra type:—Three coins from Hajipur hoard. On the obverse of this type, we find the king standing to left and offering oblations upon altar with right hand, left hand resting upon the hilt of the sword hanging by his left side. Behind him a dwarf attendant holding an umbrella (Chatra) over him. The circular legend is in some cases in prose and in some cases in metric. The prose circular legent runs as follows: ‘Maharajadhiraja Srit Candraguptah’ (king of kings, His Majesty Candra Gupta). The metric legend runs as follows: ‘Kshitmavajitya sucharitairdvam jayati Vikramadityah’ (having conquered the earth, Vikramaditya wins the heaven by his meritorious deeds). On the reverse we get goddess Lakshmi standing on a lotus, holding noose in right hand and lotus in left; symbol on the left. The legend is ‘Vikramadityah’.

Lion-combatant type:—Three coins from Hajipur hoard. On the obverse, we find the king standing to left or right and usually shooting an arrow at the lion at point blank range; bow in the left or right hand. The legend is ‘Narendracandraya prathitarano rane jayatyajeyo bhumi simhavikramah’ (the moon among the kings, who is famous
for his war-fare, who is invincible, and who is valorous like a lion, is victorious on the battle-field). On the reverse we find the goddess Lakshmi seated on lion, usually with a noose in right hand and lotus in left. The symbol on left. The legend is ‘Simhavikramaḥ’.

The types of two of his coins from Banka hoard are not known.

Candra Gupta II’s son and successor Kumāra Gupta I also had issued different types of gold coins. About fourteen varieties of his gold coins have been discovered throughout India, but Bihar has yielded only three, two from the Banka hoard and one from Nālandā, but unfortunately their types are not known.

Among the Imperial Gupta rulers, we do not get the coins of Skanda Gupta in Bihar, although his coins are found elsewhere in India. It also seems to be strange that no coinage of the later imperial Guptas have so far been found in this State except one of Narasimha Gupta from Nālandā in spite of the fact that their seat of administration was in Magadha.

The Gupta rulers issued silver coins as well, but Bihar has not yielded even a single coin of theirs although a few copper coins of Candra Gupta II have been found from the Kumhrar excavations. On such coins, on the obverse, we find the bust of the king; sometimes we get him offering oblations at the altar by right hand and sometimes holding flower in right hand. On some of the coins we get the reproduction of the Chatra-type of the gold currency (king with umbrella bearer). Invariably the reverse is divided into two halves, the upper one having Gāruḍa and the lower one the legend i.e. the name of the king ‘Candra-guptah’.

With the close up of the Imperial Gupta dynasty and before the rise of Harshavardhana the history of Bihar is
largely a conflict between the later Guptas and the Maukharis and the Gauḍas. It appears that in the war the Maukharis succeeded in making themselves master of Magadha after defeating Mahāsena Gupta. But it is strange to find that so far we could not come across with any coin of the Maukharī rulers in Bihar, although reports have been made about discovery of their coins in Madhyadesa.

After Maukharis, Magadha passed into the hands of Śaśāṅka. His only one gold coin is reported from Nālandā. After Śaśāṅka, Harsha ruled over here and later on we find a branch of the later Gupta under Mādhava Gupta ruling over Magadha, but the lack of their currency in Bihar is a matter of surprise.

The last ruler of the later Gupta dynasty, king Jjīvita Gupta II was killed by Yaśovarman and this caused an era of anarchy and confusion in Bihar and Bengal. It was in such critical circumstances that the Pālas under Gopala I came to power and they ruled over here for a pretty long time. But when we think of the long rule of the Pāla dynasty and the extent of its kingdom, its lack of currency becomes an intriguing problem which cannot be adequately explained in the present state of our knowledge. However, we get a few silver coins of Śrī Vigraha in Eastern India.\textsuperscript{109} In Bihar, similar coins have been reported from the districts of Shahabad\textsuperscript{110} and Monghyr.\textsuperscript{111} These coins have been attributed to king Vigrahapāla, one of the rulers of the Pāla dynasty. The Bodh-Gayā inscription of Dharmapāla\textsuperscript{112} refers the term Dramma as a designation of coins. So the coins having the legend Śrī-Vigraha attributed to king Vigrahapāla are generally called Vigrahapāla dramma. These coins are circular in shape. It bears on the obverse, very rude head, Śrī in large letter in front of face; Vigra-
(ha) below. On the reverse, we find the indication of Sasanian altar with attendants, in centre the character Sa
is clear (Cunningham calls it Ma). A gold coin of Devapāla has recently been reported\[3\] but outside Bihar.

In course of excavation at Nālandā\[\text{4}\], a gold and a few copper coins of Govinda Candra of Gāhaḍavāla dynasty of Kanauj were discovered. The gold coin bears on the obverse three lined legend: (I) Srimad—Go (II) Vinda—Candra (III) Deva, followed by triśūla, probably a mint-mark. On the reverse, we find seated goddess, as on the coins of Gāngeyadeva of Cedi. On copper coins, the obverse shows two lined legend: (I) Srimad—Go (II) Vindacandra. On the reverse, we find the usual seated goddess; The silver coins which were found at Nālandā are of Ādi-varāha or Bhoja I of the Gurjara Pratihāra dynasty.

All the coins of different dynasties of this period, so far discovered in Bihar, either gold, silver or copper, are invariably circular. Their weight system is a bit irregular. The early Gupta rulers followed the standard of the Kushāṇa weighing about 121 grains.\[\text{5}\] It was perhaps as stated earlier, to maintain a balance in the foreign market that they adopted the foreign weight standard for their currency. According to Manu,\[\text{6}\] the standard weight of a gold coin was eighty ratti or about 146 grains, but none of the early Gupta rulers followed this traditional weight standard. From the time of Skanda Gupta, there is a reversion to suvarṇa or 146 grain standard.

The copper coins also are a bit irregular in weight. Their range of weight varies from between four to seven grains.\[\text{7}\] No methodical study of the weight system of the coins of Vigrahapāla dramma or of Bhoja has yet been done and so is the case with the coins of Govindacandra of Gāhaḍavāla dynasty of Kanauj.

Some sorts of symbols occur on the coins of the Gupta, Pāla and the Gāhaḍavāla kings. There is a great controversy amongst scholars regarding the occurrence of those
symbols, but one has to come to any definite conclusion. Smith is of opinion that most probably the symbols had some religious significance, others put forward that those symbols like the Indo-Greek coinage, may be connected with the mint-cities or mint-master, but this view has totally been discarded on the ground that the symbols on Candra Gupta I coinage persisted for several successive reigns and it is not possible that the same mint-master continued for generations.

Referring the symbols on the coins of the Gupta kings, Altekar has stated, "Artistic variety was in the very life blood of the votaries of Fine-Arts of the Gupta period, and it would have been a wonder if the Gupta mint-master had confined themselves to the few symbols that had occurred on the Kushāṇa coins. They are soon seen discarding the symbols occuring on the Kushāṇa coins. A number of new and original symbols are also seen making their appearance. The number of symbols on the coinage of Samudra Gupta is very much more numerous than that on the coins of his father, and same is the case with coinage of Candra Gupta II and so on." He has further stated, "the symbols were accepted by mint authorities on the Gupta gold coins as a decorative element from the Kushāṇa prototype."

On Pāla coins, we, however, do not find any symbol except, the indication of Sasanian altar on the reverse of the Vigrahapāliya-dramma. On the coins of Govindacandra, we find trisūla on the obverse, probably indicating his devotion to Śaivism.
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CHAPTER XLII

Bihar and the World Outside India

I

Although the colonial and maritime activities of many regions of India have received fuller treatment, those of Bihar have not yet received even scant attention. Hence an attempt is made here to review the colonial, cultural and commercial activities of the inhabitants of Bihar in early times.

The countries around India, with which Bihar established relations, may be divided into four groups...West (Iran to the Mediterranean Sea), North (Central Asia), North-East (Tibet, China, Korea and Japan, South-East (Ceylon, Burma, Thailand or Siam, Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia including Sumatra, Java, Bali and South Borneo).

First of all, we shall deal with the spread of culture and then of commerce.

II

Six regions figure prominently in which the people of Bihar founded their settlements. Chronologically speaking, they are Ceylon, Central Asia, Vietnam (formerly Annam), Malay Peninsula, Burma and South China.

Ceylon: From the Epic-Puranic literature it appears that Ceylon was claimed to be politically under Vaiśālī for sometime. It is stated that 'Vaiśravaṇa'-Kubera made Laṅkā an appanage of Vaiśālī. In the historical period, however, Ceylon had its independent status but culturally it was considerably influenced by Bihar. It received its religion from Magadha from where Mahendra and Saṅghamitrā, son and daughter of Aśoka (third century B.C.)
respectively, went there and preached the teachings of Śākyamuni. Buddhaghosha (fifth century A.D.) of Magadha went to Ceylon and wrote commentaries on the Tripitaka literature. The fort Nālandā in Ceylon seems to have been named after the famous vihāra in India.3

Central Asia: Evidence of the foundation of Khotan in Central Asia by Kushtana, a son of Aśoka, is derived mainly from Tibetan sources.4 From them it is learnt that Kushtana was thrown away by his father, Aśoka, after his birth. A minister named Yaśa was also banished. They after some time founded the city Khotan which later on developed into an important state.

Vietnam (Annam): Campā (modern Vietnam) was the remotest colony in the East. It is a well-known practice for new settlers to name the new country after famous places in their motherland.5 The Indian settlers also imported celebrated place-names of their motherland into their new home, and thus we find new towns and countries called Ayodhya, Kauśāmbī, Śrīksetra, Dvārāvatī, Mathurā, Campā, Kalinga, Kāmboja and Gāndhāra springing up hundreds of miles away from their name-sakes.6 It can be concluded that the new settlement of Campā was the work of the inhabitants of Campā (modern Bhagalpur) which was already a great centre of trade and commerce. Campā became an independent state in A.D. 192 and flourished for several centuries until the conquest of the country by the Annamites in the fifteenth century A.D.

Malaya Peninsula: The foundation of Ligor is ascribed by tradition to a descendant of Aśoka who fled from Magadha, embarked a vessel at Dantapura and was wrecked on the coast of the Malay Peninsula.7 Three inscriptions have been discovered at Ligor. They are of not later than the fifth century A.D. The characters
are of early Indian type and show no traces of the characteristics of South Indian alphabet.

Burma: Vaiśālī was the name of a famous city in Arakan. According to the local chronicles it was built in 789 A.D. by a king of the Candra dynasty, and henceforth became its capital. This tradition is fully supported by the coins and inscriptions of a long line of kings whose names ended in Candra. For two centuries, if not more, Vaiśālī retained its position as a capital city and a stronghold of Indian culture, specially of Buddhism. The place of the city is now occupied by the village Wethali (in the Akyab district), which is only the local pronunciation of Vaiśālī.

South China: A part of the modern Chinese province Yunnan was called Videha-rājya and capital was named Mithilā, the kingdom being sometimes referred to as Mithilā-rāṣṭra. This kingdom, which the Chinese call Nan-chao and is referred to as Mithilā-rāṣṭra in Thai chronicles, comprised the northern part of Yunnan.

III

Just as the achievements of the people of early Bihar in the realm of colonial expansion were no mean ones, so also their achievements in the sphere of spread of culture were very remarkable. Besides the new settlements founded by the valiant sons of early Bihar, which were centres of Indian culture, Tibet, China, Cambodia and Suvarṇadvīpa figure very prominently.

Tibet: Tāranātha is our main authority for asserting that it was in the Vikramaśilā and the Jagaddala Universities founded by the Pāla kings of Bihar and Bengal, that Tantrayāna Buddhism was fully developed, and that it was from these centres that famous missionaries went to preach in Tibet and Nepal. We learn that Sanskrit books were
translated into Tibetan at Vikramaśilā itself, which was the resort of many Tibetan students. Nālandā was another centre and resort of Tibetan students.

While many Tibetan students studied in the famous universities of Bihar, many scholars from Nālandā and Vikramaśilā went to Tibet and preached Buddhism. Of these, four names stand very high, viz., Śāntarakshita, Padmasambhava, Kamalaśīla and Dīpankara Śrījñāna (Atīśa). The birthplaces of the scholars like Śāntarakshita and Dīpankara lay really in Bihar, though so far they have been claimed by many scholars to have been in Bengal. Of the late Mahapandita Rahula Sankrityayana has decisively shown that scholars like S.C. Das and Benayatosh Bhattacharya had been unfair in identifying 'Sābhor', the birthplace of Atīśa with 'Schere' in the Vikramapurparagana of the Dacca district. Sahor, the birthplace of Śāntarakshita and Dīpankara Śrījñāna, has been identified by Rahula Sankrityayana with modern Sabour (Sahor = Sabhor = Sabour) which is a suburb of Bhagalpur (ancient 'Bhagalā').

The scholars, who went to Tibet, not only preached Buddhism, but also translated Sanskrit books into Tibetan.

Many Tibetan vihāras were built on the pattern of the vihāras like Nālandā, Vikramaśilā and Vajrāsana (Bodhgaya).

China: There was close relation between India and China especially from the 2nd century B.C. to the 11th century A.D. China welcomed the Buddhist scholars and preachers from India and sent pilgrims and students to India. There were many Chinese students at the Nālandā University. Chinese pilgrims like Hsuan Tsang (629-645) and I-tsing (671-695) spent good time there. The number of Indian scholars visiting China is very large, but it cannot be said with definiteness as to which of them came from
Bihar, i.e., Tirhut, Magadha and Campā. Yet there is no doubt that those scholars included a good number of scholars from Bihar as well.

Hirananda Sastri narrates a story in this connection. "Wu-ti or Hsias, the first Liang emperor of China, an ardent Buddhist, sent a mission to Nālandā in 539 (A. D.) to collect Mahāyāna texts and to secure the services of a competent scholar to translate them. In compliance with the wishes of the Chinese Emperor the king of Magadha placed the services of Paramārtha, the learned monk, at the disposal of the mission and he not only accompanied the mission on its sojourn in India but went to China with it taking the large collection of manuscripts he had translated."

Coming to a specific case, we may offer the example of Nan-Chao in Yunnan. The Hindus established in Yunnan the kingdom of Nan-Chao or Tali in the upper valleys of the Mekong and the Red River. According to local traditions, the third son of king Asoka had nine grandsons who became the progenitors not only of the people of Nan-Chao, but also of the Tibetans, the Chinese, the Annamites, the Singhalese etc. Whatever we may think of this story, there cannot be any doubt about a strong Indian element in the population. Buddhism had a stronghold in this region and we find the Pippala cave, the Bodhi tree, the Grdhraluṭa, the Kukkuṭapādagiri, the stone mansion of Upagupta and the stūpa containing the relics of Ananda—all appearing again in the neighbourhood of Nan-Chao. In the first half of the ninth century A. D., a Hindu Bhikshu of Magadha named Candra Gupta led a brilliant career of Thaumaturgist in Yunnan.

Mongolia, Korea and Japan: Many students and pilgrims from distant countries like Mongolia, Korea and Japan came to Nālandā which was an international seat
of learning. The work of the University of Nalanda was not confined to the teaching of students who were within its precincts. It sent out scholars to China, Korea, Japan and Ceylon to light the lamp of knowledge in these foreign lands."

Cambodia: In reply to the question as to the part of India from which Kambuja and Sriwijaya got Mahayana Buddhism, Bijan Raj Chatterji* writes: "If the early Saiva cult in Indo-China and the Malay archipelago seems to have originated from South India—the later wave of Mahayana Buddhism, it seems to me, is to be traced to Magadha and Bengal." This is clear not only from the decay of Hinayana in South India and the predominance of Mahayana Buddhism in Magadha and Bengal at the time and the similarity of scripts of the inscriptions, but also from other evidence. Senart, while discussing the inscription of Sri Santhor quotes Taranatha as mentioning that many Buddhists came to Koki (i.e., Indo-China) from Madhyadesa (Magadha) in the eighth century. We have also to point out similarity between the shrines of Bodh-Gaya and Nalanda on one hand and those of Kambuja on the other. This is really very remarkable and should be given proper weight. Groslier in his *Recherches sur les Cambodgiens* (p 359) draws our attention to the striking similarity in essential features between the imposing tower of Bodh-Gaya and a brick tower on a far humbler scale at Hanchei (Cambodia) of probably the seventh century. He is of the opinion that from the seventh to the tenth centuries the Kambuja architect is strongly influenced by this great Magadha shrine. Moreover, the description of Nalanda by I-tsing is remarkably like that of the shrines of Hariharalaya (Banteai Prakhan) and Amarendrapura (Banteai Chmar), with their Nagatanks (Mebourne), which Jayavarman II (802-869 A.D.) built soon after coming from Java.
**Suvarṇadvīpa**: According to B. R. Chatterji, quoted already, the Mahāyāna doctrines in Śrīvijaya (modern Palembang in Sumatra) were introduced from Magadha. Magadha was a great centre of Buddhism. Lama Sarvājña Puṇḍārīka in his book *Dharmodhava* says that there were four important seats of the (Bhikshu) Saṅgha, *viz.*, Udyantapuri, Śrī Nālandā, Vajrāsana and Vikramaśilā. As most of the important seats are found in Bihar, it may be inferred that Bihar was a greater centre of Buddhism than Bengal and hence much of the credit claimed by Bengal up till now in the sphere of spread of Buddhism and translation work in Tibet, China, etc. should really go to Bihar. Magadha as a centre of Buddhism was so famous that Dharmakīrti, who was born in the royal family of Suvarṇadvīpa, came to Vajrāsana (Bodh-Gayā) with a view to acquiring a thorough knowledge of the Dharma. The great Ācārya Śrī Ratna at Vajrāsana instructed the prince. After finishing his education at Vajrāsana (Gaya), Dharmakīrti went back to Suvarṇadvīpa, and such was the fame of his learning that he made Suvarṇadvīpa the headquarters of Buddhism in the East. The Tibetan annals tell us that during Nāyapāla’s reign Buddhist bhikkhus proceeded to Suvarṇadvīpa for education.

With regard to the influence of Pāla Art, Grousset says in an article in the *Etudes d’Orientalisme als memore de Raymonde Linossier* that this school had an influence not inferior to that of the art of Gāndhāra and of the Gupta Empire. After becoming generally common in Magadha, it spread in the east to Java. Sumatra, Cambodia, China, and in the north to Nepal and Tibet.

With regard to its spread in Java, Kempers, who has made a detailed study of the bronzes found at Nālandā and in Java, establishes the theory almost conclusively. Explaining first, the causes of Nālandā’s artistic influence
over the Malay Archipelago, he says that Nālandā, in the
beginning, brought to bear its cultural influence over the
Archipelago, for "among the constituent parts of Hindu-
Javanese culture, one of its essential features, Mahāyāna
Buddhism, originates from Nālandā." In his opinion
Nālandā exercised a great influence on the religious life in
Malay Archipelago and because of the close epigraphical
similarities of the Pāla and Java inscription he concludes
that relation between the Nālandā monastery and the
Archipelago must have been continuous."

IV

Not only religious missionaries but also traders and
merchants from Bihar braved the perils of the deep in
ships and carried home vast wealth. Vaiśālī, Pātaliputra
and Campā were the most important centres of trade in
early Bihar.

Vaiśālī : A large number of seals39 found at Basārkh,
the ancient site of Vaiśālī, clearly indicate the volume of
trade carried on by the capital of Tirabhukti, Vaidehaka,
which literally means 'an inhabitant of Videha', meant
'a trader' in ancient times (Cf. the Arthāśāstra of Kauṭilya).

Pātaliputra : Pātaliputra, being situated on the
confluence of the Gāṅgā and the Šoṇa, was a great centre
of trade with the East. This is amply proved by references
in ancient Indian literature, foreign accounts and the
archaeological discoveries. The Gāṅgā acted as a great
highway of commerce.

Campā : In the Mahājanaka-Āṭaka (No. 539) reference
is made to voyages between Campā and Suvarṇabhūmi.
Similarly passengers from distant inland cities like Patna
and Vārānasī (Banaras) travelled to the coast of Bengal
by land or by water and then sailed in open seas for eastern
islands, Tāmralipti (modern Tamluk) in Midnapur district
in West Bengal being the most important sea-port.39
Details about commerce are fairly better known. Hence we do not think it necessary to discuss it fully here.

V

More important among the diplomatic relations which Pātaliputra established with various countries of the world are:

(i) Relations of Candra Gupta Maurya with Seleukos Nikator of West Asia.
(ii) Relations of Bindusāra Amitraghāta with the king of West Asia.
(iii) Relations of Aśoka with the five Hellenistic kings of the West.
(iv) Relations between Kambuja and Pātaliputra (third century A.D.).
(v) Relations between Meghavarna, king of Ceylon, and Samudra Gupta (fourth century A.D.).
(vi) Relations between Bālaputradeva, king of Suvarṇadvipa, and Devapāla (ninth century).
(vii) Relations between Vaiśālī and the Arakanese king (eleventh century).
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CHAPTER XLIII

Ancient Bihar’s Contribution to Indian Culture

(1) INTRODUCTION

In order to get a fair idea of Bihar’s contribution to ancient Indian culture it is necessary, at the very outset, to have a definite view on two pertinent points, namely, what is meant by Indian culture and what are the proper means to estimate the contribution of one region to the sum total of that Indian culture.

Even so late as the beginning of the present century there was not much scope for difference of opinion about the meaning of Indian culture. It meant the Hindu culture of which the beginning goes back to the Samhitā of the Rgveda and whose evolution through succeeding ages is reflected in the successive stages of the sacred literature of the Hindus, such as the other Samhitās, the Yajus, Sāman and Atharvan—the Brāhmaṇas of these Samhitās, the Āranyakas, Upanishads, Sūtras, Smṛtis and Purāṇas, to which may be added the six systems of philosophy with their later developments and the literature of the various religious sects that grew out of Hinduism. It was dimly perceived that in the long course of this evolution or development the Hindu culture also absorbed some elements from the non-Aryan peoples with whom the Vedic Aryans and their successors came into contact after their settlement in India. Many did not give much importance to this point, and even those who did had no very clear ideas of the different non-Aryan elements which were thus absorbed and now form an essential part of Indian culture, though some scholars emphasised the elements borrowed by Aryans from the Dravidians in a somewhat vague manner.
This idea of a simple process of evolution received a rude shock when the remains of a highly developed culture were discovered at Mohenjo-daro, Harappa, and other regions in the valley of the Indus or Sindh river. Though people were not wanting who were loth to give up the old idea, and looked upon the Indus Valley culture as later then, and more or less a part of, Vedic culture, the general consensus of opinion was that former was prior in point of time and was in a flourishing condition when the Aryans entered India. A further development of this idea was that the Aryans deliberately destroyed the Indus Valley culture, or what seems to be more reasonable, they were instrumental to its decline and downfall; and in either case though the old culture came to an end as a distinct entity, some or many of its features were so absorbed by the Aryans that they have formed essential elements of Hindu culture ever since. As a typical instance reference is made to the worship of icons, particularly of Śiva. The idea that that the Aryans absorbed elements of diverse cultures have gathered force since the archaeological discoveries in the Indus Valley first brought it home to us. For archaeological excavations carries in many other localities in India have revealed traces of a high degree of material culture that flourished in these regions at a time when the Aryans had not yet come into contact with them and referred to their people in most contemptuous terms. Reference may be made in this connection to excavations in the valleys of the Ajay, Kunur, Bakreshwar, Mayurakshi, and Kopai rivers in the districts of Burdwan and Birbhum, lying just beyond the eastern frontier of Bihar. In Chirand in North Bihar has been discovered a well developed neolithic culture with variety of bone tools, painted pottery and beautiful stone beads. They knew rice, wheat, barley, lentiles, etc. The date is earlier than 2000 B.C. In Chirand and Sonapur (Gayā district)
evidences of chalcolithic culture have been excavated. In short, it may be now readily assumed that neolithic and chalcolithic culture, flourished in Bihar before the Aryans came into contact with them, though they later formed integral parts of Aryanised India. Such amalgamation or absorption is proved by the history of the world to have involved the process of 'give and take' on both sides.

We should therefore take ancient Indian culture to mean essentially the Vedic culture, as modified, apart from its own internal evolution, by the Indus Valley culture and that of many other peoples with whom the Vedic Aryans came into contact after their arrival in India, prior to the Muslim conquest in the 13th century.

This very assumption pre-supposes contributions made by diverse peoples or regions to the original stock of Vedic culture. Now, it is easy to recognise or admit the broad fact that different regions made contributions to the development of Indian culture, but it is more difficult to comprehend their nature and value. It is necessary, therefore, to lay down some general principles by which we may test whether any ideas, beliefs or practices prevailing in any particular region may be regarded as a new contribution to the Indian culture. Bearing in mind what has been said above about the evolution of India culture, primarily from the Vedic culture, we may regard the following as the crucial test of finding out new contributions to Indian culture in the process of its evolution.

If, in the first place, we find that certain ideas, organizations, practices, beliefs, etc. existed in a particular region at a time when we cannot trace their existence in the Vedic culture; further, if we have good grounds to believe that these were unknown to it at the time; and we also find abundant evidence that they were common features of Indian culture in later times; then we may reasonably
presume these elements to be contributions made by the region concerned to Indian culture. We propose to proceed upon this principle at least so long as no other better criterion or test of such contribution is available.

For our present purpose, we shall restrict our inquiry in this respect to Bihar, as we are concerned only with the contribution of this region. We have positive evidences which not only indicate that Bihar was outside the pale of Aryan culture for a long time after the composition of the Samhitās of the Rgveda and Atharvaveda, but also give us an approximate idea of the time when Aryan culture was firmly established in Bihar.

The most circumstantial account of the progress of Aryan culture from the Punjab towards the east is found in the story of Māthava Videgha as given in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (I. 4, 7.10 ff.). We are told that this king started with his family priest, Rṣi Gotma Rāhugaṇa, and the sacrificial fire from the banks of the Sarasvati (the lost river in the East Punjab now represented roughly by the channel of the Ghagghra river) and proceeded towards the east. Māthava carried Agni Vaiśvānara in his mouth, and as the priest invoked it with verses of the Rgveda, it "issued from his mouth, and fell down on this earth". What followed is thus described in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

"Māthava, the Videgha, was at that time on the (river) Sarasvati. He (Agni) thence went burning along this earth towards the east; and Gotma Rāhugaṇa and the Videgha Māthava followed after him as he was burning along. He burnt over (dried up) all these rivers. Now that (river), which is called ‘Sadāntrā’ flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain: that one he did not burn over. That one the Brāhmaṇas did not cross in former times, thinking, ‘it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara'."
“Now-a-days, however, there are many Brāhmaṇas to the east of it. At that time it (the land east of the Sadānirā) was very uncultivated, very marshy, because it had not been tasted by Agni Vaiśvānara”.

Professor Weber, who first drew the attention of the scholars to this passage, also explained its great significance. He pointed out that this legend distinguishes three successive stages of the eastward migration of the Brahmanical Hindus. In the first place the settlement of the Aryans had already been extended as far as the Sarasvati. They thence pushed forward as far east as the Sadānirā. For some time the Aryans did not venture to cross this river, but at the time when the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa was composed the Brāhmaṇas had settled in the country to the east of it. This view is based upon the very reasonable assumption of Weber that the Agni Vaiśvānara in the above legend was a personification of Brahmanical worship and civilisation. The River Sadānirā, which marks the limit of the second stage of the expansion of Aryan culture to the east, is generally identified with the Gaṇḍakī river. This broad outline of the advance of Aryan culture to the east is fully corroborated by passages scattered in the Vedic literature.

The Aryans in the age of the Vedic Samhitās regarded Bihar as a non-Aryan land, comparatively unknown and somewhat barbarian in character. This has been inferred from the reference to Kīkāṭa in a single passage of the Rgveda where its people appear as hostile to the Vedic Aryans. Yāska takes Kīkāṭa as the name of a non-Aryan country, and later gives it as a synonym of Magadhā. We find the same thing in the Samhitās of the other Vedas. Thus in the Atharvaveda a wish is expressed that fever should (leave the Aryans and) go to the Anās and Māgadhās, and the Vṛātyas are associated with
Magadha. Again in the \textit{Tajuroeda} Magadha or a man of Magadha is included in the list of victims at the Purushamedha (human sacrifice).

Even after Videha or North Bihar was partially Aryanised, the southern part of Bihar remained outside the pale of Aryan culture for a long time. Thus the \textit{Aitareya Aranyaka} (101, 200) refers in contemptuous terms to Vanga-Vagadha which probably denotes Vanga and Magadha (South Bihar). The \textit{Baudhāyana Dharma-Sūtra} (I, 1, 2, 13-15) condemns the people of Anāga as "Samvāpyoni" which Buhler takes to mean 'of mixed origin', but the commentator Govindasvāmin explains as 'not following proper rules of conduct'.

All these are in full consonance with, and fully corroborate, the view that Bihar lay outside the pale of Aryan culture not only during the age of the Samhitās of the Vedas but even for a long time after that, and that though Videha or North Bihar was Aryanised, at least partially, before the \textit{Satapatha Brāhmaṇa} was composed; South Bihar remained outside the sphere of Aryan culture even in the time of the Dharma-Sūtras, i.e. about the 4th or 5th century B.C.

This is, however, quite inconsistent with the Puranic legend which gives an elaborate account of the political history of North India from the days of Manu Vaivasvata, the primeval king and ancestor of all the Aryan royal families. This gives the impression that Bihar was ruled by Aryan kings from the time of Manu and that more than ninety generations of Aryan kings had ruled in Bihar before the Bhārata War, the date of which is traditionally fixed at the beginning of the Kali Age (3102 B.C.) or shortly before that, and is given by modern scholars about 1000 B.C.
“Pargiter has made an attempt to defend the account of the Purāṇas and Epics by various bold hypotheses concerning the early history of India. These include the assumptions that Aryans did not enter India from the north-west and gradually proceed towards the east, as is generally supposed, but came from the mid-Himalayan region; that the Iranians were an offshoot of the Indo-Aryans and that they migrated from India to Iran; that Brāhmaṇism was not an Aryan institution, but that the earliest Brāhmaṇas were connected with non-Aryan peoples and were established among them when the Aryans entered India; that only the families of Pururavas and Saudyumna, who descended from Ilā, were Ailas or Aryans, and that the other families descended from Manu, i. e., most of the royal families described in the Epics and Purāṇas belonged to non-Aryan stock, and so on.  

According to the above view of Pargiter, the Indian culture was practically a non-Vedic culture modified to a certain extent by that of the Vedic Aryans. The object of our discussion, namely, Bihar’s contribution to ancient Indian culture, would then bear a quite different meaning and we have to unlearn most of the things that we have so long accepted as authentic about the ancient Indian history and culture. It must be remembered, however, that Pargiter’s views are based on the Purāṇas and Epics which were not composed till at least one thousand years after the Vedic literature cited above, and if the conclusions based on these two sources of evidence are fundamentally opposed to each other, then, according to the very basic historical principles, there should be no hesitation in rejecting Pargiter’s view and accepting the theory of the gradual progress of Aryan culture to the east in three stages as deduced above from the Vedic literature.

We may, therefore, assume that the region to the east of the Sadāntrā, i. e. the whole of Bihar, lay outside the pale
of Aryan culture until at least the beginning of the Brāhmaṇa literature about 800 B.C., and South Bihar was not fully Aryanised even in the age of the Sūtras i.e., about 500-400 B.C. We are now in a position to apply the tests mentioned above in order to find out the important contributions of Bihar to Indian culture. These may be studied under two broad heads, namely political and cultural.

(II) BIHAR'S CONTRIBUTION IN POLITICAL SPHERE

The first notable contribution may be said to be the formation of big empires. The Purāṇas, no doubt, refer to the mighty empires founded two to three thousand years or more before they were composed, but for reasons stated above, we should not accept their evidence as valid unless corroborated by reliable historical evidence. The first big empire mentioned by the Purāṇas which is supported by contemporary evidence is that of the Nandas of Magadha which extended according to contemporary Greek accounts from the river Beas in the Punjab to the mouth of the Ganges, if not further beyond. The Purāṇas distinctly state that this empire was founded by a Śūdra, i.e. non-Aryan, who exterminated the numerous kingdoms ruled by the Aryans. This Nanda Empire of Magadha was gradually extended by the Mauryas till it covered the whole of India except a small strip in the South Indian Peninsula, but included the north-western hilly regions, beyond India, as far as the Hindukush mountains. Its capital, Pātaliputra—modern Patna—was the first imperial city of India of which we possess any definite evidence. On the other hand, the general tenor of the Vedic literature makes it almost certain that no such big empire was known to the authors of the Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas. Thus both positive and negative evidences support the view that the centre of the first big empire in India was in South Bihar.
The view that south Bihar was the homeland of imperialism finds some corroboration even in the *Mahābhārata*. The main object of the great epic is to describe the foundation of a big empire—the Dharmarājya—by Yudhishṭhirā with its centre at Indraprastha near Delhi. But the epic describes in glowing terms the big empire of Jarāsandha. He had defeated numerous Kshatriya rulers and many Kshatriyas including the Yādavas and the Bhojas fled in terror from their homes towards the west. The Yavana ruler Bhagadatta was submissive, and Pauṇḍraka Vāsudeva, ruler of Vaṅga, Puṇḍra and Kirāṭas sought for his protection. He had two powerful lieutenants, Hamsa and Dimbaka. These two names, the human sacrifice of Jarāsandha, and the miraculous story how the two queens of Brhadrathā produced two halves of a child which being united by a demoness (rākshast) named Jarā formed the united body who was accordingly named Jarāsandha indicate some non-Aryan elements in the royal family. Thus the only big empire known to the *Mahābhārata* before Yudhishṭhirā, was the Magadha Empire ruled by a non-Aryan. Thus the idea of an all-India empire may be reckoned as a contribution of Bihar.

Similarly, the first great treatise on political statecraft, which was regarded as the most authoritative text on the subject throughout the ancient period, is that of Kauṭilya, also associated with Magadha or South Bihar. As is well-known, Kauṭilya’s *Arthasastra* not only gives the most comprehensive account of administrative system but definitely emphasizes the ideal of a universal empire. It is natural to suppose that such mature knowledge of imperial administration as is displayed in this work grew out of actual experience, and we may regard the development of State-craft as a by-product of imperialism, and also a further contribution of Bihar.
Another bye-product of imperialism seems to be the military organisation. Here also we find Magadha associated with development of new types of weapons, and a big standing army, the existence of which in earlier times is not known from any authentic source.

As regards the new weapons, we find an express reference in the Jain Sūtras. It is said that Ajātaśatru, the king of Magadha towards the end of Buddha’s life, made use of two weapons, Mahāsilā-Kaṇṭaka and Rathamūśala, which were till then quite unknown. It is not easy to form a clear idea of the nature of these weapons, but so far as we can judge from the name and brief description, Mahāsilā-Kaṇṭaka was a kind of catapult by means of which heavy blocks of stone could be hurled from a distance, and this would facilitate the capture of a fort by making breaches in its stone walls such as were done in later days by artillery. Rathamūśala seems to have been a chariot of a special design, with iron rods projecting from its sides, which could be rapidly moved about either by one or more men hidden inside, or by a mechanical process, or by a combination of both, so that in a close hand-to-hand fight between two armies, such chariots would prove as dangerous and effective as the armoured car in the modern wars. History records numerous instances of easy victories gained by a king over his enemies, even against heavy odds, by means of weapons unknown to the latter. Reference may be made to the use of artillery which enabled Babur to defeat Ibrahim Lodi and the brave Rājput hosts of Rāpā Saṅgrāma Simha. It is not unlikely that the discovery of new weapons like the two described above account for the successive victories of Magadha over other kingdoms.

As regards huge standing armies the Mahābhārata, which did not assume its present form till the early centu-
ries of the Christian era, refers to the number of soldiers of the combatants in the Great War in astronomical figures. But these are obviously later legends and no reliance can be placed on them. Earlier literature does not contain a single reference nor even any veiled allusion to such huge standing armies as were maintained by the ruler of Magadha at the time of the invasion of Alexander and shortly after it, i.e., towards the end of the fourth and the beginning of the third century B.C. Thus we learn from the accounts of Diodorus Siculus, who lived in the first century B.C., that when Alexander advanced to the Punjab he learnt that Xandarmes, i.e., the Nanda king of Magadha, "had an army of 20,000 horses, 200,000 infantry, 2,000 chariots and 4,000 elephants trained and equipped for war". We are further told that "Alexander, distrusting these statements, sent for Porus and questioned him as to their accuracy. Porus (the Indian king in the western Punjab) assured him of the correctness of the information". Another Greek writer refers to the army of the Magadha king as consisting of 600,000 infantry 30,000 cavalry and 900 elephants; and this probably refers to the army of Candragupta Maurya. Indeed the army was so large and well organised that the Greek writers describe the soldiers as forming a separate caste and give the following accounts about them.

"The fifth caste among the Indians consists of the warriors, who are second in point of numbers to the husbandmen, but lead a life of supreme freedom and enjoyments. They have only military duties to perform. Others make their arms, and others supply them with horses, and they have others to attend on them in the camp, who take care of their horses, clean their arms, drive their elephants, prepare their chariots, and act as their charioteers. As long as they are required to fight they
fight, and when peace returns they abandon themselves to enjoyment,—the pay which they receive from the State being so liberal that they can with ease maintain themselves and others besides."

We have also an account of the system of military administration which may be summed up as follows:

"Next to the city magistrates there is a third governing body, which directs military affairs. This also consists of six divisions, with five members to each. One division is appointed to co-operate with the admiral of the fleet, another with the superintendent of the bullock-trains which are used for transporting engines of war, food for the soldiers, provender for the cattle, and other military requisites. The third division has charge of the foot-soldiers, the fourth of the horses, the fifth of the war-chariots, and the sixth of the elephants. There are royal stables for the horses and elephants, and also a royal magazine for the arms, because the soldier has to return his arms to the magazine, and his horse and his elephant to the stables."

Thus Imperialism, backed by a huge standing army, well-organised and equipped with new weapons, may be said to be a contribution of Bihar to Indian culture. It is also likely that the highly bureaucratic organisation of monarchical states such as we find in Kautilya's *Arthasastra* was a bye-product of Imperialism.

To this may be added two others, namely, (1) Development of republican constitution such as those of the Śākyas and Licchavis, among others, and (2) Municipal administration as described by the Greek writers with reference to the city of Pāṭaliputra. It is true that on both these points we are on somewhat dubious grounds. For the municipal administration seems to have been quite a familiar institution from early times in South India. Though its antiquity cannot be definitely ascertained and
we are not sure whether Bihar or South India contributed this element to Indian culture, there is one argument in favour of the latter." Where as the system of municipal administration such as we find in Pātaliputra stand alone and no other example of it is known in early times, either in Bihar or Northern India, there is evidence of the continuity and gradual evolution of the system in south India. It is more likely therefore that the credit of introducing this element in Indian polity goes to south India. As regards republican clans, their existence in early period has been inferred from Vedic literature, and they existed in large numbers in the Punjab and the territories adjoining to it on the west as far back as the fourth century B.C. It is true that we have no detailed reference in the Vedic literature to the republican constitution such as we find in the Buddhist scriptures, which also testify to their existence at least two centuries earlier, than in the Punjab. But in view of the facts stated above it is difficult to conclude that the idea of republican constitution originated in Bihar rather than among the Aryans in the Punjab, particularly as the tribal states mentioned in the Vedic literature more or less pre-suppose a republican or somewhat similar constitution.

Another bye-product of Magadhan Imperialism is the issue of royal proclamations, the earliest specimens of which are furnished by the 14 Rock and 7 Pillar Edicts of Aśoka. It has been suggested that the ideas of such royal proclamations were derived from those of the Achaemenid Emperors. But even if that were so, it is not material to our present discussion, for even in that case the credit of this innovation in Indian polity goes to the Mauryas and consequently may be regarded as a contribution of Bihar for it was not known in any other region in India in any earlier period but became a familiar feature in Indian polity in subsequent ages.
The issue of gold coins with the name and portrait of the king began with the Imperial Guptas of Magadha. This idea was undoubtedly derived from foreign rulers of the north-western region such as the Greeks and the Kushānas. But no Indian ruler adopted it before Candra Gupta I of the Gupta dynasty. It may be argued that it was due to the exigency of imperial needs. But then it should not be forgotten that the first two great empires in India—the Maurya and the Gupta—had both their centre in Bihar.

One of the most important contributions of Bihar, not probably altogether unconnected with its Imperialism, is the introduction of the art of writing for general use as a part of intellectual development. The origin and antiquity of the Indian alphabet are both involved in obscurity. There are many theories on the subject but none is based on, or supported by any reliable or reasonable, for less authentic, evidence. The seals discovered in Mohenjo-daro are no doubt engraved with pictographs which, in normal course of evolution might lead to the alphabetic system. This has been the case in Egypt, for example. But unfortunately no connecting link between these pictographs and the Brāhmi alphabet used in Asoka’s inscriptions has been yet discovered.

It is neither possible nor necessary to enter into an elaborate discussion on the subject. The general view held by older generation of scholars has been ably summed up by Buhler and Rhys Davids. The theories upheld by both of them and others, is that the art of writing was introduced into India from Western Asia, some time about the 9th century B.C. (a little earlier or later according to different authors). It is based on very insufficient evidence and is not accepted by many scholars. But far greater value attaches to the facts brought out by them that
both the Buddhist and Jain Scriptures were preserved by their followers committing them to memory, and were not put into writing for a long time. What is more significant is that references are made on more than one occasion to the danger of some parts of the scriptures being lost with the death of an individual monk who alone knew them by heart, and provision was made for even breaking monastic rules in order to ward off that danger. Thus there was a rule forbidding the Buddhist monks to travel in the rainy season. But an exception was made in case a report was received from a monk who knew a Suttanta that some monk should visit him and learn it from him, as otherwise the Suttanta would fall into oblivion. Such an emergency, involving violation of monastic discipline, is incompatible with a knowledge of the art of writing which could easily solve the problem.

At the same time Rhys Davids has quoted passages from the Buddhist scriptures which clearly indicate the knowledge of the art of writing. For example, according to Vinaya texts (IV. 7) though the nuns were to abstain from worldly arts, an exception was made in the case of learning to write. There are other casual references to the art of writing in the Vinaya texts.

It is difficult to account for the fact that if the art of writing was known, no attempt was made to preserve the sacred texts in writing even when the possibility, otherwise, of these being lost for ever was clearly foreseen. It is difficult to reconcile the knowledge of writing with a deliberate resolve not to apply it in order to preserve the sacred scriptures—not even a small Suttanta, with full consciousness of the risk of losing it for ever. Several suggestions have been offered to solve this difficulty. First, that writing was introduced into India long after the peoples have been used to preserve the sacred texts by
committing them to memory. Secondly, no writing materials were known. Thirdly, a desire to withhold the knowledge of the sacred scriptures from the common man.

These explanations do not deserve serious consideration. It would be strange indeed that materials like palm-leaf or birch-bark were not thought of as materials for writing books. In any case if no materials were known, how did the people write at all? For they must have something to write upon, when they first learnt how to write, and then keep up the practice. One of the passages in Vinaya Piṭaka disapproves of the career or profession of a writer or scribe on the ground that though “he will dwell at ease and in comfort, his fingers will ache”. This clearly shows that the scribe had to do extensive writing, and there must have been materials for writing upon which were readily available.

As to the third argument, “in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, the growing desire to withhold the sacred mantras from the people and retain teaching as an exclusive privilege for themselves might act as an incentive to oral teaching to the exclusion of books. But the same motive could not possibly operate in the case of the heterodox sects like the Buddhists.”

On the whole it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that the passages in the Buddhist scriptures referring to the art of writing were added at a later date when these texts were put into writing, or that for a long time after writing came into vogue as a new and strange innovation, it was not used for general purposes, such as intellectual development and personal or administrative communication.

We may now sum up the relevant facts, which admit of no dispute.

1. The Brāhmī alphabet used in Aśoka’s inscription represents the most ancient form of alphabet of which we have got any specimen in any actual record in India.
2. The evolution of all the alphabets now in use in India (excepting, of course, Arabic or English introduced later), stage by stage, from this alphabet may be traced with the help of actual inscriptions and this has been illustrated in Buhler's palaeographic charts.

3. The use of the Brāhmī alphabet did not begin long before Aśoka, as in that case there would have been local variations in the forms of alphabets such as actually happened in course of a century or so. The uniformity in the shape of the alphabets over a vast region extending from Himalayas to Mysore and Gujarat to Bengal, in those days of difficult communication, unerringly indicates that it was imposed by a central authority and we cannot think of any such authority except the Magadhan Empire of the Mauryas or Nandas.

These three facts, taken by themselves, irresistibly lead to the presumption that the alphabetic system in India known as Brāhmī, was brought into general use by Aśoka, even though it might not have been invented by him. But whatever views one might take in this matter, Aśoka's inscriptions must be regarded as having played a prominent role in bring the art of writing into general use in India and make it a great vehicle of intellectual development, administrative and personal communication, and an invaluable mode of expressing thoughts and ideas to a wide public. From this point of view alone it was one of the greatest contributions of Bihar to the intellectual development of the people of India.

Next to politics Bihar's contribution to philosophy and religion may be regarded as very valuable.

Bihar made a great contribution to the development of the Upanishads. This is proved by the traditions associated with Janaka, King of Videha. Many Upanishads refer to the philosophical discussions in his court which was
adorned by sage Yājñavalkya and the great lady scholar Gārgi Vācaknavi. The Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad relates how
great philosophers from distant regions, even from Kuru
and Paṇcāla, celebrated centres of Vedic culture, came to
the court of Janaka and took part in abstruse philoso-
phical discussions about Brahman, Soul, etc. (III, 1.1).
According to another passage in the same Upanishad people
rushed to him saying, 'Janaka, Janaka'. There are various
evidences to indicate that the court of Janaka at Mithilā
had attained unique renown as stronghold of philosophy.
According to the Devā Bhāgavata 'All the kings born in this
family, known as the Janakas or Videhas, are reputed for
their philosophical wisdom'. The Bhāgavat Purāṇa extols
the eminence of the people of Mithilā (N. Bihar) in the
knowledge of philosophy. It says: 'Oh king, these Maithilas
are adepts in the true knowledge of self. Through the
grace of Yogeśvara they are true to the philosophical ideal
of being beyond good and evil in their homes'.

According to a tradition recorded in the Skanda
Purāṇa, Gautama, the founder of the Nyāya School of Philo-
sophy, was born in Mithilā. It is a significant fact that
the reputation of Mithilā for this branch of philosophical
knowledge persisted down to the medieval age when it
enjoyed for a long time the unique honour of being the
only centre of learning Nyāyānyāya. Mithilā was also
reputed as the homeland of eminent scholars in associated
branches of learning—such as Yājñavalkya, the author of
a famous Smṛti work, Maṇḍanamīśra the famous scholar
in Mīmāṃsā, who carried on a public discussion with
Śaṁkaraśārya.

But the greatest contribution of Bihar to Indian
culture is in the domain of religion. The founder of
Buddhism, though not born in Bihar, spent the best part
of his active life in that Province. He began his medita-
tion and attained enlightenment in Gaya, his missionary activity is associated with many localities in Bihar, and the first three General Assemblies of the Buddhist monks which gave the final shape to Buddhism, were all held within the geographical limits of Bihar. The great missionary activities which not only spread Buddhism throughout India but also outside the country and made it a world religion had their centre in Pāṭaliputra and are intimately associated with its great emperor Asoka.

Mahāvīra, the historical founder of Jainism, was born in Bihar and the early history of Jainism is indissolubly bound up with that Province. According to Jain tradition, no less than twenty out of twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras attained salvation in the Pārśvanātha Hills, and two others, including Mahāvīra, attained Nirvāṇa at Campāpura and Pāvā all in Bihar. Bihar was stronghold of both Buddhism and Jainism for a long time. If we remember the profound influence exercised by these two religious sects on various aspects of Indian culture, we can never forget the immense debt it owes to Bihar. It may not be a mere accident that the two heterodox sects like Buddhism and Jainism had their origin and chief centre in Bihar. The revolt against Vedic sacrifices which came to be regarded as the chief feature of Brahmanical religion and the acceptance of Vedic Saṁhitās as the chief source of that religion, may be traced in the Upanishads. This is too well-known to need a general discussion. But attention may be drawn to two characteristic passages in the Muṇḍaka-Upanishad.

"The lower knowledge is the RgVeda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda, Atharva-Veda.......but the higher knowledge is that by which the indestructible (Brahman) is apprehended" (I. 1.5).

"But frail, in truth, are those boats, the sacrifices....... Fools who praise this as the highest good are subject again and again to old age and death" (I. 2.7).
The same idea is found in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopanishad*. In the course of a discussion at the court of Janaka, King of Videha, Yājñavalkya told Gārgi Vācaknavi.

"Whoever, O Gārgi, without knowing that *Akṣhara* (the imperishable) offers oblations in this world, sacrifices and performs penance for a thousand years, his work will have an end. Whosoever, O Gārgi, without knowing this *Akṣhara*, departs this world, he is miserable (like a slave). But he, O Gārgi, who departs this world, knowing this *Akṣhara*, he is a *Bṛāhmaṇa*" (III.8.10).

These show a radical departure from the traditional notions about the infallibility of the Vedas and the place of supremacy in religion accorded to the performances of sacrifices and austerities (*tapas*). Yet it is exactly the radical ideas of this nature which formed the basis of Buddhism and Jainism. If we remember that the Upanishads flourished in the court of Janaka in Videha (North Bihar) it is reasonable to conclude that Bihar, which lay outside the pale of Vedic culture represented by the Samhitās and Bṛāhmaṇas, played an important role in the development of that later phase of Indian culture which, breaking off from the orthodox Vedic tradition of *yajña* (sacrifice) and *tapas* (austerities) emphasized other means of salvation, namely the knowledge of the Absolute, as in the Upanishads, and an ethical code of conduct as in Buddhism. If we accept this view we must regard it as the most notable and the most enduring contribution of Bihar to Indian culture.

Apart from what has been said above in connection with the Upanishads, Buddhism and Jainism, there are other evidences to indicate that Bihar was the centre of an intellectual development which affected the whole of India. Though definite and authentic evidence is lacking, there is a tradition about the association of some renowned scholars of all-India fame with Pāṭaliputra, the capital
of Magadha Empire. There is reference to it in the Kāvyā-māṁsā of Rājaśekhara who flourished in the 9th century A. D. The relevant passage may be translated as follows:

'We have heard of the examination being hold of the great authors of 'śāstras' (systematized knowledge) at Pāṭaliputra. It was here that Upavarsha and Varsha, Pāṇini and Piṅgala, as well as Vyādi, Vararuci, and Patañjali—all these were tested (partkṣhitāḥ) and gained renown.

"All these persons are well-known as intellectual giants and are evidently arranged in chronological order. Traditionally, Varsha was the guru (preceptor) of Pāṇini, and Upavarsha, the first promulgator of Māṁsā doctrine. Pāṇini flourished about the fifth century B. C. if not earlier, and his commentator Patañjali in the first half of the second century B. C. Of the three names interposed between those two, Piṅgala is referred to in a Buddhist text as the guru of the sons of Bindusāra, including Aśoka, and this fits in with the chronology of the times."[^11]

There are some corroborative evidences in support of this tradition, Patañjali's association with Pāṭaliputra is known from the fact stated in the Mahābhāṣya that he performed a sacrifice for Pushyamitra in that city. There is a tradition in the Kathāsarit-Sāgara that Pāṇini lived in the court of the Nandas.

Another great scholar, associated with the court of Pāṭaliputra was Kauṭilya. It is true that both he and Pāṇini were born in the remote western regions of the Punjab. But we may well believe that they settled in Pāṭaliputra. It has been suggested that the conquest of the Punjab by the Achaemenian rulers and the Greeks forced these scholars to seek refuge in the court of Pāṭali-
putra. This is not unlikely but in any case their association with Pāṭaliputra is well attested. Both of them were outstanding personalities and made notable contributions to Indian culture.

But by far the most distinguished man of science produced in India was also associated with Pāṭaliputra. This was Āryabhāta who was born in Pāṭaliputra in 476 A. D. and wrote his Āryabhaṭiyam in 499. A. D. "Besides dealing with the rules of involution and evolution it deals with the arithmetic progression, both of numbers, as well as of their squares and cubes. In the realm of geometry the work describes several properties of the circle, discusses questions connected with projective geometry and gives a value for π, far more accurate than any supposed till then. In algebra simultaneous equations with four unknown quantities have been solved, and the problem of finding a general solution of the indeterminates of the first degree is successfully tackled."* He was also a great astronomer. He was the first to proclaim boldly in defiance of the traditions of the sacred scriptures of the Hindus, that eclipses are caused, not by the demons Rāhu and Ketu, but by the moon coming within the earth's shadow or between the earth and the sun.

"Āryabhāta was the first Indian astronomer to discover that the earth rotates round its axis (IV, 9). He was the first to find out sine functions and utilise them in astronomy. He worked out the accurate formula to measure the increase or decrease in the duration of two consecutive days (IV, 26). He obtained the correct equation for the orbit of a planet by taking the apse (III, 22-3). He postulated an epicyclic theory of his own to explain the variations in planetary motions (III, 21). His equations of spherical trigonometry to find out the right ascension and declination of any point on the ecliptic are also
correct (IV, 25). He accurately expressed the angular diameter of the earth's shadow at the moon's orbit (IV, 39-40), and knew how to find half the duration of an eclipse and total obscuration (IV, 41-2). He has also given rules to ascertain what part of the moon will be obscured in an eclipse (IV, 43-4). The length of his year, 365.2586805 days (III, 1), is nearer its true duration (365.25683604) than that postulated by Ptolemy (365.2631579); the same is the case about his longitude of the sun's apogee and sidereal period of the moon's nodes."

Aryabhaṭa established a school of astronomy through his disciples, "of whom Nīśaṅka, Pāṇḍuraṅgasvāmin and Lātadeva may be mentioned here. Of these the last became very famous; he was known as the expert in the whole science (sarvasiddhāntaguru) and is known to have expounded Pauliśa and Romaka Siddhāntas." It is not definitely known whether all or any of them worked in Pāṭaliputra.

A distinct class of ancient literature may be associated with Bihar. The literary composition of bardic chronicles containing songs and genealogies of kings formed an important section of the Purāṇas. The fact that their authors were known by the generic term Māgadha indicates the close association of their writers with Magadha, even though we may not accept Pargiter's interpretation of Māgadhā as an inhabitant of Magadha. The traditions preserved by the Māgadhās along with the Sūtas formed the nucleus of the historical account of kings in the Purāṇas and may be regarded as the oldest historical literature in India.

Two important offshoots of Buddhism in the shape of the two great universities at Nālandā and Vikramaśilā—both in Bihar—may be reckoned as the two greatest universities in India. Their reputation as seats of learning was 38-II.
not confined to India but spread almost all over Asia. Their contribution to the intellectual development of India and the expansion of Indian culture to Central Asia, China, Tibet, Korea, Japan and South-east Asia, including East Indies, cannot be over-estimated. The scholars who assembled in these two universities shed lustre on the whole of India.

It may be truly said that these two were the only Universities in ancient India, if we take the word in the real sense. Taxilā is famed as a much older institution, but we have no evidence to show that it was an organised centre of education in which large number of students gathered to learn diverse subjects from a body of learned teachers—all together forming a corporate body. In Taxilā we hear of eminent individual teachers in particular subjects attracting students from far and near, but there is nothing to show that different teachers and students formed a body corporate with a permanent organisation. There were also educational institutions attached to individual temples, particularly in South India, but they correspond to Colleges rather than Universities. The true type of universities illustrated by those in Nālandā and Vikramaśilā are distinct contributions of Bihar to Indian culture. It is not necessary to give detailed accounts of either as they will be found elsewhere in this book.

Among the notable contribution of Bihar to Indian culture prominence must be given to splendid beginnings of architecture and sculpture in stone associated with the name of the great emperor Aśoka. It is not necessary to give a detailed account of the specimens of this art as these are well-known to students of history and have been dealt with elsewhere in this work. It is true that many of these specimens, including some of the finest, have been found outside Bihar, but they all bear the definite stamps of
Maurya art. As the inscriptions of Aśoka scattered all over India contain the earliest specimens of Indian writing so the Aśokan art shows us the beginnings of architecture and sculpture in stone. The wonderful palace at Pāthaliputra has perished but we may form an idea of its splendour and excellence from Greek and Chinese accounts. The fine metallic polish of Aśoka’s monolithic pillars and the wonderful Lion Capital found at Sarnath, now accepted as the emblem of the Republic of India, will for ever stand as undying monuments of Bihar’s contribution to the Indian art. They have never been equalled in the domain of art either in India or anywhere else in the world. The construction of caves hewn out of solid rock, which developed into one of the finest arts in India, also had its beginnings in Bihar, in the oldest Saptaparni cave at Rajgir and somewhat later, the cave at Barabar hills.

This glorious art tradition set up by the Maurya Emperor Aśoka was continued by two later imperial ruling dynasties in Bihar, viz. the Śuṅgas and the Guptaśas. Later, the Eastern School of Art flourished under the Pālās who ruled over Bengal and Bihar. Many fine specimens of these, notably the bronze images and manuscript illuminations, have been found in Bihar. Details of these will be found in chapters of Art. On the whole Bihar made a distinct contribution to the development of Indian art in all its forms.

Finally reference may be made to the contribution of Bihar to the development of regional languages of Eastern India. The Aryan languages of Eastern India such as Bengali, Asamese and Oriya all originated from the Māgadhi Prākṛta i.e. the form of Prākṛta language which was current in Bihar. In order to explain the full significance of this contribution it is necessary to point out that there were at least three racial elements in the population
of Eastern India, namely Mongoloid, Austric or Aurochsian, and Dravidian, each having distinct languages or dialects of its own. All these three were welded together into one Aryan—speaking people in historical times. For example, even in the time of the Buddha, the Aryan language did not spread beyond East Bihar. It would seem that from the Maurya period onwards there was a powerful movement of Aryan-speakers from Bihar passing on into north and west Bengal, and from thence spreading to Assam in the east and to Orissa in the south. These Aryan-speakers, themselves of mixed origin, as much as the people of Bengal, took with them the speech of Magadha; and it was known as Māgadhi-Prākṛta and later as Māgadhi-Apabhramśa when the Aryan speech was established in Bengal, Assam and Orissa.

Thus Bihar made a substantial contribution to the evolution of Bengali, Assamese and Oriya dialects. It is this circumstance which probably explains the curious fact that the language of the Čāryāpadas which were discovered by MM. Haraprasad Sastri and were composed probably between A. D. 950 and 1200, has been claimed as the oldest form of Bengali, Assamese, Oriya and Maithili, (and Magahi-Ed.) by persons speaking these different languages.
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CHAPTER XLIV

The Coinage of Bihar

In a passage in the Rgveda the price of the Indra (image), which was being offered by a sage for sale, is said to be ten cows.1 Another sage is said in another passage to have refused to sell his Indra (image) even for a hundred or a thousand or a ten thousand cows.2 In a third passage we are told that the Bhārata army went out for war impelled by the desire to acquire cows.3 Again, we find that Indra sent his messenger Saramā to find out his stolen treasure; and that treasure was nothing else but cows.4 These and similar other references in the Vedic literature, suggest that in those early days, the people in India had established values in terms of cows. This was, however, not exclusive to them. Almost all the ancient societies, who were once nomads and owned flocks and herds, valued similarly.

In course of time, the early Vedic civilization realised the value of metal and regarded gold as the most desirable and the most valued possession. It was so valuable to them that for safety they stored it in pots and buried underground.5 We are told in one of the hymns of the Rgveda that the king Divodāsa presented to his priest ten bags (most likely, of gold), ten horses, ten garments and ten ingots of gold (hiranya-pinda).6 In another hymn, the sage Kakshivat has described as to how he got from the king Bhavya, ten horses and ten nīshkas.7 In the Atharvaaveda, a poet has described the generosity of his patron, who gave him a hundred nīshkas, ten necklaces, three hundred horses and ten thousand cows.8 In the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, we find Uddālaka Āruṇi, a distinguished scholar of Kuru-paṇcāla
country moving throughout the country with a challenge for debate and an offer of a nishka attached to his banner to him who would surpass him in debate.⁸ Again in the the Chāndogya-Upanishad it is said that a king offered his daughter along with a thousand cows, a horse and a chariot, a village and nishka to a sage as the inducement to accept certain esoteric doctrine.⁹ These show that during this period great value was attached to the metal; and the gold, in the form of pīṇḍa (ingots) and nishka (an ornament or metal-piece) was commonly presented by the kings as gift. But we have no reference of these metallic pieces being used in the exchange of goods. Yet, it would not be wrong to think that by the time of the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads i.e. by Circa 800 B.C. the "currency" had developed in India. It might not have taken till then the form of money; i.e. no specific weight standard for the metal pieces was evolved.

In the later Sāmhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, we come across the references of Śatamāna, which was round in shape. Two such Śatamānas were attached to the two wheels of the royal chariot, in the chariot race in course of the Rājasūya sacrifice at the time of the coronation of a king. These Śatamānas were later given to the priest. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad describes the Bahu-dakshina sacrifice, performed by king Janaka of Videha. He organised a philosophical congress and arranged debates to find out the most learned scholar amongst those present in his court. For this, he offered a most tempting prize of a thousand cows, each having ten pādas attached to the horns.¹⁰ Thus the winner was to get one thousand cows and ten thousand pādas. Here in these instances, the words Śatamāna and pāda indicate that they were of some specific weight standards. "Śatamāna" means "an object of hundred units" most probably of weight; and
“pāḍa” was the quarter of some specific object of value having some specific measure or weight. Thus we find that the “currency” had taken the form of “money” by this time i.e. c. 600 B.C. The metal was exchanged for goods according to some specific weight standard; but if they were “coins”, we have yet to know. There is no indication in the contemporary literature that these metallic pieces had any marks or devices of any responsible authority, which is essential for any metallic piece being called “coin”.

The definite evidence of stamped metallic pieces of specific weight standard i.e. coins, is available earliest only in Pāṇini’s grammar Ashtadhyāyī, which is datable to the middle of the fifth century B.C. It gives several instances of transactions concluded in terms of nishkas. There the terms Naishkikam, Dvi-naishkikam and Treishkikam are said to denote articles purchased for one, two and three nishkas respectively. Similarly, naishkā-śatikā and naishkā-sahasrika, according to the grammar, expressed the wealth of a person. The other terms denoting coins, mentioned in the grammar are—Śatamāṇa, Śaṇa, Kārśāpaṇa, Māsha, Viṃśatikā and Triṃśatikā. Pāṇini, in one of his śūtras specifically mentions that the metallic pieces were stamped with symbols. And actually, we have the earliest coins of India stamped with symbols. Each symbol on these coins is stamped with individual punches; so, the numismatists have named them “Punch-marked Coins.”

The detailed method of manufacturing these coins, is nowhere available in the existing literature. But incidently, Kauṭilya, while referring to the counterfeiteers of coins (kāta-rūpa-kāraka) has given a list of objects that were used in a mint in the manufacture of coins. They were metal (lōha), crucibles (mūsha), alkalis (kshāra), charcoal (angāra), bellow (bhastra), clipper (sandāsa), hammer (mush-
tika), an oil (adhikarṇī) and dies or punches having designs or symbols (bimba-taṅka)." These suggest that the process of the coins would have been something like this. The metal was melted in the crucibles (mūsha) and purified with alkalis (kṣaṛa); then it was beaten into sheets on the anvil (adhikarṇī) with a hammer (mushṭika) and cut into pieces with clipper (sandamśa). Later on, the pieces, so prepared, were stamped with the dies or punches (bimba-taṅka). Save the automatic mechanical devising, the same process is used in the modern mints. So, the same process would have been prevalent even in the times before Kauṭilya.

The stamping of the symbols on the coins was the guarantee and the authentication of the fact that the coins contained some specified quality of metal and were of some definite weights and carried certain definite value. As such, it has been the searching question to the economists, numismatists and historians, as to who was the authority that took upon himself this responsibility and issued the coins. It is mostly suggested that merchants and traders were the people most concerned with the smooth sailing of the commercial transactions. So, the coins would have been initiated by their guilds and corporations. But that the traders and merchants had ever issued their coins, is neither testified from any literary sources nor from the extant specimens of the coins. If they had any hand in the origin of the coins, it would have been only in the primitive stage, when metal evolved into currency and subsequently into money. The formation of the strong monarchies, which is seen towards the close of the Vedic period, must have necessitated the state control over the coinage.

The earliest punch-marked coins have been found in the habitational deposits at various sites, which yield
N. B. P. Ware. The earliest date for the N. B. P. Ware, computed by the radio-carbon dating method, is in the proximity of 500 B.C. Taking together the evidence of Pāṇini and the radio-carbon dating, it may be assumed that the coins originated in India some time in the sixth century and were positively current in the fifth century B.C. And by this time the monarchies in the country had become quite strong. So, the coins of the period should be attributed to them. But at the same time, we should admit that the authority of the state over the coinage was not so effective for a long time, as to create confidence amongst the traders and merchants about their authenticity. We find that barring a few early issues, which have blank reverses, almost all the pre-Mauryan punch-marked coins are counterstruck with a large number of minute marks scattered all over the reverse and occasionally on the obverse. The merchants and moneyers seem to have punched them to test their worth, when they passed through their hands.

How exactly the Magadha state was regulating the mint and the coinage before the time of the Mauryas, we cannot precisely say; but it would not be wrong to assume that the Mauryan system, that we know from the Arthasāstra of Kautilya, would have been in the continuation of the earlier system or an improvement upon it. According to the Arthasāstra the issue of the coins was the state’s exclusive concern. A superintendent (takṣaḥgādhyakṣa) was appointed to run the mint and issue coins on its behalf.1 If the state maintained a central mint or several mints were situated at various places in the state, it is not clear. But from the coins, it appears that in the Mauryan period, there were a number of zonal or provincial mints.

Officers called rāpadarśaka regulated the currency of the coins (pāṇa-vatā), exchange (vyavahārika) and legal
tender (*kośa-praveśa*). It seems that the coins were sent from the mint to these officers; who arranged for their circulation probably a similar arrangement that we have today in our country between the Government mint and the Issue Department of the Reserve Bank. But unlike today, the coins were issued on payment of eight per cent as _rupika_ over the metal value. This was either seigniorage or as the name indicates the cost of the manufacture.

No coins, which were more than one _Māsha_ less in weight than the standard, were taken to be legal tender. So, in all probability, the worn coins were brought back to the _Rūpadarśaka_; and he issued fresh coins after charging a _vyāji_ of five percent. The _Vyāji_ was most likely to meet the loss in weight.

The treasurers (*sannidhāta*_ ) were instructed to receive only those coins, which were declared genuine by the _Rūpadarśaka_. The latter was authorised to destroy the bad coins, as is the custom even now in the banks and treasuries. For testing the coins, the _Rūpadarśaka_ charged 1/8 per-cent as his fee (*pūrıkshīka*). Whether this fee was charged on all the coins that were brought to him or for only those coins, which were to be received in the state treasury for deposit as state dues, is not explicit. But most likely, he might have been charging in all the cases.

**SILVER PUNCH-MARKED COINS**

The earliest silver punch-marked coins, that may be identified as the coins of Bihar or to be more precise, of the ancient state (*janapada*) of Magadhā are those, which belong to a hoard that was found in about 1953 somewhere in the vicinity of Bhabhua in the district of Shahabad. The hoard reached into the hands of a local dealer, who dispersed them amongst many public and private collections. Now, the known deposits of these coins are the _Bhārata Kāla Bhavana_, Banaras Hindu
University (having 70 coins) and the Patna Museum (only 20 coins)."

These early Magadhan silver punch-marked coins are the products of two distinct processes. In one, the coins were made by cut-sheet process. In this method, the metal was beaten into flat sheets of necessary thickness, and then the sheets were cut into strips of varying breadth in proportion to the thickness of the sheets; finally blanks of approximately desired weight were cut; and then for adjustment of the weight, edges of the blanks were clipped. On these blanks the symbols were punched. Our coins, made of this process are made of very thin sheets, neatly cut into round or long ovalide shape and weigh 12 to 16 grains and 7 to 8 grains. The coins of the higher weight bear two different bold symbols on one side. One of the symbols appears to be various forms of a complex type of six-armed symbol. The form of the other symbol constitutes mostly complex geometrical patterns; and it is difficult to make out the actual form. The coins of the lower weight have a single symbol, same as the complex six armed symbol, mentioned above.

The second process, employed in the manufacture of the coins, was to take metal equal in weight to that of an individual coin and melt it separately and then pour it out on the earth or wooden board to cool and take its shape. And then, if necessary to press it to have a flat surface. It seems that the symbols were punched in this process when the metal was still soft. The coins made of this process, weigh 92 to 97 grains and 46 to 49 grains. While the coins of the lower weight have only one symbol the same as the six-armed symbol mentioned above; the higher weight coins bear four symbols. These four symbols may be distinguished into two sets. One set of two symbols are bold and big and are almost the same two symbols, that
are found on the coins of the higher weight, made of cut-sheet process described above. The other set of two symbols, is approximately half in size of the other two symbols and are quite different. Here the two symbols are identical.

We find that the coins, made of the two processes, were based on the binary system in their weight-standard i.e. one was the half of the other in weight. But they maintained trinary system in their inter-relation. The coins of the higher weight of the cut-sheet fabric are one-third of the coins of the lower weight coins of the molten fabric. Such a gamut of coins having binary-cum-trinary system of metrology is perhaps unknown elsewhere.

From the same place and most probably in the same hoard which had the above coins, were found a few other coins of cut-sheet fabric; but they are distinct in execution from the others. Two of these coins are in the Bhārata Kalā Bhavana, Varanasi. One of them, thick, broad, ovalide in shape 1.35" × 9" in size and 123.5 grains in weight, bears two symbols, resembling very much like a lotus. One of the symbols is smaller than the other and differs a little in form. The other is a tiny round coin, only 4" in diameter and 2.3 grains in weight and bears a lotus like symbol. In what way these two coins were related amongst themselves and with the coins of the earlier type, is not possible to determine; but since they have been found in the same hoard, it may be suggested that they belong to Magadha.

Another type of cut-sheet fabric coins, that may be identified as the coins of Magadha also hails from Bhābhua area. The coins of this type were found in another hoard and at some different place and on different occasion. These coins were also dispersed through the same local dealers to various collections. These coins are also broad
and thin; and they have four distinct symbols (i) sun; (ii) six-armed symbol with three arrows and three ovals alternately placed; (iii) standing bull facing right; and (iv) lion standing facing left. They weigh in the proximity of 71-72 grains.

None of the coins of these three types have been found outside the state (janapada) of Magadha and exclusive to Bhabhua region. On various considerations, it may be suggested that they were issued from the capital mint at Rājaçarha during the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru.

When the capital of Magadha was shifted from Rājaçarha to Pātaliputra, another type of silver punch-marked coins having five symbols were issued and in course of time, when Magadha gradually expanded into an empire, the coins of this type became universal. No less than 150 hoards of these coins are known today as the finds from all corners of the country right from Dacca in the east to Rawalpindi and Afghanistan in the west and Kangra valley in the north to Tinnevelly in the south." These coins may be distinguished in no less than 550 varieties according to the group of symbols that they have on them. The varieties of the coins variously differ in their fabric and execution, their size, their metal-contents and also in the use of the reverse of the flan. On the basis of these distinctions, the condition of the coins in the hoards and the comparative study of the hoards and their contents, the varieties of the coins, may be attributed to different periods, dynasties and kings.

The earliest coins of this type were found in a small hoard of 108 coins at Golakpur muhalla in Patna town. These coins are broad in flan similar to the coins of the third variety of Bhabhua finds and also bear the same first two symbols—(i) sun and (ii) six-armed symbol with three arrows and three ovals alternately placed. It is evident
thus that these coins are their immediate successors. The continuation of the varieties of the coins of this hoard is found in the hoards known from Aurihar (district Ghazipur), Rajghat (Varanasi) and Jaunpur. In all these hoards the coins are in good condition. A few coins of these varieties are found elsewhere; but there they are extremely worn and are associated with the coins of such varieties which are unknown in these hoards and are well preserved there. These indicate that the coins of this type was originally confined to Magadha and Kāśi, which had come under the influence of the former by this time. The coins thus may well be attributed to Udāyi and his successors.

Some of the worn coins of the above varieties, that are found in hoards, scattered over the various parts of the country, bear well preserved group of another five symbols on the other i.e. on the reverse side. These coins indicate that the original issuers of these coins were over-thrown and some new king, after occupying their throne, re-issued these coins by re-stamping them by his own symbols. And actually, according to the Buddhist records, the fifth ruler after Ajātashatru was deposed by the people and his amātya Śiśunāga was placed on the throne. Thus the later symbol-groups on the coins, which include the symbol ‘a hare with three taurines around’ as the Class Mark and ‘palm tree’ as the Group Mark, may be attributed to Śiśunāga.

Most of the coins, which have the above re-striking symbol-group as their own marks on fresh flans, are of a quite different fabric. They are smaller in size and are thicker than the above coins. For the convenience sake, they may be called as medium fabric coins. The metal of these coins is also more alloyed. These facts also reflect that with them, the coinage of a new dynasty began. To this new dynasty of Śiśunāg, may be attributed all those coins that
have animal symbols as their Class mark, and in chronology they are anterior to the coins of the same fabric that have Hill symbols as the Class mark.\textsuperscript{88}

That the coins having the Class marks of Hill series e.g. Six-arched hill, Hare-on-the-hill, Bull-on-the-hill, tree-on-the-hill and the like, relate to a different Series, than those having animal symbols as their Class mark, appears from the fact that the inter-relation of the symbols in the symbol-group of these coins, is not the same as those that have animal symbols as their Class marks.\textsuperscript{89} These coins are posterior to the coins of Animal Class is also suggested from the fact that in almost all the hoards, where the coins of both these Classes are found together, the coins of the Hill Class marks are found less worn and with few reverse marks than the coins with Animal Class marks. This is further supported from the contents of the hoards found at Gorhoghat (district Bhagalpur), Allahabad and Kunniamkuttai (district Salem, Tamilnadu) and the two hoards in the Mathura Museum.\textsuperscript{91} The Gorhoghat and the Kunniamkuttai hoards and one of the hoards of the Mathura Museum (the hoard of 1954-55) do not include any coins of the Animal Class marks and its preceding classes; and only one coin each of the Animal Class marks and no coins of earlier series are know in the other hoards i.e. the Allahabad hoard and the other hoard of Mathura Museum (the hoard of 1952-53). These reflect that the coins with Hill Class marks were issued by the dynasty, which succeeded the Śāśunāgas; and thus they may well be attributed to the Nanda dynasty.

Another series of the coins, that followed the coins with Hill Class marks, are found made of three different fabrics. Some of the coins of the series are of medium fabric in continuation of the earlier series; the others are thick, quite small in size and dumpy—sometimes as thick
as one centimeter. These dumpy coins are either sheet-cut or made from globules (made out of molten metal), which were later on given a flattened shape with hammer. These dumpy coins were made of highly adulterated silver. They may be identified as Mauryan on the basis of various considerations. Some of these may conveniently be attributed to Candragupta Maurya and his son; the others to Aśoka. A few varieties of this series may be post-Aśokan; but this is by no means certain.

With the fall of the Mauryan empire in the second century B.C., the minting of these coins ceased for ever; but the coins remained in currency for a long time till about the fourth century A.D. They were so popular that during the second-third century A.D., when they gradually began to disappear being worn, people copied these coins by the mould process in various parts of the country. A number of such moulds have been found at Mathura, Jhusi (Allahabad), Sisupalagarh (Orissa) and Kondapur (Andhra Pradesh).\[n\]

Following hoards of these coins are known so far from Bihar: (1) Bhalna, district Gaya—129 coins (1948);\[n\] (ii) Ghorhoghat, district Bhagalpur—58 coins (1919);\[n\] (3) Gohada, district Monghyr—611 coins (1942);\[n\] (4) Golakpur, Patna town—108 coins (1918);\[n\] (5) Jalloy, district Darbhanga—38 coins (1927);\[n\] (6) Macchuatoli, Patna town—2232 (1937);\[n\] (7) Somewhere in Patna district—33 (1935);\[n\] (8) Patraha, district Purnea—2873 (1925);\[n\] (9) Ramna, Patna town—45 (1935);\[n\] (10) Sikta, district Champaran—21 coins (1955);\[n\] (11) Singhbhum (Chaibasa) district—1191 coins (Third quarter of the 19th century);\[n\] (12) Supaul, district Bhagalpur—15 coins (1909);\[n\] (13) Taregna, district Patna—254 coins (1925);\[n\] (14) Vaiśālī, district Muzaffarpur—52 coins (1953).\[n\] Besides
these stray finds of the punch-marked coins often come to notice from almost all parts of the State now and then.

The varieties of the silver punch-marked coins, known from these finds are not exclusive. They are found in almost all the hoards and from all parts of the country. So, in the present circumstance of our knowledge, it is not possible to suggest whether all the coins were issued from a central mint, which catered the entire empire or there were zonal, territorial or provincial mints. It can only be said that these coins belonged to Magadha.

These coins, inspite of the fact that they appear in different fabrics and their metal contents are not the same all the time, weigh in the proximity of 56 grains when they are almost in the mint condition. Assuming that the raktika or Guṇjā seed (Abruš Procatorious) was the unit weight of ancient India, on the basis of a passage in the Manusmṛti, our scholars suggest that these coins belong to 32 rattis standard; to them 56 grains weight of the coins conform to 32 rattis. But this is by no means certain.

According to the Arthaśāstra silver coins of four denominations—Paṇa, Ardha-pana, Pāda and Ashta-bhūga were produced at the Mauryan mint." Pāṇini also refers to the use of the coins of the first three denominations. So, it would not be wrong to assume that the coins of at least three denominations were current in this country from the time of Udāyi to Aśoka. But the existing coins represent only one denomination. Not a single silver coin of any other denomination, either higher or lower in weight have so far been found. This conspicuous absence of the coins of other denominations does not mean that they were never produced or if produced, were produced in small quantity. This only reflects the psychology of the people. It has been always and everywhere the tendency of the people to hoard only the coins of higher value and discard the
coins of lower value. As such, we may conveniently identify the existing coins as Paṇa of Pāṇini’s and Kautilya’s time even without knowing their actual weight-standard.

COPPER PUNCH-MARKED COINS

Unlike the silver punch-marked coins, the copper punch-marked coins that are known in Bihār, are exclusively the currency of the state. They are not known elsewhere outside. These copper punch-marked coins are found in excavations associated with those varieties of the punch-marked coins, which are attributable to Aśoka. This suggests that the copper coins came in vogue only in his time. The copper punch-marked coins, found in excavations from various sites, all belong to only one variety, i.e., all of them bear the same symbol group. These coins bear five symbols on the obverse and four on the reverse, all equally bold. Of the five symbols on the obverse, the first three are almost the same, that are seen on the Aśokan silver punch-marked coins. The other two symbols and all the four symbols on the reverse are quite new, unknown on the silver pieces.

Apart from the stray finds in the excavations, two hoards are also known of these coins. One of them was found at Madhepura in the Saharsa district in the early part of the third decade of the present century. The exact content of the hoard is not known; but 54 coins from this hoard are in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. These coins weigh between 286.7 and 163.9 grains. The other hoard exists in the British Museum, London, where it was acquired from W. H. Valentine, who got the entire hoard of 214 coins, most probably from the finder himself. The findspot is not known. These coins weigh between 359 and 162 grains.18

The weights known from these hoards, show that the difference between the highest and the lowest weights of
the coins; is more than double; yet there is no appreciable
break in between the weights of the coins, in both the
hoards to suggest that the coins belonged to more than one
denomination. But whether they really belonged to one
denomination, is also not possible to say at the same time.

The *Arthaśāstra* mentions that the copper coins were
made at the Mauryan mint and they were lower in deno-
mination than *pāda*. They were called *Māshaka*, *Ardha-
māshaka*, *Kākiṇī* and *Ardha-Kākiṇī*. How they were related
to silver coins, is not mentioned there. But from a passage,
given elsewhere in the same book, it appears that the *pāda*
was most likely equal to 8 *māshakas.* If the *Māshaka* coin
had the same weight as the *Māshaka* unit of weight, then
according to the weight given for *Māshaka* by *Kauṭilya*,
the Mashaka coin would have been 5 *rattis* or approximately
8 grains in weight.

The present coins are much heavier in weight. If the
silver *pana* coin valued 32 copper *Māshaka*—coins of 5 *rattis*
weight, then a coin of the same value in copper would
weigh 160 *rattis*. As such, it is not unlikely that these coins
might be the copper *panas* called *Kārśāpana* and their
fractions and multiples.

**COPPER CAST COINS**

Along with these copper punch-marked coins, are
found some other copper coins in the excavations at various
sites in Bihar, which are the products of a quite different
technique. They are casts from moulds. Whereever
they have been found in the excavations, they have out-
numbered the copper punch-marked coins. This suggests
that these coins were more common than these copper
punchmarked coins; yet surprisingly enough not a single
hoard has come to light so far. Only occasionally they are
found on the mounds at the ancient sites,
Two main types are so far known. The most numerous type is the square or rectangular one having four symbols on each side. They usually bear (i) Tree-in-railing; (ii) three-arched hill with crescent; (iii) Hollow-cross and (iv) taurins on one side; and (i) Triangle-headed standard; (ii) Svastika; (iii) Taurine and (iv) Elephant on the other. On some coins a fifth symbol-ladder is also seen on this side. The arrangement of the symbols are not always the same. Thus they may be distinguished in a number of varieties. The placement of the symbols on both the sides bring these coins very close to the copper punch-marked coins; but none of the symbols except the three-arched hill with crescent are common to both. These cast coins weigh between 25 and 70 grains; and most likely belong to two denominations; but how they fit in the gamut of the Karshapanas is not possible to suggest.

The other type of the cast coins is round and has an elephant on one side and the three-arched Hill on the other. Thus the two symbols of the above type are found on these coins in the same way on the obverse and reverse and thus relate with them. These coins weigh between 10 and 60 grains and may be the coins of smaller denominations; but it is not possible to distinguish various denominations.

These cast coins are not exclusive to Bihar and are known from many North Indian sites. How long these coins were being issued is not known; but they remained current till the second-third century A. D.

AYODHYĀ AND PAṆCĀLA COINS

So far we had the coins, whose origin may be anticipated in Bihar. But hence onward we have the coins that originated definitely outside the state. A few Ayodhya and Pañcāla coins are known from the excavations from
Kumhrar (Pāṭaliputra). Then 10 Ayodhya coins were found at Buxar along with Kushāṇa coins in a hoard. Whether, these coins are just drifts or bear some political significance, is not possible to speculate at the moment.

**KUSHĀṇA COINS**

At least five hoards of the copper Kushāṇa coins are so far known to the author as the finds from Bihar. Two of them were found in Champaran district; one at Radhia in 1937 and the other at Lauria in 1940. The latter included the coins of Kanishka and Huvishka along with a few Puri Kushāṇas; the former had the coins of Wima Kadphises also; but then it had no Puri-Kushāṇas. The third hoard was found in about 1950 at Buxar. It included 23 coins of Wima Kadphises, 159 coins of Kanishka, 172 coins of Huvishka, 10 of indistinct Kushāṇas. Along with them were found 10 coins of Ayodhya kings. The other two hoards were found within last few years in Saran and Darbhanga districts; but they were dispersed by the finders before any thing could be known about them. A stray copper coin of Wima Kadaphises and a few of Huvishka were picked up by a friend of ours in the vicinity of Bangari in Champaran district. The excavations at Vaiśālī (district Muzaffarpur) yielded copper Kushāṇa coins. The exact number of the coins found in earlier excavations are not known; they are said to be fairly large. But the latest excavations have yielded only nine. The excavations at Kumhrar (Pāṭaliputra) during 1951-55 yielded seven coins. The earlier excavations conducted by Spooner in 1912-13 had brought only five. These show that the Kushāṇa coins are known chiefly in the north Bihar across the Gangā or on the Gangā. In south Bihar only a stray coin from Ranchi district and a few from Kumhrar are the only ones that are on record. (A hoard of 80 copper Kushāṇa coins were discovered in
Chirand excavations in stratified Kushāṇa layer. They are too worn out to be deciphered—Ed.)

Gold coins of the great Kushāṇas are almost unknown. Except a coin of Huvishka from Belwadaga in Ranchi district⁴⁷ no coin is known ever reported. A coin amulet of Huvishka was discovered in Kumhrar excavations. A coin of later Kushāṇas was found along with a coin of Samudra Gupta, both hooked along with a few gold ornaments at Sultanganj district Bhagalpur in 1959.⁴⁸ A hoard of 18 Kidāra Kushāṇa coins were discovered in 1920 at Raftiganj in Gaya district.⁴⁸

A section of scholars, on the basis of these coins, believe that Bihar was included in the domain of the Kushāṇas. But the other section takes their entry by the way of trade. Nothing can be said in favour or against either of the views unless the matter is thoroughly investigated.

**PURI-KUSHĀṆA COINS**

Copper coins of a type, having a standing figure on both the sides very much alike only with the arms varying in position, are found quite frequently in the Chota Nagpur area. In the Singhbhum district, these coins were found in Rakha Hills in 1917 and again in 1927; at Kusumbagan in 1928 and at Pendrapara (Saraikela) in 1953. In Dalbhum area they were found at Mohalia in 1933 and in Purulia in 1920. Out side this region, they are known exclusively in a hoard found at Lauriya in Champaran district in 1940 mixed with the copper coins of Kaṇīṣhka and Huvishka.⁴⁹ These coins are called Puri-Kushana coins by the numismatists.

This nomenclature gives an idea that the coins originated at Puri or Orissa and were issued by the Kushāṇas. But the name was given to them for the simple reason
that they were discovered for the first time in Puri and that they appeared to be a very crude imitations of the coins of the Kushāna ruler Kaṇishka. Their origin in Puri or Orissa is by no means certain. The coins, that were discovered in 1917 in Rakha Hills, were almost fresh; the superfluous metal flown through the channel and spread outside the edges of the moulds, were still there. Thus their appearance showed that they were not circulated till then. The natural conclusion thus adduced is that a mint existed in the vicinity of the find place; and a mint is not expected far from the capital or a provincial town. So, it is not unlikely that these coins belong to the rulers of that area. Who were the rulers is not known so far. But it appears from the facts available that they were current in the period, when the Imperial Guptas were ruling over Magadh. They have been found in association with the coins of Kaṇishka and Huvishka at several places in Orissa and in Champaran district. In all these hoards the Kushāna coins were quite worn. This suggests that the Puri-Kushāna coins are later than them. Then one of the coins in the Rakha Hills find of 1917 bears a legend on the reverse in place of the human figure. This legend is read as *ṭhaka*. The letter *ṭka* is very much similar to that in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta, while the letter *ṭa* does not appear to be so early. The earliest example resembling it, appears in the inscription of Aṃśuvarman (635 A. D.) according to the chart prepared by Buhler. This tends to suggest that these coins continued to be issued till the sixth century A. D. if not later.

These coins appear to have been issued in two or three denominations. The coins of higher denominations are known weighing between 130 and 160 grains and of the lower denomination between 60 and 90 grains. The
coins of the Rakha Hills find, weigh between 50 and 80 grains and have the superfluous metal flown out from the mould. So their actual weight would be much less. These may be the coins of a third and lower denomination.

**THE GUPTA COINS**

The Gupta emperors, who had Pātaliputra as their capital and Magadha as the core of their empire, are known to have profusely issued gold coins. Their coins are found in quite a large number in Uttara Pradesh; but surprisingly enough, the finds of their coins in their own land are few. So far, only the following finds are on record:

1. Cunningham records a find from Gaya which had only 8 coins. It included a coin of Candra Gupta I; a coin of Samudra Gupta (Standard type); four coins of Candra Gupta II (Archer type 3; Lion-slayer type I); a coin of Kumāra Gupta I (Horseman type) and a coin of Skanda Gupta (heavy weight with the legend Kramāditya).  

2. A hoard of 22 coins was found near Kunhara Ghat in Hajipur town in 1893; of which only 14 could be recovered. The break-up is as follows:—1 coin of Candra Gupta I; 4 coins of Samudra Gupta (Standard type 2; Archer type 1; Battle-axe type 1); 9 coins of Candra Gupta II (Archer type 3; Chatra type 3; Lion-slayer type 3).  

3. A hoard of 18 coins was found at Shahjahanpur (Futwah) in Patna district in 1925 of which only 5 could be recovered and they belonged to Candra Gupta II (4 coins of Archer type and 1 coin of Chatra type).  

4. Four coins were discovered in 1912 at Banka in Bhagalpur district. Two of them belonged to Candra Gupta II and two to Kumāra Gupta I.  

5. A coin of Samudra Gupta along with a coin of Later Kushāṇa, both hooked, were found in 1959 at Sultan-
ganj in Bhagalpur district along with a few other gold jewellery.  

6. In 1933 a coin of Samudra Gupta along with another defaced Gupta coin was found in Hazaribagh district.

7. A coin of Candra Gupta II was discovered in 1934 at Deogarh in Santhal Pargana.

Besides these, a gold coin of Kumāra Gupta I (Archer type) was found on the top floor level of monastery No. 4 during the excavations at Nālandā.

These finds though represent the coins from Candra Gupta I to Skanda Gupta and show their distribution over a fairly large part of Bihar, are confined to only a few varieties. Samudra Gupta had issued six types but only three—Standard, Archer and Battle-axe were found in these finds. Candra Gupta II had issued eight varieties; but only three—Archer, Chatra and Lion-slayer are seen here. Kumāra Gupta I had the largest number of varieties, fourteen but we find here only two—Archer and Horseman. Of Skanda Gupta we get only one variety out of three. Do they indicate that the other varieties were not known to this part of the empire? If so, it would mean that they were issued from some mint or mints outside Pātaliputra.

Among the later Gupta rulers, we have a single coin of Nārisimha Gupta, that was found at Nālandā among the ruins, while the clay-sealings of almost all the later Guptas are found from this place. This can well be explained by suggesting that Nālandā was a monastic area and the keeping of the coins were forbidden for the monks by the religious injunctions. But, then the discovery of two coin-moulds of Nārisimha Gupta from the monastic area is surprising. Evidently they suggest that there existed some mint where the coins of Nārisimha Gupta were produced by mould-process. All the Gupta coins are die-struck coins; so the
find of the moulds is all the more startling. They were the contrivance of the forgers. They indicate that counterfeit coins were being manufactured at Nalanda in the time of Narasimha Gupta or after him.

Silver coins were introduced by Candra Gupta II for the first time in the Gupta history, which follow the silver coins of the Western Kshatrapas. They were meant to be used in the western part of the empire. Kumāra Gupta I issued coins of a different variety for the use in the eastern part of the empire and it remained confined to him and to Budha Gupta. These silver coins are scarce and none have been found anywhere in Bihar. However, a silver coin of Candra Gupta II of the western type along with a coin of a Western Kshatrapa was found in a Stūpa at Sultanganj, district Bhagalpur during the last century.

Like the silver coins, copper coins of the Gupta rulers are rare. If Samudra Gupta issued any is not certain though R. D. Banerji refers to have found two of his copper coins in Burdwan district. Candra Gupta II and Kumāra Gupta I are the only rulers whose copper coins are known; but in Bihar the copper coins only of Candra Gupta II have been so far found and that too only in excavations at Kumhrar. In the excavations 1912-13 only three coins were found; and in the excavations of 1951-55, 19 coins were discovered; and they belonged to four varieties according to the obverse. In one variety the bust of the king is represented, in the other three the king is shown standing. In one he is holding a flower, in the other he is offering oblations and in the third an umbrella-bearer stands behind him.

These coins are as small as to weigh only 4 grains and as big as to weigh 70 grains. The coins are worn and corroded; so in their actual weight, they must have been heavier than the weight that we have. So, the actual
standard weight of these coins is not possible to suggest. But it may be said that they represented a number of denominations.

POST-GUPTA COINS

No coins of indigenous origin are found in Bihar after the Guptas. The coins of post-Gupta period that are found in this state, belong to three distinct series belonging to three different periods.

1. *Debased silver coins of Vigra* (c. 900 A.D.): Some coins of debased silver are known from Bihar in the tradition of the imitation of the Sassanian coins, which are called Indo-Sassanian. They bear the crude head with the legend *Sri Vigra* on the obverse and the remnants of the fire altar on the reverse. A hoard of these coins was found in 1960 at Buxar; another hoard at Hajipur (Muzaffarpur) in 1918 and a third one in 1928 in Puranea district. Smith attributes these coins with almost positive certainty to one or other of the kings of Magadha named Vigrahapāla. According to him, the least barbarous specimens were issued by the first king of that name in about 900 A.D.; and the wholly corrupt copies as late as the time of Vigrahapāla III in the middle of the eleventh century A.D. ⁴⁴

But this attribution is extremely doubtful. No Pāla rulers, who enjoyed the sovereignty with power and strength are known to have issued any coin. And we know that Vigrahapāla I of the Pāla dynasty did not rule for more than three or four years and was unmartial in nature. In his time the Pāla power was at the lowest ebb. So was the case with the rule of Vigrahapāla II (c. 980 A.D.). None of them are known to have marched ever to west in any part of Uttar Pradesh, where these coins are profusely found. The period of Vigrahapāla III, is too late to think of him being the issuer of these coins.
These coins are purely north-western in nature and are very much similar to the Śrīmadādivarāha coins of the powerful king Bhojadeva I of Kanauj (840-890 A. D.) and are frequently found mixed with the latter coins at many sites in Uttar Pradesh. There they are found in all their forms, without any kind of discrimination. Variations in the form of the coins, to which Smith has stressed, are mostly due to different dies and their cutters. In them there is nothing to show that they were issued by more than one king or that they had a long continued currency. As such they cannot be placed at distance from Bhojadeva I. Taking all the circumstances together, it appears that these coins are the issues of some ruler outside Bihar. But who issued them and how they entered into Bihar, cannot be precisely suggested.

2. *Gold coins of Gāṅgeya Deva of Tripuri* (1019-1034 A. D.): A small hoard of his coins is known from Dumari in Saran district, which was found in 1924. This might be the remnant of his expedition against Aṅga i.e. Bhagalpur, which was then under the kingdom of Mahāpāla I of Gauḍa.

3. *Electrum coins of Govinda Candra of Gāhaḍavāla dynasty* (1114-1154 A. D.): Four hoards of the electrum (gold-silver alloy) coins of the king Govinda Candra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty are known from Bihar. One was found at Chausa in Arrah district in 1923. The exact content of this find is not known. Two hoards were found in Monghyr district, one in 1912 at Kalangarh, Jamui and the other in 1940 at Surajgarha. The former had four and the latter three coins. Thus these finds are very small. The fourth hoard was found in Ranchi district at Biro in 1918. The find at Chausa may well be accounted as a copper grant of the king is known from Maner and it is believed that the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom
extended up to Danapur (Patna). But the other finds, that were found beyond this limit, cannot be explained unless we presume that they had travelled in later times along with the coins of the Muslim rulers.
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CHAPTER XLV

Terracottas of Bihar

Terracottas occupy an important place in the history of plastic art of Ancient India. Numerous figurines, made out of baked clay, which have been discovered from various parts of this country, bear clear testimony to it. They serve to satisfy creative impulse of ordinary man, as much for aesthetic expression as for domestic and ritualistic needs. Even for individual self-expression of the artists or craftsmen, no material affords so much scope as does the terracottas. It is, thus, an excellent embodiment of their sense of beauty. The study of plastic art, without the study of the terracottas, will, therefore, remain incomplete. Beginning from the Harappan down to the Pāla period, the terracotta art is found spread as a rich and significant brocade on the composite textile of India’s artistic achievements. Coomaraswamy has, therefore, rightly observed that “the early Indian terracottas are of great importance, not only as documents of religious culture, but as documents of the history of art.” The terracotta art took its origin from clay, one of the cheapest and easily available materials, and, as such, man from the very threshold of the civilization started making household utensils, toys and figurines of gods and goddesses from it. Though other material like copper, iron, stone, etc., were also available, yet their unductile character demanded exceptional labour and patience on the part of the craftsmen or artists. Clay was, therefore, preferred to other materials being not only cheap and easily available, but also ductile, soft and tractable. The most ancient and original form of expression of plastic art was thus made through the
medium of the terracottas. Subsequently, the material grew unpopular on account of its fragile nature; but even then a continuous stream of specimens of terracotta art fills the entire period of our cultural tradition. They have characteristic features of their own, revealing particular trends distinctively prominent everywhere. Bihar is one of the important Indian states which yielded various types of terracotta figurines, ranging from the pre-Mauryan to the Pāla period. The frequency of the terracotta objects is, however, greater in the earlier periods as compared to that in the later periods. From the Kushāṇa period onwards, the frequency diminished, yielding place to artistic representations in stone.

There are three main problems relating to the terracotta art, viz., the technique, the chronology and the purpose of the art.

The technique of the terracotta art followed a progressive course in different periods of history. The material, being clay, is found in abundance in every nook and corner of the country. One point is, however, of special interest in the art of making terracottas, and it is the frequent introduction of foreign substances such as sand, small pebbles and mica into clay to avoid cracking when fired. Pure clay contracts considerably in the process of drying and firing. The contraction is generally uniform in case of vases with the result that they do not damage, but in figurines, unless they are virtually without modelling, it is uneven, causing distortion and breakages. It was, therefore, natural that some foreign substances were added to hold up the contraction. The second stage included the fashioning of the clay which may have been done in various ways. This may be modelling by the hand, may be thrown on the wheel or may be made by these methods in combination. Modelling by hand is
the most primitive technique. The pre-historic terracottas were made by this method, and as such they were almost always crudely and hastily made. The second method is the 'Snowman technique' in which bit after bit is added to the original lump to mould the limbs and features, one dab stuck on for the nose, others for the eyes, two rolls for the arms and so forth. The proto-historic terracottas were generally made by this method. The third method is the practice of casting in a single mould and many such moulds have been discovered. These are all of fired clay, but their very scarcity suggest that other models might have been in a more perishable material, such as unfired clay or wax. Of course mould could also be taken from the existing objects in other material such as metal, stone or wood. To make a mould, wet clay is pressed over the model, layer by layer, until the required thickness is reached, and left until it hardened slightly. It cannot be left long, since it would contract as it dried. If a frontal mould is required, this can be lifted out as it is; but if both front and back of the model are being moulded then the enveloping clay must be cut vertically and removed into two pieces, and thereafter the mould is left for little drying and then touched up with a modelling tool. Finally, it is put into the kiln and fired. The temperature used for the mould was higher than for terracottas in general, as they had to face more wear and tear. The simplest type of moulded terracotta was made by pressing the clay into the mould until it was level with the edge, resulting into a solid piece with a moulded front and flat back. This method was used for the manufacture not only of self contained pieces but also of human heads for attachment to hand or wheel made bodies. A variation of this type of figure was achieved by building up the clay in the mould so that it overlapped the edges, thus producing a relief plaque instead of a free standing figure.
The fourth method is to make two separate moulds, one for the front and the other for the back and to fasten them together. The exact adjustment of the two moulds was achieved by means of incised guiding lines on the sides of the moulds which had to be brought into line with each other. This is very similar to the piece moulded, but the majority of the terracottas discovered so far are hollow. To mould a hollow terracotta only, a thin wall of clay was pressed into the mould of an even depth of about 25 mms. Sometimes two moulds were used one for the front and the other for the back. But more frequently only the front was moulded, the back being made from a strip of clay laid on to the back of the moulded front. Thereafter, the joint between front and back was strengthened by the application of a ribbon of clay inside as far as the fingers could reach. There are certain advantages in this technique i.e., saving of the clay and increased lightness, but at the same time there is a distinct disadvantage also i.e., the bursting of the hollow figure in the process of firing, if there were no means for expanding air to get out. It is therefore, essential that a hold should be made in the back or underneath which may be closed by a strip of clay after firing. Generally, the heads of the hollow figurines are solid because the neck being so thin would block the space of the air from the head if they are hollow. There is nothing new in this technique, rather it is an elaboration of the third method. The fifth and last method is to make free standing figures modelled round a piece of stone or wood. These figures were left to be dried in the natural heat of the sun and finally some colour was applied over it. This technique is noticed in the last phase of the Pāla period and the most remarkable point is that it is continuing in some form or the other till to-day. Numerous figures are fashioned on this technique every year on the occasion of festivals, and are immersed in the river after
the purpose was served. They are mostly the figures of gods and goddesses and the object of worship. Of course, hand modelled and moulded figurines are also fashioned. The terracottas discovered from various ancient sites of Bihar bear testimony to the use of all the above five techniques. But from the Kushāṅa period onwards the material became coarse with a considerable admixture of chopped husk, mica and sand. Majority of them are baked to various shades of ochre and red depending upon the chemical components in the material and also on the heat and process of firing. As a rule, if the air has free access during firing, the iron which is contained in the clay will be oxidised and this produced the red colour; if however, the combustion is imperfect, the terracotta is grey or black. The latter process is also popular. In this process the charcoal is kept glowing around an earthen vessel in which the clay object to be burnt are surrounded and covered with husk. In order to intensify the colour of the terracotta a slip of deeper colour is applied to the figure. Terracottas of red, light and dark grey and black colours have been found from Patna, Bulandibāgh, Kumhrar, Buxar and Vaiśālī. The light grey coloured terracottas are relatively heavier and show traces of thick black glaze colour painted with light ochre colour. The grey-coloured terracottas may not be taken to antedate the red terracottas as ochre and red terracottas have been found in large quantity. Further, it appears that some of terracottas from Pāṭaliputra have traces of polychrome coloring similar to the Mohen-jo-dāro terracottas but they are not distinct.

Of all the problems, the most baffling is the chronology of the terracottas. The earlier excavations were not conducted on the scientific lines and it is mainly due to this very reason that various dates have been assigned to a particular object by various competent authorities.
But later on, when the excavation technique improved, proper attention was given to the stratification leaving hardly any scope for the objects of the earlier period being mixed up with those of the later period, or vice-versa. There are other factors which go a long way in fixing the date of a particular object, viz., their artistic style, treatment of the hair and beard, physical features, facial expression and quality of the clay employed. But too often (when they are purchased or donated) the provenance is entirely unknown, and in that case they can better be dated by comparing them with better documented pieces which have come from stratified layers of scientific excavations. Thus the accounts of the archaeological excavations are of great importance in the task of assigning dates to the terracotta objects, for certain sites can now be dated within definite limits. Recently a new method has been introduced for fixing the date i.e., the C 14 technique, on this basis one can arrive almost at a definite date.

Coomaraswamy has divided the early Indian terracottas into four groups, and has called them as 'archaic terracottas'. They are—(i) the Indo-Sumerian terracottas (ii) terracottas belonging to a period from c. 3000 B.C. to c. 1000 B.C. (iii) the Śunga or the early Āndhra terracottas and (iv) the Śaka-Kushāna, Gupta, Pāla and later terracottas. Saraswati has divided them into two groups only—one indicating a primitive form and experience and the other showing the impress and formulations of a stylistic advance natural to a progressive art movement in a chronological sequence. Expressing a similar view, Kramrisch remarks that the former types is the ageless or timeless type, while the latter is the timed variation or time-bound type. These two types are found occurring side by side in different levels of various archaeological excavations. They still continue, the one as
primitive as ever, the other with all the attributes of style and local adaptations. Of the above classifications, those of Saraswati and Kramrisch appear to be more reasonable than those of Coomaraswamy. Coomaraswamy's classification of the terracottas from Harappa and Mohen-jo-daro as Sumerian is very doubtful, as no distinct trace of Sumerian culture is noticed over these terracottas. He assigned them to some part of the 2nd millennium B. C., but Gordon is of the view that they are earlier in date than 2000 B. C., with a few belonging to somewhat a later date. They may, therefore, safely be placed in the ageless or timeless type. It would, however, be the best way to classify the earlier group of terracottas periodwise as the pre-historic terracottas, the Harappan terracottas, the pre-Mavryan terracottas, the Maurya, Śuṅga, Kushāṇa, Gupta and Pāla terracottas. General features of the terracottas of different periods are described below but those of Bihar are dealt with separately.

Terracotta figurines of the pre-historic period are entirely hand modelled and crude, having pinched nose with eyes, ears and mouth indicated by incised lines, and arms and legs represented as two straight lines without any indication of fingers and toes. They are also nude and static in nature. Terracottas of this period have not been found so far from any part of this country. Of course terracottas possessing similar features have been found from Bihar, but they are of a later date. These terracottas may therefore, be described as the traditional type.

The second group consisting of the Harappan terracottas forms a class by itself because of its independent characteristic features, though some similarity with others is also noticeable. The terracottas of this group are also
hand modelled; but eyes are separately made and affixed within the sockets already provided for the purpose, ears seldom marked, mouth indicated by deep cut, arms represented as circular curves without any indication of elbows, wrists and fingers, legs represented as two wooden sticks without any bend for knees, ankles and toes and are static in nature. The most remarkable point relating to these terracottas is that various types of hair arrangement and head-dress are noticed. The lower parts of some of the terracotta human figurines appear to be covered by some kind of cloth, though most of them are nude. Moreover, they have also been shown wearing necklaces. Terracottas of this type have also been found from Bihar.

The third group comprises of the pre-Muryan terracottas which may also be labelled as the post-Harappan terracottas. The terracottas of this period are more akin to the succeeding group than to the Harappan terracottas. Of course some of the terracottas of this group are hand modelled; but there are several which have been fashioned on the applique technique which appears for the first time in this period though the earlier techniques also continued side by side. Traditional types are more or less similar to the second group excepting that eyes, nose, and mouth are to some extent symmetrical and a number of ornaments are added on them. Generally, the arms and the legs are shown like two vertical lines but sometimes representations of hands with fingers are also noticed. The second type appears to be dynamic in character, and is completely different from the traditional type. In this type, the face is moulded and affixed to the hand modelled bodies. This shows its relative chronology with that of the traditional type, as well as marks the transition in the art of making terracottas. This technique has been the most persistent one, and figurines with moulded face and hand modelled bodies are known to have survived in all phases of Indian
art even up to the present day. Such terracottas are also found in Bihar.

The fourth group consists of the Maurya terracottas. According to Saraswati, they are characterised by individual traits in respect of physiognomy as well as expression. He says that their ascription to the Mauryan age may be doubtful, but their very individuality mark them as forming a distinct class by themselves, as significant as the sculptural art in stone of the epoch. In respect of size also, Maurya terracottas are comparatively bigger than the remaining ones. These terracottas have moulded face and modelled body like the pre-Maurya terracottas figurines and no part appears to have been separately made and affixed. Besides these, there are certain terracotta human figurines which appear to have been completely made with the help of moulds of such a perishable material that no trace has been left; but this is very doubtful, as scholars hold that the body is modelled, head is moulded and jewellery and apparel are affixed. In this connection it may also be noted that the traditional types of terracottas were also continuing side by side as a large number of them has been reported from Bihar.

The fifth group consists of the Śunga terracottas which show further advancement in the art of terracotta making. In this period, no distinct change is noticed so far the technique is concerned, though some miniature figurines, completely moulded, have been included in this group by some scholars; yet the possibility of these plaques being of a later date cannot be excluded. These terracottas, which are sensitively modelled, have therefore, more disciplined lines, contours, gradation of planes, better regulated, heavily coiffured, elaborate jewellery and dress, Indianised features, nose naturalistically modelled and dynamic in nature, and they legitimately should be placed in this
group. The arms show the indication of the elbows, the wrists, and the fingers, while the legs show the representations of the knees, the ankles and the toes. In case of female figurines, Sārī has been shown and breasts are made in a naturalistic way having the spontaneous development out of the flesh of the body. There is also difference in the pose of the figures or in the objects they hold. They appear to be more akin to the Bhārhat sculptures which indicate that a definite relationship existed in between stone sculptures and terracotta figurines of this period. Numerous terracottas of this group have been found from Bihar. These terracottas show an elaboration of the pre-Mauryan and the Mauryan techniques. The traditional types were, however, continuing even in this period.

The sixth group comprises of the Kushāna terracottas which show mixture of Hellenistic and Indian motifs in the art of making terracottas. In the words of Saraswati, the terracotta art of this period seems to represent a movement, parallel to the contemporary plastic art in stone, and bears the stamp and impress of the latter. These terracottas are well modelled, smooth and show sensuous contours. They have almond-shaped eyes, flat nose, half opened mouth and naturalistically modelled ears (or sometimes unnatural ears, and unproportionate arms and legs). Male figurines have been shown wearing Dhoti, while female figurines are found wearing Sārī. Most of them are completely clothed. Numerous terracottas of this group have been found from recent excavations in Bihar. They are quite different from the earlier types and bear hellenic touch and as such they form a new type. Traditional types of terracottas, however, continue side by side.

The seventh group consists of the Gupta terracottas, but they are less in number in comparison to the terracottas belonging to the pre-Maurya, Maurya, and Śuṅga
periods. These show that the art of making terracottas of this period is far more finished style but gradually it was becoming unpopular. They are more humane and less sophisticated. All the terracottas of this period are mechanical reproductions from moulds, and the point of special interest is that some of them are painted. During this period, plaques of large size were made, but side small plaques were also fashioned. Plaques of light weight having light ochre colour were prepared in this period. The head in these cases is massive and the body is hollow. Such heads are moulded in two parts, front and back separately, and joined latterly, whereas there are also attempts at moulding the two halves separately and joining them along the ridge of the nose. Grooves, holes in the pupils and at the corners of the mouth are deepened after moulding. Further, there is pre-eminence of the dynamic element, showing complete unification of different art elements. The terracotta human figurines belonging to this period have been generally shown wearing loose robe, while some of them wear jackets. The terracottas of this group have been found mainly from Kaushâmbî, Ahichhatra, Sahet-Mahet and Râjghât, but some pieces have also been found from Bihar. Thus in this period we find the beginning of a new technique of making terracottas with the help of moulds though hand made terracottas are also noticed.

The last group consists of the terracottas of the Pâla period. These terracottas are completely moulded. They are represented by broad chest, proportionately thin waist, well-formed hands and legs, big eyes, broad mouth, peculiar and varied style of hair arrangement, prominent nose, broad forehead, symmetrical eye brows, well proportioned mark between the eye brows and thick lower lip, close fitting cap, long trousers and various types of ornaments. Terracottas
of this group have been found from Paharpur in Bengal and Antichak in Bihar. These terracottas are generally moulded. Mostly they are represented in large plaques though smaller plaques have also been noticed from Dharawat in the district of Gayā which may be ascribed to this group on the basis of the inscription they possess. Further, the terracotta figurines of this period show profuse ornamentation and most of them are very close to the contemporary stone sculptures. Kramrisch has, therefore, aptly remarked that some of these terracottas represent undiluted and indigenous eastern Indian contribution, while rest of them are highly reminiscent of the Gupta sculptures.

Thus, the terracottas discovered so far from this country can be divided into eight groups on the basis of chronology, and a particular date may be ascribed to a particular object. There is, however, one more interesting problem regarding these terracottas and that is their purpose. They were intended for use as architectural decorations, domestic and religious purposes, household decorations and children’s toys. In the Maurya and Sunga periods, we get both religious and secular types of terracottas though the latter was predominating. In the Kushāna period, however, there does not appear to be any remarkable change in the purpose, but in the Gupta period a distinct change can be marked. The terracottas became objects of worship, plaything of children and decoration of the outer walls. Thus the architectural decorations appear to be of a later conception. In the Pāla period, however, they were made more from the point of architectural decoration than for worship or plaything of children. One thing is most remarkable regarding these terracottas, and it is that so long they were objects of worship, they were fashioned in abundance but gradually when their purpose changed and became secular in
character, their production considerably diminished. The terracottas from Bihar bear testimony to all the above purposes.

Dress, head-dress, hair arrangement and ornaments also go a long way in determining the date of the terracottas with changes in culture. Such changes are noticed even in art. This can be illustrated from the Harappan to the Pāla period. These changes can be noticed first on the dress, head-dress, hair arrangement and ornament. So these are also some of the important aspects of human culture which must be taken into consideration in fixing the date of the terracotta figurines. Some of the terracotta figurines of the Harappan period show the use of scanty skirt as lower garment having upper part bare, while majority of the figurines have been represented nude. Various types of head-dresses were worn of which fan-shaped type is of special interest. Among ornaments, only necklaces were generally used. In the pre-Maurya period, a change in the head dress, hair arrangement and number of ornaments is noticed. In the Maurya period male dress consisted either of one piece of cloth sufficiently long or of two separate pieces. The female dress consisted of sārti and skirt. Various types of head-dresses were worn of which bicornate, bowl-shaped and crescent-shaped are remarkable. Necklaces of various strings, ear-rings of different shapes were now being used. In the Śuṅga period, there appears to be a distinct change in the arrangement of the hair and the head-dress. Various types of head-dresses were worn by both men and women, but the arrangement of the hair was not so simple. It was arranged with a parting line in the middle and the mass of hair gathered together at the back and plaited into one or two long rolls hanging down as low as the waist or twisted or tied into a large knot at the back. Various types of ornaments were also used by both the sexes of which
tara, bangles and wristlets may particularly be mentioned, as they appear for the first time. In the Kushāṇa period, foreign inspired dresses and ornaments came into vogue. People started wearing long coat and trousers though dhoti was also continuing. They wore high helmets and peaked caps. Some change in the design of the ornaments is also noticed. In the Gupta period male dress consisted either of two pieces of garments or of three pieces, arranged in various ways, reaching down to the ankles or to the knees. Besides these, short skirts and knickers were also used. The use of one robe covering the body became popular among ascetics during the period. The transparency of the dress is a most remarkable feature of this period. Various types of head-dresses were worn and the hair was arranged in a more elegant manner. The top-knot and wig-like arrangements were very popular. The use of profuse ornaments became the fashion of the day, as various types of ornaments were now being used such as necklaces and ear-rings of various designs, girdles, anklets, crests, and hair-nets. Hair-net, ankles, and crests appear to have become popular particularly in the Gupta period.

In the Pāla period, there is, however, no remarkable change in the dress pattern and ornament, though some distinct change is noticed in the arrangement of the hair and the head-dress. Many new types of head-dresses, dresses used to be worn of which crowns of various shapes and designs may particularly be mentioned. Thus, dress, head-dress, hair-arrangement and ornament also show distinct change in different periods, and as such, they are of great use in classifying the terracottas in different groups without going into other details like style, linear composition and technique.

Numerous terracottas figurines have been found from various ancient sites of Bihar, i.e., Kumhrar, Bulandibagh,
and Mahabirghat in the district of Patna; Basarh or Vaisali in the district of Muzaffarpur; Chausa and Buxar in the district of Shahabad; Sonepur, Dharaawat and Bodhgaya in the district of Gayà; Chirand and Belwa in the district of Saran; Antichak and Oriup in the district of Bhagalpur and Balirajgadh in the district of Darbhanga. These terracottas belong to different periods of history, ranging from pre-Maurya down to the Pala periods, consisting of human figurines both men and women, figurines of animals and birds, religious and secular figurines, so on and so forth. Among these, the terracottas which have been found earlier do not belong to the stratified layer as the earlier excavations were not conducted on scientific lines.

Terracottas of a pre-historic date have not been found from Bihar, though terracottas possessing similar features have been found. These terracottas may, therefore, be described as traditional types. The recent excavations at Oriup in the district of Bhagalpur has, however, yielded a terracotta female figurine of Mother goddess which possesses all the characteristic features of a pre-historic type. The figurine has been found from the earliest level in association with the Black-and Red ware, bone objects and copper pieces. On the basis of the stratification, it may be ascribed to the post-Harappan period. This may go to suggest that pre-historic types of terracottas were continuing till a later date. Besides this, a headless bird figurine from Chirand (District Saran) with a punctured decoration on its body has been found in association with copper, iron, and Black-and Red ware. This figurine also appears to be of this group.

The history of terracotta in Bihar, as a matter of fact, begins from the pre-Mauryan period. Numerous terracotta figurines have been retrieved from Buxar, Bulandibagh,
Vaisālī, Sonepur, Chiraud, Kumhrār and Mahabirghat. These terracottas may be divided into three groups: human figurines (both men and women), animal figurines, and bird figurines. Some of them are hand-modelled while others appear to have been fashioned on the applique technique. The arms and legs in most of the cases look like two vertical lines though in some cases representation of hands with fingers are also noticed. In this connection, special mention may be made of a terracotta male figurine from Mahabirghat (in the district of Patna) in which legs are like two vertical lines and arms are represented without the indication of elbows. A female figurine from Buxar also deserves special notice. She is seated on a stool-like object with two flattened legs. She is holding a child in her left arm, and the left leg of the child rests on the breast of the mother while the right arm and leg on her back. The figure of the child has been separately modelled and affixed. The nose is pinched and slightly modelled and a slit has been used for the mouth. The mother is wearing wheel-shaped ear-rings. The snake goddesses and Naigameśā were cult objects. As far as animal figurines are concerned, elephant, dog and ram are represented. Among birds, dove and cock are represented which are similar to the Harappan type in technique and style. The representation of the cock probably appears for the first time.

Mauryan terracotta figurines are quite individual in their character and style and are generally larger in size. The terracottas of this group have so far been found from Bulandibagh, Patna, Buxar, Sonepur, Chirand and Balirajgadh, and they may be divided again into same three broad groups—human figurines, men, women and children, animal figurines and bird figurines. Female figurines with bare breasts are more or less in dancing poses and possess dynamic in character. The facial expression, the use of skirt
and profuse ornamentation go to enhance the beauty of the pieces. These figurines most probably, have been fashioned with the help of a single mould; the front portion being moulded and the back being hand-modelled. The back portion of all these terracottas are flat and hand-modelled. The jewellery and head-dress, however, appear to have been affixed afterwards. Further, they are delicately modelled having exceedingly high forehead with head sometime surmounted by a head-gear which rises in two lateral cones. Besides these, particular mention may be made of the laughing boy and the smiling girl. They show in their very realistic manner the inherent simplicity of juvenile mind. It may be mentioned here that only heads of the above two figurines have been found. The former has two cornered head-dress covered by a cloth and fastened at the back, and the hem of the cloth shows its wavy edge around the back of the head. It is buff in colour from outside and black from inside. The latter is the head of a female figurine and her hair is marked on the high forehead coming forth from underneath the rim of the head-gear. The lateral horns rise from the broad and high curves of the coiffure and are covered with cloth separately, the end of which is held by an ornamental device. The ears are drawn out laterally into flat discs and at the back, flat pieces of cloth hang down and are affixed in the centre. It is also buff in colour with pinkish white slip. Furthermore, it may be stated here that the figurines referred to above are the finest specimens of Indian terracotta art. One of the best examples is the figure of a Yogī with child-like appearance having jātā-like head-dress. He wears ear-rings, necklaces and a beaded girdle, but is in absolute nudity. The nude sex organ and yogic posture of legs characterise it as being a religious figurine. Jayaswal identifies it with the figure of Śiva. The body is bare but well modelled. The back is treated as a flat
surface. It is in light red colour, and the clay of which it is made contains mica. Further, a male torso, very similar to the Lohanipur Jain torso may also be ascribed to the period and believed to be religious in nature. Amongst animal figurines belonging to this period are elephants, horses, dogs and rams. These animal figurines are better in workmanship than the pre-Mauryan ones. Besides these, various bird figurines have also been found.

The terracotta figurines of the Śūṅga period constitute the fourth group. These terracotta figurines can also be broadly divided into three groups—(i) figurines consisting of male, female and children, (ii) animal figurines and (iii) bird figurines. The human figurines, as in the previous periods, may further be subdivided into two groups—religious and secular. The terracottas which have been ascribed to this group have been found from Bulandibagh, Patna, Buxar, Sonepur, Kumhrar and Vaiśāli. These sites have yielded numerous terracotta figurines, and the point of special interest is that a majority of them is ascribable to the Śūṅga period, on the ground of style and technique. The terracotta human figurines of this period appear to be sensitively modelled and are better regulated having more disciplined lines. They were heavy coiffures, elaborate jewellery and dress and are Indianised in character. The nose is naturalistically moulded, the arms show the indication of the elbows, the wrists and the fingers while the legs show the representation of the knees, the ankles and the toes. These figurines closely resemble with the Bodh-Gaya and the Bhārhatīt sculptures. Traditional types of terracotta figurines belonging to this period may be put into the religious group. As far as these figurines are concerned, one may doubt if they were actually worshipped but the figure of a Śūrya depicted on a terracotta plaque makes it obvious that religious terracottas were fashioned in a more deve-
loped style. The plaque is no doubt far superior in technique and style than than the traditional types of terracotta figurines indicating that numerous terracotta figurines might have been fashioned for the religious purposes, of which some might have been stylistic and others traditional types. The plaque depicting the figure of Śūrya is round in shape. The deity is standing on a chariot drawn by four horses. He wears a coat, and carries quiver and shoots an arrow from the bow. The charioteer, on his right, holds with the left hand the reins of the four horses and with the right a long staff; a bird is perched behind the chariot. The back of the plaque is impressed with two concentric rings, the outer with crescent shape, the inner with deeply holed dots and the central with an indistinct floral design. This figure is very similar to the figure of Śūrya depicted on the Bodh-Gayā railing pillar showing the god on a chariot driven by four horses, and as such its ascription to the Śūngā age is not at all doubtful. Another plaque depicting a standing male and a female figure close to each other (in mithuna style) also lends support that various terracotta human figurines were made. The man wears a scarf across the chest having hair arranged in the jaṭā style, on the top of the head. The male figure is very much similar to the figure of Śiva whose hair arrangement is almost identical. The female figure is almost nude having sex organ prominently shown. The nudity of the female figurine and the hair arrangement of the male figure clearly go to show that the artist intended to depict some religious episode, and in all probability the above plaque represents the figure of Śiva and Pārvati. Particular mention may be made of two female figurines, one from Buxar and the other from Patna. The former is putting on a heavy coiffure, looking like a basket, and wearing beautiful necklace and ear-rings, while the latter is a torso wearing
elaborate jewellery. The torque ends in a round skein of thread gathered on the back in a pot-like device. She wears sārī tied with a waist-belt having long strings ending in tassels. The figure resembles very much the Didarganj Yakshi. The difference in between the two lies in the ornamentation. The former is more ornamented than the latter. Moreover, it shows close association in between the terracotta figurines and the stone sculptures. Among the animal figurines dogs, rams, elephants and bulls are noticed. Numerous bird figurines have also been found and they are parrots, cocks, geese, doves etc. Besides these types, figurines of fish and squirrel have also been found. These types of figurines are not noticed in the earlier group of terracottas so far discovered.

The Kushāṇa terracottas have been found from Kumhrar, Patna, Buxar, Vaiśāḷī, Belwa, Chirand and Sonepur. These terracottas are well modelled, smooth, and shows sensuous contours. They have almond-shaped eyes, flat and heavy nose, broad chest, and folds in the garment. These figurines may also be divided into three groups that is, human figurines, animal figurines and bird figurines. As far as human figurines are concerned, majority of them are secular while those bearing traditional features are religious. Moreover, there are some figurines of serpent goddesses which might have been fashioned for religious purposes. Of secular figurines, particular mention may be made of two human figurines, one a male and the other a female. The male figure has a broad chest with the upper part of the body bare. He wears a loin cloth reaching down to the knees which is richly folded and draped unlike earlier terracotta human figurines. Further, the lower garment is tied with a chain consisting of three strings while the garment of the female figurine is arranged in such a manner that it covers her entire body in one
sweep. This style of wearing sārī is still popular amongst the ladies, and is marked for the first time in the Kushāṇa period. The hair arrangement is also unusual though it very much resembles with the style of hair-arrangement in vogue at present. Among the animal figurines, elephants, horses, bears, tigers and rams are noticed.66 Birds and fish are also represented.67 In this connection, it may be mentioned that the terracottas of this group have been found in less quantity as against the terracottas of the earlier group. But the recent excavations at Kumhrar, Sonepur, Chirand and Vaśālī have yielded numerous terracotta figurines which definitely belong to this group as they bear un-Indian faces and have been found in association with the Kushāṇa coins. These terracotta human figurines have almond-shaped eyes with deep holes in the circular eye-balls, flat nose, half opened mouth and unnaturally long ears, indicative of the Kushāṇa characteristics. Two terracotta heads from Kumhrar68 are very interesting as they wear helmet-shaped cap which were worn by Indo-Scythians. Besides this, numerous terracotta human figurines from Vaśālī, Sonepur and Chirand are also equally interesting as they have typical foreign face, and the Kushāṇa influence is very clear upon them.69 It may, therefore, be suggested that the Kushāṇas very much influenced the terracotta art of Bihar. The traditional types of terracottas, however, appear to have continued even in this period.70

The sixth group comprises of the Gupta terracottas which are more humane and less sophisticated. These terracottas were prepared entirely with the help of the moulds. The head in these cases is massive but delicate and the body is hollow. The terracottas of this group have been found from Kumhrar, Patna, Buxar, Vaśālī, Belwa, and Bodh-Gaya respectively. These terrac-
cotta figurines, like earlier ones, may also be divided into three groups—human figurines, animal figurines and bird figurines. Human figurines may further be sub-divided into two groups i.e., religious and secular. Numerous religious figurines have been found, of which special mention may be made of the figurines of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and Saptamātrkās. Many terracotta figurines of the secular group have also been found, of which special mention may be made of two figurines, one showing a heavy wig, and the other showing a veil. Various types of animal figurines have been found which include elephants, horses, monkeys and crocodiles. Besides these, several bird figurines have been found. Apart from all these, some figurines of tortoise belonging to this period have also been noticed. Thus various types of terracotta figurines have been found and they are better in execution and workmanship than the terracotta figurines of the earlier periods, but their quantity is considerably less. The recent excavations at Kumhrar has, however, yielded many terracotta figurines of which some may be ascribed to this group. These terracottas have been found from period IV (300 A.D.—450 A.D.) which has also yielded coins of Candra Gupta II and terracotta sealings in the Gupta character. On the basis of these finds it may be suggested that these terracottas definitely belong to the Gupta period. Moreover the technique and style is also typical in its character. One of the finest and most artistic terracottas found from Kumhrar is the bust of a male figure having broad forehead with a ribbon going round and hair above the head raised upwards and matted in several groups. Eyebrows, eyes, nose and ears are very prominent. Lips are closed and moustaches are thick and upraised. The head is slightly bent to the left and the facial expression is one of gravity and moodiness. The figure is as such very artistic. The head of a female having half closed eyes
representing a peaceful mood is no less important." Her hair is arranged in a honey-combed style tied at the back in a jūḍā style with a string. Further a terracotta from Chausa is also very significant as it represents the Rāmāyaṇa scene. The representation of the Rāmāyaṇa scenes in Indian art is noticed for the first time in this period. This is similar to the Rāmāyaṇa scenes depicted in the Daśāvatāra temple in Uttar Pradesh. Moreover the figure of a deer represented on the upper part of a large terracotta plaque is unique in its type."

The seventh group consists of the Pāla terracottas which have been found mainly from Antichak in the district of Bhagalpur and Dharawat in the district of Gaya. They are represented by broad chest, proportionately thin waist, well formed hands and legs, big eyes, broad mouth, broad forehead and elaborate ornaments. The terracotta plaques found from Dharawat show that they were fashioned mainly for religious purposes or for votive offerings. They depict figures of the Buddha, and the Bodhisattvas and some of them are even inscribed showing that they definitely belong to this period. Those discovered from Antichak are not only religious in character, but also show that they were used as architectural decorations. These terracotta figurines may also be divided into three broad categories as human, animal and bird figurines. The human figurines may further be subdivided into two groups—religious and secular. It is interesting to note that majority of the terracotta figurines belonging to this group are religious in nature. They depict figures of various gods and goddesses, but some of them are purely secular, of which particular mention may be made of a lady in toilet, dancing girl, hunters, musicians, and so on and so forth. They are all depicted on large plaques which are still fixed
on the outer walls of the Stūpa mound at Antichak. The figure of lady in toilet is very interesting. She is shown seated gracefully, legs crossing each other, with a double bend in her body and holding a mirror in the left hand. She is looking at the mirror while she is engaged in applying vermillion on the partition of her hair. She has round face, well formed breasts and thin waist which enhances the beauty of her female form. The beauty of the figure is further enhanced by the adornment of body with a number of ornaments. In style and technique the figure has close resemblance with the stone sculptures of the period. Another terracotta plaque showing an archer holding a bow in his left outstretched hand in the act of taking out an arrow from a quiver at his back and shooting it is very enchanting, because in another plaque a boar has been represented as being shot down by an arrow. The head of the boar is turned backward and an arrow hit at it, is grazing its body. It appears that probably the archer after shooting the arrow at it is taking out another one from his quiver to hit it again. The expression of the boar is very natural as it has been shown very much perplexed at the hit, hence standing angrily and turning his head at the back. Both the plaques appear to have been related to one another as they display portions of one scene. The other plaques are also equally interesting. In one such plaque a dancing girl has been represented with voluptuous limbs decorated with various types of ornaments. The figures of ascetic and snake charmer are no less important as they have a naturalistic touch in their expression and mood. Of these the figure of snake charmer is exquisite. He is shown in a squatting posture holding the head of the snake in his right hand and tail in the left. He is bearded and does not put on any ornament on his person. Such scenes are noticed even to this day. These
scenes are, therefore, very natural and appealing to the eyes and heart. The large sized clay figurines of the Bodhisattvas* discovered from Antichak deserve special notice, and in all probability they belong to this period. Various types of animal figurines are also represented on the terracotta plaques from Antichak showing elephants, horses, rams, deer, boars etc. The representation of the birds have also been given due importance, and many types of bird figurines are noticed such as peacocks, doves, etc.

It would, therefore, be apt to conclude that Bihar has produced numerous terracotta figurines belonging to different periods, and as such it had important centres of terracotta art. Further, they present the story of the people, their life, thought, culture, beliefs, aesthetic qualities, love for beauty and refinement, besides their social and economic conditions. These terracotta figurines thus play a vital role in reconstructing the cultural history of Bihar.
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APPENDIX I

Capital of the Gupta Empire

In view of the fact that there is no epigraphic or literary reference to the exact capital of the Gupta empire, one has to depend on circumstantial evidence, which depends very much on the identification of Pushpapura, mentioned in Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta. Fleet has aptly observed, "In connection with Samudra Gupta, there is mentioned in line 14, a city named Pushpapura which is spoken of in such a way as to indicate, apparently that it was his capital." The inscription giving an account of Samudra Gupta’s victory over Acyuta and Nāgasena and capture of the one born in the family of Koṭa (Koṭakulajana), refers to Samudra’s taking pleasure (Krṣata) at Pushpapura." It is not necessary to conclude by this that a member of the Koṭa dynasty was ruling at Pushpapura and only after capturing him that Samudra Gupta re-entered the city. Jayaswal identified Koṭa-kula with the Magadha-kula of the Kaumudīmahotsava and identified the adversary of Samudra Gupta as Kalyānavarman who had recovered Patañaputra from Candra Gupta (Caṇḍasena) as the latter had occupied Patañaputra after killing his foster father Sundaravarman, as known from the Kaumudīmahotsava. In view of the fact that copper coins bearing inscription Koṭa are known and they resemble the Śrūtā coins attributed to a rule of Śravasti and that Koṭa coins were common in Delhi bazaar and Eastern Punjab, it becomes difficult to believe that the Koṭas were ruling at Patañaputra. Actually the relevant reference in the Allahabad inscription does not necessarily mean that the Koṭas were ruling at Pushpapura. It may mean that after scoring victories over his enemies including the scion
of the Kōta family, Samudra Gupta relaxed at Pushpapura. It may mean that Samudra Gupta lived in Pāṭaliputra before he embarked on the second campaign, but the city was not the scene of battle, but the capital city where Samudra Gupta returned after his successful military campaigns. Pushpapura is certainly to be identified with Pāṭaliputra. It is a synonym of Kusumapura, both meaning ‘city of flowers’. St. Petersburg Dictionary informs us that in the Mudrārākshasa and Kathāsarit-sāgara, by Kusumapura, Pāṭaliputra is meant. Monier-Williams Dictionary refers to such authorities as Āryabhaṭṭiyam, besides Mudrārākshasa and KSS, equating Kusumapura with Pāṭaliputra. Abhidhāna Rajendra also takes Kusumapura and Pāṭaliputra as one. The author of Śabdakalpadruma, on the authority of Hemacandra, says that Kusumapura was another name of Pāṭaliputra which was also called Pushpapura. In the Yuga Purāṇa section of the Gārgī Samhitā, Kusumapura (Kusumadhvaja) and Pushpapura are referred to as the same city. From the Pariśisṭha-parvan we know that Udāyī built the capital Pāṭaliputra. Gārgī Samhitā and the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa say that Udāyī built the capital city Kusumapura. So the Jain and the Puranic traditions identify Kusumapura with Pāṭaliputra and Pushpapura. A Nepal inscription connects early Licchavis and Pushpapura. This must be Pāṭaliputra. Candra Gupta is referred to in the Mudrārākshasa as staying in Kusumapura. Thus there was a persistent tradition that Kusumapura was another name of Pāṭaliputra. Kusumapura = Pushpapura, Malalēkha clearly says on the authority of MV. IV. 31 and DV. XI. 281, that Pāṭaliputra was called Pupphapura (Pushpapura), and was identical with Kusumapura, as known from Mahābodhivamśa. Pushpapura is referred to as another name of the city of Pāṭaliputra in the Rāghuvamśa. In the Rāghuvamśa, Pushpapura is referred to as a city full of Pāṭala flowers, and the beautiful city was
Pāṭaliputra. Mallinatha also in his commentary equates Pushpapura with Pāṭaliputra. Thus there is continuous tradition, some contemporary (Raghuvaṃśa and Mudrārākṣasa), and some recording earlier traditions as the Mahāvaṃśa and Dīpavaṃśa did, that by Pushpapura Pāṭaliputra was meant in the days before, during and after the Guptas. The only city on river bank which is claimed to be another Pushpapura is said to be Kāṇauj on the single uncorroborated evidence of Hsuan Tsang who was referring to a hearsay. He observes, "According to the story long ago, when Brahmadatta was king, and men lived very many years, the name of the city (Kāṇya-kubja) was Kusumapura (i. e. Flower-palace of city)." Brahmadatta is a well known king of Kāśi, and in the Jātakas, which refer to him, there is no reference to Kāṇya-kubja or Pāṭaliputra. It appears to be a baseless story related to the Chinese pilgrim or the latter has confused the legends. He knows that Pāṭaliputra was also known as Kusumapura. Tripathī has pointed out that Hindu authority in support of this synonym Kāṇya-kubja = Kusumapura is wanting. As against this we have Hindu, Buddhist, Jain and foreign sources unanimously registering the fact that Pāṭaliputra had synonyms with Kusumapura as well as Pushpapura. It is therefore proper to reject the testimony of Hsuan Tsang and hold that the only city in ancient times known as Pushpapura (or Kusumapura) was Pāṭaliputra. It may be of some interest to note that the Chinese pilgrim does not mention Kāṇya-kubja as Pushpapura but as Kusumapura alone. If Pāṭaliputra was the capital of Samudra Gupta, it remained so in the time of Candra Gupta II. From the Udayagiri cave inscription of Candra Gupta II we learn that Vīrasena-Saba was a minister of Peace and War and came from Pāṭaliputra (or belongs to the city of Pāṭaliputra) with the king-emperor Candra Gupta II intent on world conquest. It should be obvious
that if Vitasena-Saba came with Candragupta on military campaign from Pataliputra, then Candragupta also must have started from the same city, naturally then his capital, Pataliputra is also mentioned in the Gaudha stone inscription of Candragupta. Samudra Gupta's Nalanda and Gayap plates were found in Magadha. The Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription has been found at Biharsharif, about 50 miles from Patna, ancient Pataliputra. This inscription records the erection of a sacrificial column by Anantasena, who was a minister of Kumara Gupta, and whose (Anantasena's) sister was Kumara Gupta's queen. The inscription may not belong to Skanda Gupta, but to Puru Gupta. But the point to note is that a minister again was erecting a Yupa in Magadha. Seals of Budha Gupta, Vainya Gupta, Narasimha Gupta, Kumara Gupta III and Vishnu Gupta have been found in Nalanda. Coins of later imperial Guptas are mostly found from Kalighat hoard. Hsuan Tsang refers to Gupta kings and Baladitya's war with Mihirkula in contest of his visit to Magadha. Fa-hsian refers to Pataliputra in a way which makes it the most important city that he visited. Hsuan Tsang refers to Baladitya's disregard of Mihirakula's anti-Buddhist policy and consequent Mihirakula's raid and sack of Pataliputra, and Baladitya's retreat to the swampy region. This certainly suggests that the fortified city of Pataliputra was the capital of Baladitya. Thus we find, on the basis of circumstantial evidence that from the time of Samudra Gupta, rather from Candragupta I, to the last of the imperial Guptas, Pataliputra was the capital. Ujjaini and Ayodhya may have been other secondary capitals.

However there have been objections raised against the identification of Pataliputra as the capital city of the Gupta empire. Fleet's objections were that (i) until the time of Skanda Gupta, no inscription of the dynasty has been
found anywhere in the neighbourhood of Pātaliputra. (ii) though Pātaliputra is mentioned, under its own proper name in two of the inscriptions of Candra Gupta II, yet neither of these passages connects the city with him as his capital, (iii) Kusumapura was another name of Kānyakubja in ancient times also. So according to him, "a capital here, (Kanauj) or anywhere in its neighbourhood (Kanauj) would be for more in accordance with the localities at which all the earlier inscriptions of the dynasty exist, and still more so with the selection of a column either at Allahabad or at Kauśāmbi, to contain the record of the conquests of Samudra Gupta, by whom the power of the family was brought to maturity, and was placed on an extensive footing". Goyal has reinforced these arguments and has concluded that Prayāga was the capital of the Guptas in the early part of their history, and later the capital was shifted to Ayodhyā. He observes", "The evidence of the Purāṇas from which we learn that Prayāga was the nucleus of the original Gupta state, the incision of the praśasti of Smudra Gupta on a stone pillar at Prayāga, the discovery of several other early Gupta inscriptions and numerous hoards of coins from this area and the possibility of the performance of Aśvamadha at Prayāga by Samudra Gupta, bring out the fact that at least in the early part of their history, the Guptas had their capital at Prayāga. Its location at the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā the centre of the Gaṅgā valley from where all the provinces of the empire could be easily controlled, was ideal for this purpose."

The arguments appear at the first instance formidable, but do not stand scrutiny by a critical examination. We have already seen that Pushpapura was certainly Pātaliputra and not Kanauj. There are inscriptions belonging to Samudra Gupta found in Magadha, however, there
genuineness is doubted. But non-availability of inscriptions of early Gupta kings does not prove that their capital was not in Magadha. No inscription of Aśoka has been found in Paṭaliputra or its neighbourhood, and at Sahasram we have only a version of a Minor Edict. But no one doubts that Paṭaliputra was the capital of Aśoka. Skanda Gupta’s achievements are recorded at Bhitārī on the Bhitārī Pillar, but is is no body’s case that it was his capital. Samudra Gupta finding the Aśokan Pillar Inscription at Kosam or Prayāga, nearest extant one from Paṭaliputra, might have been inspired to get his achievements also recorded there. Prayāga was a very ancient religious place, and performance of āsvamedha, even if it is believed to have been performed there, would not make Prayāga the capital. Ten horse sacrifices were performed at Kāśi but it was not an imperial capital. Ancient history and traditions are unanimous in holding Paṭaliputra and Magadha as a whole as suitable imperial centres for launching and administering large Indian empires. Prayāga has not such tradition behind it. The Purāṇas do not only refer to Sāketa and Prayāga but also to Magadha in their earliest references to the Guptas. Gupta coin-hoards (except one at Hajipur) have not been found in Bihar. But who can say, they may not be found in future; moreover coin hoards are buried during the time of disturbances, and naturally they would be found more probably at areas beyond the heart of the empire when its border provinces were in turmoil due to external or internal causes.

Under the circumstances, the hypothesis that Paṭaliputra was the capital of the Guptas, holds true today until positive proofs to the contrary are available.
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APPENDIX II

Gupta Era and Chronology of the Guptas

Dates given in some Gupta inscriptions, as the Mathurā stone inscription dated year (Samvat) 61, Junagarh Rock-inscription of Skanda Gupta in the year 136, 137, 138 (Samvatāraṇāmādhike śate tu triṃśadbhiranyairpi śaḍbhivreya......gupta-prakāla gaganām vidhāya; samvatāraṇāmādhike śate tu triṃśadbhiranyairapi saptabhīś ca; varshaśate-śhtūtrīṁśa guptānāṃ kāla), Sarnath Buddhist stone image inscription of Kumāra Gupta II of the year 134 (Varshaśate guptānām sacatuḥ paṇeśaduttare), Sarnath Buddhist image inscription of Budha Gupta, dated in year 157 (Guptānām samatikkante saṇḍapacāśaduttare)1 clearly prove that there was an era used by the Guptas at least from the time of Candra Gupta II. We find on some silver coins of the Guptas from Candra Gupta II onwards2 also dates given which should be assigned to the same reckoning as given in the inscriptions.

What was the epoch of the 'Era'? On the basis of an interpretation of the relevant passage in Alberuni's India, it was believed by many that the Gupta era was counted from the extinction of the Guptas and the Valabhi era started almost at the same time. However Fleet3 has conclusively proved that the Gupta era was not to be counted from the extermination of the Guptas and that the Valabhi era was the same as the Gupta era. Fleet4 has also successfully demolished the views of Fergusson believing in 318-19 for the epoch of the era, of Bühler who believed that the era must have commenced either shortly before or shortly after 200 A. D. of Bayly for 190-191 A. D. for the epoch, of Cunningham
that the Gupta era commenced in 167 A. D., of Thomas who believed the Gupta era was identical with the Śaka era, and of Hoernle who accepted Cunningham's view as 'being the final' verdict of the historic researches regarding the 'Gupta dynasty.' Fleet rightly pointed out that the Mandasore inscription of Kumāra Gupta I and Bandhuvarman dated in the expired Mālava era 493, which gives the date 436-37 A. D. for Kumāra Gupta, and therefore the foundation of Gupta era cannot be placed in the 2nd or 3rd century A. D., and that any statement by Alberuni that the Gupta power came to an end in or about 319 A. D. must certainly be wrong. Fleet also fixed 319-20 equivalent to Śaka-samvat 241 expired as the correct epoch of the Gupta era, instead of 318-19 or 320-21 A. D. The years of the Gupta era are believed to have started on Caitrāśudi, and the months are regarded as Purṇimānta. To get the equivalent Christian year, 318-19 is required to be added to the current Kārttikādi Valabhi year and 319-20 to the current Caitrāśudi Gupta year.

However, even after Fleet's clear conclusion scholars continued to air independent but fanciful theories about the epoch of the Gupta era. Shamsastry believed that the Gupta era started in 200 A. D. and Pai thought of 272-73 A. D. for the same. The date in the Mandasore inscription for Kumāra Gupta does not tally with the dates propounded by Sastry and Pai. Moreover the Ganjam Copper Plates of Śaśāṅka is dated in 300 Gupta era and we know that Śaśāṅka was a contemporary of Harsha who ruled from 606-646 A. D. The epoch of the Gupta era proposed by Sastry or Pai would not make Śaśāṅka contemporary of Harsha, as rightly pointed out by Chattopadhyaya. Moreover we all know that Candra Gupta II put an end to the western Kshatrapa dynasty. Now the last date of the Śaka dynasty known from the coins is 304
(= 382 A. D.). So Candra Gupta II must have been living after 382 A. D., and so could not be placed in the epoch proposed by Shamsastry and Pai. Thus Fleet's conclusion about the epoch of the Gupta era has to prevail. P. L. Gupta\(^{11}\) after discussing the problem in detail has concluded that either the epoch of the Gupta Era would be 9th March, 319 A. D. or 20th December, 318 A. D., and the difference of 79 days is not material for our purpose.

Fleet has pointed out that though Alberuni calls the era Gupta-kāla, this name is not mentioned in the dated inscription of the Guptas or their feudatories. All the dated Gupta inscriptions before the Junagarh inscription of Skanda Gupta mention the date beginning with saṃvat or saṃvatāsara. The Junagarh rock inscription refers to 'Gupta prakāla gaṇanāṃ vidhāya.' This definitely connects the era with the Guptas, but Fleet\(^{12}\) opined that it does not suffice to show 'that the era was established by the Guptas themselves,' and that even at this time it had received the accepted name of the Gupta era. The same inscription also in line 27 has 'Guptānāṃ kālāh'. Both the phrases have been translated by Fleet as 'making the calculation in the reckoning of the Guptas'. The Sarnath image inscription of the time of Budha Gupta has 'Guptānāṃ samavikkrānte'. Thus we are inclined to believe that at least from the time of Skanda Gupta the era was virtually known as the Gupta era, it appears to specifically mentioned as such in the Sarnath image inscription of Budha Gupta and in the (E. I. VI, p. 143 ff.) Ganjam Copper Plates of Śaśāṅka where the word 'Guptābde' occurs.

However, Fleet appears to have been influenced in arriving at this conclusion by his analysis which suggested to him that the era could not have been started by Candra Gupta I or any of his predecessors. Fleet, therefore,
suggested that the early Gupta kings who must have
known the nature and origin of the era Licchavis were
using, adopted the Licchavi era dating either from a
time when the republican or tribal constitution of the
Licchavis was abolished in favour of a monarchy; or
from the commencement of the reign of Jayadeva I as
the founder of a royal house in a branch of the tribe that
had settled in Nepal."

Fleet's view is apparently wrong as there is no
evidence of the Licchavi using any era commencing from
319-20 A.D. Bhagvanlal Indraji had identified the Lic-
chavi era with the Vikrama samvat and Sylvan Levi suggested that the Licchavi era started in 110 A.D.
D. G. Sircar has pointed out that the theory of Fleet
does not appear to suit the palaeography of the Licchavi
inscriptions, and in his opinion it is the Saka era which is
used in the Licchavi inscription.

Fleet has conclusively shown that epoch of Gupta
era was not dependent on any chronological or astrononi-
cal calculations. "Its origin, therefore, must be found in
some historical event, which actually occurred in 320
A.D." What was the event? Sri Gupta and Ghatotkaca are mere 'mahārājas' and so they must have been either
feudatories or minor rulers. It is not possible to be certain
as to who were their overlords and it is not reasonable to
believe that the imperial Guptas will continue an era which
smacked of their earlier feudatory status. Candra Gupta I
is the first 'mahārājādhirāja' in the family. He must
have the title, and this must have meant actual increase in
his status as a king. It could have been the conquest of
Magadha and occupation of Pātaliputra. As Candra Gupta
was stepping into the shoes of the great Candra Gupta
Maurya who ruled over a large empire from Pātaliputra,
in our opinion the epoch of the Gupta era was counted
not from the date of the accession of Candra Gupta I, but on his assumption of the title of Mahārājādhirāja as a sequel to the conquest of Magadha and inauguration of another great imperial rule from Pātaliputra. Fleet has expressed doubt that Candra Gupta I originated the era, because that would mean average reign of 34 years between Candra Gupta I and his great grandson Kumāra Gupta I (455-319 A.D. = 136) in four generations which is a high figure. An average of 32 years for four successive reigns of *Hindu fathers and sons*, seems from every point of view, an impossibility.” However, Fleet himself was aware of an abnormal average in the Western Cālukya genealogy, with 37½ years for each generation if one counts up to four generations. However, Fleet taking the whole period of Western Cālukya dynasty arrived at an average of 19 years each. Now if we take the entire period of the rule by Gupta dynasty from Candra Gupta I to Vishṇu Gupta (Candra Gupta I, Samudra Gupta, Candra Gupta II, Kumāra Gupta I, Skanda Gupta, Puru Gupta II, Budha Gupta, Narasimha Gupta, Kumāra Gupta III and Vishṇu Gupta), we have 11 kings ruling between c. 319 to 550 A.D., and average regnal period comes to 21 years. Thus, it is not impossible that one of the kings, Samudra Gupta ruled for very many years. Then we know from the Mathura stone inscription that Candra Gupta II came to the throne in G. E. 56. Thus two generations of father and son, Candra Gupta I and Samudra Gupta (if we exclude Rāma Gupta) ruled for a total period of 56 years, and so the average was 28 years and not 34 years. Moreover there is no reason to emphasise ‘*Hindu fathers and sons*’; longevity among the Hindus was not specially rare. If we take the Mughal dynasty, the period from Akbar to Aurangzeb, the period of imperial Mughal rule, comes to 151 years (1556-1707) between fathers and sons for four generations, average being 37½ years, more than the Gupta average for four generations.
from Candra Gupta I to Skanda Gupta. Thus there is no valid reason to doubt that the beginning of the epoch of the Gupta era was reckoned from the assumption of imperial status by Candra Gupta I in c. 319 A.D.

But the theory that the era was actually started by Candra Gupta I has received a severe jolt in the discovery of the Nālandā copper plate of the year 5 of Samudra Gupta. Much earlier, the Gaya copper plate of the year 9 of Samudra Gupta was found. Fleet who edited the inscription declared it spurious, though the seal of Samudra Gupta attached to the plate is said to be ‘in all probability a genuine one.’ Fleet took the palaeography of the inscription as belonging to the beginning of the 8th century A.D. Sircar thinks ‘it may have been fabricated in the 6th or 7th century.’ The Nālandā Copper Plate because of the similarity of the inscription, was also declared to have been ‘forged in early Gupta times.’ According to Sircar, ‘The record is certainly spurious. It was forged sometime in the 6th or 7th century.’ But one thing that is interesting is that in both the inscriptions the donee is Gopasvāmin and the inscriptions were engrave by the order of Gopasvāmin. Sircar is inclined to believe that Gopadevasvāmin, the donee of the Gaya plate and Gopasvāmin under whose orders the Nālandā and Gayā plates were prepared, may have been identical. A. Ghosh observed, ‘As the texts of the Nālandā and Gayā plates are mutatis mutandis identical, it is very likely that both of them were copied from the same grant.’ R. C. Majumdar has thrown doubts on the theory of Fleet and Ghosh. Sircar thinks that Kumā(—ra) Candra Gupta, the dūtaka (executor) of the Nālandā grant should be indentified with Candra Gupta II, son of Samudra Gupta; he thinks that if Samudra Gupta is believed to have been ruling in the 5th year (324-25 A. D.), then it would be proper to hold that
the era was counted from the reign of Samudra Gupta. R. C. Majumdar also regarded that Samudra Gupta was the founder of the era. Then we would have to believe that Samudra Gupta ruled for 50 years, and then his son Candra Gupta II for at least 37 years. It is not impossible but improbable. Scholars like Gupta and Goyal think that these inscriptions are based on genuine grants by Samudra Gupta and dates are in the regnal years of Samudra Gupta, and not in the Gupta era started by him or his father Candra Gupta I. In their opinion the era was started by Candra Gupta II before 380-1 A.D., his fifth year and was counted from 319 A.D. marking the accession of his grand-father Candra Gupta I. However, in our opinion the texts of the inscriptions are spurious. There are some very unsurmountable problems met with if the records are declared genuine. The use of title of 'Paramabhāgavata' given to Samudra Gupta and the reference to restoration of āśvamedha sacrifice which was long in abeyance raise serious doubts. It is really unexplainable that if Samudra Gupta was 'paramabhāgavata' as early as in the 5th year of his reign, it will not be mentioned in his Allahabad and Eran inscriptions, nor on his coins as we find in the case of Candra Gupta II. It may be true that Samudra Gupta was a Vaishnava (garuda standard on his coins may suggest so), but 'Paramabhāgavata' is a title assumed by the Gupta emperors from the time of Candra Gupta II, even when kings like Kumāra Gupta I and Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya might have had other personal religions, the title 'paramabhāgavata' continued to be ascribed to them on inscriptions. It is again difficult to believe that Samudra Gupta had won all his numerous wars before the 5th year of his reign as recorded in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription which should be considered to be engraved before his performance of the Āśvamedha sacrifice which is not mentioned in the inscription,
and if the latter was later than the performance of Aśvamedha, then this achievement could not have been ignored in the official praśasti when it is mentioned in the inscription of his relatives—the Vākāṭakas, where Samudra Gupta is referred to as ‘ānekāśvamedhayājin’ (performer of many horse-sacrifices).44 Another difficulty in accepting the inscriptions as genuine may be noted. Kumāra Candra Gupta in the Nālandā plate is believed to be Candra Gupta II. Now Candra Gupta II must have been a prince of at least 20 years to have been appointed dūtaka, and he would be certainly more than 40 when he ascended the throne in 375 A.D. It is very difficult to believe that at such an advanced age he would be able to pose successfully in the guise of Dhruvasvāmini in the Śaka king’s court (if the historicity of Rāma Gupta is believed, and in view of recent discoveries, the view has gathered strength). Then, it has to be noted that the first patron of Nālandā according to Hsuan Tsang33 was Śakrāditya who may be Kumāra Gupta I, or Kumāra Gupta II, probably the latter as suggested by us earlier.34 The earliest Gupta inscriptions found in Nālandā excavation are seals of Budha Gupta, Narasimha Gupta, Vainya Gupta, Kumāra Gupta III and Vishnu Gupta. It is therefore rather strange that (genuine?) Copper Plate of Samudra Gupta would be found in Nālandā. What appears to have happened is that the forger or the beneficiary found a genuine copper seal of Samudra Gupta, and he fixed it to the copy of the text of the inscription of a descendent of Candra Gupta II, probably towards the end of the 5th century A.D., and realising the mistake of using ‘genetive’ in the early part changed over to nominative. This explains the Gayā Copper Plate with the seal of Samudra Gupta but with the difference in the state of the preservation of the copper in the two as shown by Fleet.35 But the Nālandā plate raises some difficulty. There is no seal, and the palaeography of the inscription is slightly
earlier than the Gayā plates. To us it appears that the Gayā plate was first forged, and after this the forger when forging the Nālandā plate realised the mistake and tried to imitate the earlier forms of the script to give it apparently more colour of genuineness. Forgers of grants in ancient times are known.\textsuperscript{36} The beneficiary of the grant wanted to show the antiquity of his title on the land towards the end of the 5th or 6th century A. D., and copying from earlier records of Candra Gupta II or his successor, he was not careful enough to give correct epithets to Samudra Gupta. In the Poona-plates of Prabhāvatī Gupta, attributes of Samudra Gupta are given to Candra Gupta II. To believe\textsuperscript{37} in the performance of one horse sacrifice by Samudra Gupta before the 5th year of his reign, and the other later, on the authority of Poona plates of Prabhāvatī Gupta making Samudra Gupta ‘anekāśvamedhayājin’ thus loses much force. There is no explanation of the omission of any reference to horse sacrifice in the Allahabad inscription, if the first horse-sacrifice was performed earlier than the engraving of the inscription. It would, therefore, be best to ignore the two copper plates in discussing the origins of the Gupta era.

The fact that the Allahabad Pillar Inscription is undated and so is the Eran Inscription, it is safe to presume that the era was not prevalent in his time. Then the fact that Candra Gupta II in the Mathura stone image inscription refers to the dynastic reckoning and also his regnal years has been taken by Gupta\textsuperscript{38} to mean that the tradition of dating in the dynastic era was a recent one. He has given other reasons also for holding that the era was started by Candra Gupta II, and was to be counted from the accession of Candra Gupta I in 319 A. D. At the present state of our knowledge this seems to be the most plausible hypothesis, though there is no incontrovertible evidence to
show that the era could not have been started by Candra Gupta I himself, who had founded the tradition of starting gold coinage by Indian dynasties.

Candra Gupta I assumed the imperial status in 319 A.D., and he may have married Kumāradevī in 317-18 A.D. Samudra Gupta could have been born in 319 A.D., and must have been aged enough to give proof of his valour and special ability to be selected by his father to succeed him. This may have happened in c. 345 A.D. Candra Gupta II may have been born of Dattādevī in c. 350 A.D. Sāmudra Gupta ruled up to 374 A.D., and was succeeded by Rāma Gupta, who was challenged by Candra Gupta. Candra Gupta defeated the Śaka chief, murdered Rāma Gupta, ascended the throne and married Dhruvasvāminī in c. 375 A.D., Candra Gupta married Kuveranāgā in the life time of his father who might have obtained the daughter of a defeated Nāga king for his favourite son. Their daughter Prabhāvatī Guptā was married to Rudrāsena II in c. 380 A.D. Candra Gupta ruled up to 412-413 A.D. certainly and was followed by his son Kumāra Gupta I certainly before 415 A.D., the date of his Bilsand Stone Inscription.
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APPENDIX III

The Causes of the Downfall of the Gupta Empire

The Gupta imperial dynasty might have continued till the middle of the 6th century A.D., but the Gupta empire as a reality had ceased to exist many years earlier. Budha Gupta appears to be the last Gupta emperor whose authority extended from north Bengal to Malwa and Gujrat in western India. Gujrat or ancient Valabhi was lost in the time of Narasimha Gupta, and Malwa was also out of his control. The western variety of Silver coins are not met with after Budha Gupta. Coins of Narsimha Gupta (successor of Budha Gupta), Kumara Gupta III and Vishnu Gupta have been mostly found from the Kalighat hoard. There is nothing to connect the later imperial Guptas with region west of Magadha. The Maukhari had established their rule over Uttar Pradesh, and in Bengal the Gaudas, the haughty enemies on the sea-shore, were appearing as a power to reckon with for the first time. Even in Magadha itself the Maukharis feudalatory family of Yajnavarman was excercising authority in Barabar region, and in Pataliputra the dynasty of Krishna Gupta was emerging as the ‘mayor of the palace’ of the weak Gupta emperors.

The question is why the Gupta empire broke up. There are many special causes for this, but the fundamental reason lay in the inherent defect in hereditary kingship as source of all powers and prestige. The Gupta emperors not only initiated the high imperial titles of the Kushanas, but also like them claimed a kind of divine status. Samudra Gupta claimed equality with Indra and Yama in his powers and achievements, and Kumara
Gupta and Budha Gupta were ‘paramadaivata’—a supreme deity according to the Damodarpur Copper Plates. The Ārya-Manjuśrī-Mulakalpa refers to the tradition of Gupta kings being worshipped. Now this tendency to find divinity in the king was not only indicative of supreme position of the king, but also of the demoralisation set in the imperial dynasty and the subjects on the whole. The situation worsened with the passage of time, and with diminishing prestige and extent of territories, the claim to divine status proved to be bogus and actually weakened the kingship and made it more irresponsible and less responsive. Too much depended on the character and ability of the king. It was good fortune that a succession of able and dynamic rulers from Samudra Gupta to Skanda Gupta followed. But divine dispensation and natural justice could not assure a perennial succession of able kings in the Gupta line, (as in other ruling dynasties of India and abroad), and after Skanda Gupta the stream of dynamism and vigour appear to be fast drying up, and consequently the huge structure—the empire—with weak top foundered and broke up.

And this fundamental weakness let loose forces which were ready to overwhelm the empire. The Gupta administrative system had inherent defects which under weak rulers could erode the authority of the king. From the time of Samudra Gupta we find individual officers in charge of many important departments of government, both civil and military. Mahāśāmanta Vijayasena under Vainya Gupta is mahāpartihāra, Mahāpilupati, and dūta as well.

Moreover high offices often went by hereditary principle. Virasena-Saba held his position by hereditary descent. Anantasena who was a high officer in the time of Kumāra Gupta I was also latter’s queen’s brother. The practice
of the king marrying in the family of high officers must have made the family in course of time entertain ambitions often injurious to imperial interests and excited jealousy among other officers. In the time of Kumāra Gupta I, even the district officers were appointed by the provincial governor (Uparika). Brahmadatta and Jayadatta, the provincial governors of the time of Budha Gupta appear to be the scions of the same family, whose first known member is Girātadatta, the Uparika of Puradravardhanabhukti under Kumāra Gupta I. While Skanda Gupta appointed Parnadatta as the governor (gopīr) of Saurāshtra, the latter appointed his own son Cakrapālita as governor of the city. Droṇa Simha of Valabhi had to be recognised as Mahārāja by the Gupta Emperor himself.

The Gupta empire does not appear to be closely knit empire administered by imperial officers like the Mauryas. From the Allahabad Inscription of Samudra Gupta, we learn that there were many forms of subordinate relations that were entered into by subordinate and feudatory rulers enjoying wide autonomy. The Varmanas of Malwa though feudatories of the Gupta, enjoyed hereditary though subordinate kingship, made land grants without emperor’s interference and used an era different from the era used by the Guptas and some other feudatories. Some subordinate kings even issued coins like Mahārāja Hastin. In some inscriptions of the Gangetic valley even it was not considered necessary to mention the name of their overlord at all. The silent and sure growth of economic and political feudalism was undermining the vitality of the empire, or rather the weakness of the empire was encouraging political feudalism.

The Huṇa invasions which overwhelmed the empire after the reign of Budha Gupta was more a symptom than the cause of the decline, and certainly registered a huge shock to the economy and prestige of the empire. Malwa
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was certainly occupied by the Hūṇas under Toramāṇa in the early years of the 6th century A.D., and the Varman ruling dynasty had changed its allegiance from the Guptas to the Hūṇas. The attempt by Goparāja and Bhānu Gupta to repulse the Hūṇas had failed, and Mihirakula continued to rule over central India at least till the 15th year of the reign. However Mihirakula was defeated by Bālāditya and Yaśodharman, and had to retire to the Punjab or Kashmir. In A.D. 518-19 the suzerainty of the Guptas is acknowledged in the Tripura Vishaya (Jabhalapore District). In the year 528-29 the Gupta sway was still acknowledged by the Parivṛṣaja mahāraja Dabhala. Yaśodharman Vishṇuvardhana also refers to 'Gupta nāthas' and Iśānavarman did not assume imperial titles till 554 A.D. But this recovery by the Guptas after the Hūṇa invasions was more apparent than real. Yaśodharman Vishṇuvardhana who might have started his career technically as a Gupta feudatory and took important part in inflicting a crushing defeat on Mihirakula, actually defied the Gupta suzerainty, carried out his digvijaya as far as east as the Lauhitya ostensively against the Gupta imperial interest and defeated the mighty king of the east who might be the Gupta emperor himself. While it is true that Gupta suzerainty continued in N. Bengal till 543 at least, yet the prestige and authority of the Gupta empire received a shattering blow. Thus there is no doubt that Hūṇa raids under Mihirakula and Toramāṇa had left the empire gasping for breath. The economic damage is proved by the heavy debased coins of Narasimha Gupta and his successors. The political disintegration is writ large on the rise of Yaśodharman, the later Gupta in Magadha itself, the Maukharis of Kanauj and the Gaṇḍas of Bengal.

Dr. Raychaudhari's suggestion that the Buddhist leaning of the later imperial Guptas contributed to the
downfall of the empire lacks conviction. Pro-Buddhist king Harsha continued wars till the late years of his reign, and the Pālas of Bengal were not pacifists. There is no reason to blame Buddhism for the weak policy of the later Gupta emperors like Bālāditya.

It is true that all these factors stated above contributed to the decline of the Gupta empire. But the real crux was the rot in the dynasty itself. The imperial dynasty appears to have been ridden with internal dissensions. Kāca contested Samudra Gupta, and Rāma Gupta was elbowed out by Candra Gupta II. There is great probability that after Kumāra Gupta I, there was a war of succession. Things might have again repeated after Budha Gupta, particularly unfortunate, as this coincided with the Hūṇa invasion. Narasimha Gupta, Vainya Gupta and probably Bhānu Gupta were rivals actually ruling over different parts of the already shrunk empire. It was impossible in such a situation for the ruling dynasty to successfully challenge the grave internal developments and external aggression.

The Gupta empire thus fell bedevilled by the same forces—internal dissensions, weak rulers, defiance be feudalities of governors, and external aggression—which caused the disappearance of the Mauryas, and Turko-Afghan and the Mughal empire. R. C. Majumdar rightly observes, “Indeed, from various points of view the end of the Gupta empire offers a striking analogy to that of the Mughal empire. The decline and downfall of both were brought about mainly by internal dissensions in the royal family and the rebellions of feudal chiefs and provincial satraps, though foreign invasion was an important contributory factor.
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APPENDIX IV

Āryabhaṭa, the First Indian Astronomer and Mathematician.

It is a matter of little wonder that about Āryabhaṭa, the first Indian Astronomer, who lived and flourished in Patna so little is known. He was the first man of learning and erudition to know that the earth moves and he actually observed the planets and wrote a book on astronomy and mathematics named ‘Āryabhaṭīya’ at the age of only 23.

Mathematics is a most valuable branch of Science of human knowledge in the modern world as it was in ancient India. Lagudha, the author of Vedāṅga Jyotisha says that Jyotisha shines on the head of all Vedāṅga Śāstras just as the crown on peacock’s head and the crest jewels shine on the serpents’ heads.¹

A writer named Bhāskara who wrote a book named ‘Laghu Āryabhaṭīya’ in Śaka era 434, just after 13 years of ‘Āryabhaṭīya’ came into existence, eulogises Āryabhaṭa very much. He says that Āryabhaṭa is so renowned that his fame spread far and wide beyond the limits of the ocean that he was incomparable among the astronomers who know the movement of the planets. The ground of the reputation of Āryabhaṭa is his supreme knowledge of astronomy.

There is a famous verse in praise of Āryabhaṭa which says that Āryabhaṭa was born in Kusumapura (Patna) as an incarnation of the sun in Kaliyuga. He knew astronomy and was the patron of learning.² Brahmagupta who flourished more than a hundred years after Āryabhaṭa and became a serious critic of him however in his famous work ‘Khaṇḍa-khādyā’ clearly says that he was following Āryabhaṭa
literally. Lallācārya also clearly says in his book ‘Śishyadhītbriddhidā’ that he too followed the great Āryabhata. The praises of these astronomers clearly express that Āryabhata enjoyed high reputation among the astronomers.

Āryabhata mentions the time when he was born, and when he wrote his book. He says in his book that when cyclic Jupiter years passed sixty times from the beginning of the Kali he was of 23 years of age. One cyclic Jupiter year is completed in 60 years. Therefore $60 \times 60 = 3600$ years passed when he was 23 years that is when 3577 years passed from Kali he was born. Śaka era begins when 3179 years passed in Kali i.e. 3577–3517 = 398 Śaka era i.e. in 477 A.D. he was born and he wrote his book in 500 A.D. The later great Indian astronomers followed him in this respect.

Brahmagupta in his book ‘Brāhmaśphuta Siddhānta’ says that he wrote his book in 550 Śaka = 627 A.D. when he was thirty years of his age. Bhāskarācārya says in his ‘Goladhyāya’ that he was born on 1036 Śaka i.e. 1115 A.D. and wrote his book in 1072 Śaka i.e. 1151 A.D. when he was thirty six years of his age. Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa wrote his famous book ‘Siddhāntatattvaviveka’ in 1580 Śaka i.e. 1659 A.D. So Āryabhata was the originator of the practice of mentioning the time of the composition of his work.

The followers of Āryabhata gave their times in Śaka era but Āryabhata gives his time from the beginning of the Kali. This shows that the use of the Śaka era was probably not popular in his time. Āryabhata wrote his book ‘Āryabhātiya’ when he was only 23 years of age.

Ārybhaṭa became a scholar of established fame at only 23. He could compose an uncommon book. This shows that he was a genius—a man of uncommon merit.

Āryabhata was the resident of Kusumapura (Patna). He says simply that he wrote his book in Kusumapura.
Another name of Kusumapura is Pushpapura as pushpa is a synonym of kusuma. This Pushpapura was called Paṭaliputra also as Paṭala is the name of a flower. Shankar Balkrishna Dikshit writes in his book, ‘Indian Astronomy’ that Āryabhaṭa belonged to the Deccan, as the book ‘Āryabhaṭīya’ was found by Dr. Kern in Malabar. So there might have been a city named Kusumapura. We do not agree with this view as Kusumapura or Pushpapura, present Patna is very famous city from a long time before Āryabhaṭa was born.

Besides, Varāhamihira also belonged to this very place as he expresses his views contrary to that of Āryabhaṭa. Both flourished in about same time. There is only a difference of six years as Varāhamihira wrote his book ‘Paṇcasiddhānta’ in Śaka year 427. At that time it would have been difficult for Varahāmihira to know the views of Āryabhaṭa within such a short time had they not been the residents of the same city. Moreover, Utpala, the commentator on the ‘Bṛhat Saṁhitā’ writes in Śaka year 888 = A. D. 966, that Varahāmihira was a Māgadha Brāhmaṇa. Therefore, Āryabhaṭa belonged to this very Patna. Mahamahopādhyāya Sudhakar Dwivedi says in his book ‘Gaṇaka Tarāṇgini,’ that Āryabhaṭa was the inhabitant of Patna. Shankar Balkrishna Dikshit also says that many people call this Kusumapura the present Patna.

About the contribution of Āryabhaṭa in his book ‘Āryabhaṭīya’ the first thing to be mentioned is his theory of the motion of the earth. How he learnt that the earth moves, he gives his reasoning. “When a man sits in a boat he observes that all immovable things like buildings, trees move in the opposite directions. Similarly we observe the planets and stars moving towards the west but actually these are stationary. The earth herself moves. But this view of his was not accepted by the later astronomers of
India, rather they criticised him. In a way he became unpopular for this view which goes against the views of the Vedas and Purāṇas. But time changed and at present Āryabhaṭa is mostly respected for this view.

The second remarkable notion which Āryabhaṭa expounded is the relation of circumference and diameter \( \frac{3927}{1250} \). It is wonderful how he got this relation at such an early time. In a curvature he wrote 24 signs.

One strange thing he invented was that how a big number can be written through the letters. In his time numbers were written up to ten digits only but he had to write the Bhagahas up to the eighteen places, therefore he invented this wonderful new system. A few examples are given. Khu means 20000, Yu means 300000, Ghri means 4000000, therefore Khuyughri means 4320000. He has described this clue in one verse only.\textsuperscript{11}

He has given the scientific reason of the eclipses that the shadow of the Earth is the cause of the lunar eclipse and of the Moon is the cause of the solar eclipse.\textsuperscript{11} Before him the only view was the Pauranic view that the Rāhu eclipses the Sun and Moon.

Āryabhaṭa has given the rule as to how to know the area of a triangle, and that of a quadrilateral, the area of a circle, the cubic area and how to know the result of an equation and a quadrilateral equation. He has written many more things within 119 verses. He divided the book in four parts.

Some European scholars suggest that Āryabhaṭa borrowed the knowledge from the west. We do not believe that. Many things written by Āryabhaṭa were quite unknown to the west then. The similarity they find in Āryabhaṭa with the Greeks is that Āryabhaṭa wrote the number
in alphabets just as the Greeks did. Long before Āryabhaṭa the sage Jaimini introduced this method in his 'Jaimini Sūtra'. Or the same idea of expressing the number like that might have come in the head of Āryabhaṭa quite independently. Great minds think alike. Had Āryabhata borrowed the things from the Greeks there must been some references to it in his work. Besides Varāhamihira who borrowed certain things from the Greeks would have borrowed these also from the Greeks and mentioned it. Besides, Brahmagupta criticises Āryabhaṭa much in his treatise named Brahmasphutasiddhānta. Had these been a borrowed knowledge, he must have taken Āryabhata to task for that also, therefore Āryabhaṭa deserves due praise for his originality and first-hand knowledge.

Though the base of his book is the Brahmasiddhānta, yet he has dived deep into the ocean of Mathematics and brought out the jewel of knowledge through the boat of his intellect." It is remarkable that he used the word boat in two places, firstly in observing the movements of the earth and bringing out the jewels from the ocean of knowledge through the boat of his intellect. He expresses his gratitude to the Brahmasiddhānta or to Brahma itself through whose favour he could learn all these. Brahma Gupta also gives the authority to Brahmasiddhānta. Varāhamihira's one of the authorities is Brahmasiddhānta but all these Siddhāntas are not the same. They differ. We may pay our attention to the fact that although Āryabhaṭa says that he follows the Brahmasiddhānta yet the name of his book is 'Āryabhaṭiya.' That is the book written by Āryabhaṭa, whereas the name of the book of Brahmagupta is Brahmasphutasiddhānta that is polished or clarified Brahmasiddhānta. So the very name suggests that Brahmagupta follows the Brahmasiddhānta literally; therefore Āryabhaṭiya is called Āryasiddhānta and its author was a simple not follower of the Brahma Siddhānta.
Jyotisha śāstra is respected in three ways. Saur, Brāhma and Ārya. All those authors who follow the Sūryaśiddhānta are called Saur, those who follow the Brahmasiddhānta are called Brāhma and the third who follow the Āryasiddhānta are called Ārya. So Āryabhaṭa’s Siddhānta is recognised as a clan by itself.

Āryabhaṭa does not mention the name of any author. It seems that Āryabhaṭa did not rely on earlier authorities. He himself observed and came to conclusion. Āryabhaṭa takes the name of Brahma simply to attribute piety to his work because he himself says if anybody would show disrespect to this book he would incur sin as the book is no other than Brahmasiddhānta. It is gratifying to note that Āryabhaṭa’s scientific views were respected in his life time as he himself says “Kusumapura bhyarcitam jñānam”. This knowledge was honoured in Kusumapura. It seems so long Āryabhaṭa, Varāhamihira and Brahmagupta flourished, they got due respect in this country. Afterwards philosophy took its place.

Āryabhaṭa has expressed his free and independent opinion in his book Āryabhaṭiya. For this Brahmagupta criticised him much. Later writers also expressed similar opinions as far as the motion of the earth is concerned.
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APPENDIX V

The Original Home of the Later Guptas

It is generally agreed that Ādityasena and his successors ruled in Magadha, for their inscriptions have all been found only in that region, and Ādityasena is referred to as lord of Magadha in a Nepalese inscription.¹ The Aphsad inscription of Ādityasena gives an unbroken genealogy of this king and continuous history of his ancestors from the time of Krṣṇa Gupta, and there is no indication that his predecessors ever ruled in any other region. This naturally gives rise to the presumption that these kings were rulers of Magadha, and Fleet described them as Later Guptas of Magadha. Some scholars have, however, expressed the view that the early Later Gupta rulers up to Mahāsesa Gupta were rulers of Mālava, that his son Mādhava Gupta was appointed king of Magadha by Harshavardhana, and since his time the Later Gupta ruled in Magadha.²

This supposition is primarily based on a statement in the Harsha-carita to the effect that Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta, two sons of a Mālava king (Mālavarājaputra), were appointed attendants (anucara) of the two brothers, Rājyavardhana and Harshavardhana.³ As this Mādhava Gupta has been very plausibly identified with the father of Ādityasena, as noted above, it follows that the grand father of Ādityasena, Mahāsesa Gupta, was a ruler of Mālava.

That Mahāsesa Gupta was regarded by Bāṇabhaṭṭa, the author of Harsha-carita, as a ruler of Mālava, may be readily admitted. But the real question is whether this negatives the idea that the former and his ancestors might
also be rulers of Magadha. In order to come to a decision on this point we must remember two facts. First, that there is no doubt that the territories ruled over by the Later Guptas once belonged to the Imperial Guptas. Even though we have not sufficient evidence to conclude that the Later Guptas were descended from the Imperial Guptas, or were a collateral branch of them, the name-ending Gupta and the three common names of kings between the two families certainly suggest a possibility that they were closely connected and came into possession of large territories of the Imperial Guptas which had not been carved into separate dominions. As such, their authority might extend over both Magadha and Mālava. The suggestion seem to be improbable on general grounds, but the second fact removes this improbability. It is an express statement in the Apsad Inscription to the effect that Mahāsena Gupta carried his victorious arms up to the banks of the Lauhitya. We have, therefore, to choose between two alternatives. Either Mahāsena Gupta was a ruler of Mālava and overran the whole of the region from Malwa to Assam, or that he was the ruler of Magadha with suzerainty over Mālava, and made a campaign from South Bihar, across Northern Bengal, to Assam. It is difficult to contend that the latter hypothesis is more unnatural or objectionable than the former.

A far less tenable objection against the occupation of Magadha by early Later Gupta kings is the alleged Maukhari rule over Magadha. This is inferred from the occupation by Šarvavarman and Avantivarman of the Village Deo Baramark, situated on the western border of South Bihar, within a few miles of the eastern border of U. P. The village, as suggested above, might have formed a part of the Maukhari dominions until it was conquered by Jivita Gupta II. It might have also changed hands during the conflict between the Maukhars and the Later
Guptas. But in any case, it is highly unreasonable to assume that if a village on the Kosala-Magadh border was within the dominions of the Maukharis for some time, the Later Guptas could not possibly rule in Magadhā. There is no evidence in support of the statement by Dr. D.C. Sircar that the Maukharis were "in practical possession of large parts of Bihar". Dr. Sircar finds further evidence in support of his view in "the discovery of some earlier records of the Maukharis in the Gayā District." "But there is no evidence to show that the Maukharis of U. P., who are the subjects of discussion, had any connection with those Maukharis. To argue that because some Maukharis ruled as Gupta feudatories in the Gayā District, the independent Maukhari kingdom established in U. P. must have also reigned in South Bihar, is certainly less valid or reasonable than the supposition that because the Imperial Guptas ruled from Malwa to Assam, another Gupta family, the Later Guptas, did the same.

Then there is the third argument based on the Sirpur Inscription of Mahāsenagupta Bālārjuna, a Pāṇḍuvamši king of South Kośala, which refers to one Śuryavarman as a ruler born in the Varman family that held sway over Magadhā. The argument presupposes the identifcation of this Śuryavarman with the homonymous son of Īśānavarman mentioned in his Haraha Inscription. There are, however, serious objections against this identification which have been pointed out by Mr. A. Ghosh. In particular, the comparative palaeographic chart in Mr. Ghosh's article hardly leaves any doubt that so far as palaeography may be accepted as the test for fixing chronology, the Sirpur Inscription should be regarded as probably belonging to the 8th century A.D., and in any case, considerably later than the Haraha Inscription of Īśānavarman. After a careful analysis of the forms of letters in different copper-plates
Mr. Ghosh concludes that Tivara, the Pāṇḍava king of South Kośala, "may be tentatively placed in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D." As Harshagupta, son of the younger brother of Tivara and father of Mahāśivagupta Bālārjuna who issued the Sirpur plates, married the daughter of king (nṛpā) Sūryavarman, this Sūryavarman cannot be identified with the son of Īśānavarman of that name mentioned in the Haraha Inscription dated 554 A. D. Dr. D.C. Sircar has sought to refute the arguments of Mr. A. Ghosh, but without success. He makes the dogmatic assertion that Tivara "must have ruled in the sixth century A.D." and then simply comments that "there seems to be no paleographical difficulty about the above dates" without any discussion of the very cogent arguments of Mr. Ghosh to the contrary.

Mr. V. V. Mirashi's criticism of the theory of Mr. A. Ghosh, so far as palaeographic test is concerned, deserves more serious consideration. Mr Ghosh's theory was based on the hitherto accepted date of the Arang plates, namely A. D. 601, and he sought to demonstrate that the letters in Bhandak plates of the father of Tivaradeva had much later forms. Mirashi has now suggested that the real date of the Bhandak plates is A. D. 501; Tivaradeva might therefore "have come to the throne about A. D. 560," and his contemporary Sūryavarman, mentioned in the Sirpur Inscription, may be identified with the homonymous son of Īśānavarman. Though Professor Mirashi's view, unlike that of Dr. D. C. Sircar, commands our serious attention, it cannot be regarded as conclusive, so far as the date of Tivaradeva is concerned.

The reference in the Sirpur Inscription to the 'Varman dynasty holding sway in Magadha' raises an important issue, even though we reject the identification of Sūryavarman mentioned in the record with that of the
Haraha Inscription. One may well ask, who were these Varman rulers of Magadha? A clue may be furnished by the statement of Hsuan Tsang to the effect that one Pūrṇavarman was ruling in Magadha shortly after the death of Śaśāṅka. The Chinese traveller refers to him as the last of the race of Aśoka Rāja. It is obvious therefore that Pūrṇavarman, the ruler in Magadha about 640 A. D., claimed descent from the illustrious Mauryas. Sūryavarman of the Sirpur Inscription, who probably lived during the latter half of the seventh century A. D., might have belonged to the same family. It is to be noted that the Sirpur Inscription merely refers to a family who boasted of once having ruled in Magadha, but not necessarily at the time the record was written or even in the time of Sūryavarman.

It may be further pointed out that Hwui Lun, a Korean Buddhist pilgrim visiting India shortly after the reign of Ādityasena, refers to king Devavarman, as a contemporary “King of Eastern India.” As mentioned above, Deva Gupta was the name of Ādityasena’s son and successor. It is not unlikely that this king was referred to as Deva Varman by the Chinese pilgrim, particularly as he refers to Ādityasena (sun-army) almost immediately before. In that case we must presume that Varman, the well-known name-ending of Kshatriya kings was alternately assumed by the Later Gupta Kings, or they were referred to as such by others. Further, the king of Eastern India in A. D. 692 was known to the Chinese as Mo-lo-pa-ma. This has been taken to be a Chinese rendering of Malavarman. Whatever we might think of the proposed identification of Devavarman and Mo-lo-pa-ma, there is no doubt of the Varman kings ruling in Eastern India in the seventh century A. D., and one of them, Pūrṇavarman, had at least very high pretensions. Sūryavarman might have belonged
to this class. Another possible clue of the Varman dynasty in Magadha should not be ignored. As mentioned above, there was a Maukhari family ruling in the Gaya region of South Bihar, and all the three rulers of this family, known so far, had their names ending in Varman. Although the first of these three, Yajñavarman, is expressly referred to as a feudatory chief, his grandson Anantavarman, who issued all the three inscriptions of the family known so far, does not refer to any paramount sovereign. In other words, he took advantage of the visible decline of the Imperial Guptas to assume a status of de facto, if not de jure, independence. It is not impossible that a scion of this family, like Suryavarman, would, years later, represent it as great on account of supremacy in Magadha. If Suryavarman mentioned in the Sirpur inscription were the son of the great Maukhari king Iśānavarman, it must be regarded as very curious that he should have called his family Varman, rather than Maukhari. On the other hand, a scion of the Maukhari family of Gaya, would naturally not use the term Maukhari, which by that time was specially associated with the powerful dynasty ruling in Kanauj, and would only like to take pride in their shortlived sovereignty in Magadha. It is not unlikely that Purnavarman, who ruled in Magadha after Śaśānka, also belonged to this class whose family-name Maukhari was confused with the Mauryas by the Chinese pilgrim. All these are, of course, mere hypotheses, and are only put forward to show that various other equally plausible explanations are possible than the one assumed by those who definitely reject the possibility of the Later Guptas having their ancestral home in Magadha.

It will appear from the above discussion that there are no serious objections, far less conclusive arguments, against the very natural presumption that the early rulers of the Later Gupta family, like the later ones, belonged to
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Magadha, though at least one of them, Mahāsenagupta, if not others also, ruled over Mālava. On the other hand, it must be admitted that there is no positive evidence in support of this view. But two circumstances in support of it may be mentioned. In the first place, the activities of Jīvita Gupta I in the Himalaya region and near the sea (in Bengal) make it more likely that he belonged to Magadha rather than distant Mālava. Secondly, the fact that Mādhava Gupta was placed on the throne of Magadha by Harsha, or that he secured it after Harsha’s death, make it more likely that his family was originally ruling in Magadha, for it was either an act of reinstating his friend on his ancestral throne on the part of Harsha or regaining it by his own prowess on the part of Mādhava Gupta. If the Later Guptas had their ancestral home in Mālava, Harsha might have easily placed him on the throne of Mālava, so much nearer to his own kingdom, or Mādhava Gupta might have secured it with his help.

But none of these two circumstances may be regarded as conclusive in any way. While, therefore, it would be unwise to be dogmatic one way or the other, the natural presumption that the Later Guptas had their ancestral home in Magadha rather than in Mālava should be looked upon as a more acceptable hypothesis until it is disproved by more definite evidence than is yet available.
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APPENDIX VI

Art of War in Ancient Bihar

Bihar was not only the land of ‘men of peace’ like Yājñavalkya, Buddha, Mahāvīra and Aśoka but also of great militarists and imperialists like Jarāsandha, Ajātaśatru, Kauṭilya, Candragupta Maurya and Samudra Gupta. While contributions of Bihar in the fields of religion, philosophy, arts and science are well known, its singular services in the art of war and military organisation are not generally appreciated. War is probably as ancient as man. In the prehistoric ages of scanty economic resources and continuous struggle for survival, man fought not only the animals but also his fellow beings with the crude stone weapons that he made or with his physique. In the neolithic age when man resorted to a settled life in a village with agriculture and hunting as his main occupations, wars between rival groups for possession of cultivated land must have been fought by bows and arrows, and other missiles. At Chirand in the Saran district have been found remains of neolithic settlement with large variety of arrowheads, tanged and socketed. These darts must have been fixed in arrows to be shot at with bow. These microlithic arrowheads are both of stone and bone. Terracotta balls could have been used as freehand missiles or sling balls.¹

With the rise of kingdoms, wars became more frequent either for possession of land, or for women or for vindication of honour, or for economic reasons. Both defensive and offensive wars were fought.

The Purāṇas and the Epics refer to many ancient kings of Bihar waging wars. Jarāsandha, the king of Magadha, was a very powerful king. Having provided for heavy
defences for his hill-girt capital city—Rājagṛha—by providing high cyclopean walls skirting the hills around the city, he could very well think of aggressive wars. Being a relation of Kaṃśa, king of Mathurā, he was a deadly enemy of Śrī Kṛśna. He raided Mathurā many times with many divisions (akṣhaṇinīs) of his army, and finally Kṛśna abandoned Mathurā for his newly built capital city Dvārakā in Saurāśṭra. From the Mahābhārata we learn that on the advice of Kṛśna, a wrestling-duel was fought between Bhīma and Jarāsandha, in which the latter was fatally wounded. It appears that in early days wrestling-duel was a recognised method of warfare in which the issue was finally settled. It might, if held early, save much loss of lives. What is important to note that while wrestling-duels continued, sometimes it was not resorted to as a decisive factor in the early stage of the struggle. The wrestling-duel between Duryodhana and Bhīma was fought towards the end of the Great War when heavy losses in men and material were already there.

With the dawn of the historical period in c. 600 B.C. we are on surer grounds for reconstructing the history of the arts of war in ancient Bihar. Due to many advantages, discussed earlier in the book, Magadha set out on an imperialist career at the beginning of the century. It had to fight kingdoms of Aṅga, and Kośala, and the Licchavi republic at Vaiśāli. It apprehended attack from the Licchavis and the kings of Avanti and Kośala. Therefore both defensive and aggressive military measures had to be carried out. The construction of a fort on the south bank of the Gaṅgā at Pāṭaligrāma (later Pāṭaliputra) was occasional largely as a part of strategy of war against the Licchavi republic across the Gaṅgā on the opposite. The shift of the capital and strengthening of its defences by Ajātaśatru as corroborated by recent excavations at Rājagṛha, were guided by fear of attack from the south-west,
may be from Pradyota of Avanti. The war against the Licchavis and their allies was fierce and protracted. The Magadha army introduced two new types of war-machines Mahāsilākaṃṭaka and Rathamusala, one threw large stones on the enemies and the other was a chariot like thing equipped with deadly maces creating havoc among the enemy soldiers by killing them by striking indiscriminately. These weapons were manipulated by some mechanism. The result was the ultimate victory for the Magadhan army. From the Greek account including Megasthenes and the Arthaśāstra it is clear that Magadhan army was a standing, professional and paid army; it was not an army recruited to meet an emergency and then, after the emergency was over to be dispersed. Kautilya refers to intensive training of the military personnel and their receiving regular salary—a permanent charge on state expenditure budget. It appears that the Nandas were first to organise a permanent and standing army, Mahāpadma Nanda the exterminator of the Kshatriyas overran with his large army a large part of North India and a part of the Deccan. His descendant Dhanananda, the contemporary of Alexander, was credited to have a large standing army consisting of 80000 horses, 200000 foot-soldiers, 8000 war chariots and 6000 fighting elephants. Magadhan military machine was further strengthened by Candragupta Maurya who maintained 600000 foot-soldiers.

The army had traditionally four wings—the chariotry, elephantry, cavalry and infantry. Jarasandha’s army had the four wings. In the Great War the four wings of the army are invariably found fighting in the Kurukshetra. Ajatasatru in his questions to Buddha refers to the professions of elephant riders, cavalry, charioteers and archers (footmen). The Nanda army according to Curtius, had an army of 600000 infantry, 20000 cavalry, 2000 four-horsed
chariots, and 3000 elephants. The Arthaśāstra speaks of four-fold army at many places. However, the Mauryan army also had war-fleet and commissariat as other two important wings administered by separate committees of the Military Board as mentioned by Megasthenes. The introduction of war-fleet appears to be an innovation by Candra-Gupta Maurya and so also the organisation of transport and commissariat, and shows not only careful planning for the army but also its expansion. War-fleet continued to be a wing of the Gupta army. The Nālandā and Gayā plates of Samudra Gupta (even if early forgeries) indicate that the Gupta army consisted of ships, elephants and horsemen. Samudra Gupta’s overlordship over islands also indicates the existence of war-fleet. The Deo-Barnark inscription of Jīvita Gupta II refers to the Later Gupta army consisting of ships, elephants, horses and foot-soldiers (paṭṭi). It appears that chariotry had lost its influence, as it is not mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions, nor the Gupta king is found depicted on Chariots on the coins. In the war against Alexander, Chariots had proved cumbersome in the rainsoaked wet grounds. But chariots were included in the army of Khāravela and Rudradāmana. What was the position of chariotry in the Gupta period is not clear. Samudra Gupta is referred to as ‘apratiratha’ on his archer type of coins. Literally it means ‘unrivalled as a chariot-warrior.’ It appears that the epithet ‘apratiratha’ had come to mean only ‘a matchless warrior’. Chariots are not found used in later period in war also, though processions of deities on chariots continue to this day. However, elephants continued to play an important part in war throughout ancient period. Elephants were known to the Harappan and also to the Vedic Aryans. But there is no evidence that they were used in war. In the Mahābhārata the kings of Magadha and Kārusha are fighting sitting on elephants. Elephant division of the Magadha army is specially men-
tioned and it was mauled by Abhimanyu.\textsuperscript{13} The Great Epic is generally placed in 3rd or 2nd century B.C. for its final compilation. It is the Magadhan king who is first known to have a large elephant wing in his army. The king of Gangaridai and Prasi (usually identified with the Nanda king) had 3000 or 600 war elephants.\textsuperscript{10} It is therefore possible to believe that the organisation of an elephant wing as a regular force in the army was first tried in Magadha, and later it was expanded by Nanda rulers. Chandragupta Maurya had the largest elephant division known so far, 9000 war elephants.\textsuperscript{17} According to Diodorus,\textsuperscript{16} Alexander did not take the expedition against the Gangaridai as he was deterred by the multitude of their elephants. The utmost reliance in war on elephants during this period is clear from the statement of Kautilya, "it is on elephants that the destruction of any enemy's army depends."\textsuperscript{19} Elephants were used in siege warfare as well. Kautilya considered them useful for 'marching in front, preparing the roads and the camping ground, protecting the sides of the army (from attack), for forced entrance into impregnable forts, breaking a compact army, destruction of walls, gates and towers of the enemy.'\textsuperscript{20} They were also useful in helping the army to cross water.\textsuperscript{31} Naturally, therefore, capture of elephants was carefully planned,\textsuperscript{32} and elephant forests were royal monopoly\textsuperscript{33} and private possessions of elephant was banned.\textsuperscript{34} Kautilya prescribed many kinds of training for war elephants.\textsuperscript{35} Aelian also refers to early capture of elephants, their being tended as children and bestowing on them great care and attention, and subjecting them to long course of training.\textsuperscript{36} Naturally so much attention was paid to war elephants, because the victory of kings in battle depended mainly on elephants.\textsuperscript{7} The Mauryan war elephant carried three archers and the driver.\textsuperscript{48} We find in Sanchi two riders on elephants. Indian example of using elephants in war proved infectious. Seleucus obtained 500 elephants from
Candra Gupta in return for four provinces. The former's victory over Antegonas in the battle of Ipsos is attributed to the deployment of elephants. The Syrian emperor Antiochus III renewed the treaty with Subhagasena, the king of Indians, and went back with 150 elephants. In his war against Rome he used elephants also. Pyrrhus king of Epirus used elephants which terrified the Romans. Hannibal, the great Carthegian leader began his attack with elephants on the Roman army at Ou-et-tune. Thus we can see that even after Puru's defeat and rout of his elephant force by Alexander's horsemen, elephants continued to be relied upon as an important wing of the army by Indians. It is surprising that inspite of the experience of the successes of the Śaka and Kushāṇa cavalry, Indian powers continued to rely on elephants in the army. Even the Śaka Kshatrapa Rudradāman had an elephant division in the army. In the Gupta period, Samudra Gupta had an elephant division, and Kumāra Gupta I is depicted riding an elephant and slaying a lion on one of his coin-types. However, instead of holding bow and arrow, he is holding a sword. Kāmandaka's Nitisāra which is assigned to the Gupta period refers to the four traditional wings of the army, including elephantry. The Deo-Barnerk inscription of Jīvita Gupta II includes elephants as a unit in the army. Among Gupta officers was Mahapilupati in-charge of elephants. The Pāla army also included elephants under an officer pilupati.

Horse was certainly known to the Vedic Aryans, but there is no evidence that horseman-soldier was known. Horse was mostly used in driving chariots. In the Mahābhārata there are numerous references to horsemen in both the armies, but it is significant that no important warrior is seen fighting mounted on horse back. Horseman-soldiers appear to have come into use in the early Buddhist period.
From the *Bhajātiya Jātaka* we learn that the Bodhisattva was born as a horse and mounted on it the knight of Brhadatta broke the enemy's camp. Kings of Assaka and and Kalinga fought on horseback with spears in hand. In the siege of Kuṣinagara during the war for Relics, cavalry besides elephantary and charioteery are seen in operation. It is possible to presume that growing importance of cavalry during this period may have been due to knowledge of the reliance on cavalry by Medians and the Persians. In Assyrian army also by the 8th century B.C., cavalry becomes more important than chariotry, which is left to kings alone. Persian and Median horsemen carried javelins, knife and short swords. The Assyrian cavalry was divided into two parts—Horse-archers, and Horse-spearmen. Bow, swords, spear and also shield were carried by Assyrian cavalry. Thus cavalry had attained great importance in the Assyrian and Achemenian army, and as we have seen was being introduced in the Indian army as well. The army of Nanda contained 20000 horsemen. According to Megasthenes the army of Candragupta had 30000 horses, and was looked after a committee of the Military Board. Horse was so indispensable for the army that no private person was allowed to possess it. War-horses were regularly trained for war purposes and were looked after by a superintendent. Cavalry was employed in the destruction of enemy's commissariat, for supervision of the army, for protection of the sides of the army, for seizing enemy's territory, for attacking the enemy in rear and for pursuing the defeated enemy. Cavalry became more important in the post-Mauryan period, and as mounted archers Scythians created havoc in enemy's armies. The Guptas appear to have realised their importance. Candra Gupta II introduced horsemen type of coins, showing that he was a great cavalry leader, like the Indo-Parthian and Scythian rulers, with whom horsemen type of
coins was quite common. From the (spurious?) Nalanda and Gayā Plates of Samudra Gupta we learn that cavalry was a unit of the army and it continued to be so in the later Gupta period as is obvious from the Deo Barnark inscription of Jivita Gupta II. The mounted-soldier in the Mauryan period carried two lances and a short buckler; and did not use saddle nor bits to curb the horses. However, by the 2nd-1st century B.C., the Indian cavalry used saddle and stirrups as found depicted on Sanchi reliefs and according to Marshall “this is the earliest example by some five centuries of the use of stirrups in any part of the world.” The saddle is represented on the Asvamedha type of coins and leather straps can be seen on the Horsemen-type of coins of Candra Gupta II. In class II of the Horsemen type of Kumāra Gupta I, the horse is fully accoutred. On some types of coins of the Gupta kings including those of Candra Gupta II, the king on horseback is holding bow and arrow. This appears to be an innovation—mounted archer—probably influenced by the Scythian examples. It appears that horse-archery never became popular with the Indians and with the end of the Gupta period, it disappeared.

Infantry (foot-soldiers) was the largest unit of the army. The king of Prasii and Gangaridie (Nanda?) had 200000 soldiers while Candra Gupta Maurya had 600000. The infantry continued as an essential unit of the army throughout, as a matter of fact no army even in modern times can be imagined without its infantry divisions. In the early Vedic period foot-soldier was quite important. Rudra was pattināmpatiḥ (lord of foot-soldiers) and a combatant on a chariot was according to the Atharvaveda, facing foot soldiers as powerful opponents. It appears that with the growing popularity of chariotority in war, the footmen were gradually reduced to secondary
importance, the base of a knightly pyramid. But still large number of foot-soldiers in the army was a source of strength. Kautilya thinks that even effete persons could be recruited in the army to terrify the enemy by their numbers. In the opinion of Bhishma, an army which has a large infantry force is very strong. It was 'the sheer weight of numbers which brought predominance for a century to the Achemenian dynasty of Persia. But the infantry was assigned a very subsidiary role, as camp followers of the elephant-rider, charioteer or horsemen, unto each horse (man) were assigned 10 foot-soldiers. There was great massacre of foot soldiers. Bhishma promised to kill 10000 soldiers daily. Infantry was well organised and equipped by the Greek and the Romans. However in the Mauryan period the infantry was assigned duties of fighting and carrying weapons and standards. The foot-soldier was well equipped. Besides having coats of mail and headgear he carried long-sword and arrows and a large shield. They also carried heavy swords and scimitar. Some carried spears of javelins in place of bow. They also used sling to throw stones or terracotta balls. In excavations at Campa large number of terracotta balls have been found in situ in the passage to the top of the fortification wall, presumably meant as defensive missiles against the besieging army.

Megasthenes, includes transport and commissariat as one of the important units of the army administered by a sub-committee of 5 members of the Military Board. They were responsible for the supplies to the army, such as bullock-carts for carrying engines of war, food for soldiers, provender for cattle and other military requisites. Was this important innovation also introduced after the Persian example, where when the Persian army was on march an ample baggage train sufficient to supply the army for a few months accompanied the army? Physicians and
surgeons also accompanied the army and tended the sick and wounded in the battle-field. Kauṭilya observes, "Physicians with surgical instruments, remedial oils and cloth (for bandage) and women with cooked food and beverages (nurses ?) should stand behind......the fighting-men." Soldiers were provided with weapons, horse, elephant or chariot as the case may be. When called upon to take the field, they were ever ready as they had to carry nothing of their own except their own bodies.

Among the weapons of war bows and arrows were most common. The dominating character of archery in ancient Indian military science is proved from the fact that the science is known by Dhanured. Swords, lances, axes, and javelins and spears were other weapons. We have already referred to such engines of war as rathamusulas and mahāsilakaṇṭaka invented during the time of Ajātashatru's war against Vaiśālī. Mace-fight was very ancient, and Jarāsandha and Bhipa fought with maces. It is well-known that discovery of iron gave a great fillip to Magadhan militarism as in Magadha and near about iron was found and worked. There is no doubt that iron weapons were very strong and powerful and the Magadhan army carried everything before it. According to Shaw, 'the hardest tools in ancient Egypt such as drills were made of Indian iron, and according to Nearchus Porus gave 30 lbs. of steel to Alexander as the most precious present.' Kauṭilya refers to satāghṇī, jāmadagnya (a large machine to shoot arrows), viśvāsaghṛti, saṅghṛti (a long pole to set fire to towers of a fort), and other weapons used in defensive and offensive siege warfare. Among other weapons are musala (pointed rods made of Khadira), mudgara, gadā (mace), kudāla (spade), triśūla (trident), cakra (disc with sharp points all round), sakti (a metallic weapon four hands long), prāsa (a weapon 24 inches long with two
handles), kunta (a wooden rod), suta (a pointed rod), barbed and to be thrown, swords of three kinds, paraśu (scimitar) kuṭhāra, khanitra, kuddāla (axes). Stones used as missile weapons and use of battle-axes are mentioned. The Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta refers to paraśu (battle-axe), śara (arrow), śāṃku (spear) śakti (pika), prāsa (barbed dart), aśi (sword), tomara (lance), bhindipāla (javelin for throwing), nārāca (iron-arrow) and vaitastika. The Mahābhārata also refers to arrows with metal tips, and sharp and pointed iron shafts (nārāca), barbed darts, and nālikā which vomited stone pieces of iron (the cylindrical case was probably pushed from behind by hand or some mechanical device). Soldiers also had coats of mail, breastplate, head-helmets and finger-covers. For protection of the body in defensive action, mats of copper to cover the body, or of leather, wooden board, cover made of leather or bamboo were used, probably when regular armour was not available to citizens at large in defence during emergency.

The standing army well provided and well paid, in peacetime enjoyed life. Strabo informs us that 'the fighting men when not engaged in active service pass their time in idleness and drinking.' According to Megasthenes, "Its only duty was to fight and in times of peace it was given to idleness and amusement." They could afford it, because they were well paid. According to Arrian the pay that they received from the state being so liberal that they can with ease maintain themselves and others besides. The commander of the army received highest pay, 48000 paṇas, paid to the prime-minister and a trained soldier received 500 paṇas, equal to that of grāmabhṛtaka, fiery spies and more than that of musician (Kuśilava), etc. Besides the paid standing army, there were, if necessary, troops from allies, corporations (śrenis), and hired or mercenary (bhṛta) and forest (āṭavika) troops.
While sometime there was no choice of time for waging war, Kauṭilya preferred the month of Mārgaśīrṣa, Caitra, or Jyeshṭha for marching. We do not have any scene depicting the actual battle formations but Kauṭilya and the *Mahābhārata* refer to numerous battle arrays (*Vyūhas*). It is very difficult to say whether these arrays were merely theoretical or were actually formed. The army was led by the commandar or senāpati with separate sub-commanders for different wings, and both from Kauṭilya and lists of army officers known from the inscriptions, it is clear that a large number of graded military officers led the army in the field. But the king himself was the supreme commander. From Plutarch it appears that Candragupta Maurya himself led the army of conquest. Samudra Gupta fought and took part in battles personally and won the wars by force of his own arms. He was a victor of hundreds of battles and had received numerous wounds. Candra Gupta II appears to have personally marched with his army against the Šakas; Skanda Gupta had to sleep in the battle field fighting the Pushyamitrās.

But the kings of Magadha did not only wage wars of aggression. They were also prepared for defensive wars against enemies. That explains the care devoted to building of fortification, particularly for the capital city. Bodhisattva had caused a great rampart to be built for the city of Mithilā, and along the rampart were watch towers, and surrounding the rampart were three moats, a mud-moat and a dry moat. We have already referred to the cyclopean stone-wall fortifications of Rājagṛha. According to Megasthenes Pātaliputra was protected by a timber paisade (remains of which have been found at Bulandibag and Kankarbag in south Patna). It had 64 gates and 570 towers. It was surrounded by a broad and deep moat which was 6 plethora (606 ft.) wide, and 30 cubic deep.
Kauṭilya wants the fortified capitals to be surrounded by three ditches and a rampart 36 feet high and 72 feet wide with square towers, with wide road on the rampart, intervening and providing for indrakosa to allow three archers to be able to attack the besiegers, outside the rampart numerous kinds of obstruction such as thorns, pits mounds of earth, and water pools were to be provided to make access to the fort difficult. He also refers to numerous stationary war-machines to be fixed on the fort walls to assail the besieging army. Excavation at Campā near Bhagalpur and Šīsupālagarh near Bhuvaneshwar reveal state of fortification in the Maurya Śungra period. The mud fortifications were reinforced by bricks and thick and strong walls were built with ditch all around. The excavations at Vaiśālī also exposed remains of fortifications in the pre-and Gupta periods. The accounts of Hsuan Tsang shows that Pāṭaliputra in the time of Bālāditya was fortified and surrounded by a ditch full of water which was drunk dry by the large number of horses of Mihrakula’s army who besieged the city and captured it. Gomatikoṭṭakas were fortified military posts in the Gupta and later Gupta period, and Mudgagiri and Pāṭaliputra were such fortified cities in the time of the Pālas.

War was thus a very specialised thing and every king was expected to be intent on conquest. Wars could be fought for obtaining gold, friend or territory, and for Kauṭilya, seizure of territory was the most proper objective of war. But the war was to be made as humane as possible. Megasthenes says that the non-combatants were not injured in the war. However, Kauṭilya speaks of open battles, treacherous battles and silent battles. He suggests many deceitful means to defeat the enemy such as bribing the soldiers of the enemy, striking him when he is tired or careless. Various kinds of poisoned missiles, and chemicals
were to be used which would cause blindness or death. Even water, grass and fields could be poisoned or made desolate. However, there could be no comparison with Assyrian savagery in war and on captives. Assyrian kings gloated over flying their enemies, deporting them and inflicting inhuman cruelties on them.
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APPENDIX VII

A Short Note on the Panchobh Copper Plate of Saṅgrāma Gupta (c. 12th century A. D).
(Plate is in the Patna Museum)

The Copper Plate inscription, in question, was discovered by Sri Amiri Choudhary in 1915-16 in the village of Panchobh, six miles to the west of Laheriasarai (Darbhanga, Bihar). There are in all thirty lines in the plate and the language of the record is Sanskrit. In the upper part of the plate there is a representation of a bull or Nandī facing towards the proper right in a slightly recumbent posture. The legend gives the name of Saṅgrāma Gupta. The Bull couchant is confirmed by the use of the epithet Vṛshabhadhvaja in connection with Kājādityagupta and the donor. Since no date is given, we have to depend on the character of the plate in determining its age. The letters in the epigraph bear close resemblance to the Deopara inscription of Vijayasena, and Vaidyadeva’s grant of 1143, and on this basis we can assign it to the twelfth century A. D. R. D. Banerji believes that the characters of the Panchobh CP script bear close resemblance to those used in the grants of Lakshaṇapāseha. The plate can be safely assigned to the twelfth century of the Christian era.

The inscription records the grant of a village named Vanigāma situated in the district of Jambubanī made by Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Parameṣvara, Mahāmāṇḍalika Saṅgrāmagupta who is described as the lord of Jayapura and the most devout worshipper of Maheśvara. The donee is a learned Brāhmaṇa of Śāṇḍilya gotra, learned in the Tajuraveda, and having the three pravaras of Śāṇḍilya,
Asita and Devata, Kumāraśvamin by name son of Kṛṣṇāditya and grandson of Śrī Rāma, who hailed from Kolāńca. No particular occasion is mentioned for making the grant. An account of the ancestors of the donor is also available from the record and they are (1) Yajñēśagupta, (2) Dāmodara-gupta, (3) Devagupta, (4) Rājadityagupta, (5) Kṛṣna-gupta, and (6) Saṅgrāmagupta. From a critical study of the epigraph, the following points are clear:—

(i) The record is not dated and hence it is of no remarkable help in so far as the study of political history is concerned. No important historical event is referred to in the inscription.

(ii) The mention of the Gupṭavāṃśa, however, is suggestive of the fact that the royal line might have been in some way connected with the later Guptas of Magadha, of which fact they seem to have retained a very hazy impression. While Rājāditya Gupta (No. 4) is credited with all the imperial titles of Saṅgrāma Gupta (N. 6). Kṛṣna Gupta (No. 5) is dismissed with the only epithet of Rājeputra, which seems to indicate that he predeceased his father. On the basis of the evidence furnished by the epigraph, we do not feel inclined to agree with R. D. Banerji that "the family had been at first feudatories of the Pālas or Senas and assumed titles of independence after the decline in power or the downfall of their suzerains" and "assumed independence after the downfall of the Senas."3

(iii) The grant makes it clear that Rājāditya Gupta made himself independent. He was possibly a Mahā-mangalikā and later assumed full royal titles when he thought that his assumption of independence was complete.

(iv) The charter was issued from the royal camp of victory (Jayaskandhāvara) though the name of that camp of victory is not given. It was issued on the ninth day.
of the dark fortnight of the month of \textit{Kārttika} in the seventeenth year of the reign of Śaṅgrāma Guptā.

(v) The grant was made over to a Brāhmaṇa from \textit{Kolāṇca}, whence Bhaṭṭa Śrī Rāma, the grandfather of the donee had emigrated.

Since the publication of the inscription (without plate), no further study of the text has been made. Dr. R. C. Majumdar, solely relying on the study made by Amareśvara Thakur, J. N. Sikdar and R. D. Banerji, suggested that this Copper-plate "introduced us to a line of the Gupta dynasty." A second study of the same inscription has been made by Dr. Upendra Thakur. In his recent study, Thakur admits that the record may be assigned to the second half of the twelfth century but his following observations about Bhaṭṭa Śrī Rāma are wrong. He says—"Bhaṭṭa Śrī Rāma is said to have visited Tirabhukti or Mithilā. He has referred to the ruling Mithilā king in his work. It is therefore quite likely that the grant was made to his grandson by Mahāmaṇḍiliya Śaṅgrāmagupta, the feudatory of the Maithila Karnaṭa' king. "It may be pointed out here that Bhaṭṭa Śrī Rāma of Prayāga visited Tirabhukti when Rāmabhadra Ṛūpanārāyaṇa of the Oinavara dynasty (not a Karnaṭa) was ruling in Mithilā in the first quarter of the sixteenth century A. D. Śrī Rāma has left his impressions about Rāmabhadra at the end of his chapter of his commentary on the Sārasvata grammar. How can the grandson of Bhaṭṭa Śrī Rāma (of 16th century), if we accept Thakur's identification, get a grant from a ruler or a feudatory of the twelfth century A. D.? By no stretch of imagination we can identify Bhaṭṭa Śrī Rāma of the 16th century with his namesake in the Panchobh CP. Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya, on the basis of the Panchobh CP, has tried to prove that the kings of the
imperial Gupta dynasty were of Kshatriya origin and that they were Śaivas.  

With these preliminary remarks we shall now proceed to examine the texts of the plate. The first three kings are simply referred to as kings and only the fourth and the sixth are credited with all the imperial titles, viz, Paramabhāttraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Parameshvara, Paramamāheśvara, Vyṣabhadvajā, Somānya-arjunavamsodhāvha (an epithet bearing close resemblance to a newly discovered inscription of Jīvītagupta from Katra police station in the district of Muzaffarpur, Bihar, and yet unpublished) Jayapura paramesvara, Mahāmāṇḍalika............Śrīmat Śaṅgrāmagupta Devapāda Pravaradhamāna Vijayarājye saṁpadāsasohvatvatsare Kārttika krṣṇa navamam titthau Śrimajjayaskandhāvartin ayameba Mahārājādhirāja Mahāmāṇḍalika Śrīmat Śaṅgrāmagupta Vijayī (Lines 2 to 5). We further learn—Rāmaguptavatī Samudratanaya yenata uccaistoro nahiśo Gupta Vyṣabhadvajīrjuna jayairyukto Nyapapanaṇam (L.15). From the above it appears that these kings were Śaivas with Bull as their insignia and claimed descent from Arjuna of the Lunar dynasty, belonging to the Gupta-paṇsa and were the lords of Jayapura.

The true status of the donor is evident from the epithet, Mahāmāṇḍalika, though it is preceded by some high sounding titles. It is known to us from various literary records of Mithila that the feudatories of the Karpatas used such high sounding titles even though they were ordinary ministers. Bāṭudāsa, father Śridharadāsa of the Andhratharhi Inscription, was also a Mahāmāṇḍalika. Mahāmāṇḍalika was something like a Māṇḍalapati. The assumption of high sounding titles by Mahāmāṇḍalika Saṅgrāma Gupta need not detract us from asserting that he was a lord of some Māṇḍalas (administrative unit) in Mithila. Even the minister of Nānyadeva, Śridhara, was called a Mahāmāṇḍalika. Though the true nature of the social and
political status of a *Mahāmāyaṇaṇiaka*, is not clear, we know that the ministers of the Karnaṭa king made grants to the Brāhmaṇas and others for the attainment of merit here and in other world. Candesvara, though a minister, was so powerful that he maintained under him a vassal. In the circumstances if we get a copper-plate grant issued by *Mahāmāyaṇaṇiaka* Saṅgrāma Gupta, there is nothing to be surprised about. Saṅgrāma Gupta was a *Mahāmāyaṇaṇiaka* under some Karnaṭa king after Nānyadeva. The weakness of his master might have emboldened him to assume such high sounding titles and that was possible only after Nānyadeva. He was a Śaiva and his official seal had the bull councchant.

Saṅgrāma Gupta has been described as descended from the Gupta dynasty of which the earliest founder was Arjuna. We know of no other Arjuna except one of the same name ruling in Tirhut as governor of Harshavardhana and independently, after his death. Arjuna was defeated by Wang-hiuen-tse, the Chinese ambassador with the help of Nepal and Tibet. The lineage of that Arjuna is not known to us. Line 15 of the epigraph suggests that the family became exalted and famous for the victory of Arjuna and Line 16 suggests that after the powerful kings passed away a scion of this family became powerful. He was Yajñesha Gupta. Since no other Arjuna is known to us, we may infer from these to lines that in the period following the disappearance of the Tibetan rule and the consequent void in the history of Mithilā, these people again raised their head on the northern strip of Tirhut bordering on the Tarai area of Nepal and strengthened their power. It is not clearly known if Arjuna belonged to the *Guptavānsa*. The recent discovery of a copper plate in the Katra thana refers to a line of the Guptas who were the later Guptas and records a grant of land during the time of Jīvita Gupta. Whether this Jīvita Gupta is to be
identified with the one of the Apshad stone inscription or not, we cannot definitely say at present. Here we have to bear in mind that no records of the later Guptas have been discovered from north Bihar, except the one referred to above. The Katra CP refers, though doubtfully, to some connection with Arjuna (text has not yet been finally deciphered). It seems that after the fall of the later Guptas, who had possibly also a hand in the defeat of the Chinese cum Tibetan and Nepal army, a branch of theirs settled in Tirhut. While there is a reference to the Cāmunḍā vishaya in Tīrabhutki in the Katra thana plate, line 20 of the Panchobh CP refers to one Cāmunḍarāja (possibly to Dāmodara Gupta, also called Amarapuri-nāthādideva in line 21). It these two be connected, there would be no hesitation in accepting the fact that the ancestors of Saṅgrāma Gupta were descendants of the Later Gupta dynasty. The pedigree in the Panchobh CP has begun from Yajñeṣa Gupta, who possibly revived the fortunes of his family. The only other possibility is that they might have been descended from Arjuna, the governor of Harsha in Tirhut. But here we have to bear in mind that Arjuna was taken captive to China and we do not know anything about him.

Saṅgrāma Gupta is said to be the lord of Jayapura which has been identified by us with Jayanagar in the district of Darbhanga.11 R. D. Banerji identified it with Jayanagar in the Monghyr district (op. cit. V 585; 207). Jamvūvanī may be either Yogavani or Jayanagar in Tirhut. It was in the district of Jamvūvanī that the village of Vanigama was situated, and it was in that village that all the officials assembled to make the grant (L. 6). The village appears to have been an important centre of administration. Thakur identifies this village with Vaniyagrama in the region of Vaisali,12 but we cannot rule out
the possibility of its identification with Bangama in the district of Saharsa. Unless further evidence is forthcoming, we cannot be sure about its identification though the expression Cāmuṇḍarāja is a pointer.

The system of granting lands to the Brāhmaṇas from Kolaṇḍa is very old in Mithila and we have a record of the Pāla period showing what the Kolāṇḍa Brāhmaṇas were to others in matters of grant. We learn from the Nyāyakarṇīka of Vācaspati Miśra about one Ādisūra. It may be tempting but by no means certain to identify this Ādisūra with the king of that name in Bengal who introduced Kulinism. The Panchobh CP simply confirms the view that grants to Kolāṇḍa Brāhmaṇas were yet made in the 12th-century A.D. and it is they who were regarded as superior to others. The donee in the grant in question was versed in the Yajuraveda. It may be pointed out here that Mithilā since time immemorial has been the seat of vedic learning and the study of Yajuraveda was preferred to others. The village of Tājuara in the district of Darbhanga is yet an important centre of Yajurvedic studies and the name of the village itself is derived from the Yajurvedins. The reference to the worship of Śiva in our grant is also found in the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla and we learn that Mithilā was an important centre of Śiva worship and we find here a reference to the erection of about a thousand temples of Śiva. Śiva's Vāhana Nandin has great importance in the Śaiva mythology. Only recently a very fine image of Nandin has been discovered from Birpur in Begusarai. Vṛshabhadvaja in our grant is indicative of the fact that Saṅgrāmagupta was a devotee of Śiva and had therefore adopted Bull as his insignia. Śiva has been a very favourite deity in Mithilā and it is not unnatural if we find the Bull standard as the insignia in the Panchobh CP. The most important point that goes in favour of the record being
one of Mithilā in the use of the expression "Baṭuka" in line 12 indicating that the donee was a mere boy, son of Krṣṇāditya and grandson of Śrī Rāma. The word "Baṭuka" for a small boy is yet prevalent in Mithilā. The family no doubt seems to have been an emigrant from Kolāṇca and settled in Mithilā.

Had Saṅgrāmagupta been an independent ruler, he must have mentioned the name of his Jayaskandhāvara. The date indicates that it was granted when Mahāmāṇḍalika Saṅgrāmagupta was in the seventeenth year of his office. There is nothing to show that Saṅgrāmagupta was an independent ruler or that he ever assumed independence. The non-mention of any ruling monarch is an indication of the weakness of the king under whom Saṅgrāmagupta was a Mahāmāṇḍalika and not of his independent status. He used such high sounding titles in imitation of other feudatory nobles of Mithilā possibly at a time when there was a chaos following the death of Nānyadeva and the division of kingdom between Gaṅgadeva and Malladeva. This much is sure that Mahāmāṇḍalika Saṅgrāmagupta held some very important post. Such high sounding titles were also used by ministers like Caṇḍeśvara and others.
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<td>Shihabuddin Muhammad Ghori 320-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam 561.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikdar J. N. 709.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śikharaśvāmin 180.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śikṣā-Saṃuccaya 162, 430.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śikta 609.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śilabhādra 383, 390.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīlāditya II Dharmāditya 232, 294.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīlarakshita 290.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silsia Rock Inscription 543.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simarana 306-8, 319.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhacandra 290.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhala 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhapura 163, 249.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhu 250.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singhbhum 418, 452, 542, 609, 615.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sircar, D. C. 55, 65, 87, 91, 92, 97-98, 101, 126-27, 129, 156,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243, 271, 294, 312, 326, 411, 414-15, 417, 433, 487, 493, 662,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664, 668, 688.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sircar, S.C. 569.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirpur Inscription 222, 685, 687.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sishyadhibāddhīda 677.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiśunāga 607.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisupalagār 609, 703.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sītā-Kōhbar 503.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīva 86, 128, 130, 133-34, 140, 157, 263, 292, 408, 422, 507,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511-12, 519-20, 526, 538, 641, 643, 713.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīvār Plate Inscription 272.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīva-Pārvatī 204, 217.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīkṣavārttika 465.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda Gupta 43, 60-79, 106-9, 155, 191, 199, 219, 542, 553,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555, 617-18, 655, 657, 663-64, 671-72, 702.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda Purāṇa 588.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, V.A. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10-11, 35, 71, 72, 77-91, 96, 101, 102,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104, 105, 106, 181, 399, 526, 528, 556, 620-21, 706.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soḍhadeva 257, 312.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohini, S.V. 669.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somadeva 61, 171, 281.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someśvara-I 301, 305.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someśvara-II 309.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someśvara Bhātta 466.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somavamsa 266.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sone East Bank C.P. Inscription 422, 488.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonpur fair 409.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonpur (Gaya) 538, 572, 639-40, 642, 644-45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somapura Vihāra 252.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonbhandara Cave 136, 195.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooner 127-29, 157, 197, 409, 531, 614.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śravasti 21, 206, 208, 405, 508, 514-15, 652.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrestha 119.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrī Bhāṇugupta 87-88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdhara 281, 408.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdhāradāsa 281, 307, 319, 364, 462, 710.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrī Gupta 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 550, 662.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīkṣetra 562.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīnagar Bhukti 340, 539.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrī Śīlāditya 117.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sten Konow 100.
Stein, M.A. 454, 569.
Sthirapāla 263, 436, 449, 495.
Subhakar Singh 390.
Subhamitra 290.
Śūdraka 266, 275.
Śūgūra 187.
Śūlikas 222, 227.
Sultangunj 169, 196, 207, 209, 212-13, 216-17, 398, 483, 516, 525, 540, 549, 617, 619.
Sumatra 561, 567.
Sumantagāvalīśaṁit 160-61.
Śundaravarman 2, 8, 91.
Śūga 631, 633-34, 636, 649.
Supaul 311, 317 609.
Supratishthitavarman 229.
Śurajanka Peak 205.
Śurajgarha 116, 621.
Śrāpadā 264-56, 491.
Śrāpadā II 267, 276.
Śrīrañābhāadāgaradhiśikarana 117.
Sūrya 132-33, 158, 191, 204, 403-4, 420-21, 511-13, 515, 519, 526, 643, 681.
Sūryaditya 295.
Sūryavarman 222, 685-88.
Sūsthitavarman 229.
Susunia 25.
Śatrulakhāra 436.
Suttanipāta 385.
Suvarṇadvīpa 254, 370, 375, 429, 523, 563, 567-70.
Śvāmidatta 23.
Śvayambhū Purāṇa 291-92.
Swordman Coin type of Kumāra Gupta I 62.
Sylhet 282.
Takakusu 188, 192, 374, 398-406.
Tamralipti 568.
Tao-ch'en 285.
Tao-ch'ing 388.
Tārā 430, 432, 433.
Tara Chandi Inscription 543, 545.
Taregana 609.
Tarkajvala 162.
Tathāgata Gupta 177.
Tātparyaṇṭkā 466.
Tattvasambhara 192, 393.
Tattvasamāṅkṣa 397.
Tawney 104.
Taxila 594.
Telāṅga 300.
Teli-ka-Mandir 526.
Tezpur 210.
Thailand 561.
Thakur Amaresvar 709.
Thakur, D. C. 501.
Thāneśvara 231-33, 235, 237.
Thomas 93, 660.
Tiger slayer coin type
—of Samudra Gupta 15, 17, 35.
—of Kumāra Gupta 57, 62.
Tibet 520, 561, 563, 567, 595, 711-12.
Tilāḍhaka 380.
Tilūga 290.
Tilopa 439.
Tinna valley 606.
Tipperah C. P. Inscription 83.
Tirabhusuki 68, 114-15, 172, 261,
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Tirthankara Images 212.
Todd 330.
Toramāya 110, 112, 673.
Trisñatika 600.
Tripathi 243, 654, 658.
Tirupuri 621.
Tsang-chén-Tenn 285.
Tucci 187.
Tumain Inscription 4, 57, 58, 68,
70.
Tungā Dharmāvaloka 303.
Uchchaitha 539.
Udānakītya 119.
Udayagiri Cave Inscription 47, 157,
163, 654.
Udayagiri (Rājagṛha) 137.
Udayasundartkathā 277.
Udayi 607, 610, 653.
Udayamāna 333.
Uddalaka Āruṇi 598.
Uddyoṭkara 461-63, 471.
Udumbaraka (Nalanda) seal 133.
Udyanā 416, 493, 472, 476-77,
480, 483, 500.
Ugrasena 22.
Ujjain 191, 232, 665.
Uma 129.
Uma-Mahēśvara 505, 511, 512.
Umaśati 281.
Umbeka Bhaṭṭa 466, 468.
U. Mishra 499.
United States of America 210.
Upagupta 90, 243, 565.
Upāsika 114-15.
Upārīkara 114.
Upavarsa 189, 591.
Uren 428.
Ushā 132-33, 513.
U. Shastri 499.
Utkala 233, 252.
Uttar Pradesh 1, 12-13, 16, 28-29,
74-75, 89, 217, 221-22, 240-42,
245, 617, 620-21, 647, 670, 685,
690.
Uttara Purāṇa 453.
Vācaspati Mishra 397, 414, 462-63, 468, 471-76, 480, 713.
Vāgāvāra 388.
Vālīyaka Cave 193.
Vāhlikā 12, 49-50, 61.
Vai bhāra hill 193.
Vaidyadeva 707.
Vaiṣṇava Gupt 85-86, 111-12, 125,
655, 666, 671, 674.
Vairocana 394.
Vaiśālī 3, 4, 11, 54, 68, 70, 114-19, 121, 124, 128, 168-70, 173,
74, 208, 215, 217-18, 225, 323,
423-24, 457, 459, 508, 531, 539,
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Vairājāvarāhakṣāna 509.
Vajrāsana, image of 587.
Vaiṣṇata 3, 4, 8, 9, 15, 26, 27,
Vākpāla 256.
Vākpatirāja 288.
Valabhi 82, 84, 135, 189, 232, 387, 672.
Valentine, W. H. 611.
Valgudar Inscription 270, 335, 411, 419, 486, 493, 540.
Vallalasena 268, 272-73, 408.
Vāmana 281.
Vappagoshavata grant Inscription 282-83.
Vāpyaka 246.
Vardhanas 362-63, 366.
Vārāha 127, 191, 211.
Vārahī 131.
Vārahāmihiira 166, 191-92, 419, 678, 680.
Vārāha Purāṇa 421.
Varanasi 82, 568, 605, 607.
Varanasi Pillar Inscription 80.
Vararuci 591.
Varendra 387, 391.
Varendri 246, 267, 275, 283, 290, 292, 300, 302, 311.
Varṣaratnākara 281, 355.
Varsha 189, 591.
Vasu, N. 323.
Vatsabhāṣṭa 183-84.
Vatsadevt 238.
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Vatsyāyana 181, 184, 216.
Vāyu Purāṇa 9, 653.
Vedāṅga Jyotisha 676.
Vedānta 155.
Varpa 399, 401, 402.
Victoria and Albert Museum (London) 207.
Vidarbha 250.
Videha 182.
Videsa Vasukrtih 193.
Vidiśā 27.
Vidyādhara 264.
Vigama Candra 290.
Vigrahapāla II 371-72, 620.
Vijayacandra 272, 312.
Vijayakāmadeva 321.
Vijjika 184, 190.
Vijñāpatīratāsiddhi 142.
Vikramākadevacarita 281, 326-27.
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502, 535-36, 540, 563-64, 570, 590-95.
Vīnāyadītya 239.
Vīnayapīṭaka 586.
Vīnayatīkītthāpaka 117.
Vindhyavāsinī 241, 247.
Vintadeva 392.
Vīmānavatthu commentry 139
Vimalacandra 290.
Vimalakṛiti 138.
Vimala Suri 454.
Vimśatikā 600.
Vipula mountain 136-37, 160.
Vtrasena Sāba 47, 157, 183, 654-55, 671.
Viśākhadatta 37, 40, 42, 183-84, 191.
Viśhaya 115, 166.
Viśhayanatī 166, 345, 349.
Viṣṇu 125-27, 133-34, 201, 204, 207, 210-11, 263, 404, 407, 409-11, 504, 511, 513, 515, 519-20, 538.
Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa 216, 421, 489, 517.
Viṣṇudāsa 125.
Viṣṇuugopa 23.
Viṣṇu Gupta Candrādītya 90-91.
Viṣṇupāda 125, 158, 411.
Viṣṇupura 296, 414, 510-11, 526.
Viṣṇu Purāṇa 9, 10, 704.
Viṣvavaraman’s Inscription 55.
Viṣudhimagga 141, 150, 153, 161, 164.
Viṣvavarṇapasena 267, 274-75.
Vītpāla 503.
Vogel, J. P. 528.
Vṛkṣacandra 290.
Vṛjīt 124, 285, 423.
Vulture Peak Mountain 138.
Vyādi 189, 591.
Vyāghrāja 22, 52.
Vyavahārika 602.
Vyākhya-yuktī 162.
Vyāsa 180.
Waddel 285, 323, 438, 494.
Walters Thomas 111, 658.
Wang-Hiuen-Tse 284-86, 538, 711.
Wethali 563.
Winternitz 190, 192, 438.
Wima Kadphises 614, 623.
Wright, D.W. 329.
Xandarmos 581.
Yādavas 248-49.
Yadus 249.
Yajñāsena Gupta 708, 711-12.
Yajñēśu Gupta 275.
Yajñāvalkya 119, 588, 590, 611.
Yajñavarman 123-24, 331, 670, 688.
Yajurveda 405, 578, 589, 587, 707, 713.
Yaksapāla 275, 373, 406, 415, 420, 484, 526.
Yasakarṇa 308.
Yaśastilaka 282.
Yashodharman 89-90, 282, 673.
Yaudheya coins 31.
Yauvanaśtri 296.
Yavana 61, 76, 248-49.
Yazdigard 77.
Yogacāra school 167.
Yuan Chwang 244.
Yudhishtīra 579.
Yui-Chi 50.
Yunnan 563, 565.
Zebulistan 84.
## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

*Serial numbers of plates continued from Part-I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate no.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Courtesy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Mundeshwari Temple (Bhabua)</td>
<td>A. S. I., Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Apsad Mound (Apsad)</td>
<td>D. A. M., Bihar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Rama Sita, Lakshmana and Kevaṭa crossing the Ganga at Sringeraperapura (Stucco Panel)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Rama, Sita and Lakshmana with Bharadvaja at Prayaga (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Rama, Sita, and Lakshmana crossing the Ganga on a raft (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Rama, Sita and Lakshmana in forest (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Rama, Sita and Lakshmana with Valmiki at Citrakuta (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Rama and Sita with Lakshmana on top of tree (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>The Procession from Ayodhya (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Bharata meeting Rama at Citrakuta (Stucco)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>(i) Dancing Geesha (Stone, Eksari)</td>
<td>Patna Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Surya (Stone)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) A female attendant (Stone, Rajmahal)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>(i) UmaMaheswara (Stone, Monghyr)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Kalyanaasundara (Stone, Gaya)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Buddha (Stone, Lakhisarai)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate no.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Courtesy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>(i) Tārā (Stone)</td>
<td>Patna Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Buddha with bowl and monkey (Stone, Bodh-Gaya)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>(i) Parwatt on lion with Karitkeya (Stone, Patna)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Vishnu (Govind) (Stone, Monghyr)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Sarasvatt (Bihar, Stone)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Buddha (Stone)</td>
<td>Indian Museum, Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71a</td>
<td>Sūrya (Stone)</td>
<td>G. D. College Begusari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Buddha (Stone, Antichak Vikramila)</td>
<td>Patna University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Lady in Toilet (Terracotta Panel, Antichak).</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>(i) Maitreya (Stone, Vishnu-pur, Gaya).</td>
<td>Patna Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Buddha (Stone, Vishnu-pur, Gaya).</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Buddha (Stone, Bodh Gaya)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Trailokyavijaya (Bronze, Nalanda)</td>
<td>A. S. I., Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>(i) Lokanātha (Bronze)</td>
<td>Patna Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Avalokiteswara (Bronze)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>(i) Balarāma (Bronze)</td>
<td>Patna Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Buddha (Bronze)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>(i) Saraswatt Bronze, Nalanda</td>
<td>A. S. I., Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Balarāma (Bronze, Nalanda)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAPS:

1. Itinerary of Hsuen Tsang in Bihar
2. Itinerary of I-ting in Bihar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chandra</td>
<td>Candra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vaiśāli</td>
<td>Vaiśālat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>form of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Licchavis</td>
<td>Licchavia's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>HHK</td>
<td>MMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assume</td>
<td>assure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Vanity</td>
<td>Variety a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>when he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>rule</td>
<td>ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ghandrav</td>
<td>Candra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>masters</td>
<td>master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>epethet</td>
<td>epithet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dhandavaruṇendraṁ-</td>
<td>dhanadavaruṇendrānta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lakasace</td>
<td>kasamasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>types</td>
<td>types of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The</td>
<td>That</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>decomfature</td>
<td>discomfature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Devaputraḥāṭa</td>
<td>Devaputraḥāḥt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>became</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>435-36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Successors</td>
<td>Successors'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kośals</td>
<td>Kośala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Junaggarh</td>
<td>Junagarh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>fell</td>
<td>felt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>is not</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vītnasaikavitraḥ</td>
<td>Vītnasaikavitraḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>held</td>
<td>held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yueches</td>
<td>Yuechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sovereignty</td>
<td>sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>in of</td>
<td>in or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>NIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>with debased</td>
<td>in debased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>put</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>17, 24</td>
<td>Kāṭakula</td>
<td>Koṭakula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>EHND</td>
<td>EHNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>JRASIS</td>
<td>JRASNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>MNEI</td>
<td>HNEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gyaṃakṣa pataṇḍhākṛ</td>
<td>grāmākṣhapaṭaṇḍhākṛta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kumara Gupta</td>
<td>Kumāra Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mahabharata</td>
<td>Mahabhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>in in</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Raktabvija</td>
<td>Raktabija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pārvati</td>
<td>Pārvati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lakottara</td>
<td>lokottara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>strength</td>
<td>strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>due</td>
<td>due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nirvāṇa</td>
<td>Nirvāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>escription</td>
<td>ascription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vaiśālī</td>
<td>Vaiśālī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>C. 76</td>
<td>C. 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>conspicuous</td>
<td>conspicuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>unioj</td>
<td>junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>later</td>
<td>Latter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>The Apsad inscription</td>
<td>(to be Deleted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>compers</td>
<td>Kumāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gupta came out Victorious</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>ditya, Jayapida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>hagemony</td>
<td>hegemony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>statesman</td>
<td>statesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Thus</td>
<td>These</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saujan</td>
<td>Sanjan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sonapura</td>
<td>Somapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nara Narayana</td>
<td>N(u)jna-Narayana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dulaka</td>
<td>Dutka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brahmanical</td>
<td>Brahmanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mudguagiri</td>
<td>Muddagiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Karpaṭakakudabhushana</td>
<td>Karpaṭakakubhushana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shajna</td>
<td>Ghajna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pithpati</td>
<td>Pithipati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>became</td>
<td>came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hemmana Kesara</td>
<td>Kesara, Hansana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mannikesa</td>
<td>Masanikesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>shows that</td>
<td>shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>how</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>step</td>
<td>steep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rudramna</td>
<td>Rudramana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lakshmisarai</td>
<td>Lakhisarai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>dynasty</td>
<td>dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>boasted</td>
<td>boasted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>UKM</td>
<td>DKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>of the</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Napal</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>issued</td>
<td>been issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Viceroy's</td>
<td>Victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vardhana</td>
<td>Vardhana and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Punyāloka</td>
<td>Punyāvaloka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ballā</td>
<td>Ballāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>malles</td>
<td>Mallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td>period and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HBORI</td>
<td>ABORI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DKNI</td>
<td>DHNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ABORT</td>
<td>ABORI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>deśapa</td>
<td>dasapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>indication</td>
<td>indication in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>naibandhoka</td>
<td>Naibandhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kasapādhyaksha</td>
<td>Karaṇādhyakṣī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>proved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>returnor</td>
<td>return of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td>maintenance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>vary</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>jñanapada</td>
<td>Jñānapāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>sadhana</td>
<td>Sadhanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>jñanapada</td>
<td>Jñānapāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sankrityayaña</td>
<td>Rahul Sankrityayana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>pahudhā</td>
<td>Pahudhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Samantabhadra</td>
<td>Samantabhadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thithi</td>
<td>rithi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Śūnya</td>
<td>Śūnya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Purvabhadra</td>
<td>Purvabhadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>assert</td>
<td>assert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>anecdote</td>
<td>anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tusite</td>
<td>Tusita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>double-petalled</td>
<td>double-petalled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>mudra</td>
<td>mudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>thir</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>facility</td>
<td>felicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>rock-out</td>
<td>rock-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mannikese</td>
<td>Mannikesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Panchdet</td>
<td>Panchobh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Samgrama</td>
<td>Samgrama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>appanage</td>
<td>appanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>of the late</td>
<td>of late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>carries</td>
<td>carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hold</td>
<td>held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>For</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>beginnigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>anvil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>several</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Śiśunāga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Saharsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>They</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>terracotta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kauśāmbi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Possess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>wear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kulajam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>engraved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Narsimha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Vītrasena-Saba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barnark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>occasional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>possession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>depicting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dhanurveda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yajurveda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yajurveda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yajurveda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLATE No. 58  Rāma, Sītā, Lakshmana and Kevaṭa crossing the Gāṅgā at Śrīgaverapura (Stucco Panel, Apsad)  DAM, Bihar
PLATE No. 59 Rāma, Sita and Laksmana with Bharadvaja at Prayāga (Stucco) DAM, Bihar
PLATE No. 60  Rama, Sītā and Lakshmana crossing the Yamuna on a raft (Stucco, Aphsad)  DAM, Bihar
Plate No. 61  Rama, Sita and Lakshmana in forest (Stucco, Apisad)  DAM, Bihar
PLATE No. 62  Rāma, Sītā and Lakshmana with Vālmīki at Citrakāṭa
(Stucco, Apsad)

DAM, Bihar
PLATE No. 63  Rama and Sita with Lakshmana on top of tree
(Stucco, Apshad)
(ii) Surya (Stone)

(iii) A female attendant (Stone, Rajmahal)

PLATE NO. 09
(1) Dancing Gopasa (Stone, Eksar)
(ii) Kalyaganandara (Stone, Gaya)

PLATE No. 67 (i) Uma Maheswara (Stone, Monghyr)
PLATE No. 71

Buddha (Stone)

Indian Museum, Calcutta
PLATE No. 78  (i) Balarama (Bronze)  (ii) Buddha (Bronze)  Patna Museum
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